

MASSIVE IMMIGRATION REQUIRED TO SUSTAIN CANADA

Statistics Canada released a report on March 14, 2007 which pointed out that 2/3rds (66%) of Canada's population growth today is fueled by immigration, and that by 2030, immigration will be the only source of Canada's growth. This is due to Canada's abysmal birth rate of only 1.5 children per woman of childbearing age. We have a population today of 31.6 million and by 2050 it is estimated that we will have grown to 43 million, but any such increase will be due entirely to immigration.

At present, Canada accepts 240,000 immigrants per year, which is the highest per capita immigration rate among the industrialized countries. This distinguishes Canada from the United States, where 60% of its growth is "natural increase", due to its birth rate of 2.1 children per woman of childbearing age.

Because of our need for immigrants, Canada plans to admit between 240,000 and 265,000 immigrants in 2007. Of these, about 60% are to be economic class, meaning badly needed skilled workers, 25% family class, and 15% protected persons (refugees).

The largest sources of immigrants to Canada are, in order: China, India, Philippines, Pakistan, United States, Columbia, UK, South Korea, Iran and France.

Canada's growth is largely concentrated in a handful of metropolitan areas and their suburbs, to which 80% of our country's newcomers are attracted – especially Toronto (population of 5.1 million), Montreal (3.6 million) and Vancouver (2.1 million). Such a concentration of population, however, causes traffic congestion, higher pollution levels and over burdened public transit systems. Social tensions also rise, with strains on schools and workplaces, as newcomers struggle to adjust to a country, that, unfortunately, does a poor job of helping them. Canada will have to do a better job of integration to accommodate these newcomers, many of whom have trouble finding jobs suitable to their skills.

Unfortunately, second generation immigrants are just like native-born Canadians, in that, instead of having large families, they only have one or two children. This means that, in order for immigration to sustain Canada, we must bring in massive numbers of immigrants each year – at least twice our current level, e.g. 500,000 immigrants per year. It is a fact, however, that Canada took in 400,000 immigrants in 1913 when our population was barely 7 million! So this may not be as impossible a number as one might think.

Moreover, we cannot always count on Canada continuing to be a desirable destination for immigrants as there already is competition among other countries for educated and prosperous immigrants, i.e. Australia and Europe. Complicating matters further is the fact that China and India are currently experiencing economic booms, so there is no longer the incentive for many residents from there to emigrate to Canada.

We have to deal with these problems now.

Government Is Aware of the Problem

The current government is apparently aware of this problem. However, it has not yet found a solution to it. REAL Women found this out when we attended a consultation with the Minister of Finance, Jim Flaherty, in February, about six weeks before the budget was handed down. There were about 20 selected groups at this consultation, who were requested to put forward their concerns about the budget. REAL Women raised the demographic issue – namely, our low birth rate that will result in Canada being unable to sustain its social infrastructure in the near future. We suggested that efforts must be made by the government to include in its budget provisions to lighten the load for struggling families in order to provide an incentive for Canadians to have more children. We recommended lower taxes; splitting incomes for families; increasing financial benefits and extending maternity benefits to the

self-employed and those on contract, who are currently not eligible for maternity leave; spousal exemption to match personal exemption in the Income Tax Act; and a financial programme to allow parents to care for their disabled children (similar to the RRSP and RESP Education fund), i.e. a fund giving shelters to contributors who wish to protect their disabled children in later life: i.e. a Registered Disability Saving Plan (RDSP). We were pleased that the budget included at least two of REAL Women's recommendations: the increase in spousal exemption and the fund for disabled children.

What was interesting to us, however, was that in his summation of the discussions during the meeting, Mr. Flaherty directly referred to Canada's demographic problems, both now and in the future, and the difficulty of encouraging individuals to live away from major cities and the problem of encouraging an increase in the birth rate.

Mr. Flaherty's genuine concern about Canada's demographic problems was also reflected in his budget speech when he stated, "We need to make it more affordable for people to have children and to raise them". We couldn't agree more and are pleased that the government is not only concerned about it, but has at least attempted to assist families in their responsibilities, for example, by providing the new \$2000 child tax benefit, which will provide up to \$310 of tax relief for each child under 18 years of age, affecting more than 3 million Canadian families. Other family based benefits were also encouraging.

Abortion Creates a Demographic Deficit

One solution to our low birth rate is staring us in the face, but is never mentioned in political circles. It is that unrestricted abortion in Canada is contributing, in large part, to our demographic problem. We cannot continue killing over 100,000 of our future citizens each year without paying a heavy price. If these dispensable children had been allowed to live, they would become our future taxpayers, skilled workers and professionals and the mothers and fathers of future generations. Such a loss to Canada is incalculable.

Further Solutions to Our Demographic Deficit

It is time to look to other countries, such as France, which has implemented policies that have had some effect in raising its birth rate to 1.9 children per woman of childbearing age, which is the highest in Europe. A third of the births in France, however, are not of the French but of the new Muslim community that has moved into the country. Plainly put, France will very soon become a country that is not French! Generous tax subsidies for families in France with three or more children nonetheless has spurred a mini-renaissance in that country's birth rate. Why not apply such incentives here as well? The French government, for example, provides family allowances, which include a special allowance for parents with a handicapped child or ill child if he/she requires parental care; housing allowance to help offset housing costs; school allowance for children three to 18 years going to school, pursuing an apprenticeship program or other studies; allowance for child care at home for children under six years of age; allowance for a second child up to 20 years of age and increased allowance for each subsequent child born to that family. These many benefits make a big difference to families in France and they would to Canadian families too. Money spent to assist parents raising their children is a much better investment than a national day care plan, which will cost Canadians between \$12 - \$15 billion annually and which will not increase the birth rate. This is evidenced by the province of Quebec, even though it has provided a \$7.00 per day child care program since 1997, this has had no effect on Quebec's birth rate.

Increased family benefits is surely the direction the government should take if we are to have a higher birth rate in Canada. That, and changing our disgraceful law allowing unrestricted abortion.

OUR WAYWARD GOVERNOR-GENERAL MICHAËLLE JEAN

When former Liberal Prime Minister Paul Martin appointed Michaëlle Jean as Governor-General in August 2005, he was thrilled with his choice believing that she was the perfect candidate for the position.

Ms Jean was a French speaking CBC broadcaster in Quebec, a “woman of colour” and a naturalized Canadian from Haiti. She was also young, female and attractive. He reasoned that Canadians would be just as excited as he was over his choice.

Ms Jean’s appointment, however, appears also to have had a lot to do with partisan considerations by Mr. Martin who was concerned about several Liberal seats in Montreal at that time and believed that her appointment as a Quebec-based francophone, whose views epitomized that of the Liberal party, would be helpful to him.

It did not take long, however, for problems to emerge from his choice of Governor-General. First of all, there was that little separatism problem. Ms Jean had once cavorted on film with separatist supporters and raised a glass to Quebec independence. Her husband Jean-Daniel Lafond had written a book in which he compared the plight of Quebec to that of ex-colonial Caribbean nations struggling against “the transnational techno-capitalism Mafia”. M. Jean-Daniel Lafond is a former philosophy professor from France and currently a filmmaker in Quebec. He is supposed to be an “intellectual” so that what he writes can be very obscure and often does not make sense. Both Ms Jean and her husband were citizens of France, as well as Canada, but due to adverse comments at the time of her appointment, Ms. Jean gave up her French citizenship. Ms Jean established her left wing credentials by making a documentary in which she celebrated the 40-year rule of Cuban communist dictator Fidel Castro. These revelations led to Ms Jean making a face-saving statement saying she really did believe in Canada. What an extraordinary declaration for a Governor-General to have to make public.

Unfortunately, Ms Jean appears to be a lightweight with little or no grasp of Canadian history, culture or traditions. She also appears to have an imperfect understanding of the role of Governor-General. This institution is supposed to be the symbol of the monarchy in that Ms Jean is the Queen’s representative in Canada. The position also has vital constitutional implications, as the Governor-General has the power to dismiss a government and call on the opposition to try to form a government. It is also the Governor-General’s job to encourage, advise and warn a government, but with Ms Jean’s lack of background and separatist sympathies, there is not much advice she can give to the Prime Minister.

Ms Jean’s partisan, left-based views are also evidenced in her speeches, which are mediocre left wing nostrums without substance. They amount to a re-hashing of the left wing political agenda, whether about women suffering discrimination (see Governor-General Person’s Award, REALity January/February. 2006 p. 18) or violence (Vancouver speech, March 2006).

Canadians can live with Ms Jean’s inconsequential feminist speeches, but what we cannot accept is her political meddling. She apparently believes that it is her role to publicly scold and embarrass the government when it deviates from her own left wing agenda. For example, Ms Jean:

Hosted a private dinner party at Rideau Hall in October 2006 which was attended by outspoken critics of the Afghanistan war. The pretext for the party was to supposedly honour Afghanistan’s Prime Minister Hamid Karzai. No cabinet ministers were invited. Ms Jean is a political neophyte and lacks the experience of our seasoned and astute Queen who has been observing world events for decades. Nonetheless, Ms Jean felt competent to use her position and Rideau Hall to trespass on a political issue.

On April 16, 2007, on the occasion of the celebration of the 25-year anniversary of the Charter of Rights, Ms Jean took the opportunity to claim that vulnerable groups do not have access to the “justice system”. She also declared that Canada was at a crossroads and spoke darkly about the need to “resist the temptation to deny our fellow citizens their most basic rights”. Her comments came at the same time the Conservative party was being criticized in the House of Commons for withdrawing funding from the Court Challenges Program by both the NDP and the Liberal leader Stéphane Dion. The latter stated that if elected, he would not only restore the Court Challenges Program, but would also double its budget to \$11.2 million.

Even the Globe and Mail reacted unfavourably to Ms Jean's political incursions. It stated in an editorial on April 19, 2007:

Even if it was not her intention, she created that perception, leaving herself and her office open to allegations of partisanship.

Whether or not one agrees with the Conservative government's decision to withdraw funding from the Court Challenges Program it is a decision that the government has the right to make without getting sideswiped by the viceroy. If Ms Jean has any concerns about government policy, she should register them with the Prime Minister in the time-honoured fashion of Westminster-style government – in private, where such views belong.

When Ms Jean was appointed Governor-General, Mr. Martin stated exuberantly that with Ms Jean and her husband, Jean-Daniel Lafond, Canadians would have "two for the price of one". In this regard, Mr. Lafond's contribution to the vice-regal role is to publicly display his boredom and indifference for the position. At public events he leans, with arms folded across his chest, against anything available whether a table or a wall. He remains utterly disengaged from the proceedings. However, he is not above interfering in the background when it suits his purposes, such as the 400th anniversary of the founding of Quebec where the Governor-General's office was not welcomed. He gives the impression that he is there only on sufferance, indulging his "little woman" on her caprice as Governor-General. Ms Jean, for her part, however, is obviously having the time of her life loving the attention, the luxury, the clothes, and the travel. It is all about "me". The history, purpose and the responsibilities, apart from a few scattered trendy speeches, of her high office appear to sit lightly on her shoulders. She declined to swear in the new cabinet ministers in the January 2007 cabinet shuffle, an important part of her constitutional duties, because she wanted to spend time with her husband and daughter after returning from a trip to Africa. She has been Governor-General 18 months and still has not visited all the 10 provinces or the three territories. She has also removed the paintings of the former vice-regal appointments – many of them British royalty, to a space near the washrooms and cloak rooms and replaced them with Canadian paintings – mostly from Quebec. The history of Canada, or Rideau Hall or her predecessors apparently hold little interest for her.

Her lack of a sense of proportion about being the Governor-General was apparent when Ms Jean decided in June 2006 not to attend the 80th birthday celebration of the Queen held in London, although her counterparts from Australia and the Bahamas were there. The event included a Eucharist in St. Paul's Cathedral and a luncheon where the Queen was to give a speech. Ms Jean claimed her decision not to attend the Queen's celebration was due to a scheduling conflict in Toronto, including attending a play about her. Ms Jean reacted emotionally to the play and was moved to tears by it.

Together Ms Jean and her husband, Jean-Daniel Lafond, make quite the vice-regal pair.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

As I look around and see the changes being wrought on societies around the world, I am reminded of the ancient Chinese farewell, "May you live in interesting times." We certainly are.

You will note from this issue of REALITY some of the challenges that we are facing here in Canada. We have the media manufacturing news not just reporting it; the UN seeking ever more power to direct, control and tax sovereign nations; more than 100,000 Canadian babies being killed every year by abortion in the name of women's "choice", and the relationship of two consenting adults regardless of gender, being recognized in law as being married. It all seems so incomprehensible.

However, despite the challenges that these issues are creating, we have a responsibility to do what we can to change the outcome of them.

In some ways, it is a privilege to be involved in these challenges, as history will show that there were those in Canada who did not blindly accept these tragic events, but, instead, struggled against them.

At the time I am writing this, we do not know when the next federal election will be called. When the election is held, it will be a very crucial one. It is very important that we have men and women elected to Parliament who will vote firmly on principle, not according to the whims of the party leader and their political career. Please cast your vote for the individual candidate based on his/her values, and the candidate's readiness to support the pro-life/pro-family cause.

REAL Women will continue as always to deal with the issues as they come along, but we do need strong members of Parliament with whom we can continue to work.

Till next time!

Laurie

UNITED NATIONS OUT OF CONTROL

When the UN was established in 1945, with awesome hope and overwhelming good will, no one predicted it would become an agency that would probe and penetrate into the private and domestic lives of individuals residing in its member countries. This, however, is exactly what the UN is attempting to do. It is trying to introduce value systems, policies and practices that are alien to many, if not most, countries and which are very harmful, especially to women and girls and to their societies, in regard to abortion, homosexuality, sexual education and prostitution.

In short, the officials operating the UN are pushing for power to transform the world in accordance with their own personal belief systems. They are attempting to accomplish this by two methods:

1. Treaty Monitoring Committees

The UN human rights treaties include a provision that ratifying states must submit an official report to the UN officials who monitor the treaties every four or five years (depending on the treaty) in order to indicate whether the country has complied with the treaty provisions.

These treaty-monitoring committees are attempting to change the world to fit their own anti-life/anti-family ideologies by re-interpreting the treaties by way of "reading in" provisions that are not written in the actual text. For example, although the word "abortion" or access to sexual education and contraceptives or homosexuality are not a part of any treaty entered into within the UN system, the monitoring committees have "read in" these provisions and have repeatedly directed reporting states to implement these new-found provisions in their domestic law.

Monitoring Committee for the Women's Convention

One of the worst offenders is the monitoring committee for the Convention for the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). Although abortion is not mentioned in the CEDAW document, that committee has recommended that abortion be instituted in 37 different countries. The committee especially directs its attention to Catholic countries, such as Ireland, Malta, Poland, Peru, etc., criticizing them for their failure to provide open access to abortion.

This criticism, although not legally binding on countries, has been effective, unfortunately, in inducing some countries to change their abortion law. This occurred most recently in the Catholic country of Colombia, where its laws prohibited all abortions. A U.S. based feminist group, The Center for Reproductive Rights, located in New York, with tentacles worldwide, commenced a constitutional legal challenge of the abortion law in Colombia. The Attorney General of Colombia was extremely deferential to the criticisms by the CEDAW monitoring committee in his brief to

the court, quoting from the committee that it “noted with concern the existence of legislation criminalizing all abortions which would lead women to undergo high risk abortions”. The Attorney General also quoted from the monitoring committee when it stated that criminalizing abortion “constitutes a violation of a women’s right to equality since it violates a woman’s rights to health and life”. In its judgement, handed down on May 10, 2006, the Constitutional Court of Colombia quoted from the Attorney General’s deferential assessment of the monitoring committee’s recommendations, and even though they were merely ideological, and not based on the text of the treaty, relied on them in reaching its conclusions.

The result of this was that the Colombian court legalized abortion in cases of forced pregnancy, fetal malformation and endangerment of the life of the mother – a remarkable amendment to the abortion law, which will undoubtedly be widened further over the next few years.

Further examples of absurd recommendations of the CEDAW monitoring committee include directing China to legalize prostitution; directing Kyrgystan to legalize lesbianism; directing Belarus to cancel Mother’s Day because it “perpetuates” a negative cultural stereotype. It also criticized Ireland for allowing the Catholic Church too great a voice in public policy!

The monitoring committee for CEDAW’s “sister” treaty, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, has also had a field day re-interpreting its provisions and running amok over parental rights by extending new rights to minor children. For example, Canada has been criticized a number of times by this committee for its failure to ban the spanking of children. This, despite the fact that the Supreme Court of Canada has upheld the rights of parents to spank their children if it is reasonable under the circumstances as set out in S. 43 of the Criminal Code. Also, all polls clearly indicate by a wide margin that Canadians believe parents should have this reasonable right to discipline their children. Who are these so-called “experts,” frequently drawn from such bastions of human rights as Cuba, Saudi Arabia and China, to tell us what are acceptable practices for raising our children?

How the Monitoring Committees Acquired Influence

The influence of these treaty monitoring committees arose from a secret arrangement, made in December 1996, at Deep Cove, New York, between the heads of UN agencies and feminist NGOs at the UN. At this meeting, it was decided that monitoring committees would “re-interpret” all UN treaties so as to read into them feminist, anti-family provisions that were never written into these treaties in the first place. The document created at this meeting is called, “Round Table of Human Rights Treaty Bodies on Human Rights Approaches to Women’s Health, with a Focus on Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights.” At this meeting, the committees were also instructed to send out “special rapporteurs” (reporters) to cross the borders into countries which had ratified the treaties in order to investigate, personally, whether compliance with the committees’ interpretation of the treaties was actually taking place.

This charade is due to the fact that most UN treaties came into existence and were ratified years ago, well before the western powers’ feminist, anti-life agenda had coalesced at the UN. As a result, the treaties do not include feminist provisions so the committees are now re-interpreting the treaties to incorporate such objectives.

In September 2006, Dr. Kristina Morvai of Hungary, who has been a member of the CEDAW monitoring committee since 2002, spoke out publicly against the questionable tactics used by the CEDAW monitoring committee. She pointed out that the State Parties to CEDAW never gave authority to the committee to declare or create rights through its own interpretations of the treaty. She also confirmed that the committee is legislating in fields that are not covered by the Convention and that there are large inconsistencies, incoherency and unpredictability in the treaty monitoring committees’ positions. Dr. Morvai’s outspoken objections to the activities of the monitoring committee led to her removal from the committee.

The treaty monitoring committees, whose recommendations are non-binding and advisory only, have become so discredited that Australia, in September 2000, decided that it would no longer report to UN committees because they

consistently overstep their mandates. Canada should follow Australia's example.

The Effect of UN Recommendations and Reports

Although the recommendations by the UN treaty monitoring committees and the rapporteurs are not binding or enforceable in law, they nonetheless serve as a useful tool for feminist NGOs to pressure and embarrass governments into implementing their recommendations. In Canada, in the December and January hearings (see Reality March/April, 2007) the criticism by the treaty monitoring committee was used time and time again in the testimony before the Status of Women Standing Committee as indication that the Conservative government was "anti-women" and was denying Canadian women their equality rights" by its cut back to that agency's funding.

The Canadian Courts and UN Treaties

A further concern is that the Supreme Court of Canada has recently begun to look to UN treaties for direction in interpreting human rights in Canada, even though such legislation has not been passed under Canadian law.

That is, in order for international treaties to be enforced in Canada, they must first be enacted into domestic legislation. However, feminist Supreme Court Judge, Madame Justice Claire L'Heureux Dubé, in the 1999 case, *Law vs. Minister of Immigration*, got around this lack of domestic enactment by simply proclaiming that "the values and principles reflected in international human right laws assist in interpreting [Canadian] statutes...".

Again, in the 2004 Supreme Court of Canada decision in *Canadian Foundation for Children v. Attorney General of Canada* (the spanking case), in which REAL Women intervened, the applicant (the Foundation which opposed spanking) used the UN treaties and the "interpretation" of them by the monitoring committee as an indication that spanking children was "unreasonable" and supposedly counter to international law. Fortunately, however, in that case, the Supreme Court of Canada chose to ignore the treaty monitoring committee's interpretation and looked instead to the actual wording of the treaty itself and found that it did not explicitly ban the spanking of children. Next time we might not be so lucky.

2.UN Rapporteur (Reporters)

The United Nations has another method to try to change the values of its member nations. It has now developed the practice of retaining rapporteurs (reporters) who are supposed to be experts, selected to provide recommendations to various UN agencies and committees. An example of this was the appointment of an American so-called expert, Paul Hunt, to the Geneva based UN Human Rights Commission. In 2004, Mr. Hunt submitted a report that stated that sexual and reproductive health was an integral element of mental and physical health, and, therefore, nations had an obligation to provide abortion. He further stated, "Women with unwanted pregnancies should be offered reliable information and compassionate counselling, including information on where and when a pregnancy may be terminated legally". Mr. Hunt also stated, "As has been noted, discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation is impermissible under international human rights law".

These comments infuriated the delegates at the conference because they were deliberate misstatements. Fortunately, because of the diligent work of the pro-family NGOs and delegations, including REAL Women's representative there, Ginger Malacko, some of the more harmful statements in Mr. Hunt's report were watered down.

Nonetheless, a draft resolution was proposed by Brazil to "welcome" Hunt's Report. After extensive lobbying, this resolution was downgraded to state that Mr. Hunt's report "would be taken note of." This greatly downgraded Mr. Hunt's egregious report.

A more recent example of an unacceptable United Nations report is the 148-page report released in January 2007 by the Executive Director of UNICEF, Anne Veneman, who reported on "The State of the World's Children 2007". In fact,

her report focused instead on the supposed discrimination and disempowerment of women. One sidebar sets out the “deleterious consequences” of gender discrimination across the life cycle. Gender inequality, according to the report, is “precarious”. The report did manage finally to tie in children by stating that the achievement of gender equality makes the “world fit for children”.

In its reference to violent homes, the UNICEF Report indicated only that the perpetrators of violence could be “parents or other close family members”. The careful wording about “violent homes” and “domestic settings” totally ignored the problems that result from family breakdown and skates over the fact that fathers are not the primary abusers of their children. Of course, in this politically correct, gobbledygook document, children’s vulnerability necessitates the “primary responsibility” of the “state” to “uphold children’s rights to protection and access to services”.

This UNICEF report is, in reality, all about a left wing “women’s agenda,” albeit, papered over with slogans such as “a world fit for women is a world fit for children”.

Another example of UN tampering is the report issued by the Secretary General’s appointed “expert”, Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro, presented to the UN’s General Assembly on October 11 and 12, 2006. This report is entitled “Report on Violence Against Children” and drew on a previous United Nations report, “Global Summary of the Legal Status of Corporal Punishment of Children.” Mr. Pinheiro’s report recommended the prohibition “of all forms of violence, including corporal punishment against children.” It also recommended that the public, including children should be educated on children’s rights, and that children should participate in the development of national strategies, including making “child-friendly” reporting mechanisms. A brave new world it will be if his recommendations are ever implemented.

Conclusion

Canadians should follow the example set by Australia and cease to make their reports to treaty monitoring committees until such time as the committees stop making recommendations on ideological grounds, contrary to the actual text of the treaties.

The Canadian Ambassador to the United Nations John McNee, a professional diplomat and former Canadian Ambassador to Belgium, should be required to raise this matter of the abuse by the treaty monitoring committees with the new United Nations Secretary-General, Ban-Ki Moon.

Please write to Prime Minister Harper and Minister of Foreign Affairs Peter McKay and your MP to bring to their attention the manipulation by these treaty monitoring committees led by feminist so-called “experts.” Request that Canada no longer undergo the expense and time consuming effort of submitting reports to them. We know that Canadian feminist NGOs will be submitting their “shadow” reports to the CEDAW committee at the same time Canada makes its next official report in 2007, providing the committee with ammunition to criticize the Conservative government for its alleged anti-women policies. That is how these committees operate: they rely on feminist NGOs from member States to provide the information necessary to attack the governments of their country for not implementing feminist ideology into their domestic legislation. We do not need such nonsense.

Please write to:

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper
Office of the Prime Minister
80 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A2
Fax: 613-941-6900

The Honourable Peter McKay
Minister of Foreign Affairs Canada
125 Sussex Drive
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C2
Fax: 613-996-9709

UN MEETING OF THE COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

51st Session, New York, February 26 - March 9, 2007

By Ginger Malacko, UN Representative, REAL Women of Canada

The United Nations Commission on the Status of Women chose as its topic of review this year the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination and Violence Against the Girl Child, meaning an entire two weeks devoted to drafting an official document focused on protecting female children in every nation. This posed a unique challenge for the delegates – how to move away from the predictable women's rights discussion into something that addressed the particular needs of what is probably the most vulnerable portion of the world's population. In other words, how to deal appropriately with children's issues in a forum overrun by radical feminists. It was not at all surprising to witness Canada and the European Union attempting to load this document with language that would guarantee a right to abortion services and confidential (without parental knowledge or consent) 'sexuality' counseling to adolescents. What was surprising though, was the introduction and promotion of a neglected and highly explosive issue proposed by the United States: the Elimination of Harmful Practices of Prenatal Sex Selection and Female Infanticide.

Both compelling and urgent, this issue strikes at the heart of discrimination against women. After all, do any other rights matter if a baby girl is not allowed to live? Unfortunately, population control has been the paramount social and development issue at the UN for decades. Even though it is as divisive an issue among member nations as it ever was, and the western world and some of Asia are experiencing a serious depopulation problem, the UN organization operates as though the world's population is still its chief mandate and priority. Nowhere is this more evident than in the push for women's sexual and reproductive rights (abortion), which pervades the entire UN system. As a result, not one human rights body of the UN has given any serious consideration to the fact that an estimated one hundred million baby girls are 'missing' due to sex selective abortion and female infanticide.

Member states at the UN have been just as guilty in sweeping this issue under the rug, some for reasons more obvious than others. China, for instance, is always quick to defend this extreme method of 'family planning'. But this year China was anxious about the issue and was able to prove it has taken measures to shut down abortion clinics performing sex selective abortions. Why? Because China is experiencing the same problem that most countries worldwide are experiencing to some degree...a shortage of baby girls. India has reason to object to a real discussion on the issue of sex selective abortion since it is experiencing real problems in this regard as well. Thus, it was willing to work with the US proposal because of the acknowledged serious societal problems resulting from the decline of female births in India. If the world's greatest perpetrators of sex selective abortions were willing to examine their own practices in order to repair the demographic damage inflicted on their populations, then this obviously was the time to take action on a global level.

But for many, admitting that there is an 'unethical' side to abortion is opening the proverbial can of worms. If aborting baby girls because they are girls is wrong, then aborting baby boys because they are boys must also be wrong. Objections to gender based abortions affirm that there is no justification for taking any unwanted child's life. This is why the delegations of the European Union and New Zealand objected strenuously to the US proposal. They are a part of a group of nations that have been unceasing in their attempts to create a human right to abortion and are unwilling to discuss anything that could shed a negative light on legalization. But the imperative question for us is, where does Canada stand on the issue of sex selective abortion? Like the US, we are a conservative-led country in which abortion is legal. And, like most of the world, we are a country with a shrinking population. Further, according to Statistics Canada, the male and female births were almost even in the 1950's, but now there is a striking gap in the

number of male births compared to the number of female births. In 2006, male children under the age of 4 years made up 5.4% of the population, while female children made up only 5.1%. That works out to approximately 42,000 fewer baby girls in Canada. So this is not just a problem in developing countries that are notorious for the preferential treatment of male children. This is also a problem in the developed world, where abortion is legal and easily accessible, and people are choosing to have fewer children.

Unfortunately, the only response Canada made to the US proposal at this meeting was to stammer that maybe they could agree to it, but first they would have to make sure women's 'reproductive rights' were not compromised in any way. Canada then proceeded to work against the resolution by loading up the draft document with language that the US could not support. Canada was concerned about a 'balance'. In so saying, the Canadian delegates neatly summed up in a few words what the abortion debate is all about: the indisputable human right to life versus the debatable right to reproductive autonomy. Can these things be brought to a "balance", or are they on separate planes?

Evidence was shown at the conference that sex selection is increasingly linked to organized crime, rape kidnapping and trafficking in women and girls. Yet the Canadian delegation to deal with the subject of sex selective abortion reflected our government's reluctance to discuss abortion at all. In turn, this reflects a reluctance shared by most Canadians to re-open an issue that would force them to come out on one side or the other. Will we continue to shake our heads at China and India for their horrendous treatment of baby girls, while our own baby girls continue to go 'missing'?

At this session of the UN commission, the typical 'sexual rights' agenda lost some of its momentum as more pressing issues captured the delegates' attention. All language that could be interpreted to grant a right to abortion was removed from the document, but so was the US proposal on sex selective abortion. There is a vague, watered down paragraph that remains in the document that addresses the problems of sex selection and infanticide. This was a disappointment to many who were hoping that the issue would finally be given due consideration. But at least the nations of the world were engaged in a discussion that no one thought possible, so it is a step forward.

Now that the ill effects of legalized abortion can no longer be glossed over, it is up to concerned activists to begin a real discussion on sex selective abortion. Either there is a human right to life, which we are duty bound to protect, or there is not. And since both the UN Charter of Human Rights and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms declare that there is an inalienable right to life, we had better start talking seriously about how we are going to honor that right. And that means engaging in an honest and inclusive discussion about abortion, not just in the UN, but in this country as well.

CANADIAN DELEGATION AT UN COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN 2007

It is little wonder that Canada took such a perverse position on sex based abortions at the UN 's Commission on the Status of Women. A quick look at who was on the Canadian delegation at that meeting explains a great deal. They include:

Florence levers, Head of Delegation, Coordinator, Status of Women Canada

Henri-Paul Normandin, Alternate Head of Delegation, Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative of the Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations in New York

Julie Delahanty, Deputy Director, Human Rights, Gender Equality, Health & Population Division, Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada

Nanci-Jean Waugh, Alternate Head of Delegation, Deputy Coordinator, Status of Women Canada

Chantale Walker, Senior Policy Advisor, Human Rights, Gender Equality, Health & Population Division, Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada

Nell Stewart, First Secretary, Human Rights, Canada's Permanent Mission to the United Nations in New York

Rebecca Smith, Policy Analyst, Human Rights, Gender Equality, Health & Population Division, Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada

Stacey Douglas, Policy Analyst, Human Rights, Gender Equality, Health & Population Division, Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada

Mary-Lou Sutton, Policy Analyst, Status of Women Canada,

Marianne Fofonoff, Policy analyst, Status of Women Canada

Jennifer Myles, Policy Analyst, Gender Equality Division, Policy Branch, Canadian International Development Agency

Duy Ai Kien, Senior Policy Advisor, Gender Equality Division, Policy Branch, Canadian International Development Agency

Rawwida Baksh, Program Leader, Women's Rights and Citizenship, International Development Research Centre

Kara Mitchell, Policy Analyst, Education Division, Policy Branch, Canadian International Development Agency

Sherry Lewis, Executive Director, Native Women's Association of Canada

Nisha Lynn Sajnani, Popular Educator, Power Camp

Thérèse Mailloux, Deputy Minister Responsible for Women's Issues, Quebec

Sophie Niquette, Responsible for International Affairs Women's Issues, Quebec

It is significant that, at the April 20, 2005 meeting of the UN Human Rights Commission in Geneva, Henri-Paul Normandin (see above), who was then the Foreign Affairs Director of Human Rights, International Women's Equality Division, supported a report in support of the full recognition of abortion services and the acceptance of homosexuality.

In a consultation, held by Canadian Foreign Affairs, with Canada's NGO's, including REAL Women of Canada, on February 7, 2006, Mr. Normandin stated:

It is the responsibility and duty of those elected, as well as civil servants, to provide direction to Foreign Affairs.

When will the Conservative government rid itself of these feminist ideologues who seem to dominate the public service in Ottawa? We need a broom to sweep out the Foreign Affairs Department (among others) and its public servants who are using their positions as public servants, both within Canada and on our delegations at international conferences, to force an agenda, unbeknownst to Canadians, which destroys society and families. It is a big job to get rid of these obnoxious, unpleasant and narrow-minded public servants, but it has to be done.

The Conservative government has been in power for 16 months - how much longer before the government, rather than the public servants, take charge of Canada's international policies?

Please write to:

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper

House of Commons

Ottawa ON K1A 0A6

Fax: (613) 941-6900

Honourable Peter MacKay

Minister of Foreign Affairs

House of Commons

Ottawa ON K1A 0A6

Fax: (613) 992-2337

Your MP

House of Commons

Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A6

Raise objections to the anti-family, pro-abortion policies of Canada at international conferences. This misrepresentation of Canadians' views must stop!

BOOK REVIEW: WOMEN WHO MAKE THE WORLD WORSE

By Kate O'Beirne, Washington Editor of National Review Magazine, Published By Sentinel, \$18.50

Kate O'Beirne has written a lively book about feminism with the deliciously appropriate title, "Women Who Make the World Worse". Her sharp mind, sparkling wit and insights pinpoint the lack of logic and many contradictions in the feminist agenda. She points out that the feminist movement is totalitarian in its methods, radical in its aims, and dishonest in its advocacy. She states that feminists employ coercion through the courts to enforce their unpopular agenda, such as abortion and gender quotas because their militant agenda is not supported by the general public.

In her book, Kate O'Beirne discusses how radical feminists have weakened the family and made fathers disposable items. The well being of children never takes precedence over the desires of feminists. The latter ignore the benefits of marriage, such as better health, higher satisfaction with life, financial stability and greater sexual satisfaction – all of which are verifiable facts.

Kate O'Beirne is at her best when discussing women serving in combat roles in the military. She agrees that women do admirable service in non-combat positions, thereby freeing men to be on the front lines, but she believes they should not serve in combat positions. She states on page 113:

Feminists knew that winning the 'right' for women to kill and be killed beside men would be a triumph over far more than women's limited career options. It would be a successful challenge to masculinity and the male imperative to protect the weaker sex. The aim is to deny that a soldier's attributes of physical courage, aggression, and risk-taking are quintessential male traits.

She goes on to make the point that in the name of phony equality, women are being asked to serve in combat duty when they do not have an equal chance to survive. She gives as an example, U.S. Private Jessica Lynch, who, before being rescued by the U.S. military, was continuously raped by her captors:

... the right arm was shattered between her shoulder and her elbow, and the compound fracture shoved slivers of bone through muscles, nerves and skin, leaving her right hand all but useless. Her spine was fractured in two places, causing nerve damage that left her unable to control her kidneys or bowels. Her right foot was crushed. Her left leg had broken into pieces above and below the knee...and left her without feeling in that limb.

The medical records of Private Lynch do not indicate whether she was sexually assaulted before or after sustaining her grave injuries, but Newsweek reported that U.S. military intelligence officers believe Lynch's injuries were inflicted after she and other survivors surrendered. Three sources claimed she was standing, with minor injuries, when she surrendered. An Iraqi surgeon explained, "Her injuries appeared to have been inflicted by a severe beating, probably with rifle butts."

The media celebratory coverage of this teenager's rescue delicately avoided what she must have endured. According to Kate, it is typical that:

Snapshots of sanitized yellow-ribbon moments reassure the public – and hide the reality of violence against America's daughters.

Feminists imply that women serving in combat are merely carrying out work that is an extension of working outside the home. Of the 213,059 women in the U.S. military on active service over 24,000 are single mothers and there are 29,000 married women with children, and it is the children who are casualties of war. According to Kate O'Beirne, the military is increasingly a mecca for single parents since it provides a tempting safety net of benefits, including health care and housing. As a result, a significant number of deployed parents are leaving behind children who pay a heavy price when their mothers or fathers are called to active duty abroad.

Kate points out that although feminists maintain there are no differences between the sexes in the military, they believe women in the workplace are frail creatures with special vulnerabilities that are particularly affected by coarse behaviour. Any sexual overture in the workplace, according to feminists, is a cause for alarm and leads to rape that requires strict sexual harassment laws.

In short, the feminist position on integrating combat ranks puts feminists in the position of saying violence against women is a terrible thing unless it is at the hands of the enemy, in which case it is a welcome tribute to women's equality.

Kate O'Beirne's book includes a chapter on day care in which she points out that feminists and their sister child care operators (an industry worth \$36 billion U.S. per year) engage in deceit and censorship to prevent an honest assessment of what a decade of research tells us about the effect of substitute care on children. She states that, "consistent research findings show child care is physically and emotionally harmful to children, but few experts are brave enough to risk the wrath of feminists and the day care establishment". According to Kate, "feminist intimidation has created plenty of cowards".

Kate calls abortion the feminist "holy grail" and says modern feminism's biggest enemies are the smallest humans. She asserts that feminist fundamentalism believes that they cannot win the battle of the sexes unless women make war on these tiniest of human beings. Yet, according to Kate, a 2003 poll commissioned by the feminist Center for the Advancement of Women found that 51 percent of women felt that abortion should be available only in cases of rape or incest or to save the life of the mother. Only 30% support the feminist position.

In the chapter entitled "Mother Nature is a Bitch", Kate O'Beirne points out that the very real differences between men and women have nothing to do with cultural "conditioning", as asserted by feminists, as Mother Nature apparently hasn't read the feminist script. According to Kate, the differences between men and women occur to assist mankind, not hinder the feminist agenda. For example, women's nurturing ability and men's testosterone, making them assertive and protective, are all characteristics necessary for the survival of society. As stated by Kate, "All of these women who make the world worse by waging a destructive war between the sexes are at war with Mother Nature."

Kate O'Beirne's book analyses the weird world of feminism. It's a great read!

GLOBE AND MAIL CREATES NEWS RATHER THAN REPORTING IT

One thing is clear – the Globe and Mail cannot stand having Mr. Harper and the Conservatives in power. The newspaper obviously longs for the day when the Liberals, Canada's supposedly "natural governing party", will repossess the mantle and Crown of government to set Canada back on the right – that is, the left-track again. The newspaper is doing all it can to make this happen.

This is proving to be tough sledding for the Globe & Mail, however, because of the confusing flip flops by Liberal leader, Stéphane Dion. Mr. Dion is trying to move his party to the left - presumably to out-manoeuvre the NDP and Green parties. This has resulted, however, in the three major left-wing parties falling all over one another in a confused heap on the left, making it difficult to discern where each of the parties stands on which policy. Also, Mr. Dion is experiencing dissent within his own caucus over Canadian troops in Afghanistan, the renewal of some provisions to the Terrorist Act, and the environment. Further, Mr. Dion has not soared in the public's estimation because of his flip flops on issues earning him the moniker of "Flipper".

Despite this, the Globe & Mail is still striving to re-live the giddy days it experienced during the June 2004 election when it managed to portray Mr. Harper as "scary" by resurrecting an old interview by Conservative MP Bob Merrifield (Yellowhead), who had put forward the not unreasonable notion that women should have counseling before they undergo an abortion. The Globe & Mail built this old news into new news by repeating the story and all derivatives

thereof, day after day during the 2004 election – managing to convey an image of Mr. Harper and his party as being scary, right-wing extremists. Pro-abortion organizations, right on cue, did their bit to assist the Globe & Mail by holding press conferences, etc. about how Mr. Harper will surely set back the clock for women on abortion. Never mind that Mr. Harper said no such thing – but there you have it – spin and fantasy over fact is the Globe & Mail's apparent delight in order to manipulate the outcome of the election.

To resume its glory days and pursue its objective of undermining the credibility of the Conservatives, the Globe & Mail has been trying very hard to build a case against Mr. Harper. It first tried, in blaring headlines, to show that Mr. Harper had no interest in the environment and that he was ignoring the Kyoto Treaty on the environment that Canada had ratified. Unfortunately, this avenue faltered for the Globe & Mail when Mr. Harper piously put on a mantle of green and expressed his heart-felt concerns about the environment, and put his “bull dog” Minister John Baird in charge of the environment portfolio. Also, Mr. Harper pointed out that Stéphane Dion, when he was the Liberal Minister of the Environment, had achieved - well nothing – to improve the environment or enforce the Kyoto Treaty. It did not help either that Mr. Dion had previously admitted to the press that the Kyoto objectives were not achievable. In short, Mr. Harper expressed his deep sorrow over the state of the environment and that he, at least, was willing to do something about it (unlike the Liberals).

So, the environment issue did not do the trick of undermining the Conservatives.

The Globe & Mail then had to turn to another “terrifying” tale about the Conservatives – this time that the Conservatives were actively placing some conservatives as well as police representatives on the committees that advise the Prime Minister on judicial appointments. The advisory committees, called Judicial Advisory Committees (JAC), had previously been filled to the brim with Liberal appointees. The Globe & Mail's shocking news was picked up by several other newspapers but the story did not have “legs” in view of the fact that the Liberals were even more partisan in their selections to the JAC's and in their judicial appointments than the Conservatives.

The Globe and Mail was quickly inundated with letters and articles pointing out its hypocrisy: why did it not express concerns about the Liberal government's bias in its appointments to the bench when it was in power? The Globe & Mail was soon spinning in deep waters, and therefore began a tactical retreat on the Conservatives' judicial appointments story.

At the time of this writing, the Globe & Mail is still looking around for further inspiration for a new avenue to attack the Conservatives. Meanwhile, while we wait for its next great exposé on the Conservatives, the Globe & Mail should be reminded that its role is to report the news, not to make it. The newspaper's credibility is at rock bottom with its clumsy maneuvering.

Apology for Canada's Same-sex Marriage Legislation

Pro-family groups in Canada believe it is necessary to apologize to the people of the world for the difficulties caused in other countries by the legislation in Canada which permits same-sex marriages to non-residents. Same-sex couples having gone through a form of marriage in Canada are bringing their “marriages” to the courts in their own country to have them recognized as legally valid. Courts in Ireland and the UK have refused this legal recognition. However, recently, the New York Supreme Court recognized a Canadian same-sex marriage. This case is now on appeal. According to 2003 Statistics Canada, 55% of same-sex marriages performed in BC have been granted to foreign couples. The apology was included in a media release distributed by REAL Women of Canada on April 11th, 2007. The apology is to be delivered to the world leaders, to the UN and will be distributed at the World Congress of Families in Warsaw in May. Below are the media release and the apology.

Media Release

It is unfortunate that some foreign same-sex partners have come to Canada to participate in same-sex marriage

ceremonies and subsequently applied to the courts in their own country to recognize this so-called Canadian marriage. Canadian marriage law does not demand residency requirements and this is being used by activists to attempt to change the marriage laws in their own country.

There are also many Canadians who do not, and will not, accept the marriage of same-sex partners. Such Canadians will continue to work to restore the traditional definition of marriage defined as being between a man and a woman only. To do so is not to discriminate against same-sex partners, since their relationships are markedly different from those of opposite-sex relationships, regardless of what the law in Canada states.

The unfortunate results of the change in the legal definition of marriage in Canada, which came about not by the will of the people, but rather through the manipulation of the vote by both the former Liberal governing party and some of the opposition parties, have now become apparent. The insistence that children in public schools be provided with biased and inaccurate information on the homosexual issue, and the continuous attack, by way of the courts and by current provincial government policies, on those who oppose same-sex marriage are but two examples of the detrimental effects of same-sex marriage in Canada.

Canadians who do not accept the same-sex marriage legislation, and who grasp the ramifications of this legislation, both here and abroad, wish to apologize to the world by way of correspondence with the world leaders and the UN as well as other avenues, for the same-sex marriage legislation passed in Canada, and to give warning to other nations of the problems that this legislation is creating.

Apology To the World's Leaders and People,

We, the people of Canada who support marriage solely as the union of a man and a woman, apologize to the people of the world for harm done through Canada's legislation of homosexual marriage.

We are grieved and troubled as we consider the impact this is having in weakening the fundamental institution of marriage in countries and cultures around the world. We understand that because Canada does not impose citizenship or residency requirements in order for same-sex individuals to be "married" here, couples are coming to Canada to seek legal sanction for their homosexual relationships with the intent of returning to their own countries to challenge those countries' legal definition of marriage.

We understand that Canada is seen by people around the world as a country in which public policy is developed carefully and judiciously. It would, therefore, be a natural assumption that in legalizing homosexual marriage our government and courts thoroughly considered the implications of this action through proper and extensive study of social sciences and facts. But it is essential that the people of the world understand that this was not the case. Our government and courts only considered adult "rights." Among other things, religious rights, adoption, the economy and family law were never fully considered. Changes were implemented quickly and without a genuinely free vote in our federal parliament.

Our warning to you, the people of the world, is to learn from our mistakes and avoid repeating them in your own countries.

Forewarned should be forearmed.

Groups who endorsed statement:

REAL Women of Canada
Canada Family Action Coalition
United Families Canada
Christian Heritage Party of Canada
Third Watch Ministries

United Mothers, Fathers & Friends
Sault Ste. Marie - CFAC
Dawn Stefanowicz - Author
MY Canada Association
Father's Resting Place