



REALISTIC + EQUAL + ACTIVE + FOR LIFE

THE CONTROVERSY OVER INCOME SPLITTING

Please encourage the Conservative government to maintain its policy of income splitting, or another policy to end the discrimination against single-income families.

During the 2011 federal election campaign, Prime Minister Stephen Harper stated that as soon as the budget was balanced, his government would provide income splitting for single-income families. He stated that the Conservative government was committed to ... “take an historic step forward to achieve greater fairness for families ... tax sharing for couples with dependent children under 18 years of age ... [this would be] ... significant tax relief for approximately 1.8 million Canadian families—each of them saving, on average, \$1,300 per year ... to ensure that the federal income tax system respects and supports the choices that families make.”

In the February, 2014 budget, Minister of Finance Jim Flaherty, announced that the budget would be balanced by the 2015 federal election, expected in October, 2015.

However, in the days following his budget speech, Mr. Flaherty sent out strong signals that the income splitting wasn't such a good idea. He stated that such a policy...“benefits some parts of the Canadian population a lot and other parts of the Canadian population virtually not at all”. This same argument, however, could be made for any number of tax provisions. For example, child tax benefits are paid only to parents with children under six years of age, even though the cost of raising children increases with the child's age and, as a consequence, such parents need the child tax benefit even more. Further, income splitting, it is argued, by mostly left-wing think tanks, would disproportionately benefit only upper income couples. Of course, it would because people who pay little or no tax are not hit by the unfairness of the present tax system. According to The School of Public Policy (University of Calgary), the one-income family earning \$70,000 a year pays 30% more in taxes than the double-income family earning the same amount. This is unacceptable to fair minded Canadians, therefore, to end this discrimination, a change to the income tax system is required.

The problem seems to be that the unfairness in question is applied to traditional couples, i.e. in which one partner is employed only part time or not at all, so that the family's whole income is earned by the employed partner, who likely faces a higher marginal tax rate on his/her income. Apparently the objection to income splitting is based on the premise that treating upper income people unfairly is the best way to tax the population!

It also seems to be based on the notion that women must be encouraged to return to the paid workforce and not “waste” their time at home, especially since today's labour market has a shortage of skilled workers and more taxes are required to cover the costs of an aging population.

REAL Women responded positively to the proposed policy of income splitting when it was announced, in 2011, as a solution to discrimination in the tax system against single-income families.

On February 19th, 2014 we sent an urgent letter to the Conservative Members of Parliament requesting that the Conservative party maintain its proposed policy of income splitting.

We requested that the government address the income splitting controversy by focussing on the main problem: the present tax system discriminates against the single-income family. We were concerned that a spokesman for the Department of Finance, responding to one of the left-wing think tanks, wrote: “While it's no surprise that a left-wing think tank would be advocating against a tax cut, our Conservative government takes pride in reducing taxes for Canadian families.”

CONTENTS

THE CONTROVERSY OVER INCOME SPLITTING	PAGE 1
UN OBSESSED WITH SEX	PAGE 2
THE FAMILY DINNER TABLE	PAGE 4
CRTC GIVES SUN NEWS A BREAK	PAGE 5
INTERESTING COMMENTS SOME PEOPLE HAVE MADE	PAGE 5

This statement does not support income splitting as a measure to provide equity in family taxation. The spokesperson's statement changes the discussion by talking about "reducing taxes" for families, instead of talking about eliminating discrimination against single-income families.

In Canada, division of income, tax sharing, or income splitting is now applied in the Canada Pension Plan, Goods and Services Tax credits, spousal RRSPs, senior's pension income, and for self-employed spouses and farmers. Family income splitting is a legitimate form of tax sharing that can remedy the disparity in taxes paid by sole and dual earner families with the same income.

We requested that the Conservative government remedy the divisive issue of discrimination against single-income families due to the tax advantages currently given to two-income families. We did suggest, however, that this can be accomplished by either a policy of income splitting or by some other equally effective policy. That is, we are open to other solutions to correct this persistent tax discrimination against single-income families.

On February 25, 2014, Prime Minister Stephen Harper, under questioning by the opposition parties in the House of Commons hinted that the policy of income splitting was

still on the table. He stated that: "Income splitting has been a good policy for seniors in Canada, and it will also be a good policy for Canadian families".

Please encourage the Conservative government to maintain its policy of income splitting, or another policy to end the discrimination against single-income families.

Please write to:

The Right Honourable Stephen Harper
Office of the Prime Minister
80 Wellington Street
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A2

The Honourable James Flaherty
Minister of Finance
House of Commons
Centre Block Building - Room 435-S
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

Your own MP
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6 ‡

UN OBSESSED WITH SEX

At every opportunity, UN agencies ... as well as anti-life NGO's are incessantly scheming, manipulating and deceiving, trying to impose sexual policies world-wide

With never-ending disasters happening around the world—earthquakes, typhoons, uprisings, epidemics, famine—one would assume that the UN had its hands full. Instead, the UN gives priority to sexual issues—abortion, homosexuality and birth control.

At every opportunity, UN agencies such as the UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA), UN bureaucrats, and the UN treaty monitoring committees, as well as anti-life NGO's are incessantly scheming, manipulating and deceiving, trying to impose sexual policies world-wide, using the mechanisms of the UN.

The UN agencies especially obsessed with the sex agenda include:

THE UN FUND FOR POPULATION ACTIVITIES (UNFPA)

The UN agency, UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) is the paramount agency at the UN pushing sexual issues. Without exaggeration, the UNFPA is downright sinister.

UNFPA refuses to subject its books to an independent audit and also refuses to share specific budget reporting to its board of directors. Its annual report asserts that in 2008, almost half of UNFPA's program expenses went to "reproductive health programs" (abortion) at a cost of \$165.1 million, up from \$146.6 million the previous year in all five regions.

An example of UNFPA's disgraceful behaviour occurred over this past year, when UNFPA hosted, around the world, a series of meetings at a cost of millions of dollars, to prepare for the 20th anniversary of the UN Conference on Population and Development, which took place in Cairo in 1994. UNFPA packed all these meetings with abortion advocates. One of these meetings took place in Bali in December, 2012. It was called the "Global Youth Forum". The final declaration of this Bali meeting purported to represent what all youth of the world want, namely, abortion on demand, gay, lesbian and transgender rights, and legalized prostitution, among other demands. The meeting, however, was a fraud.

Attending this three-day youth conference were delegates who were not representative of any government, but participants selected by a committee featuring several pro-abortion organizations, such as Planned Parenthood. Less than half of the attendees at this Youth Forum even showed up for the main sessions. The young attendees were given lengthy briefing papers from which they were to make their recommendations. It was scarcely the voice of "youth" but rather, the voice of UNFPA, which had set up this propaganda conference.

When UNFPA presented these phony results from the Youth Forum to the UN General Assembly, the latter barely even acknowledged the document. In fact, UN diplomats refused to even officially "Take Note" of the document. They knew it was a set up by UNFPA.

- In its annual report in 2009, UNFPA highlighted the organization's work on maternal health and its "continued efforts to ensure the universal access to reproductive health [abortion]"

and the right of all people to decide the number and timing of their children”.

- In its 2011 annual report, UNFPA insisted that access to abortion, sex education and birth control must become international human rights.
- In November, 2013, UNFPA released its report on population, which targeted adolescents. The report, “Motherhood in Childhood: Facing the Challenge of Adolescent Pregnancy”, denounced government failure to recognize a girl’s human right to sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights—including abortion.

UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon held a press conference in February, 2014, lending his clout to this controversial agency with its abortion/contraceptive policies. It is the western countries, such as the EU & the U.S., which provide most of the funding for the UN, and which want these policies implemented. The Secretary General knows which “friends” to support.

Delegates to the UN General Assembly have become weary of arguing over these sexual issues and especially, UNFPA’s harsh manipulation and insistence that abortion and sexual rights be introduced into countries which have no wish to be pushed in this direction. Yet UNFPA continues relentlessly in pursuit of these issues.

In 2012-2013 Canada gave \$43 million dollars to UNFPA.

THE UNITED NATIONS OFFICE OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS (OHCHR)

This UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights has an obsession with lesbian, gay, bi-sexual and transgender (LGBT) rights. It is from the OHCHR that LGBT activism is spearheaded at the UN.

The purpose of this UN agency is supposedly to protect and promote all human rights. This agency is a part of the UN Secretariat with its head office in Geneva. It also has offices at the UN headquarters in New York and in numerous other countries and regions. The agency employs more than 850 staff and includes a work force of some 240 international human rights officers. It is funded from the UN’s regular budget and from voluntary contributions.

OHCHR has produced a 60-page booklet entitled: *Born Free and Equal* which falsely states that UN treaties provide “core legal obligations” regarding homosexuality, which included asylum for LGBT people, as well a requirement to extend marriage to same-sex couples.

In November, 2013, Russia, Ethiopia, Poland, and Malta chastised this human rights office and its unending push for LGBT rights. Russia was especially incensed by this agency and its controversial pamphlet, stating that the amount of attention this human rights office spends on sexual orientation is “disproportionately high” and that “there are more topical issues in the world for us to deal with”.

Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of African countries, complained about the increasing trend by OHCHR “to create new

rights concepts, and categories and standards that are not recognized” in international agreements nor by all countries.

UN TREATY MONITORING COMMITTEES

OHCHR is also responsible for the UN treaty monitoring committees, sometimes referred to as “compliance committees”. An entire division in OHCHR is dedicated to servicing these monitoring committees to which countries must report every few years to indicate they have complied with the treaties. Because these so-called experts on the monitoring committees don’t receive a salary and dedicate only a few weeks of the year to monitoring the reports, much of this work is done at OHCHR, which produces and analyses these reports received from state governments. These monitoring committees never miss an opportunity to criticize governments for their failure to implement sexual policies not even mentioned in the treaties, such as abortion and homosexual rights.

In short, these treaty monitoring committees are a fraud. This is due to the fact that at Deep Cove, New York, in December, 1996, UN agencies, such as UNFPA, WHO (World Health Organization), UNICEF (Children’s Emergency Fund), and OHCHR, as well as feminist NGOs held a private meeting during which they decided that the treaty monitoring committees would be used to promote the feminist agenda, regardless of the actual wording and intent of the treaties. The agreement was spelled out in a document called “Round Table on Human Rights Treaty Bodies”.

For example, the Committee monitoring the “Convention for the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women” (CEDAW) has pressured more than 90 countries over 120 times to liberalize abortion laws even though this Convention does not mention abortion, nor does any other UN treaty. Other feminist demands, such as national day care plans, legalized prostitution, access to birth control and homosexual rights are also being promoted regularly by the CEDAW Committee.

The most recent example of UN Committees exerting pressure for abortion occurred when the Constitutional Court of Bolivia reviewed that country’s abortion law. Two UN Committees had pressured Bolivia’s courts to decriminalize abortion. Fortunately, the court ignored these demands in its decision, handed down in February, 2014.

The plan is that these UN committees put pressure on the domestic courts of countries to strike down the nation’s laws on abortion whereby the UN is then able to argue that there is now an international customary norm on abortion. So far they have not been successful in this plan. Only two high courts in Latin America, Columbia and Argentina, have recognized the suggestions of UN monitoring committees on abortion as authoritative or binding. Most courts, including the high courts of Mexico, Peru, and Chile, have declined to follow the recommendations of UN monitoring committees on abortion.

These offensive UN treaty monitoring committees must either be removed or reformed. Until changes are made to these committees, Canada and other sensible countries

should refuse to report to them. Australia has refused to do so since the year 2000.

UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

The UN Human Rights Council is located in Geneva, Switzerland, and is responsible, supposedly, for strengthening and promoting the protection of human rights around the globe, as well as monitoring human rights violations.

The Council is made up of 47 United Nation member states. In November, 2013, Cuba, China, Vietnam and Saudi Arabia were elected members of this Council. These countries are well known for their human rights violations, which altogether undermine the Council's credibility.

The UN Human Rights Council is also a launching pad for sexual issues. For example, in March, 2013, the Council debated the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Based on a report submitted to the Council, it recommended that children's health include the right to comprehensive sexual education and access to "confidential sexual and reproductive services, including abortion". The report also recommended that children using illicit drugs have available to them "harm reduction" strategies, including free needle exchanges, drug injection sites, etc. Finally, the report recommended that any social and cultural values, that require parental and/or spousal consent, be rejected on the basis that children should make their own decisions on sexual matters.

Fortunately, these alarming recommendations were solidly rejected by large groups of states, such as the African Group, the Arab Group and the Organization of Islamic Conferences (OIC).

This rejection, however, will not stop the Council from pushing forward with sexual issues.

CONCLUSION

Although the UN has a humanitarian role to play, such as providing refugee camps and health care, such as inoculations, the reality is that it is a corrupt and dysfunctional organization. It is being used by the wealthy nations, who fund it, as a tool to change the values, cultures, and religions of the member states of the UN, contrary to the UN's Charter, which provides that nation states retain their sovereignty and independence. This is not happening at the UN today.

What can be done about the UN? For one thing we should curtail our generous funding to it. Currently, Canada is the seventh largest financial supporter of the UN. Also, Canada should continue to demand reforms at the UN. Until such time as these reforms take place, Canada should regard the UN, its treaties (which are being malevolently interpreted by UN committees) with scorn. We should also refuse to play into the committees' agendas by submitting our treaty reports to them. It is a waste of time and expense to do so, as these reports only serve as fodder to encourage the committees to criticize Canada and to press on with their own agenda. †

THE FAMILY DINNER TABLE



According to researchers¹ at Cornell University, children who regularly eat dinner with their families have fewer depressive symptoms, lower substance abuse and engage in fewer delinquent acts.

The researchers believe that eating together protects a child from depression and risky behaviours by providing a regular and comforting context to check in with parents about their day-to-day activities and to connect with them emotionally.

The researchers, however, warn that participating in family dinners is not sufficient in itself, but, rather, is part of a "broader package" of family dynamics which protects children. This broader package includes:

1. biological parents present;
2. a mother devoted to homemaking not to outside employment; and
3. higher income.

That is, two of three beneficial factors for children are a stay-at-home mother and higher income, factors which may not be present in many families. Also, many families, which have none of these benefits, still manage to successfully raise their children.

It is a fact, however, that left-wing think tanks object to the important work of stay-at-home mothers, suggesting that

a policy, such as income splitting, will discourage women from re-entering the paid workforce. Apparently, this is a problem for them since they see more value in mothers working in the paid workforce than at home.

Further, if priority is given to both parents working outside the home, then we are asking others to teach our children morals, values and ethics, i.e., we are outsourcing our children. Significantly, successful families, whether with a parent at home or both parents working in the paid workforce, provide much more academic and vocational success than other social institutions or programs.

Unfortunately, higher rates of divorce, out-of-wedlock births, and few maternal options in regard to employment can only multiply the number of troubled adolescents, because the package of family support is missing from their lives.

Consequently, when determining government programs, officials should give this Cornell University study serious consideration and provide genuine assistance to families by way of splitting income and lowering taxation to provide more flexibility for families.

ENDNOTE

1. Kelly Musick and Ann Meier, "Assessing Causality and Persistence in Associations Between Family Dinners and Adolescent Well-Being," *Journal of Marriage and Family* [2012]: 476-93.

CRTC GIVES SUN NEWS A BREAK

Although the recent CRTC decision did not provide Sun News with a favourable placement on the dial, it did, nonetheless, make it more broadly available to Canadians.

When Sun News Network (SNN), which has a mostly conservative perspective, came on the media scene in April, 2011, the left wing Liberals heaped scorn on it. They were concerned that Sun News would interfere with their private monopoly, promoting only a left-wing perspective in the news. They were correct in their assumption, as Sun News has, indeed, provided a different perspective in its broadcasts.

However, the CRTC, perhaps reacting to the concerns of the hysterical left, did restrict Sun News' license to broadcasting only on specialty channels. Sun News was also placed on the upper end of the dial, which made it difficult for viewers to find. As a result, SNN was seen in only four out of ten Canadian homes and could not compete with the well-established CBC and CTV news networks. Quebecor, which owns SNN, was losing \$17 million each year. This could not continue.

Consequently, SNN applied to CRTC for "mandatory carriage" which was granted to CBC and CTV news when they were started. This would mean that all cable providers

would be required to carry SNN programming.

In August, 2013, the CRTC refused SNN's request for mandatory carriage. However, the Chairman of CRTC, Jean-Pierre Blais, did state, at that time, that news channels provide an important public service and that Canada should be exposed to different opinions and perspectives, inferring that this was not occurring under the present broadcasting system. The CRTC promised a new ruling on TV news broadcasting by the end of the year.

True to its word, on December 19, 2013, the CRTC ruled that television providers must make all channels devoted to national news available to their subscribers and even offer "stand alone" or an "a la carte" system to the public so that there would be an individual choice for subscribers. This is in contrast to the present system, whereby channels are bundled into packages for the viewers, whether they want to view them or not. Although the recent CRTC decision did not provide Sun News with a favourable placement on the dial, it did, nonetheless, make it more broadly available to Canadians, since all television providers must now carry SNN in their offerings, effective March 19, 2014. It's at least an incrementally positive change for SNN, which can now be placed in a more competitive position with the CBC and CTV news broadcasters. †

INTERESTING COMMENTS SOME PEOPLE HAVE MADE

Margaret Sanger, Founder of Planned Parenthood—"Plan for Peace" from *Birth Control Review* (April, 1932, pp. 107-109):

The most merciful thing that a large family does to one of its infant members is to kill it.

We should apply a stern and rigid policy of sterilization and segregation to that grade of population whose progeny is tainted, or whose inheritance is such that objectionable traits may be transmitted to offspring.

Hillary Clinton, U.S. Secretary of State (2008-2013) and likely Democratic candidate in the 2016 presidential election, awarded Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Margaret Sanger Award, March 27, 2009:

I admire Margaret Sanger enormously, her courage, her tenacity, her vision ... when I think about what she did all those years ago... ...I am really in awe of her.

Margaret Thatcher—British Prime Minister (1979—1990), Sage Magazine, 1998:

Look you can't have everything, it has been a great privilege being Prime Minister, ... Yes, I wish I saw more of my children ... But I can't regret. And I haven't lost my

children. They have their own lives. I took a different life.

Kathy Dunderdale—Premier of Newfoundland - LifeSite News, April 25, 2013:

I particularly understand, how pornography contributes to violence against women and the degradation of women, and let me tell you, I am not going to be associated with anything that promotes that kind of behaviour.

Daniel Villarreal—Homosexual Activist - Homosexual online magazine "Queerty", May 12, 2011:

That's a lie that homosexuals do not want to indoctrinate children. We want educators to teach future generations of children to accept queer sexuality. In fact, our very future depends on it. Recruiting children? You bet we are. In fact, [our] aim is to increase not only the acceptance, but also the practice of homosexuality in future generations.

Masha Gessen—Lesbian Journalist April 6, 2013 <http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/lifematters/why-get-married/4058506>):

It's a no-brainer that we should have the right to marry, but I also think equally that it's a no-brainer that the institution of

marriage should not exist... Fighting for gay marriage generally involves lying about what we are going to do with marriage when we get there—because we lie that the institution of marriage is not going to change, and that is a lie.

Robin Perelle, Managing Editor, Xtra Vancouver (formerly Xtra! West) October 20, 2011 Issue:

...the gay rights movement is shifting norms in Canada. And with that comes a message to those who won't evolve: your outdated morals are no longer acceptable, and we will teach your kids the new norm.

Gareth Kirkby, Editor, Publisher, Producer and Engagement Director at Homosexual Pink Triangle Press—Daily Xtra, July 25, 2012

Until ... church and state have been pushed back from regulating people's choices and imposing morality, and the Christian heritage is wiped from our legal codes.

And until countries around the world, including the particularly homophobic former British colonies, recognize sex- and gender-based rights and freedom for all—our work will not be done.

Bertrand Russell, Philosopher and Atheist—"Marriage and Morals" (1929):

But for children, there would be no need of any institution concerned with sex. It is through children alone that sexual relations become of importance to society, and worthy to be taken cognizance of by a legal institution.

Julian Fantino, former Minister of Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)—Embassy (Canada's Foreign Policy Newspaper) June 26, 2013:

Nearly half of the world's population is currently under

the age of 25, with the majority living in the developing world. This demographic shift presents both an opportunity and a challenge.

Youth in developing countries are an incredible resource. They have the potential to make great contributions to their communities, countries, and economics. But when they cannot be agents of positive change, they can often become victims.

Stephen Colbert, Writer, Comedian, Television Host: Stephen Colbert Quotes www.brainyquote.com/quotes/authors/s/stephen_colbert.html:

Truthiness is tearing apart our country, and I don't mean the argument over who came up with the word. I don't know whether it's a new thing, but it's certainly a current thing, in that it doesn't seem to matter what facts are. It used to be, everyone was entitled to their own opinion, but not their own facts. But that's not the case anymore. Facts matter not at all. Perception is everything.

Former B.C. Chief Justice J.V. Clyne, Speech before the Centre for Continuing Education at UBC—quoted, Globe and Mail—April 4, 1981:

... if Mr. Trudeau's proposals are accepted it will be almost impossible to amend the Canadian constitution.

The basic difficulty with the operation of judicial review of laws dealing with fundamental rights is that such decisions are inherently political decisions not legal decisions and judges should not be called upon to make political decisions ...

The proposed charter will be a boon for the legal profession and it will create a need for many more lawyers and judges. Decisions on social problems will inevitably be made on the basis of the philosophical beliefs of individual judges and this will run the danger of judges being "politicized". †

MESSAGE BOARD

- Would you like to join the national Board of REAL Women? For details, contact Cecilia Forsyth [here](#).
- Sign a global petition to Defend the Vatican at the UN. Go to <http://defendtheholyysee.org>.
- Sign petition to keep abortion out of UN development policies. New policies are being negotiated now. [Sign and share. Click here.](#)
- If you have not renewed your membership for 2014, please do so [online](#) or by mail.

REALity is a publication of **REAL Women of Canada**

PO Box 8813 Station T Ottawa ON K1G 3J1 • Tel 613-236-4001 Fax 613-236-7203
www.realwomenofcanada.ca • info@realwomenofcanada.ca

SUPPORT REAL WOMEN OF CANADA

PLEASE MAKE A CONTRIBUTION TO JOIN OUR WORK
TO DEFEND & PROTECT LIFE & THE FAMILY

Membership \$30/year • Groups \$50/year • Donation _____
Being a political lobby group, contributions are not tax deductible.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

Province _____ Postal Code _____

Tel _____ Email _____

Send online at www.realwomenofcanada.ca or by mail. Thank you.