

TRUDEAU'S SPENDING SPREE BEGINS

Since Prime Minister Trudeau took office, one thing has become clear: he is like his father, Pierre, in that he has no money sense. His father left Canada in such deep debt that it took the country nearly twenty years to pull itself out from that hole.

Young Trudeau seems to have his father's careless approach to money. It helps, one supposes, that having been born to wealth, one is able to be indifferent to the consequences of spending it. How else to explain Trudeau's recent extravagant financial largesse? He has been acting like a child left in charge of a candy store, throwing candies around for all his friends and favourite people. Only it is not candy he is distributing with such abandon, but rather, the taxpayers' hard earned cash.

- At the Commonwealth summit, held in Malta at the end of November, Trudeau announced that Canada would pay \$2.65 billion over the next five years to facilitate combatting climate change in developing countries—a doubling of previous funding.
- The week before, Trudeau announced that Canada would contribute \$1.2 billion to the UN to help them with the refugee situation. This brings Canada's contribution there close to \$1 billion since the Syrian crisis began. This is not to object to helping refugees: it is the Liberals' lack of transparency that is so disturbing. The Liberal government claims that these refugees will cost the taxpayers only \$678 million. This latter sum is ludicrous as it will not even cover the medical costs of the refugees. The govern-

ment has stated that refugees with infectious diseases will not be turned away. Many Syrians have amputations and other war injuries, are nursing chronic diseases that have gone under-treated for years, or cope with psychological conditions from insomnia to post-traumatic stress and severe depression. Their medical problems are endless and will be a never ending cost to the taxpayers. According to a government document, "Responding to the Syrian Refugee Crisis", the Immigration department alone will need \$528.4 million this year and the Defence department \$98.7 million. The document states that the refugee resettlement will cost \$1.1 billion in additional money between now and 2021. One can be certain that the sum is undoubtedly an underestimate of the true costs.

- The Canadian delegation to the Paris climate change conference consisted of more than 300 politicians, government staff and bureaucrats.

The Canadian delegation was double the US team which consisted of fewer than 150 officials and was triple that of the UK's team of about 100 attendees.

According to figures provided by CTV, the federal government budgeted more than \$650,000 for Canadian government delegates attending the conference. Of those funds, about \$200,000 was allocated for accommodation, \$48,000 for flights, \$105,967 for meals and incidentals,



Cameron Cardow, Cagle Cartoons – April 24, 2013

CONTENTS

TRUDEAU'S SPENDING SPREE BEGINS.....	PAGE 1
THE ANTI-SPANKING GANG GEARS UP.....	PAGE 2
BOOK REVIEW	
CORPORAL PUNISHMENT:	
IS IT EFFECTIVE?.....	PAGE 4
JANICE SHAW CROUSE:	
OPENING REMARKS TO THE WCF IX;.....	PAGE 5
2016 MEMBERSHIP DUES.....	PAGE 6

and \$200,000 for “other” (transport, office and equipment rental, telecommunications, shipping and hospital-ity), according to an Environment Canada official.

In addition, an estimated \$121,500 was provided to other Canadian delegates—including youth, NGOs, Aboriginal organizations, and opposition MPs—who were invited to Paris by the Liberal government:

Several provincial premiers also attended the conference paying their own way, accompanied by only a handful of staff.

- Trudeau may now be considering the possibility of spending billions and billions of dollars on a national day care program, modestly estimated at \$15 billion annually. The Liberal election platform stated “we will meet with provinces, territories, and indigenous communities to begin work on a new National Early Learning and Child Care Framework, to deliver affordable, high-quality, flexible, and fully inclusive child care for Canadian families.”

Jean Yves Duclos, the Minister for Families, Children and Social Development in Trudeau’s government was quoted in the Toronto Star on November 17, 2015:

It was too early to get into specifics, but ... the Liberal government is open to the program being universal.

All options are open and most importantly, we are open and eager to discuss with provinces and municipalities to find the best thing for Canadians.

It sounds suspiciously as if a national day care plan is shaping up. If the plan is to provide child care funds directly to “qualified” (i.e. middle class parents, whoever they may be) and to poor parents, this will be an expensive administrative task. The Conservatives provided child care funds to all parents, regardless of income, and then clawed back the money from the better-off families by way of income taxes. This approach was a less expensive way to fund families, rather than targeting categories of parents as proposed by the Liberals.

Also, it is noted that Trudeau campaigned on the policy that

wealthy parents, such as himself, should not receive child care payments. Trudeau receives a salary of over \$334,000 per year as Prime Minister, yet he is charging the taxpayers for the costs of the two nannies he has employed to care for his children. The payment to the nannies was by cabinet order and back dated to November 4, 2015, the day Trudeau was sworn in. Trudeau’s children aren’t the country’s children, and it is not the taxpayers’ job to raise them. Although Trudeau never likely completed his own income tax returns, he must have known that he would be taxed back on his daycare benefits just like all other “wealthy” parents. It was the spin that mattered, not the facts.

Daycare is a provincial matter, not a federal one. Each province is different about meeting the needs of its families. A one-size fits all daycare plan, proposed during the election by NDP leader, Thomas Mulcair was a non-starter. Hopefully, that will remain the case with the Liberal government’s grandiose plans for daycare (whatever they turn out to be). You can count on it being a heavy expense for the taxpayers since money never seems to be a problem for the Liberals – only for the taxpayers.

Please write to:

The Right Honourable Prime Minister Justin Trudeau
80 Wellington Street
Ottawa, ON Canada K1A 0A2

The Honourable Jean-Yves Duclos
Minister of Family, Children and Social Development
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario Canada K1A 0A6

and your [Member of Parliament](#) (MP)

Advise them that daycare funding should go directly to the parents who should decide how their child should be cared for—in the home by a parent, by a family member, a neighbour, for profit daycare or not for profit daycare, etc. The parents know the child best and his/her needs, as well as that of the family, and it is parents, not the state, who should be determining the care of their child. †

THE ANTI-SPANKING GANG GEARS UP

It never ends. The anti-spanking gang is back at it again, demanding that parents be prohibited from spanking their children. Nothing seems to stop these people, even a Supreme Court decision handed down in January, 2004, which upheld the constitutionality of Section 43 of the Criminal Code, which provides that parents may spank their children, if it is reasonable under the circumstances.

REAL Women of Canada, in a coalition with Focus on the Family and the Home School Legal Defence Association under the name *Coalition for Family Autonomy*, intervened before the Ontario Superior Court of Justice, the Ontario Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of Canada to uphold the constitutionality of Section 43, of the *Criminal Code* to protect parents and teachers. Nothing has changed since then.

The Supreme Court concluded that children need a safe environment, and must depend on parents and teachers for guidance and discipline to protect them from harm and to promote their healthy development. The court concluded that Section 43 of the *Criminal Code* accommodates both these needs.

The anti-spankers are spreading their usual inaccurate statements about spanking. They claim that spanking is a violent act, and an assault on a child. They argue that all spanking of children is abuse, which it is not. The anti-spankers have rolled together discipline, punishment, hurting children and violence in order to build their case against parental authority, while claiming for themselves a monopoly on determining what protections are necessary for children’s rights and dignity.

The anti-spankers seem to have no understanding that

reasonable physical discipline, provided in a loving manner for the correction of behaviour, is legitimate parental authority.

Moreover, there is no science whatsoever that shows loving parents, who may occasionally and moderately spank, cause any measureable harm of any kind. In the absence of robust scientific evidence against the use of moderate physical correction, there is every reason to refrain from passing legislation which would not command widespread public support and for which there may be a high price to pay in terms of increased levels of child abuse and youth crime.

It is significant that countries that have banned the spanking of children, such as Sweden and Austria, have experienced greatly increased societal problems with violence. For example, Sweden experimented with the banning of spanking in 1979. When the first generation of children, who were not allowed to be spanked, became teens, there was **SIX TIMES more violence** than there had been when youth were allowed to be spanked by their parents. Today, **child-on-child violence is up 2,500%** in Sweden. Within 10 years of the ban, **child abuse rose to triple the per-capita rate and is up 1,400% today.** Rape of adults was up 700%, and rape of minors up 7,200% from pre-ban rates. The children raised under these bans, as they became adults, also demonstrated the highest increase in alcoholism rates and the highest drug-induced death rates.

The World Health Organization found, in a 2002 study, that Austria, which criminalized corporal punishment in 1977, had the highest bullying rates of all 27 countries examined.

It is blatantly obvious from these facts that preventing parents from reasonably managing their child's behaviour has serious negative consequences.

In its decision on spanking, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that there were limitations on the use of force: it cannot involve children under two or over 12 years of age, or a disabled child of any age; it cannot be "degrading, inhuman or harmful" or include the use of objects, like belts or rulers; it cannot involve "slaps or blows to the head."

Further, the court stated that spanking that is "only a minor corrective force of a transitory and trifling nature" is allowed, concluding that the provision does not violate the Charter of Rights and Freedoms because it does not infringe on a child's rights to security of the person or equality, and it does not constitute cruel and unusual treatment or punishment.

The decision by the Supreme Court of Canada was balanced: it protects both children and families. Since the Supreme Court's 2004 ruling, there has been no evidence of any improper use of Section 43 being made by the courts.

SUPREME COURT RULING DOES NOT PREVENT LEGISLATIVE CHANGES

Even though the Supreme Court held that Section 43 of the *Criminal Code* is constitutional, this ruling does not prevent Parliament from repealing Section 43 of the *Criminal Code*, if it wishes to do so.

If Section 43 is removed from the *Criminal Code*, in

accordance with the anti-spankers' demands, it would criminalize the actions of a great majority of parents, and would lead to unnecessary police and social service investigations into families where children are at no risk of harm.

In 2005, the anti-spankers tried to have Parliament remove Section 43 from the *Criminal Code*. They were not supported in this since the Liberal government's Minister of Justice, Irwin Cotler, stated that the Supreme Court decision on spanking was "comprehensive" and had laid out sufficient guidelines to protect children from abuse. Consequently, he refused to back any legislative initiative to repeal the spanking law.

The anti-spankers have already written to new Liberal government officials demanding that spanking be banned i.e. the removal of Section 43 from the *Criminal Code*.

Please write to the following demanding that Section 43 be retained.

The Right Honourable Prime Minister Justin Trudeau
80 Wellington Street
Ottawa, ON Canada K1A 0A2

The Honourable Jean-Yves Duclos
Minister of Family, Children and Social Development
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario Canada K1A 0A6

The Honourable Justice Minister Jody Wilson-Raybould
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario Canada K1A 0A6

and your [Member of Parliament](#) (MP)

MESSAGE BOARD

- Please make sure you have contact information for your MP at hand: <http://www.parl.gc.ca/Parliamentarians/en/members> You will need this as it will be vital to let our Federal Government know how you feel about the family unfriendly and life unfriendly policies and laws that the pro-life and pro-family movements are anticipating. This communication will be important regardless to which federal party your MP belongs. However, because of the Liberal majority in the House of Commons, your input will be critical if your MP is Liberal. Remember to also congratulate your MP when he/she defends pro-life, pro-family policies. Writing a letter is the most effective method of communication, although phoning and e-mailing are also valid.
- ACTION ITEM: Write to your MP to let him/her know that universal daycare is not in the best interests of Canadian families. Use any of the information in this issue's comments on daycare, page 2.
- ACTION ITEM: Write to your MP regarding the spanking issue. Feel free to use any of the information in this month's REALity.

BOOK REVIEW

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT: IS IT EFFECTIVE?

Editor's Note: In order to refute the anti-spanking advocates, it is important to have the actual facts. Fortunately, an objective analysis of the spanking issue was published in a book, in 2014, entitled: *Corporal Punishment: is it effective?* written by Harold Hoff. Below is a review of his book:

Book Review

Corporal Punishment: Is it Effective?

An empirical study of school punishment records.

By: Harold A. Hoff Published by Iron Gate Research, 2014, pages 283 Cost: CDN\$ 25.00

SPANKING OUR CHILDREN

This book reviews the spanking issue in Canada. It discusses a wide range of methods used to improve children's behaviour, from time-outs and spanking, to incarceration for juvenile crime. These methods have been applied to deal with anti-social and socially destructive behaviour as well as dangerous, cruel and even life threatening behaviour.

The book is technical, and the author, Harold Hoff, avoids recommending any specific method of discipline. He just sets out the facts. He refers to studies which show that parental corporal punishment (CP) i.e. spanking, is more effective than other methods such as exclusion and confinement. Spanking will be ineffective, if used too frequently, or if the intensity of it increases so that it risks causing harm (although unintended), to children. It is most effective when first applied, and works best when used infrequently. It is also the most effective method of disciplining a child when violent offences occur.

The author reminds us that today, every society functions almost exclusively on a deterrence-based punitive system, such as fines, sanctions, penalties, incarceration. These are all designed to deter unacceptable behaviours, to establish civil order, and for the safe functioning of society. Spanking is another method of deterrence.

The book is very sensible, unbiased and judicious in its consideration of all perspectives. The author is wary of false claims and is respectful of the scientific approach to disciplining children. He addresses the issue of corporal punishment at three levels: the family, the schools and the culture at large.

PARENTAL DISCIPLINE

At the level of the family, the author does not advocate parents spank their children as he believes that corporal punishment (CP) should not be a first line, or typical response to misbehaviour. Rather, it should be used for constructive discipline in a measured, tempered manner, in a loving, thoughtful process, with the primary concern being the welfare and improvement of the child, not the relief of anger or frustration of the parent. There is no "one size fits all" approach to dealing with unacceptable behaviour, as every child and teenager is different, and this requires that the discipline method be adapted to the child and the circumstances.

Mr. Hoff, however, does refute the claim by anti spanking

enthusiasts that all physical discipline is a form of violence. Instead, Mr. Hoff makes a distinction between CP where the intention is to improve the person and to change behaviour, and violence where the intention is to cause harm to the child. He directs us to empirical evidence, which shows that abuse and mistreatment of children led to worse outcomes.

It is important to note that the criminalizing of judiciously applied corporal punishment to children, such as has occurred in Austria and Sweden, has increased violence and insecurity in schools and society.

For example, in Sweden, where CP was banned in 1979, 6 out of 10 children feel vulnerable at school, and have been victims of youth violence. "Within ten years of the ban, physical abuse had risen to three times the U.S. rate. In the thirty years since the ban, child abuse has increased by over 1400%, even though the Swedish population has only increased by about 11.5%." Similarly, the World Health Organization found in a 2002 study, that Austria, which criminalized CP in 1977, had the highest bullying rates of all 27 countries examined.

The author notes that large blocks of recorded parental CP data simply do not exist. He provides a long list of claims about physical discipline which are neither supported nor refuted by evidence. For example, the Council of Europe, Canada's Department of Justice and Public Health Agency of Canada websites all claim that corporal punishment is ineffective. According to the author, however, there is no evidence to support this claim. Further, the Department of Justice "Family Violence Initiative" and Public Health Agency of Canada both exaggerate the 2004 Supreme Court of Canada legal decision on spanking. Mr. Hoff, however, has brought this misinformation to these government departments which have now agreed to correct their websites.

The author does agree, however, with most experts that abusive physical conduct should be criminalized, and refers to the comments made by the Supreme Court in its 2004 ruling on Section 43 of the Criminal Code of Canada, which protects parents and educators from criminal charges if physical discipline is used with reasonable force to correct behaviour.

SCHOOL CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

Meticulous records of corporal punishment meted out in schools exist and they indicate the effectiveness of judiciously supervised CP for various offences. The author does not mean to advocate school corporal punishment, but merely explores the unproven claim by opponents of CP that it is ineffective as a means of discipline in schools.

School records also dispel the notion that school corporal punishment was rampant before it was banned and criminalized. A composite of school records in England between 1940 and 1959 show that there were 15 CP incidents per school per annum. 15% of pupils were exposed, 85% were not, and the average incident per CP'd pupil was 2. Records indicate that time-outs in schools

are not new but have been used for over 100 years.

The author further reports on corporal punishment records following 17,840 individuals over 262.2 record years, of 13 different institutions, in four countries - Canada, the United Kingdom, the United States and Australia.

This evidence shows that 74.8% of pupils were compliant with school expectations without the need for physical discipline, 22.0% were deterred by CP, with only 3.2% undeterred and re-offending. CP was an incentive to 62.2% from re-offending after the first application. It was effective in keeping 96.8% of pupils compliant by either deterrence-by-expectation, or deterrence-by-experience, up to three times, leaving only 3.2% of students in the undeterred-by-experience group.

Offences for which corporal punishment was used included truancy, stealing, destruction of property, class disruption, sloppiness, rudeness, setting fires, bullying, profanity, obscenity, fighting, cheating, cruelty to animals, gang formation and terrorizing other students.

Today, problematic behaviours in schools have escalated to routine slander of teachers, armed robbery, assault on teachers, alcohol and drugs, extortion, sexual assault, swarming, theft with threat of violence, weapons offences and destruction of property.

The author notes that as CP became less acceptable, it was replaced with expulsion, where the offending student was simply expelled, rather than helped to modify his/her behaviour. Being denied a further chance to obtain an education led to poor outcomes for the student and difficulties for the family. Expulsions, of course, make life easier for administrators and teachers, who rid themselves of the problem which is passed on to other segments of society.

Records show that school CP is extremely effective in deterring certain behaviours, such as cruelty to animals, playing with fire, cheating, damaging property, moral issues (indecency, obscenity, profanity, vulgarity), bullying, lying and harming others. CP is less effective, for minor misbehaviours, which are the most frequent offences. Empirical evidence shows, for example, that CP is exceptionally effective in stopping bullying which, by the way, is not caused by CP according to the evidence.

The author reviewed available school records in Ontario (Toronto, Renfrew, Waterloo and London area school boards) and found that the deterioration of discipline and

decline in enrolment in the Toronto boards followed the replacement of CP by suspensions in the 1970's. He deduces that the massive increases in school suspensions dispels the claim that CP was ineffective. Renfrew, Waterloo and London school boards reinstated school CP.

The author also makes the point that the psychological abuse that may occur as a result of punishments, such as confinement or isolation, is not as obvious or easily prosecutable as physical abuse, but nevertheless can cause serious harm as well.

JUDICIAL CORPORAL PUNISHMENT (JCP)

Judicial punishment refers to CP and incarceration for crimes. The author describes studies on judicial corporal punishment using US Department of Justice statistics on recidivism (repeat offences). The author admits that JCP does not interest our generation and is today unsupportable and unworkable, but points out that statistics show its effectiveness. He does not advocate its return, however, even though empirical evidence shows its effectiveness in changing behaviour was greater than imprisonment.

It is a fact that in Canada, in each decade since the 1950's, where judicial, school and parental CP have been limited, per capita crime and youth violence rates have risen proportionately.

CONCLUSION

Author Harold Hoff recommends that all the misinformation on CP be replaced by the facts to disprove the false claims repeatedly being made about CP.

It is fortunate that someone has, at last, made a critical, impartial review of the facts on the issue of corporal punishment. This is important since agitators, who oppose the spanking of children are again raising this issue - arguing on purely emotional grounds, while ignoring the actual facts that are available to them.

Please refer to his website for more information about the author,

Harold Hoff,
Chair/Child Protection Advocate and Researcher
KEEP 43 Committee of Canada
PO Box 65632, Dundas, Ontario, L9H 6Y6
www.keep43.ca

“OPPOSE Harmful Ideologies.
PROTECT Children and Family, and KEEP 43”

JANICE SHAW CROUSE: OPENING REMARKS TO THE WCF IX

Editor's Note: A stable marriage is the key to holding society together. It provides the best world for adults and children. Marriage is also the best education, health and welfare system that mankind has ever devised.

Below is a summary of the opening address by Janice Crouse, Executive Director of the World Congress of Families, held in Salt Lake City, Utah, in October 2015. In her address Janice outlines the astounding advantages of stable marriages.

Our dilemma as a society is to determine how we can best encourage and promote the development of stable marriages. It's our challenge.

Janice Shaw Crouse: Opening Remarks, WCF IX

Everyone understands that we are gathered at a pivotal time. Marriage rates are now half of 1969 levels. Fewer people are getting married and they are waiting longer to get married. Divorce rates are 60 percent higher than in the 1960s. Nearly half of the 500 young adults interviewed by an internet matchmaking service said they had ever observed even a single happy marriage.

Even so, when *Time* magazine ran a cover story, “Does Marriage Matter?” they concluded, “There is no other single force causing as much measurable hardship and human misery as the collapse of marriage.”

The *Washington Post* reported on new research: “States with a high concentration of married couples experience faster economic growth, less child poverty and more economic mobility than states where fewer adults are married—even after controlling for a variety of economic and demographic factors.

“What might be behind those links? The researchers suggest that it’s the effects of marriage on men—particularly younger, lower-educated men. They believe getting married and becoming a father (in that order) motivates those men to work more hours, bargain for more money and make better strategic decisions ... to improve their earning power.”

Throughout history, across civilizations and cultures, marriage and family have been the foundations of nations. It is very significant that all civilized societies have treated marriage as a special institution and favored contract. Marriage is—by its very origin and nature—a contract and covenant rooted in natural law.

The social science research is very clear and unequivocal: A married mom-and-dad family conveys on their children significant educational and cultural advantages, as well as superior outcomes on every measurable variable, over ALL other household arrangements—by wide margins.

Marriage is also best for adults—but, unlike the benefits for children (that are the same for boys and girls) the benefits of marriage for adults are very gender-specific.

Women are safer in marriage; women are 62 percent more likely to be abused by a live-in boyfriend than a husband. Married women are better off than their single counterparts in numerous ways, including financially, having better health, and experiencing greater well-being.

Married men are healthier and live longer. Married men have more stable employment and higher earnings; married men have greater wealth than single men. In fact marriage increases a man’s income as much as a college education.

Economists use an interesting—and very revealing—term: the “marriage premium” to describe the benefits of marriage in financial terms. They document the fact that marriage is more than an emotional relationship; it is an economic partnership and a social safety net. That benefit is, perhaps, seen most clearly by looking at how the decline in marriage and the breakdown of family hits everyone’s pocketbooks.

There is a clear and inextricable link between the breakdown of marriage, the slowdown of economic growth and the increasingly burdensome taxes required to finance the exorbitant growth in the need for social safety nets and the unprecedented increase in dependency.

Just look at a few of the dimensions of family breakdown that affect all dimensions of well-being of everyone—divorce, unwed childbearing, crime, drug abuse, school drop outs, domestic violence, child abuse, chronic illness, poverty, foster care, and on and on the list goes.

But the costs are not just financial; the costs in human capital are also exorbitant. Marriage is the social glue that binds people together. A healthy caring family is where dialogue and compromise are learned. Marriage and the family are so important in people’s financial, social and psychological well-being that they have been called “the original U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.”

We are gathered here at Salt Lake City to work together across our various cultural differences to create a world where positive messages about the value of families will prevail.

If we reach the culture in a transformational manner—we will have a revitalizing impact on the next generation of world leaders. We are pleased to have 500 of those future world leaders among us this week.

Through our work now and through them as they take our places of leadership, we will see the kind of future that we all envision for our individual homelands and the world.

World Congress IX speeches and presentations are now available to watch on their [WCF IX YouTube channel](#)

2016 MEMBERSHIP DUES

Membership fees are due again!

REAL Women of Canada relies heavily on our members’ annual fees to keep us going with on-going expenses such as rent, telephone, printing, office supplies, etc., and no matter how hard we try to cut back, these expenses always face us each month.

We do know that all our work, despite the efforts of our volunteers, does cost money.

Please send in your 2016 membership dues of \$30 to:

REAL Women of Canada
BOX 8813 STN T
Ottawa ON K1G 3J1

Or, if you wish, a secure online payment may be made via PayPal on our website at www.realwomenofcanada.ca

Many thanks for your wonderful on-going support for REAL Women and for our work on behalf of the traditional family. †

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 _____
Contributions, unfortunately, are not tax deductible.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

Province _____ Postal Code _____

Tel _____ Email _____

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

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