

## **WHAT SHOULD BE DONE ABOUT THE UN?**

### Problems with the UN

Over the past several years the UN has had three major scandals:

The corruption of the Iraqi Oil For Food program whereby between 1997 and 2003, Iraq's Saddam Hussein grafted billions out of the UN administered Iraqi oil revenues meant for humanitarian relief. Millions of dollars were passed under the program to UN officials and their relatives.

The sexual abuse committed by UN soldiers (so-called peace-keepers) in the Congo, and

The corruption and mismanagement of UN procurements due to weak internal controls of the organization.

A fourth major scandal is now shaping up over the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), which was designed to promote scientifically based evidence of man-made global warming.

### UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)

Although the IPCC Charter states it was to be a scientific clearing house, it has become a political lobby group rather than a scientific body. This was revealed in 2007 when the IPCC claimed that there was a 90% chance the glaciers in the Himalayas would be melted by 2035. The organization obtained this information from an article appearing in a mountaineering magazine and repeated in the World Wildlife Federation (WWF) magazine. IPCC admitted it was faulty information, but thought it would highlight this unfounded information to encourage policy makers and politicians to take concrete action. In regard to the claim of melting glaciers, Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chairman of the IPCC since 2002, appears to have a conflict of interest in that he is Director of the Energy and Resources United based in New Delhi which has collected millions in grants to study the effects of glacial melting.

In 2007, the IPCC claimed that the Netherlands is susceptible to sea level rise and river flooding because 55% of the Netherlands is below sea and that the sea level would rise by 2.7 feet by the end of the 21st century. In fact, 26% of the Netherlands is below sea level and there is no scientific proof at all that the sea level is rising.

The final straw on the fallibility of IPCC is the leaked information in November 2009 which indicated that scientists at the Climate Research Unit (CRU) of the University of East Anglia had manufactured data to "prove" that climate warming is man made. This information served as the basis of IPCC policy to implement global taxation and regulatory powers to control this purported man-made climate warming. If this policy were implemented, it would involve vast transfers of money from the West to third world countries which would seriously compromise the industrial power, economic base, and standard of living of the West.

According to the UK's "Daily Mail," (December 12, 2009) the Chairman of the IPCC, Mumbai (Bombay) based Pachauri stands to make several hundred million dollars in the caps on the carbon emissions, a policy promoted by IPCC, because of his ties to an international conglomerate based in Mumbai.

In December 2007, Mr. Pachauri shared the Nobel Peace prize with Al Gore. Mr. Pachauri represented the UN's IPCC for the peace prize.

Mr. Pachauri, who is a railroad engineer by profession but who holds a PhD in economics, flew 443,226 miles on IPCC business in the year and a half before last December's UN Copenhagen conference on climate warming. This left quite a carbon footprint. Mr. Pachauri, as chairman of IPCC, has demanded that "hefty aviation taxes should be introduced to deter people from flying".

All of this is an indication of the politicized nature of the UN led environmental policy and the dangers inherent in leaving such powers in the hands of an unaccountable international organization. UN literature promoting the climate control conference in Copenhagen states that an “institutional mechanism and equitable governance structure must be established to channel resources efficiently to developing countries”. One wonders what “institutional mechanism” the UN had in mind to channel these resources.

The concerns about the UN outlined above, by no means cover all the questions that are being raised about it today.

### Unapproved UN Policies

As recounted many times in REALity, there is an organized, well co-ordinated effort at the UN to push forward an alarming anti-life agenda, minus either debate or approval from the UN’s member states. Details of this aspect of the UN will be included in the next issue of REALity.

### The Cause of the UN’s Problems

The UN is like a giant octopus with uncoordinated tentacles pushing everywhere. It lacks proper management, oversight, ethical standards, accountability and transparency. It wastes vast resources and is failing to discharge its major responsibilities. For example, in December 2004, when the tsunami hit Asia, within days, US military aircraft and ships were providing fresh water, food and medical supplies to the needy. An investigative report of the UK Financial Times (December 23, 2005) revealed that the UN was extremely slow in reacting to this disaster, and it has continued today to resist public disclosure of how it used its funds for the tsunami. We do know, however, that the UN representative arrived many days late to oversee the damage and stayed in a luxury hotel far from the destruction.

This all points out the dangers of giving the UN more authority or a more central role in addressing international problems.

Until management and administrative reforms are implemented and existing mandates and activities are reviewed for their relevance, and, very importantly, financial management and proper business practices are installed, the UN must be regarded for what it is – an unregulated, unaccountable, and corrupt instrument attempting to control human destiny.

UN reform, however, will have to come mainly from the US, Japan, and the EU, which together contribute over 85% of the UN’s regular budget.

### Canada’s Financial Contribution to the UN

In the year 2008/2009, Canada contributed to the UN \$499.4 million through the Department of Foreign Affairs and Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

This sum includes a contribution of \$29,931,683 paid to the infamous UN Population Fund (UNPFA) which promotes population control policies, and \$1,540,000 paid for the Development Fund for Women which has assisted in the establishment of the UN feminist agency. This new agency, with a proposed annual budget of \$1 billion, will be one of the most prominent and influential of all UN agencies and will serve as the engine to spread radical feminism throughout the world. Added to the Canadian contribution referred to above is \$16 million provided for the Global Peace initiative, which includes promoting gender rights: a further contribution to UN Peacekeeping Operation (\$203.3 million) as well as the \$16.3 million contribution to the UN Office on Drugs. In short, the Canadian contribution to the UN is significant.

### What To Do About the UN

There are two trains of thought as to how to deal with the UN. On the one hand, a frustrated pro-life NGO believes we should just eliminate the UN entirely (but save the cafeteria since it serves delicious low cost meals)!

A more reasoned response was proposed by the Vatican (the Holy See), which has Permanent Observer Status at the UN. It believes that it is better to have an organization in which nations can confer and discuss issues, since this serves as a “safety valve” for countries with competing views.

Unfortunately, there is less and less discussion and debate at the UN and more and more manipulation, by way of partisans pushing the UN into a new social order.

Some think we should simply walk away from the UN and its corruption, and start again with another kind of UN equivalent consisting of a coalition of democratic states where issues would be soberly reviewed and measured responses given. But, how to safeguard such a new UN from yet another manipulative take-over would be a concern.

Canadians should ask why our country has become such a ruthless supporter at the UN of abortion and homosexual/transgendered rights? Why is the Canadian delegation at the UN unhindered in pursuing the former Liberal government’s agenda? Just who is in control of Canada’s policies at the UN?

Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lawrence Cannon, who is pro-abortion and no particular friend of the family, appears to be rubber-stamping the policies established under the Liberals which are still being promoted by the Canadian delegation at the UN under the Conservative government. Also as noted elsewhere in this issue, the bureaucracies in the Department of Foreign Affairs and the Status of Women appear currently to be holding the winning hand in determining Canada’s UN policies. Please write to the following, requesting that Canada’s policies at the UN reflect Conservative government policies rather than the former Liberal government policies.

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

The Hon. Lawrence Cannon  
Minister of Foreign Affairs  
House of Commons  
Ottawa ON K1A 0A6

## **FOREIGN AFFAIRS — A LAW UNTO ITSELF**

During the 2006 federal election, Conservative leader Stephen Harper was accused of having a “secret agenda”. On January 18, 2006, in response, Mr. Harper stated that there should be no concern about any “secret agenda” because the Liberal bureaucrats in the government and the Liberal appointed judges would restrain any conservative tendencies. Mr. Harper was right.

Nowhere is this more apparent than in regard to the bureaucrats in the Department of Foreign Affairs. They are rowing their own boat on matters of foreign policy maintaining the policies of the former Liberal government. REAL Women first stumbled across this in February 2006, just after the Conservatives were elected to office, when we attended a briefing at Foreign Affairs. We were invited, since our organization is an NGO with Consultative Status with the UN. Canadian officials at that consultation stated bluntly that they would not change their approach at the UN and that they would, instead, follow through with existing former Liberal government directives. And indeed, they have. Abortion, gender mainstreaming, homosexual rights including same-sex marriage, decriminalizing prostitution, child sexual rights, female quotas for candidates in elections - every feminist/homosexual demand has been backed by Canada at the UN since the Conservatives formed the government.

This continued militant feminist approach by the Canadian delegation at the UN puzzled us. Why wasn't the Conservative government putting a stop to these radical policies pushed by the Canadian delegation – an approach at odds with the government's own policies?

For example, in December 2006 (under the Liberals) Canada sponsored a statement on sexual orientation and gender identity. The Conservative government has continued with this policy at the UN.

In addition:

Canada is one of the most vigorous promoters and supporters of the all-women agency recently established at the UN. This new agency, with a proposed annual budget of \$1 billion, will be one of the most prominent and influential of all UN agencies and will serve as the engine to spread radical feminism throughout the world.

In 2008, at the UN Commission on the Status of Women, a resolution to oppose gender selection abortion was rejected by Canada.

In 2001 and again in 2009, Canada supported Brazil's resolution at the Human Rights Council in Geneva to promote homosexual/transgendered, same-sex marriage world wide as a human right.

The Canadian UN Delegation in New York

It is significant that in February 2010, REAL Women submitted an application for REAL Women's National President, Cecilia Forsyth, to be included on the Canadian delegation to attend this UN Beijing review in New York. Cecilia was certainly qualified since she had attended the UN 1995 Beijing + 15 Conference, and many other UN conferences over the years. Cecilia had also been involved with many conferences and consultations across Canada dealing with so-called "women's issues." Despite this, Cecilia was rejected as a member of the Canadian delegation as was the application from representative of the Ottawa based pro-family organization Institute of Marriage and Family Canada.

Delegates chosen to represent Canada at this conference were mostly bureaucrats from the Status of Women, the Department of Foreign Affairs, Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and the Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC) which provided their "experts" on gender-based analysis and gender equity. One doesn't like to think about how much the taxpayers are paying out in salaries for these "experts". Also present was the questionable human rights "expert" Jennifer Lynch, Chief Commissioner of the Canadian Human Rights Commission and her senior policy advisor on international relations. The three NGO's chosen for the delegation were all organizations heavily funded by the Women's Program Status of Women. Other members of the delegation were "gender experts" from the provincial Status of Women Directorates.

Behind the Scenes - A War at Foreign Affairs

An explanation for the remarkable inconsistency between the Conservative government's own policies and Canada's position at the UN was provided by MacLean's Magazine (February 8, 2010) in which it stated that there is a war brewing behind the scenes between the Conservative government and the bureaucrats in the Department of Foreign Affairs.

This war can be confirmed by the journal, "Embassy", billed as Canada's Foreign Affairs Policy Newsweekly. This journal targets the foreign diplomatic, trade and consular communities across Canada and claims to be well informed on policies and views of the Department of Foreign Affairs. The journal's pages, however, are filled with articles criticizing Conservative policies, not merely on foreign affairs, but also on other policies, such as the Conservative's AID's policy; funding of NGO's; prorogation; and Mr. Harper's maternal and infant health care proposal for the G-8 meeting in June, which does not include abortion and contraception. "Embassy" is especially critical of the Conservatives' international funding policies of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). Since 1999, CIDA has had gender equality as one of its major objectives. The Conservative government, however, changed the focus of this foreign funding to the relief of poverty in 25 designated third world countries. The bureaucrats at Foreign Affairs were not pleased.

To embarrass the government, the bureaucrats are leaking information to the media. An example of this was "Embassy's" July 1, 2009 issue that revealed that the Conservatives had put in place new guidelines on language, to replace guidelines which had been developed by former Liberal Foreign Affairs Minister, Lloyd Axworthy.

At first glance, the changes appear inconsequential. But that is not how foreign policy experts see it. They call the changes "significant" and "distressing" because they claim they purposely water down many of the very international human rights obligations that Canada had previously fought to have adopted in United Nations conventions. They also oppose the Harper government's antipathy to the International Criminal Court. The Conservative government, by the way, is more than justified in having concerns about the International Criminal Court (see REALity July/August 2000, "Bill C-19 – The Frightening International Criminal Court").

Since these bureaucrats are paid by the taxpayer and, in effect, are our employees – their brazen attempts to undermine government policies are unsettling. The elected government, not bureaucrats, is supposed to represent us.

Please write to:

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

Honourable Lawrence Cannon  
Minister of Foreign Affairs  
House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6  
Fax: 613-992-6802

Your MP  
House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

Please request that the foreign policies of the present government, not those of the former Liberal government, be instituted at the UN and otherwise.

### **MISMANAGEMENT AT STATUS OF WOMEN CANADA**

Status of Women Canada was established in 1973 to advance women's equality and to provide the full participation of women in the economic, social, cultural and political life of Canada.

Since that time, the Status of Women's annual department expenditures, which had reached \$16 million by 1996, rose to \$24 million in 2006 and to \$32.5 million in 2009. Helena Guergis, the current Minister for Status of Women, stated before the House of Commons Standing Committee on the Status of Women, on December 3, 2009, "Right now, our government proudly boasts that the funding for Status of Women Canada is at its highest level in Canada's history."

About half of the Status of Women budget goes to its division, the Women's Program within the Status of Women, whose purpose is to provide funds for feminist organizations. In the last three years, the Women's Program budget under the Conservatives, has doubled from \$11.5 million in the fiscal year ending 2007 to \$22.0 million in the year ending in 2009, the greatest leap since it was established. In total, the Women's

Program has handed out \$294 million over the years to feminist organizations.

Also a significant portion of the Women's Program budget goes toward administrative costs. Status of Women receives an additional \$ 2 million a year from the public treasury for Professional and Special Services, according to Public Accounts Canada.

### Conservatives Attempt to Modify Grants

In 2006, the Conservative government did make some significant changes to the Women's Program regarding the funding criteria to stop funding for advocacy or lobbying purposes. This eliminated funding for several especially radical feminist groups, but these funds were unfortunately then applied to more recently established feminist groups such as Equal Voice (whose object is to have more feminist women elected to Parliament) and the Feminist Alliance for International Action (FAFIA). Equal Voice received a grant of over \$1.2 million for 3 years from the Women's Program last year, FAFIA has received \$1.8 million since 1999, falsely claiming they represent "women and girls" in Canada (see REALity, May/June 2009, "Feminist "Equal Voice" Balloons").

FAFIA, together with several unions, submitted an angry report in February 2010 to the UN Beijing Conference Review, organized by the UN Commission on the Status of Women. The report bitterly complained that the Conservative government was denying equality for women – of course, as interpreted in accordance with their own left-wing, NDP agenda. FAFIA's report was paid for by the Canadian taxpayers by way of its huge grants received from the Women's Program.

The massive increase in funding to the Status of Women in the last few years under the Conservatives is incomprehensible - especially in view of the independent professional evaluation of the Women's Program in 2005, which paints a very poor picture of the agency.

### Evaluation of the Women's Program - 2005

A professional program evaluation of the Women's Program and Status of Women initiated by the Treasury Board, and published in 2005 by an organization called Prairie Research Associates Inc. The evaluators used interviews and responses to questionnaires provided to staff and recipients of funding and obtained an astonishing assessment of the agency. The report can be found at: <http://www.swc-cfc.gc.ca/account-resp/pr/wpeval-evalpf/wpe-epf-1-eng.html>

The evaluation disclosed the following:

There were missing documents, and a failure of final reports to establish a clear link to the original application, in order to determine if planned activities had been carried out, or whether some progress toward outcomes had been achieved.

The Women's Program suffered from poor internal communications and information sharing, along with poor relationships with Status of Women, stemming from a fundamental philosophical difference regarding the best way to achieve women's equality.

Program staff pro-actively approached favourite organizations and assisted them with proposal development and funding applications, the latter usually being approved.

Accountability was poor since recipients were not required to justify their receipts of government funds, to submit any kind of strategic plan, or to demonstrate progress toward or success in achieving some goal.

There was an absence of any strategy or tool for analyzing and reporting on program impact.

Final reports were included in only one half of files studied, and information on these final reports consisted largely of self-assessments by the funded organization.

According to the responses received in the evaluation, it was claimed that it was virtually impossible to isolate the net

contribution of the Women's Program to women's equality due to the "equally significant role of external factors" in social change. Many fund recipients felt that "reporting expectations were not consistent with the nature of social development work.

Consequently, only 5% of those who provided responses, thought that public policy and legislative change had occurred as a result of their initiatives, only 2% found increased financial independence for women, 4% felt that there was increased self-confidence and self esteem among women, and only 3% reported that more women were leaving abusive relationships.

As a result of these responses, the Evaluation Report stated: "The Program was unable to report in any systematic way to Parliament or to Canadians on the results it has achieved."

In other words, taxpayers' hard earned dollars were spent carelessly with no consideration given to basic accountability to evidence of results. Despite this report, the program continues today as an always-full pot of gold for feminists in Canada.

That is, despite the revealing evaluation of the individual projects funded by the Women's Program, faith in feminist "social development" work is apparently unshaken since there was a "broad general consensus [93%] among stakeholders that the Women's Program has had a positive impact" and 90% felt the Program was "still relevant." The feminists perennially demand more money to achieve these immeasurable objectives and Status of Women continues to provide lucrative but meaningless employment for selected women's studies graduates and professional feminists.

This occurs because the bureaucracy within the Status of Women simply ignores government policy (much like the Department of Foreign Affairs: see article "Foreign Affairs a Law Unto Itself", p. 4).

Feminist groups regard government funding as their "entitlement". Feminists and liberal/socialist bureaucrats obviously believe that it is the function of government to financially sustain leftist social movements, which are unpopular with the general public. Without government funding, feminist activism in Canada would cease to exist. Unlike REAL Women, they have no grass roots support and have only top down, paid executives to carry out their work, paid by the taxpayers by way of government funding.

#### Gender Based Analysis

Another example of government waste due to feminist ideology is the policy of gender-based analysis. In 1995 after the UN Women's Conference in Beijing, the Liberal government implemented a five-year plan to carry out a gender-based analysis of public policy decisions agreed to by Canada at that UN Beijing Conference.

Gender analysis, briefly stated, is a method of reviewing all government policies, programs and legislation to determine their differential impact on men and women. Its practical effect is to serve as a feminist tool to ensure the government adheres to feminist ideology. The Status of Women was to oversee this process. One Liberal plan, called Agenda for Gender Equality (AGE), provided an extra \$20.5 million to the Women's Program to fund a total of 122 new groups. However, when the evaluation of the women's program was carried out in 2005, it was discovered that neither the women's program staff nor its managers were certain about the purpose of AGE. As a result, the additional funds of \$20.5 million were simply invested in the overall Women's Program feminist funding.

#### Auditor General's Report

In April 2008, the feminist opposition, which dominates the House of Commons Standing Committee on the Status of Women, recommended that the Auditor General examine the implementation of gender-based analysis in the federal government as had previously been established by the Liberal government.

The Auditor General did as requested, and in her report, released in the spring of 2009, stated that the review found the tool of gender analysis was not being properly implemented in the seven government departments audited.

The Auditor General's report recommended that the Status of Women, in consultation with the Treasury Board and the Privy Council Office, clarify, establish and communicate to all government departments and agencies their responsibilities on gender issues by applying gender based analysis to all department programs, policies and legislation. This was the conclusion even though the Auditor General's report found that the great majority of departments saw no need to have gender analysis intrude into their work.

In light of the Status of Women's track record, a gender-based analysis in every government department, with staffing and training, is one venture that belongs on the chopping block to bring government program spending under control.

#### The Status of Women, a Picture of Mismanagement

The above independent evaluation of the Women's Program within the Status of Women, has uncovered a picture of gross mismanagement and abuse of taxpayer dollars. Along with incompetence, the survey reveals the staff's unbounded enthusiasm for feminism as a worldview, and insistence that feminist women are entitled to hundreds of millions of tax dollars to propagate their leftist ideology. While feminist members of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women from the Liberal, Bloc and NDP parties insist on "accountability, tracking and paper documentation" to provide evidence that all government departments are applying gender based analysis, they do not, however, appear to expect the same standards of professionalism from "women's groups", who have been allowed to fritter away millions of tax dollars with abandon.

#### Another Evaluation of the Status of Women in 2010

Another evaluation of the Status of Women and the Women's Program, at a cost of \$130,000 will be carried out no later than September 2010. Heritage Canada, through which the Status of Women is funded, like all government departments, is obliged to evaluate, demonstrate outcomes, measure and report results as a consequence of the 2006 Federal Accountability Act. After this evaluation, hopefully Canadians will see an end to the Status of Women for women's issues.

Please write to the following requesting that the outdated and biased Status of Women including its Woman's Program.

Please write to:

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

Honourable Stockwell Day  
President of the Treasury Board  
House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6  
Fax: 613-995-1154

Your MP  
House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6



## THE ARROGANCE OF SOME CANADIAN JUDGES

By C. Gwendolyn Landolt, National Vice-President, REAL Women of Canada

Prime Minister Harper is not only dealing with uncooperative bureaucracies (See “Foreign Affairs – A Law Unto Itself”, p. 13, and “Mismanagement at the Status of Women Canada”, p. 6) but also is having problems with the judiciary, mostly those appointed by the former Liberal government.

There are, at present, 887 full-time federal judges, and of these, approximately two-thirds (2/3) were Liberal appointments. They appear to be a major obstacle to carrying out the written law – especially regarding criminal justice reform.

For example, on November 27, 2009 in the Globe and Mail, Mr. Justice David Cole of the Ontario Court of Justice revealed the judges’ game when he stated:

Judges are skilled at devising ways to fight back against laws they believe may screw the system. Since when have judges been allowed to “fight back” against laws they don’t like?

Judges are required to interpret and then apply the law, not work against a law they happen to dislike. Some judges, in fact, are even publicly objecting to proposed laws before they are passed by Parliament. Mr. Justice Marc Rosenberg of the Ontario Court of Appeal, and Mr. Justice John Keast of the Superior Court in Sudbury, for example, took upon themselves the responsibility of criticizing proposed legislation that does not suit their own personal perspectives.

Mr. Justice Rosenberg, prior to his appointment to the Bench, was a criminal defence lawyer. Upon his appointment to the Bench, one would hope that he would put his personal views, developed as a defence lawyer, behind him. Instead, he complained about legislation on minimum sentences at a meeting of criminal lawyers in November, stating that he regards such legislation as “unjust punishment”. Such a view is not shared by others. However, Mr. Justice Rosenberg apparently believes that, as a judge, he is entitled to influence legislation by expressing his personal views on the issue.

Similarly, Mr. Justice Keast of the Ontario Superior Court in Sudbury, while sentencing two youths who caused an \$8 million dollar fire in Sudbury, criticized the proposed minimum sentence legislation and stated that, in his view, such legislation would “brutalize” society and that the government should instead be providing funding to “eliminate the roots of crime”, such as poverty. That again might be his personal view, but it is not necessarily shared by others, including an elected government. The latter may also wish to eliminate poverty, but it is also entitled to draft criminal laws, which it believes will be an effective response to criminal activity.

Understandably, these two Ontario judges may not want their discretionary role in sentencing to be restricted. However, if such a restriction is offensive to them, they should resign from the Bench, rather than use their prominent positions to push their own personal agenda.

### Madam Justice Beverley McLachlin Grabs for Power

In November 2005, Madam Justice Beverley McLachlin, in a public speech, declared that judges in Canada have the jurisdiction to make decisions based on “unwritten laws” because judges have a “judicial conscience”, which is founded on their “sworn commitment to uphold the rule of law”. She further stated that judges should render their opinions based on these unwritten norms, even in the face of clearly enacted laws or hostile public opinion. (See REALity Jan/Feb 2006, “Chief Justice Makes a Grab for More Power”).

The political appointment of a lawyer to the Bench does not provide him/her with special knowledge or insight to make decisions based on unwritten laws. Yet, Madam Justice McLachlin believes judges have this right. She is thus

holding out her judicial colleagues and herself to be better than anyone else. They are not. The truth is that they, as practicing lawyers, had the political influence to get themselves appointed to the Bench – regrettably, not necessarily always for reasons of merit.

This assumption of power outlined by Justice McLachlin is extremely dangerous, as it allows the court to change social values with impunity. This has occurred in numerous cases, such as in *Regina vs. Labaye* [2005] in which the court changed the standard to determine the meaning of indecency so as to allow commercial sex clubs, or in *Trinity Western University* [2001], in which the court determined that religious belief was protected under the Charter, but that religious practices were not protected, even though religious practices are integral to religious belief.

It is troubling that these unaccountable, appointed individuals use their appointments to the Bench to dramatically change Canada, morally and socially.

Any lack of respect Canadians have for the judiciary has been brought about by the judges themselves.

### Judges' Salaries

Some of the judges' salaries are as follows:

The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada Madam Justice Beverley McLachlin receives \$343,400 annually.

Other judges on the Supreme Court of Canada (called puisne judges) receive \$317,900 annual salary.

Court of Appeal judges receive \$267,200

Superior Court judges for example, British Columbia's Supreme Court, Alberta's Queens Bench, and New Brunswick Queens Bench, etc. receive \$267,200 per year

The salaries of provincial appointed judges vary from province to province. For example, Ontario Provincial Court Judges receive approximately \$262,200 per year.

Judges are well paid to carry out their responsibilities. If only they would carry them out appropriately.

## **THE NATIONAL ANTHEM SCAM**

By C. Gwendolyn Landolt, National Vice President, REAL Women of Canada

Conservative Senator Nancy Ruth is a member of the wealthy Toronto Jackman family, an ardent feminist, as well as a self-acknowledged lesbian. She was the individual who, in 1985, provided the generous seed money for the legal arm of the feminist movement LEAF (Women's Legal Education and Action Fund) to become established to bring its many feminist legal challenges to the courts.

Senator Ruth has long wanted the words, "in all thy sons command" removed from the national anthem charging they were an injustice and discrimination against women.

In the 6,000-word Throne Speech when Parliament opened on March 3, 2010, there was included an 18-word commitment to revisit the lyrics of the national anthem. Senator Ruth and her feminist sisters were ecstatic. Not so, the Canadian public. MPs were inundated with angry phone calls and e-mail from their constituents objecting to changing the national anthem. Within 48 hours, the Conservatives announced they would not consider changes in the national anthem. Senator Ruth's reaction to this was to state darkly that the refusal to change the anthem was due to a backlash based on a "hatred of women". That conclusion required a giant leap in logic!

The truth of the matter was that changing the anthem was a terrible idea. It was proposed just a few days after the Olympics in Vancouver, where our many gold medals caused Canadians from coast to coast to sing our anthem with

pride and joy. We all knew (except feminists, of course) the word “in all thy sons command” was a generic use of the word which applied to everyone and excluded no one.

The proposal in the Throne Speech to change the national anthem became a central topic in homes and offices across the country. No one talked about the budget. Canadians felt, however, that there were more important things to think about with a \$56 billion deficit, high unemployment and a worrisome health care system.

Besides, once a Parliamentary Committee began to consider an anthem change, every special interest group in the country would appear before it to explain why their views should be considered. Atheists would not want God to remain in the anthem, the First Nations would object to “our home and native land”. Canadians would become mad at each other with raucous debate filling the House of Commons. The 1965 flag debate revisited! The diversion of an anthem change we did not need!

Senator Ruth warns that a plan to change the anthem is still on the feminist agenda and it would be raised again. It had been proposed in 2001 by Liberal Senator Vivian Poy (sister-in-law of former feminist Governor General Adrienne Clarkson). Her bill died because of a lack of support. Long may it remain buried.

### **REAL WOMEN’S LEGAL DEFENCE FUND**

REAL Women’s purpose is to promote and protect the natural family in the legislatures, media and in the courts. We have unfailingly pursued this objective over the years.

Our greatest challenge, however, has been promoting the pro-life/family cause in the courts. It has been difficult, not only because of the heavy financial burden, but also because our pro-life/family views have not been welcomed by the mostly left-wing judges. This is possibly due to the fact that of the 887 full-time federally appointed judges, two thirds have been appointed by the former Liberal government. Many of these judges take a so-called “progressive” view on issues and create law not apply it.

Although REAL Women has had some successes in the courts, we have also experienced disappointments – but this has not deterred us from continuing to intervene in the courts. The pro-life/family must continue to be heard in the courts because:

History must show that there was public dissent to the many anti life/family “politically correct” decisions recently made by the courts;

REAL Women’s presence in the courts prevents judges from excusing themselves later from their questionable decisions, by arguing they were not provided with a differing perspective of the law. REAL Women has provided the courts with carefully researched well-reasoned legal arguments; and

REAL Women’s legal research on these many issues is not lost when the court hands down its contrary decisions, since our factums (legal arguments) are a matter of public record, which will be used in later years by lawyers in their legal challenges to reverse some of the more controversial decisions made by the courts in the last quarter century.

Some of the controversial decisions of the courts include the striking down of the abortion law; legalizing swinger sex clubs; undermining religious belief by giving Charter protection to religious belief, but not to religious practices (as though they can be separated); undermining traditional marriage by legalizing same-sex marriage; writing in protection for homosexuality, although this was not part of the written Charter; narrowing the application of the pornography law etc. etc.

There are now three new cases currently before the Canadian courts which outcomes will have long-range ramifications for our nation’s social values. Because of this, the Board of Directors of REAL Women believe we should intervene in these cases. They are:

## Prostitution case

It is argued that Canada's prostitution laws should be struck down on the grounds these laws restrict prostitutes' independence and their safety. If the court should order the decriminalization of prostitution as demanded, it will result in legal brothels established in our communities, as well as an increase in prostitution, both legal and illegal. This will increase the safety problem of the men and women involved in prostitution. The case was argued before the Superior Court of Ontario in October 2009. Whatever the decision of this court, it will be appealed to the Ontario Court of Appeal, and then to the Supreme Court of Canada.

## Vancouver Drug Injection Site

On January 15, 2010, the British Columbia Court of Appeal concluded that the drug injection site in Vancouver (the only one existing in North America) was a "hospital" providing "medical care" for addicts. This decision is a very dangerous one, since it is harmful in the extreme for addicts since it only deepens their addiction and leads to their inevitable and painful death. Supervising the injection of a harmful, illicit drug by an addict can by no reasonable standard be described as "health care". Only 3% of addicts using this Vancouver drug injection clinic are referred for treatment, which latter is the only way an addict can be genuinely helped. If this decision is allowed to stand, a profusion of drug injection sites will develop across Canada.

This decision also gravely undermines the successful federal policy of prevention, treatment and enforcement. Further, placing broadly defined health care beyond the reach of the criminal law, in this case, the Controlled Drug and Substance Abuse Act, will inevitably create trouble in many other areas of federal criminal law jurisdiction, such as euthanasia and reproductive issues which may then also be regarded as a provincial matter only.

## The Polygamy Law

A charge of polygamy was laid against Winston Blackmore, a resident of Bountiful, British Columbia. He is reported to have 25 "wives" and over 100 children from these relationships. He argues that polygamy is an integral part of his religious belief as a member of the Fundamentalist Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (which church is not to be confused with the Church of Latter Day Saints [Mormons], which reject polygamy). In December, 2009, the B.C. government brought a "reference" (i.e., question) before the Supreme Court of British Columbia to determine whether the polygamy provision in the Criminal Code (S. 293) is constitutional.

This case will have far reaching implications for the definition of marriage and family and the role, dignity and rights of women and children.

REAL Women, as a women's organization, is well placed because of its promotion of the natural family, defined as a man, woman and child(ren), and because of our long experience before the courts, to intervene in these cases.

REAL Women of Canada, however, depends solely on its donations and membership fees, and as a result, we have deep concerns as to how we will manage the financial undertaking of these cases. The journey for us will be long, expensive and emotionally trying, but it must be done.

We know that the voice of pro-family women from across Canada, representing many denominations, must be heard in these court struggles. Please help us defend traditional values, please make a donation to:

REAL Women of Canada Legal Defence Fund  
Box 8813 Station T  
Ottawa, ON K1G 3J1  
[www.realwomenca.com](http://www.realwomenca.com)

## **LABOUR UNIONS FUND FEMINISTS**

Canada is one of the few countries in the world in which workers must pay compulsory union dues. Unions pay no taxes on these dues.

These compulsory dues are used by unions in Canada not just for collective bargaining purposes, but also for political activism purposes to change the social direction of Canada.

Abortion clinics, homosexual lifestyle and radical feminism are all funded with these union dues.

On February 1, 2010, the Public Service Alliance of Canada (PSAC) renewed its \$90,000 financial commitment to six national feminist groups. They are:

Feminist Alliance for International Action (FAFIA), which has already received 1.8 million dollars from the Status of Women since 1999 (see "Mismanagement of Status of Women Canada," page 6),  
Child Care Advocacy Association of Canada (which promotes universal day care),  
Fédération des femmes du Québec,  
National Association of Women and the Law (NAWL),  
Canadian Institute for the Advancement of Women (CRIAOW), and  
Ad Hoc Coalition for Women's Equality.

## **PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE**

Seems like a good time to comment on the importance of the family since we recently celebrated both Family Day and Valentine's Day in the month of February.

REAL Women believes that the natural family of mother, father and children is the foundation of a society. The family unit has proven itself, over time, to be the most effective way to care for the young, the vulnerable and the elderly. There is truth to the adage that "strong families build strong countries."

Despite the negative messages about family found in our culture, mainly in the media and entertainment industry, the norm for family life is still the mother, father, and children model. The white picket fence may be gone, but moms, dads, and kids remain.

There are changes in family structure, such as, both parents working outside the home. However, the role of the family has not changed. REAL Women has always stated, "the family provides the best and least expensive system of health, education and social services."

It is in the family where children learn how to get along with others, how to care and share, and how to resolve conflicts. In other words, they learn basic human relations. I find it insulting to hear governments talk about schools or day care facilities being sources for "early childhood education and development". The implication is that nothing is ever learned in the family setting.

As the basic unit in society, the family sustains society. The family is critical to our well-being as individuals and as a country. This is the reason why REAL Women will continue to promote and defend the natural family and strive to integrate the needs of family life into government legislation and policies.

Wishing you and your families a joyous Easter season!  
Cecilia Forsyth

## **THE SELF INTEREST OF SOME MP'S**

The riding of Liberal MP Ruby Dhalla (Brampton-Springdale) consists of many residents from South Asia.

Ms Dhalla ran into trouble last May after she sponsored two personal caretakers from the Philippines to look after her aged mother. The caretakers claim that in addition to looking after Ms Dhalla's mother, the MP also insisted they clean the house and chiropractic clinic of Ms Dhalla and her brother, and work long hours carrying out many other duties that did not fall within the description of personal caretaking. The caretakers also complained that Ms Dhalla had improperly seized their passports.

Ms Dhalla has a very tenuous hold in her riding, since she won the election in 2008 by only a slim margin of 773 votes. The scandal arising over the caretakers has served to undermine her credibility with many of her constituents – some being recent immigrants themselves. They apparently did not appreciate her alleged abuse of other newly arrived immigrants.

In order to redeem herself in the eyes of her constituents, Ms Dhalla came up with a brilliant scheme.

On June 18, 2009, MP Dhalla tabled a private members Bill C-428, which would amend the Old Age Security Act to allow all new immigrants to apply for an old age pension after only three years of residence in Canada, instead of the existing requirement of 10 years' residency. This bill was seconded by new Liberal MP Bob Rae, who was formerly an NDP MP (1978-1982) and provincial NDP premier in Ontario (1990-1995). Apparently, no matter the party label, old socialist habits are hard to kill off.

If this bill is passed into law, thousands of parents of immigrants who enter Canada under our generous family reunification policy, who are elderly and frequently without English language skills, would receive a partial old age pension after only living here for three years, without having worked here or paid taxes.

Because of Canada's aging population, according to the Finance Department's monthly Fiscal Monitor, Old Age Security payouts have already increased by \$1.1 billion or 4.4% over the first nine months of the 2008-2009 fiscal year.

Minister of Finance Jim Flaherty has estimated a \$56 billion deficit in 2010. The deficit, combined with our present economic uncertainty, means that Ms Dhalla's bill, if passed, would further compromise our nation's financial situation – although it might help Ms Dhalla's re-election.

Fortunately, however, her controversial bill will not likely get very far in the House of Commons. Let's hope her constituents recognize her opportunism.

## **VANCOUVER'S DRUG INJECTION SITE**

A crucial fact about the Vancouver drug injection site which is not widely known, is that the drug addict using the site is required to obtain his/her own illegally obtained drug which he brings onto the drug injection site for injection. This means that the addict must obtain the drug from drug traffickers using the money that has invariably been obtained from criminal activity. The cost of an addict's drugs averages \$350,000 annually.

There are 65 Vancouver police officers stationed in the five blocks surrounding the Vancouver injection site. These police officers are prohibited from charging the addict with possession, and, instead, are obliged to escort the addict into the injection site. This is a travesty of the criminal law.

The cost of maintaining the drug injection site in Vancouver is approximately \$3 million per year.