

Response to Claims by Don Chapman on Gender Discrimination and Lost Canadians

Mr Chapman's News Release:

Under Jason Kenney's watch, gender discrimination in citizenship law continues. Let me start with some background:

Over the past seven years I'm been the person behind Bills C-428, C-323, S-17, S-2, and C-37, all having to do with the Lost Canadians. The opposition was so strong against C-428 and C-323 that we took our cause up in the Senate, whereby S-17 and S-2 passed unanimously. While S-17 died on the order paper, S-2 came about after an election and within weeks had made it to the House where it too passed unanimously. C-37 went further, also receiving unanimous approval in both the House and Senate. The problem- these Bills left certain people behind, and going forward there remain some glaring deficiencies.

Below you will find a Lost Canadian time line, which outlines just how we as Canadians got here. For many it's hard to believe that just over 63 years ago, Canadian citizenship did not exist. The first Act was incredibly discriminatory and the second Act didn't correct it, nor did S-2 or C-37. For example, prior to 1947 Canadian women who married non-Canadian men (men who were not British Subjects) lost their Canadian status on marriage. This was rectified in the 1990's for the women, but not for their children. Thus, today we have people who were born in Canada and lived their whole lives in Canada - some are even WWII veterans - who have no claim of citizenship. It's gender discrimination at its worst.

Background (for internal use only):

- Prior to 1947 persons born or naturalized in Canada were considered to be British subjects.
- The first *Canadian Citizenship Act* came into force on January 1, 1947. For the first time it specified who was a Canadian citizen and who could become a citizen. It also specified ways citizenship could be lost.
- A person born before 1947 became a Canadian citizen on January 1, 1947 if that person was a British subject born in Canada or born outside Canada in wedlock to a father who was a British subject born or naturalized in Canada; was a British subject who immigrated to Canada and was residing in Canada for at least five years before the child's birth; or, who had been living in Canada at least 20 years immediately before 1947.
- A person born before 1947 could have derived citizenship through a mother if born out of wedlock; however, the person must have also been a British subject when the *Canadian Citizenship Act* (1947) came into force. British subject status could only be obtained by birth in wedlock to a British subject father; by birth in a Commonwealth country or through naturalization (by making a formal application to become a British subject).

-As Mr. Chapman points out, all married women were considered to be 'under a disability' up to, and including, December 31, 1946. This meant that women were unable to be naturalized as British subjects or able to renounce their British subject status in their own right.

-Prior to 1947, British subject women who married men who were not British subjects or whose husband naturalized in a foreign country may have lost their British subject status upon marriage.

-Since 1950, a woman who lost British subject status before January 1, 1947, may acquire Canadian citizenship immediately upon written notice of her desire to become a Canadian citizen. To acquire citizenship she would have had to have been a Canadian citizen on January 1, 1947, except for loss of British subject status before that date by virtue of her marriage to a non-British subject.

-Since 1977, both parents can pass on citizenship, but only to children born abroad after February 14, 1977.

-Because recent changes to the *Citizenship Act* continued to preserve January 1, 1947 as the date when citizenship as a legal status was first established, those people who did not become citizens on January 1, 1947 did not benefit from the amendments that restored citizenship to lost Canadians.

Key Messages:

- Prior to 1947, British subject women who married men who were not British subjects or whose husband naturalized in a foreign country may have lost British subject status upon marriage.
- Since 1950, provisions have existed under the *Citizenship Act* to address this issue. Under the current Act, women who lost British subject status by virtue of their marriage to a non-British subject before January 1, 1947, may acquire Canadian citizenship upon written notice to CIC of their desire to become a citizen.
- Children born outside Canada after February 14, 1977 can derive citizenship through either parent irrespective of that parent's marital status.
- Recent amendments to the Act resolved many of the inequalities related to past legislation by giving citizenship to people who were not previously citizens.
- Persons who did not benefit from the recent amendments to the Act may be eligible for a discretionary grant of citizenship under subsection 5(4) of the *Citizenship Act*. Such grants are made on a case by case basis by the Governor in Council to relieve special and unusual hardship or to reward exceptional service to Canada.
- Those who have not lived in Canada for many years or who have never lived in Canada and who are citizens of another country may not have a strong case for a discretionary grant.

The second area needing a fix has to do with the unequal treatment of Canadian women vs. Canadian men after 1947. The discrimination was so blatant that our Supreme Court ruled unanimously in 1997 that women must have equal rights in citizenship law. In 2004 CIC decided to ignore this decision, thus Canada went back to treating women far differently than men. This not only violates our Supreme Court, but also our Charter of Rights and Freedoms and a whole host of UN Conventions which Canada agreed to uphold, such as *The Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women*. Gender discrimination must not be condoned, especially when Bill C-3 is right now making its way through Parliament and it deals with exactly the same circumstances, but only for Indian women. I would suggest that all women, regardless of ethnicity, should be afforded the same rights as men.

Background (for internal use):

-The 1947 Act provided that children born outside Canada after 1947 were only eligible for citizenship by descent if their 'responsible parent' (responsible parent was the father if born in wedlock and mother if born out of wedlock) was a Canadian citizen at the time of their birth. This rule meant that children born in wedlock to a Canadian mother and foreign father, and children born out of wedlock to a Canadian father and foreign mother were not eligible for citizenship by descent.

-This law was amended under the 1977 *Citizenship Act*. Children born outside Canada after February 14, 1977 can derive citizenship through either parent irrespective of that parent's marital status.

-To address the issue of those born before February 14, 1977 who had not previously been eligible for citizenship by descent, the 1977 Act contained a transitional provision which allowed for a grant of citizenship under section 5(2)(b) for children born between January 1, 1947 and February 14, 1977 in wedlock to a Canadian mother.

-Initially, applicants for this grant were required to undergo criminality and security checks and to take the oath of citizenship. As Mr. Chapman mentions in his release, the Supreme Court of Canada (SCC) found this infringed Charter equality rights (s. 15) in *Benner vs. Canada*. Therefore, in 1997, in following the SCC decision in *Benner vs. Canada*, the Department implemented the SCC decision by not requiring criminal or security checks or the oath for persons applying under this grant.

-In 2004, in *Augier v. Minister of Citizenship and Immigration*, the Federal Court found the 5(2)(b) grant provision to infringe Charter equality rights, (s. 15). As a result of the Augier case in 2004, the 5(2)(b) grant provision was extended to children born between 1947 and 1977 to a Canadian father out of wedlock.

-Those persons who were granted citizenship under this transitional provision (in effect 1977-2004) were citizens from that day forward and not from birth. This meant that any children they had outside Canada prior to receiving the grant were not eligible for citizenship by descent. However, any children they had outside Canada after they received the grant, but prior to the implementation of amendments to the Act in 2009, were Canadian at birth.

-The transitional provision expired on August 14, 2004.

-To resolve many of the inequalities related to past legislation, amendments to the Act in 2009 gave citizenship for the first time to all those born outside Canada in the first generation to a Canadian parent from January 1, 1947 onwards who had never acquired it. This included those who were eligible for citizenship by descent under the 1947 Act but who never registered and those who did not take advantage of the transitional provisions of 5(2)(b) before they expired in 2004.

-In preserving the date of January 1, 1947 as the date Canadian citizenship status was created, recent changes to the Act do not address any issues of gender inequality that pre-date this date and that resulted in people not becoming citizens on January 1, 1947.

-In applying consistently the first generation limit, the current Act does not give citizenship to children who are born in the second or subsequent generations outside Canada to a Canadian parent who was given citizenship because of the changes to the Act in 2009 and who had been ineligible for citizenship by descent as a result of the provisions of the 1947 Act.

Key Messages:

- Persons born abroad prior to 1977 could acquire Canadian citizenship from their Canadian father if the child was born in wedlock and from their Canadian mother if the child was born out of wedlock.
- Children born outside Canada after February 14, 1977 can derive citizenship through either parent irrespective of that parent's marital status.
- The 1977 Act contained a transitional provision which allowed for a grant of citizenship for children born between January 1, 1947 and February 14, 1977 in wedlock to a Canadian mother. In 2004, the grant provision was extended to children born between 1947 and 1977 to a Canadian father out of wedlock.
- To resolve many of the inequalities related to past legislation, amendments to the Act in 2009 gave citizenship for the first time to all those born outside Canada in the first generation to a Canadian parent from January 1, 1947 onwards who had never acquired it.
- All individuals born abroad who were citizens when the changes to the Act were implemented in 2009 continue to remain citizens, regardless if they were born in the second or subsequent generation abroad.
- Amendments made to the current Act in 2009 do not discriminate based on gender or marital status. In fact, changes to the Act in 2009 resolved many inequalities related to past legislation by giving citizenship to people who were not previously citizens.
- Persons who did not benefit from the recent amendments to the Act may be eligible for a discretionary grant of citizenship under subsection 5(4) of the *Citizenship Act*. Such

grants are made on a case by case basis by the Governor in Council to relieve special and unusual hardship or to reward exceptional service to Canada.

- Those who have not lived in Canada for many years or who have never lived in Canada and who are citizens of another country may not have a strong case for a discretionary grant.

Thirdly, the way the law is being interpreted, immigrant Canadians can actually have more rights than Canadian-born Canadians. It seems wrong to have two sets of Canadian citizens, one with more rights than the other. Equal should be just that.

Background (for internal use):

-Since April 17 2009, citizenship by descent is limited to the first generation born outside Canada.

-Mr. Chapman is critical of the first generation limit in terms of the right to pass on citizenship.

-An exception to the first generation limit exists for children born or adopted abroad by Canadians who are employed outside Canada by the Canadian armed forces, the federal public administration or provincial public service (Crown servants).

-A Canadian citizen who has acquired citizenship through birth outside Canada is not able to pass on citizenship by descent to children born abroad whereas a citizen who is born in Canada or who is naturalized is able to.

-To ensure fairness, the first generation limit applies equally to Canadian children born outside Canada to a Canadian parent and to foreign-born children adopted by a Canadian parent who obtained a direct grant of citizenship.

-Canadian citizen parents returning to live in Canada may sponsor a dependent child and then apply for citizenship immediately after the child becomes a permanent resident.

Key Messages:

- The *Citizenship Act* outlines entitlements to citizenship. There is no right under the Act to pass on citizenship by descent.
- Since April 2009, citizenship by descent is limited to the first generation born outside Canada (unless Crown servant exception applies). The first generation limit preserves the value of citizenship and ensures citizenship cannot be passed on endlessly to generations of Canadians living abroad.
- People who are born in Canada and those who immigrated to Canada and became citizens by naturalization will be able to pass on citizenship to their children born outside Canada.

- In order to be fair, the limit applies equally to those who are citizens by descent through birth outside Canada to a Canadian parent and those who are citizens by direct grant through adoption by a Canadian parent.
- Adopted persons who became citizens by naturalization after immigration to Canada are treated the same as all other naturalized Canadians. Their children born outside Canada will be citizens at birth and any children the adopted person adopts outside Canada will be eligible for a grant of citizenship without having to first become permanent residents.
- Canadians who are citizens by descent and are unable to pass on citizenship and who reside outside of Canada have options available to them if they desire Canadian citizenship for their children. They may choose to return to Canada to give birth or they can sponsor their children for permanent residence.

Fourth, there remains a problem with a handful of born out-of wedlock children to Canadian servicemen and their War Brides. Of the remaining cases, our government is once again ignoring the Supreme Court, as well as previous legislation including several Orders-in-Council. There is just no way that Canada should be excluding people in this day and age because they were born out-of wedlock.

Background (for internal use):

-The vast majority of war brides became citizens on January 1, 1947, when Canada's first citizenship legislation came into effect.

-Children born out of wedlock outside of Canada before January 1, 1947 but who were domiciled in Canada (had lived in Canada for a least five years) on January 1, 1947 or who were landed in Canada after that date were eligible for a grant of citizenship under the 1947 Act.

-War brides who landed in Canada but who left prior to January 1, 1947, did not become citizens when the 1947 Act came into effect.

-Children of war brides born out of wedlock outside Canada and who never landed in Canada or who landed but left prior to January 1, 1947 did not become Canadian citizens on January 1, 1947.

-Some war brides and children who became citizens on January 1, 1947, may have lost their Canadian citizenship due to specific loss provisions under the 1947 Act.

-Changes to the Act implemented in 2009 restored citizenship to many war brides and their children who lost their Canadian citizenship due to provisions of past legislation.

-Because changes to the Act continued to preserve January 1, 1947 as the date when Canadian citizenship as a legal status was first established, those people, including war brides and their children, who did not become citizens on January 1, 1947 did not benefit from the amendments.

Key Messages:

- The vast majority of war brides became citizens on January 1, 1947, the date when Canada's first citizenship legislation came into effect, creating the status of Canadian citizenship.
- The 1947 Act provided automatic citizenship for children born in wedlock to a Canadian father overseas, and many children of Canadian soldiers and war brides acquired citizenship this way.
- Children of war brides born out of wedlock outside Canada who never came to Canada as permanent residents or who came to Canada as permanent residents but left prior to January 1, 1947 did not become Canadian citizens on January 1, 1947.
- War brides and their children who acquired citizenship on January 1, 1947 and who lost it have benefited from the recent changes to the Act.
- All individuals who were citizens when the changes to the Act were implemented in 2009, including many war brides who never left Canada, continue to remain citizens.
- Persons who did not benefit from the recent amendments to the Act may be eligible for a discretionary grant of citizenship under subsection 5(4) of the *Citizenship Act*. Such grants are made on a case by case basis by the Governor in Council to relieve special and unusual hardship or to reward exceptional service to Canada.

Lastly, there remains a problem with 2nd-generation born abroad children, whereby they could be stateless. There's an easy solution which would both preserve the value of Canadian citizenship and recognize those children whose parents really do have a legitimate connection to our country.

Background (for internal use):

-The first generation limitation to citizenship by descent means that persons born outside Canada to a Canadian parent who was also born abroad may be stateless at birth if they do not acquire citizenship by descent due to the laws of other countries of which their parents are citizens, and do not acquire citizenship of the country of their birth because of the laws of that country.

-The Act provides a new provision for a grant of citizenship for persons born abroad to a Canadian parent in the second or subsequent generation who are, and who have always been stateless. This provision is consistent with Canada's international obligations as a party to the 1961 United Nations Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.

-Canadian parents may sponsor a spouse, partner or dependent child if the sponsor will reside in Canada when the applicant becomes a permanent resident.

Key Messages:

- Recent changes to the *Citizenship Act* comply with Canada's obligations under the 1961 United Nations Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.

- The Act provides a provision for a grant of citizenship for persons born abroad to a Canadian parent in the second or subsequent generation who are, and who have always been stateless.
- Alternatively, Canadian parents may sponsor a spouse, partner or dependent child if the sponsor will reside in Canada when the applicant becomes a permanent resident.

Keep in mind, these laws were so nutty that it's not beyond reason that several of you could one day have your own citizenship questioned. Just maybe, if not you, the person at risk might be a family member. Senator Roméo Dalliere was questioned, so too was Senator Lorna Milne's mother (and it happened when her father was Mayor of Toronto!). MP Marlene Jennings' citizenship got challenged, and MP Joe Volpe's mother lost her Canadian status prior to 1947 when she married an Italian. What I'm saying is that citizenship is not to be taken for granted, as thousands of people all across Canada are now discovering that to collect OAP, they must first prove their status. As guardians of our Constitution and the protector of the people, I would hope that citizenship is an area worthy of your time and efforts.

Don Chapman

+++++

The Lost Canadians - Timeline

1867 - Canada became a country under the British North America Act.

1868 - Canada adopts its first form of unique Canadian identity, called the Canadian Nationals Act. People are British Subjects, but Canadian Nationals. Here is the exact wording, "*married women, minors, lunatics, and idiots*" will be classified "*under the same disability*" for their national status. In essence, women were chattel of their husbands, children chattel of their fathers if born in-wedlock and chattel of their mothers if born out-of-wedlock. The language is common among the British colonies.

1868 through 1947 - Canadian women who married non-Canadian men (non-British subjects), lost their Canadian status on marriage. In the 1990's, for those women affected who were still alive, Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) decided to recognize these women as citizens. Not so for their children, even if they were born and raised in Canada.

1929- The Famous Five person's case- decided by the Privy Council of England, Canadian women were finally considered to be "people," giving women certain rights such as being a judge or Senator. It wasn't for another 89 years that most Canadian women had equal rights with regards to their own children in citizenship law.

1947 - Canada becomes the first country in the British Empire to officially create its own identity, separate from mother England. It's a result of senior cabinet minister Paul Martin, who realized just after WWII when walking through the Canadian Cimetière in Dieppe, France,

that the 707 Canadian soldiers buried there were British subjects- not Canadian citizens. Citizenship did not exist in Canada. On his return to Parliament he authored our first Citizenship Act, going into force on January 1, 1947. A product of its time, it was quite discriminatory. While married women were now able to have their own identity as citizens, they had far less rights than men- specific to do with passing citizenship onto their children. "*Minors, lunatics, and idiots*" remained classified under a "*disability*" for citizenship. If born in-wedlock, the father was deemed to be the "*responsible parent*," if born out-of-wedlock it was the mother. Often out-of-wedlock children had the word, "BASTARD" stamped on their birth certificate.

1977 - Canada adopts its second Citizenship Act, but makes the same mistake in correcting the law as was made by the country in 1793 when slavery was abolished. At that time it was written that there could be no new slaves, but for those already indentured, they would remain as slaves till they died. Thus a slave could give birth and the baby was free, but not the parent. The abolition of slavery was not made retroactive. Same thing with the citizenship act of 1977, so for those people already disenfranchised, they remained outcasts, but for anyone born or already Canadian on or after February 15, 1977, they had a different set of rights than those people who fell under the 1947 Act.

1982 - The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms was adopted, along with section 15, specifically 15(1), which stated, "*Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.*" While women cherished their new found equal rights, most were completely unaware that "*equal rights*" were not extended nor applicable in citizenship law to Canadian women and their children born pre-1977 outside of Canada.

1997 - In the Supreme Court case *Benner vs. Canada*, the justices ruled unanimously that the Citizenship Act was unconstitutional in that it blatantly discriminated against women. Under the 1947 Act Canadian women who married non-Canadian men and had a child outside of Canada did not have the right to pass citizenship onto their children. Men, however, who married non-Canadian women and fathered a child outside of Canada did have that right. In *Benner*, Canadian women who had children outside of Canada were given the same right to pass citizenship onto their children.

2004 - Because of my testimony before the Senate committee of *Social Affairs, Science, and Technology*, a top CIC bureaucrat appeared before this same committee a week later and announced the government would no longer abide by the *Benner* decision. Canada went back to discriminating against women, violating their own Supreme Court, their *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, as well as their obligation to honour the UN Convention on *The Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women*.

2007 - In May, Canada's Minister of Citizenship promises sometime before the end of the year she would introduce a Bill to correct past citizenship injustices. On December 10th, *International Human Rights Day*, the Minister introduces Bill C-37 into the House for first reading.

2008 - Bill C-37 passes unanimously in both the House and Senate, receiving Royal Assent on April 17, 2008, ironically on the 26th anniversary of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. It was not to be effective for one year.

2009 - Bill C-37 is implemented on April 17, 2009, 27 years to the day after the *Charter* became law. For the first time in Canadian history, women were equal in law, but only for women going forward. Once again the same mistake was made against women as was made 216 years earlier when the anti-slavery laws became effective- Bill C-37 was not made completely retroactive with regards to the ongoing discrimination against Canadian women. While C-37 recognized somewhere between 750-thousand to one-million people as citizens, it still left out second-generation, born out of Canada decedents of Canadian women. The second-generation born out of Canada decedents of men still had a right to citizenship. The Supreme Court decision regarding equality of rights for women continued to be ignored. Also, children born pre-1947 inside or out of Canada to Canadian mothers and non-British subject fathers, those children were still being denied citizenship.

Also in 2009 (March and October) - questions are asked in the Senate as to why this government continues discriminating against women.

2010 - March 8th, *International Women's Rights Day*, questions are asked in the House of Commons as to why this government continues its ongoing discrimination against women. Citizenship Minister Jason Kenney avoids any direct answer.

The very next day, on March 9th, Cabinet Minister Chuck Strahl announces in the House that in response to a BC court decision, the government would bring forward a Bill to give Indian women the same rights as men in passing status onto their children. Within a very short time, Bill C-3 is introduced to rectify the gender discrimination for native Canadian women. Despite the government's support for Indian women, they continue to discriminate against all other pre-1977 women. If passed, then the only women to have retroactive equality of rights with men would be Canadian Indian women. In essence, the country would be granting extra rights to one group only because of race. Put another way, people could be denied equality of rights because of their ethnicity.

The citizenship minister who introduced Bill C-37 admitted that there would still be deficiencies, despite the new law. I couldn't agree more...

Pre-1947 Gender Discrimination: Guy Valliere is an example of the pre-1947 babies. In 1926 Guy was born to a Canadian mother and U.S. father in Montreal. Because he was born "in-wedlock" he was considered be chattel of his father. Because his mother married a non-British subject, she lost her Canadian status. Of course no one ever told the family. Guy grew up in Canada, worked here, paid taxes, voted, he even defended the country as a soldier in WWII. Despite his mother, if she were alive, being retroactively granted citizenship in the 1990's, Canada refused to recognize the children. Thus a few years back when Guy had a stroke, Canada refused to pay for his medical treatment, rationalizing their decision saying that Guy wasn't Canadian. On February 1, 2009, Guy died disenfranchised from his own country- the very country he was asked to defend, with his life if need be. Regrettably Guy's story is not

unique. People are starting to have their Old-Age pensions questioned, or worse, denied. It's a bubble that will soon burst.

Remember, Guy was denied citizenship because he was born in-wedlock, thus Canada considered him to be property of his American father.

The next group consists of three people, all born out-of-wedlock to English War Brides and Canadian-soldier fathers. After the war all three babies were brought to Canada, raised here, paid taxes, voted, one even retired from the Canadian Navy, but because in law they were considered to be property of their English mothers, today they are being denied citizenship. Keep in mind that Privy Council Orders after WWII gave these women and children the exact same status as their Canadian husbands / fathers, that in 1927 Canada passed the *Legitimization Act* (upheld in the Supreme Court in 1954 - *Leung Ba Chai*) which stated that if your parents subsequently marry, your birth is "*legitimized*" and thus you were born in-wedlock, never mind all that- the government is now saying you aren't a citizen. Consider one more tidbit, which is *Taylor vs. Canada* in 2007. The Harper government took a case with the exact same circumstances as above to judicial review for the express purpose to deny Taylor his citizenship. While Taylor lost on appeal, the first decision had major ramifications that went far beyond Mr. Taylor. In the House of Commons, for the record, here are the words of the then Citizenship Minister, "*When there is a court decision that has implications for hundreds of statutes, dozens of departments, and could cost tens of billions of dollars, in situations like that, we have a duty to appeal.*" Fast forward to today. Mr. Taylor was given citizenship by a ministerial grant- which was all he ever asked for from the beginning. The government gambled Canadian taxpayer dollars - to the tune of "*tens of billions*" - just to deny one man his citizenship. Today the case is settled and Taylor is a citizen. But for Jackie Scott and two others, they have been denied by Mr. Kenney. Once again, the government is playing Russian Roulette with Canadian taxpayer money by gambling "*tens of billions*" to deny three people their citizenship - that's over \$600 to every Canadian man, woman, and child on the planet - just because they were born out-of wedlock.

Do I really have this straight? Guy Valliere would be Canadian if he had been born out-of wedlock and Jackie Scott would be Canadian if she had been born in-wedlock? Yes, this is exactly the way it is. Common sense has left the building.

1947 to 1977 gender discrimination: Kasey Neal and Lillian Miller are three-year old cousins, both born outside of Canada. Lillian can be Canadian because her connection to the country comes through her grandfather- a man. Kasey has been denied because her connection comes through her grandmother- a woman. In so doing, Canada is violating the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, the Supreme Court of Canada, and three UN Conventions (*The Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women; The Reduction of Statelessness; The Rights of the Child*).

Stateless children. There now exists a possibility that Canadians could give birth to a stateless child. The government has now given more rights to immigrant Canadians than to Canadian born citizens. This makes no sense.

MP's, Senators, and the Canadian Constitution...

Our issue isn't about party politics, nor about special favours. It's about equal rights, so that everyone is treated the same. It's about following the rule of law, our Charter, our Supreme Court decisions, and our obligations to the United Nations. It's about fairness, compassion, and human rights. It's about common sense. It's about doing what's right.

-Don Chapman