



REALity

REALISTIC • EQUAL • ACTIVE • FOR LIFE

THE BIGOTRY OF CANADIAN LAW SCHOOLS

Pro-life/family students attending Canada's law schools today must keep their heads down and their mouths shut, for fear of being targeted by the professors and bullied.

Canadian universities have become sinister, dark institutions seething with bigotry, where only politically correct opinions are tolerated.

There are no faculties at universities as intolerant as the faculties of law. Pro-life/family students attending Canada's law schools today must keep their heads down and their mouths shut, for fear of being targeted by the professors and bullied by their "progressive" (read: socially and intellectually compliant) classmates. To do otherwise, realistically, risks their failure to graduate.

Law students are being taught such human rights specialities as Aboriginal Law (mandatory at the University of British Columbia), Feminism and Law (mandatory at the University of Toronto), Environmental Law, etc. but are often not taught the fundamentals of law in such subjects as contracts or property law. Indeed, there has been many a Canadian law graduate who has never been exposed to the principles of Wills and Trusts, a subject basic to most general practices of law in Canada. Yet few lawyers, once they graduate, will be involved in any of the law specialties foisted on them at law school.

However, inevitably, a few of these lawyers will, in subsequent years, be appointed to the Bench where they will then have the authority to continue to promote these liberal policies learned in law school.

Educating future lawyers in the narrow, politically correct perspective on human rights is regarded by the law deans as a gift to the Canadian legal system, and to the general public in order to ensure the liberal interpretation of the law.

This belief was exposed when Trinity Western University (TWU) applied to open a law school. The University is located in Langley, British Columbia, and is a privately funded religious university, established by the evangelical Christian community.

The law deans were alarmed by the breach in its chain of command or control over legal education, brought about by

TWU's proposed independent law school.

TWU requires all of its students to sign a "community covenant" in which students agree to follow the evangelical Protestant tradition, including, among other requirements, "to observe modesty, purity and appropriate intimacy in all relationships and that sexual intimacy be reserved for marriage between one man and one woman..."

William Flanagan, President of the Council of Law Deans (and Dean of the Faculty of Law at Queens University in Kingston), in a letter dated November 20th, 2012, wrote to the Federation of Law Societies of Canada, complaining that TWU's covenant was inconsistent with federal and provincial laws because it intentionally discriminated against gay, lesbian and bisexual students. As a result, he concluded that TWU was "fundamentally incompatible with the core values of Canadian law schools and an equal society". The Federation of Law Societies responded to Mr. Flanagan by stating that its jurisdiction was limited to determining whether law schools meet certain technical requirements and does not extend to admission policies. This response set off a round of complaints from Mr. Flanagan, and the left wing Toronto Star, the homosexual newspaper Xtra and other such outlets.

Even though he is the Dean at Queen's Law School, Mr. Flanagan either misinterpreted or deliberately chose to ignore the freedom of conscience and religious protections included in the Charter of Rights (S.2). He also ignored two

CONTENTS

THE BIGOTRY OF CANADIAN LAW SCHOOLS	PAGE 1
DIVORCE: HOMOSEXUAL STYLE	PAGE 2
SUN NEWS NETWORK APPLIES TO CRTCC FOR EQUAL TREATMENT	PAGE 3
THE TRANSGENDERED REQUIRE COUNSELLING NOT SURGERY	PAGE 4
WHY REAL WOMEN PARTICIPATES IN THE UNITED NATIONS	PAGE 5
NOTICE OF ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING	PAGE 6

significant decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada in regard to religious rights in education. They are:

In 2001 the Supreme Court of Canada ruled in a case dealing with TWU graduates' admission to the British Columbia College of Teachers. The British Columbia College had refused to accept TWU's graduates because of TWU's "community covenant". However, the Supreme Court of Canada held that this was unacceptable since TWU met the accreditation requirements for instruction of the professional practice of teaching. Therefore, the Court ordered the British Columbia College to accept TWU graduates into its teacher training program. (TWU v. College of Teachers – British Columbia)

In 2002 the Supreme Court held that Canadians could not be disqualified from participation in the development of public policy or education because of their religious beliefs (Chamberlain vs. Surrey School District).

The fact that the Dean of Queen's law school, on behalf of other law deans, ignored the relevant law in order to

pursue a radical left wing objective is troubling. This throws into doubt the entire curriculum of the law schools. If a law school deliberately ignores the law on religious rights, then in what other areas is it ignoring the law so as to promote a particular objective? Such ideology undermines the credibility of the law graduates today as they cannot be considered knowledgeable in the law if they have not been given competent instructions.

It is significant that nobody is forcing students to attend TWU's law school. Attendance is to be absolutely voluntary. If a student does not wish to adhere to TWU's "Community Covenant", he or she is free to choose from some two dozen other, politically correct, law schools.

The anti-religious bias of Canadian law schools, which requires students to comply with one government enforced ideology, denies diversity and freedom of conscience in Canada. This is totalitarianism and cannot be accepted in a democratic country. We are grateful that TWU plans to open its law school in the fall of 2015. †

DIVORCE: HOMOSEXUAL STYLE



In their demands for legal marriage, homosexual activists argued that it was discrimination to treat their relationships differently from those of opposite-sex couples. It was only fair and just, they argued,

to legalize same-sex marriage as a matter of equality. Liberal Prime Minister Paul Martin subsequently forced through the same-sex legislation in June 2005, all in the name of equality.

Mr. Martin and his Justice Minister, Irwin Cotler, did not limit same-sex marriage to only those domiciled or resident within Canada. Instead, in their apparent enthusiasm for same-sex marriage, they opened it up to all such couples anywhere around the world, which gave them permission to apply for a legal marriage in Canada.

Both Mr. Martin and Mr. Cotler are lawyers and certainly knew, or should have known, the basic fundamentals of private international law, as it has evolved over the centuries.

Private international law, sometimes referred to as conflict of law, is that branch of law that deals with the inconsistencies or differences in laws between different nations. It reconciles these inconsistencies by deciding which law is to govern or be enforced.

In regard to the inconsistencies that arise in different nations in regard to the legalization of marriage, private international law has determined that:

1. Marriages are only recognized as valid if they are so recognized in the parties' own country of domicile; and
2. If a marriage is not recognized as valid in the country of domicile, then there cannot be a divorce of that union since there was, in fact, no marriage.

HOMOSEXUALS DEMAND DIVORCE IN CANADA

A same-sex couple, one residing in the UK and the other in Florida, married in Canada several years ago. When it didn't work out, they sought a divorce in Canada because they could not obtain a divorce in their respective countries, since neither of their countries of domicile recognized their so-called "marriage".

Their application for a divorce in Canada was objected to by the Conservative government because of the legal principle of private international law, which made such a divorce impossible since their marriage was not legally recognized in their country of domicile.

The media went crazy with the government's response, despite the fact that the federal government was merely acting according to recognized law. The media charged the Conservatives with intolerance, hate, and bigotry and with having a secret agenda against homosexuals.

The Conservatives were blind-sided by the vehemence of this media attack. The attack was especially vicious in the Globe and Mail, which made this issue front page news (January 12, 2012).

Mr. Rob Nicholson, Justice Minister, subsequently tabled Bill C-32 in the House of Commons on February 17, 2012, which permitted same-sex couples to obtain a divorce in Canada, despite the fact that this does not comply with the Canadian Divorce Act nor with private international law. That is, homosexuals, who claimed they only wanted "equality" were, in fact, seeking, and apparently obtaining, special rights and privileges not available to opposite-sex couples in regard to obtaining a divorce in Canada.

ONTARIO JUDGE ADDS TO THE CONFUSION

Bill C-32 has not yet proceeded to second reading and, therefore, is not yet the law. This “detail”, however, has not prevented an Ontario judge from granting a divorce to a same-sex couple. (Ontario Judges seem to make up the law as they go along, according to their whims.)

Madam Justice Ruth Mesbur, of the Ontario Superior Court, granted a divorce sought by a homosexual who had entered into a civil partnership in the UK in 2009 under the *British Civil Partnership Act*. (Same-sex marriage is not available under UK law). In 2010, this couple returned to Ontario to reside. One of the partners sought a “divorce” here because he wanted to be recognized as a legal “spouse” under the *Ontario Family Law Act* so that he would be eligible to receive spousal support from his partner. The federal government intervened in the case, objecting to a divorce being granted, because private international law requires the recognition of a marriage be determined by the domicile of the parties. If it is not so recognized, then no divorce can be granted.

Madam Justice Mesbur ignored the law and was happy to oblige the same-sex applicant by taking a very novel approach to the situation. She concluded that *The British Civil Partnership Act* was the same as a legal marriage!

It is a funny thing, though, that the British do not think that at all. That is why British Prime Minister David Cameron

held a vote in the House of Commons on February 5, 2013 on a Bill to legalize same-sex marriages in the UK. In doing so, he alienated over half of his caucus (which voted against his bill), the House of Lords, the Anglican, Catholic and Muslim religious leaders, as well as a large portion of the general public. It's certain that Mr. Cameron would not have gone out on such a precarious limb if he had thought civil partnerships were the same as legal marriages.

Despite the obvious differences between these two relationships, Madam Justice Ruth Mesbur concluded in her judgement that civil partnerships “must be treated as a marriage in Canada”. otherwise, it would be “clearly contrary to Canadian public policy and Charter values” and would perpetrate impermissible discrimination.

This decision further complicates an already confusing situation. Does this mean that Canada will recognize *all* civil partnership agreements, made anywhere in the globe between same-sex couples, as legal marriages under Canadian law? What a legal tangle this ideological court decision has created!

Canada seems to have more than its share of judges who, for ideological reasons, are willing to ignore the facts and the law in order to reach a desirable, radical, left-wing result. In their wake, however, these policymakers leave confusion, uncertainty, and a loss of respect for the judicial system. †

SUN NEWS NETWORK APPLIES TO CRTC FOR EQUAL TREATMENT

the license given to SNN was guaranteed to keep its views off the air, except to a very limited few.

Even before the conservative Sun News Network (SNN) went on the air in April 2011, it was viciously attacked. It was accused of producing “hate” – the latter charge promoted by the uncharming left leaning feminist writer, Margaret Atwood. It was accused of bias and bigotry, and was hilariously described as “unnecessary” since there was already, “balanced” news coverage in Canada. SNN was also derisively named by the left wing as “Fox News North”. We should be so lucky!

The CRTC reacted to these complaints from the hysterical left, by granting SNN a license permit to broadcast on speciality channels only. This meant that it was only seen in four out of every ten Canadian homes. The SNN channel was also placed at the high upper end of the dial. All of this resulted in SNN pulling in only 16,400 viewers in an average minute, even though focus groups said they would watch the channel if it were made available to them.

In short, the license given to SNN was guaranteed to keep its views off the air, except to a very limited few. Yet,

SNN has provided 8,468 hours of Canadian content, in contrast to several foreign, all-news cable channels, such as CNN and Al Jazeera (the latter owned by Middle East interests situated in Qatar). Even Oprah's channel, OWN, is more accessible to Canadians than SNN.

Quebecor, which owns SNN, was losing \$17 million each year because of the limitations placed on its operation by the CRTC.

The treatment of SNN by the CRTC is profoundly unfair; especially since it gave the left wing CBC news and CTV news channels “mandatory carriage” on the networks when they started up so that all cables providers were required to carry them. It is obvious the CRTC is discriminating against SNN because of its conservative perspective.

SNN has now applied to the CRTC to be carried by every basic cable provider, i.e. “mandatory carriage” and to be guaranteed placement on the lower end of the dial.

The CRTC will hold a hearing on SNN's application on April 23, 2013. REAL Women of Canada has requested the opportunity to make a presentation at this hearing in support of SNN's application for fair treatment by CRTC. †

THE TRANSGENDERED REQUIRE COUNSELLING NOT SURGERY

A prominent Canadian psychiatrist, Dr. Joseph Berger, has confirmed that the transgendered need treatment for their delusions or psychosis, not surgery.

Medical authorities in Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States have made it clear that the transgendered are troubled individuals. They are in need of counselling, rather than surgery and hormone treatment, in order to protect them from substantially higher morbidity and mortality than the general population after their “sex reassignment” and hormone treatment.

A prominent Canadian psychiatrist, Dr. Joseph Berger, has confirmed that the transgendered need treatment for their delusions or psychosis, not surgery.

Below is a letter sent by Dr. Berger to Members of Parliament addressing this problem.

From: Joseph BERGER
Date: Wed, Dec 19, 2012 at 9:18 PM
Subject: 'transgendered'

DR. JOSEPH BERGER

FRCPC (Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Canada), DABPN (Diploma, American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology), DLFAPA (Distinguished Life Fellow of the American Psychiatric Association)

I was asked to make a statement with reference to a bill C279 that is under consideration.

It appears to me that this bill requests that some special allowances or attitudes or possibly even ‘rights’ be given to people who identify themselves as being ‘transgendered’.

From a scientific perspective, let me clarify what ‘transgendered’ actually means. I am speaking now about the scientific perspective – and not any political lobbying position that may be proposed by any group, medical or non-medical.

‘Transgendered’ are people who claim that they really are or wish to be people of the sex opposite to which they were born as, or to which their chromosomal configuration attests to.

Sometimes, some of these people have claimed that they are ‘a woman trapped in a man’s body’ or alternatively ‘a man trapped in a woman’s body’.

Scientifically, there is no such a thing.

Therefore anyone who actually *truly* believes that notion, is by definition deluded, psychotic.

The medical treatment of delusions or psychosis is not by surgery.

On the other hand, if these people are asked to clarify exactly what they believe, that is to say do they truly believe whichever of those above propositions applies to them and they say ‘no’, they know that such a proposition is not true, but that they ‘feel’ it, then what we are talking about scientifically, is just unhappiness, and that unhappiness is being accompanied by a wish – that leads some people into taking hormones that predominate in the other sex, and even having cosmetic surgery designed to make them ‘appear’ as if they are a person of the opposite sex.

The proper treatment of emotional unhappiness is not surgery.

Cosmetic surgery will not change the chromosomes of a human being.

Cosmetic surgery will not make a man become a woman, capable of menstruating, ovulating, and having children.

Cosmetic surgery will not make a woman into a man, capable of generating sperm that can unite with an egg or ovum from a woman and fertilize that egg to produce a human child.

These are the scientific facts. There seems to me to be no medical or scientific reason to grant any special rights or considerations to people who are unhappy with the sex they were born into, or to people who wish to dress in the clothes of the opposite sex – which I believe is not illegal.

I have read the brief put forward by those advocating special rights, and I find nothing of scientific value in it.

Words and phrases are used that have no objective scientific basis such as “the inner space”.

The committee examining these proposals should be aware that there are indeed some quite rare examples where the sex of a baby at birth is uncertain.

Two particular conditions are well recognized.

One is where the child is a boy, but the testes have not descended into the testicular sac, but remain somewhere ‘stuck’ in the abdomen.

The other well-recognized condition is where the child is a girl, but because of some abnormal hormonal levels as the baby was growing in the mother’s uterus, the clitoris of the baby girl is unusually large, and might at first be mistaken for a penis.

Both these conditions are now diagnosed earlier; chromosome testing to confirm the genetic sex is widely available. They should not nowadays lead to any confusion about the real sex of the baby.

Other than these and possibly even rarer abnormalities, the so-called ‘confusion’ about their sexuality that a teenager or adult has is purely psychological.

As a psychiatrist, I see no reason for people who identify themselves in these ways to have any rights or privileges different from everyone else in Canada.

Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada and Diplomate of the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology.

Examiner from 1977-2005 for the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology in the Board Examinations to become a Board Certified Psychiatrist.

Past Assistant Professor of Psychiatry. University of Toronto.

Past President. Ontario District Branch of the American Psychiatric Association.

Representative for Ontario 2002-2010 to the Assembly (parliament) of the American Psychiatric Association.

Distinguished Life Fellow, American Psychiatric Association.

Author and Presenter, numerous medical and academic Papers at Conferences, Seminars, and in Medical Journals.

Book Author "The Independent Medical Examination in Psychiatry" ButterworthLexisNexis. †

WHY REAL WOMEN PARTICIPATES IN THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations policymakers...are working hard to promote questionable human rights to become international law. ... REAL Women of Canada also remains a determined force to protect life and the natural family.

Fifteen years ago, in 1998, REAL Women of Canada, was accredited as a non-government organization (NGO) in consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). This meant that REAL Women of Canada was permitted to attend and participate in any United Nations conference or meeting anywhere in the world.

In the past fifteen years, REAL Women of Canada has spent thousands of dollars sending our representatives to United Nations conferences (about 40 such meetings in all). Currently, National President, Cecelia Forsyth (who has much experience at the United Nations), and Karen Lilly, a member of the Saskatchewan Chapter of REAL Women of Canada, will be attending the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women to be held in New York from March 4th to March 15th, 2013.

The reason REAL Women of Canada has committed itself to attend these United Nations conferences is that we are painfully aware that no matter how hard we work within Canada for the pro-life/family cause, it could all be washed away if the United Nations should decide that the issues such as abortion, sexual orientation, gender identity (transgenderism), etc. are to be considered international human rights. If that occurs, Canada would face intense pressure, both internationally and domestically, to comply with these provisions, despite strong moral and religious objections to them.

Consequently, REAL Women of Canada has diligently worked in coalition with other pro-life/family NGO's from around the world to try to prevent the United Nations from travelling down the unsavoury pathway of turning these

unacceptable activities into international human rights that would have to be complied with around the globe.

The United Nations policymakers, such as its Treaty Monitoring Committees of the seven human rights treaties, are working hard to promote these questionable human rights to become international law. They do this by "reinterpreting" or "reading in" such provisions, which were never intended to be included in the treaties when they were signed and ratified.

Further, the United Nations Secretary General, Ban Ki-moon, and the head of the United Nations Human Rights Council in Geneva have both claimed that these controversial demands are already internationally accepted human rights. This is absolute nonsense.

The fact is that abortion, sexual orientation and gender identity, etc. have never been accepted at the United Nations because the majority of United Nations members (encouraged and assisted by pro-life/family NGO's), have steadfastly refused to accept them. Their refusal has continued despite verbal attacks on them, threatened withdrawal of foreign aid, and ridicule by the radical left at the United Nations. Time and time again, however, pro-life/family nations have stood firm against this intimidation.

Pro-life nations, have formed a coalition of 60 countries representing all regions of the world and have signed a joint declaration making clear their opposition to recognizing sexual orientation and gender identity, etc.

This declaration will not stop the relentless pressure on them, but at least the radical left at the United Nations knows that these members and the supporting NGO's remain a formidable, united force against them.

REAL Women of Canada also remains a determined force to protect life and the natural family, both within Canada and at the United Nations. †



Find Us on [Facebook](#).

NOTICE OF ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING



NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Annual General Meeting of the Members of REAL Women of Canada (hereinafter called the "Corporation") will be held on Friday, May 31st, 2013, at the Cartier Place Suite Hotel, 180 Cooper Street, Ottawa, Ontario at the hour of 7:00 p.m. for the following purposes:

1. To receive the financial statements of the Corporation for the fiscal year ending December 31, 2012, together with the reports of the directors and auditors thereon;

2. To elect a Board of Directors;

a) Advance nominations shall be in writing and shall be submitted by not less than two members in good standing, with the written consent of the nominee, and received by the **Nominations Committee** at least two weeks prior to the annual meeting (May 17, 2013). According to our constitution, no nomination can be accepted after that date. A brief resume of the candidate's biography must be submitted along with the nomination. Nominators must vouch that the candidate is a member in good standing, and upholds the philosophy, aims and objectives of REAL Women of Canada, as set out in the membership application form. Please forward nominations to: **Nominations Chairperson, Diane Watts, REAL Women of Canada, Box 8813, Station "T", Ottawa, ON K1G 3J1. Fax: (613) 236-7203 or email realwcn@rogers.com.**

b) Only those who subscribe to our objectives and have been voting members of the Corporation for at

least 60 days prior to this meeting shall have the right to vote and/or run for office.

c) New members and renewals will be accepted on the date of the meeting, but new members must attend as observers, not as voting members. Those members whose memberships have lapsed may renew and will be allowed to vote.

The General Meeting is open to members, representatives from member organizations and to co-operating organizations.

3. To hear and vote on resolutions from voting members;

a) **Resolutions** must be submitted in writing, according to the constitution, 14 days prior to the Annual Meeting (May 17, 2013), and approved by the Resolutions Committee. Please send such resolutions to: **REAL Women of Canada, Resolutions Committee, Box 8813, Station "T", Ottawa, ON K1G 3J1. Fax: (613) 236-7203 or email to realwcn@rogers.com.**

4. To transact such further or other business as may properly come before the meeting or any adjournment or adjournments thereof.

Cecilia Forsyth
Cecilia Forsyth
National President

DATED at Aberdeen, SK, this 21st day of February 2013. †

MESSAGE BOARD

- A special **Thank You** to our members for your financial support. It is greatly appreciated.
- Please **share your newsletter** with family and friends.
- Please invite one person to become a member. Personal one-to-one contact is the best method to **enlist new members**.
- To **renew or start a membership**, [click here](#).

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.org

SUPPORT REAL WOMEN OF CANADA

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

Membership: **\$25/year** • Group rate: **\$30/year** • Donation: _____
Being a political lobby group, contributions are not tax deductible.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

Province _____ Postal Code _____

Tel _____ Email _____

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