



REAL WOMEN'S PETITION ON BEHALF OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Real Women of Canada is concerned about the discrimination that is currently being experienced by Christians in Canada. Examples of discriminatory practices against Christians include:

- (i) The lack of protection for physicians and other health care workers who refuse to participate in assisted suicide for religious and conscience reasons.
- (ii) The failure to protect faith based institutions, business owners, organizations and others, such as those employed in the wedding industry, for refusing to support same-sex marriage.
- (iii) The attempt by several provincial law societies to prevent the establishment of a Christian Law School at Trinity Western University in Langley, British Columbia.
- (iv) Discrimination against Christian parents who oppose sex-education curriculums, and the establishment of transgendered rights in schools, which are contrary to their religious beliefs.
- (v) The infringement of public safety and conscience and religious rights of individuals, by the proposed amendment to the *Human Rights Act* to provide recognition and rights for the transgendered in the public sphere.
- (vi) The dismissal of Christians from employment for publicly proclaiming their Christian beliefs such as opposition to same-sex marriage.

As a result of these and other acts of discrimination against Christians, the Board of REAL Women of Canada decided, at its board meeting held in June 2016, to present a petition to Parliament urging the protection of the rights of Christians in Canada.

It is acknowledged that the petition will likely not be acted upon by the present Liberal government. Rather, its purpose is to raise the profile of the issue, and to indicate the unacceptability of discrimination against Christians. Hopefully, this may prevent even further deterioration of the situation.

The petition by REAL Women of Canada has been approved by the House of Commons Clerk of Petitions, as required under parliamentary procedure, and by MP Michael Cooper (St. Albert – Edmonton) who will be presenting the petition in the House of Commons. **A copy of the petition is enclosed in this issue of REALity and is also available on our website (in both French and English) at www.realwomenofcanada.ca.**

The parliamentary Standing Orders require the government to respond within 45 calendar days to every petition submitted.

This petition may be signed by any resident of Canada. There

is no minimum age requirement for signing the petition. You may print or photocopy as many copies of the unsigned petition as required. It is not necessary to have the page completed with all six signatures. Just send in the petition with as many signatures as you are able to obtain, even just one signature is sufficient.

Other requirements for signing the petition include:

1. Each petitioner must sign his or her own name directly on the petition and must not sign for anyone else, unless that person is unable to do so and notification of this must be included with the signature. Address information is required.
2. Any additional pages must contain the full text of the petition.
3. Petitions must be presented to Parliament as **original signed documents**. Therefore, do not fax them to REAL Women. Instead the original signed petitions should be **mailed** to us. Postage is required. Please mail to:

REAL Women of Canada
P.O. Box 8813, Station T
Ottawa ON K1G 3J1

The petitions received by REAL Women of Canada will then be forwarded to MP Michael Cooper for presentation to Parliament.

If you have any questions about this petition, please do not hesitate to contact us.

REAL Women's Board is deeply grateful to all those who obtain signatures on this petition. This discrimination, which is in contradiction to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, is designed to seriously curtail the practice of the Christian faith in Canada. †

CONTENTS

REAL WOMEN'S PETITION ON BEHALF OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.....	PAGE 1
JUSTIN TRUDEAU SUBMITS TO LGBT DEMANDS..	PAGE 2
PLANNED PARENTHOOD SPECIALIZES IN ELIMINATING BLACK LIVES.....	PAGE 3
TRUDEAU APPOINTS EXTREMIST JUDGES.....	PAGE 4
THE EUROPEAN UNION HAS MORE TROUBLES THAN JUST BREXIT.....	PAGE 5
CANADIAN MUSEUM FOR HUMAN RIGHTS.....	PAGE 6
PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.....	PAGE 6

JUSTIN TRUDEAU SUBMITS TO LGBT DEMANDS

Justin Trudeau can't say "no" to any demands made by the LGBT community, (lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered). He is an obedient servant to their cause.

In July, 2016 he made two specific controversial commitments to them:

I. Blood donations from homosexuals to be accepted after only one year's abstinence from their having same-sex relations;

However, a tragedy occurred in the 1980's when Canada experienced one of its greatest health disasters due to tainted blood donations causing 800 deaths, mainly due to blood donations contaminated by AIDS. Consequently, Canada, along with many other countries refused blood donations from homosexuals who had sex with another man during their lifetime.

Under political pressure from homosexual activists, this ban was relaxed in Canada in 2013 to permit blood from homosexuals who have not had sex with a man for a five-year period. This latter decision, however, was unacceptable to homosexual activists who claimed that this five year ban was discriminatory and "intrinsically abhorrent to the fundamental Canadian values of equality and non-discrimination". They screamed, of course, that the Canadian Blood Services was "homophobic". There was no concern at all expressed by them about the public's right to protection from receiving contaminated blood. The latter was irrelevant to them even though gay men make up 49% of new HIV cases in Canada.

As a result of this pressure, on July 12, 2016, the Liberal government reduced the waiting period to donate blood for homosexual men even further, from five years to one year's sexual abstinence.

Although there is a still-imperfect scientific technology to test for HIV, the LGBT community is still disappointed with the one-year deferral period, as is also, apparently, the Liberal government, as Canadian Health Minister, Jane Philpott, cheerfully announced in July, 2016:

There is an incredible desire and certainly a commitment on the part of our government to work toward further decreasing that donor deferral period. The desire is to be able to have those deferrals based on behaviour as opposed to sexual orientation.

It is homosexual behaviour that contaminates the blood system. Is she going to rely on a homosexual donor's assertion that he never has homosexual relations, or if he does not, he always uses condoms, and as a result, his behaviour is safe? Some protection for the public that is going to be!

II. Lowering the age of consent for anal sex.

Trudeau has announced that his government will be lowering the age of consent for anal sex from eighteen to sixteen years of age in the *Criminal Code*. This will make it legal for adult men to engage in anal sex with 16-year old adolescents.

It is a concern, however, that the homosexual lobby organization EGALE forwarded to the Liberal government in June, 2016, a report (see below) listing numerous demands. Included among these demands was one that the government repeal entirely S.159 of the *Criminal Code* which provision legalizes anal sex conducted in private for consenting adults 18 years and over. S.159 also provides that anal sex must be in private i.e. only two persons take part, or be present. Since there is no other provision in the *Criminal Code* directly relating to anal sex, repealing S.159 entirely means that there will be no limits on anal sex. That is, anal sex would be permitted at any age, in Canada, with any number of persons whether or not it takes place in public.

It may well be that reducing the age of consent from 18 to 16 is only for public consumption, and is a cover-up for the real intent of the homosexual activists i.e. to remove all limits on age and consent for anal sex whether performed in public or in private.

In its report, EGALE also calls for the repeal of the bawdy-house laws (S.210 and S.211 of the *Criminal Code*). A "bawdy house" is defined in the *Criminal Code* to mean a place used for the purpose of prostitution, or acts of indecency. This provision also prohibits public sex. This latter provision has been used in the past by police in its bathhouse raids.

In effect, if S.159 is removed in its entirety as well as the provisions against bawdy houses, as demanded in EGALE's June report, it would mean that anal sex would be available anywhere, anytime with anyone without any restrictions as to age. This is alarming!



AGE OF CONSENT FOR ANAL SEX

The issue of “age of consent for anal intercourse” first arose in 1987, when the *Criminal Code* was being amended. Homosexual MP Svend Robinson, requested, at that time, that consent for homosexual sex be the same as that allowed for sex between male and female. The Minister of Justice Raymond Hnatyshyn stated:

Medical evidence does indicate different kinds of psychological or physical harm may attach to different types of intercourse for young persons. Medical experts are not certain at what age sexual preference is established, and many argue that the age is fixed only in the later teen years. Also the question here is the heightened danger of contracting Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome or other sexually transmitted disease from penetration.

The reason for the age discrepancy for anal sex and other sexual acts was to protect adolescents from exploitation and health complications of anal sex. This fact is apparently of no concern to homosexual activists.

The Liberals are also now studying even further demands submitted to the government by the homosexual organization EGALE in its report.

These include:

- i. Individual compensation to those who suffered past discrimination because of “who they were or whom they loved”;
- ii. Providing all police officers or others in the justice system with human rights training with regard to the historic wrong of treating members of sexual minori-

ties as criminals, etc.;

- iii. Providing training to Customs officials to prevent banning homosexual materials from crossing the border;
- iv. Implementing procedures to protect the dignity of transgender or intersex persons in prisons or jails;
- v. Eliminating laws re keeping a bawdy house or criminally charging those who visit a bathhouse or who practise group sex.

TRUDEAU TO APOLOGIZE TO HOMOSEXUALS

In August, 2016, Trudeau agreed to publicly apologize on “behalf of all Canadians” to those who were imprisoned, fired from their jobs or otherwise persecuted in the past because of their homosexuality.

However, there has been a law prohibiting homosexuality since 1892 when the *Criminal Code* first came into effect. This law reflected the views of the Canadian public at that time, who rejected homosexuality because they thought it repugnant. (This is the reason that British writer Oscar Wilde was jailed for homosexuality in England in 1900, since he contravened the law prohibiting the unacceptable homosexual activity of sodomy). Because homosexuality was illegal and unacceptable to society, homosexual persons in the military and public services in Canada and elsewhere were particularly vulnerable to blackmail and a security risk. That is why they were dismissed from employment in the past.

Like much else about Justin Trudeau, he doesn’t think very deeply, and doesn’t understand the history, complexity and ramifications of his decisions on this issue and most others. As a result, he may well accede to these unreasonable homosexual demands. †

PLANNED PARENTHOOD SPECIALIZES IN ELIMINATING BLACK LIVES

Planned Parenthood in the US has established 79% of its surgical abortion facilities within walking distance of black neighbourhoods. The African-American population of the US is about 13%, but about 30% of the abortions performed in that country are on black women. As a result, the number of abortion deaths in the black community now exceeds those caused by the thirteen other leading causes of death combined, such as cancer, strokes, heart attacks, etc. In fact, more black lives have been lost by abortion, 5,800 times more, than the deaths caused to blacks by the Klu Klux Klan. That is, 3,446 blacks were lynched by the Klu Klux Klan between 1882 and 1968, compared to over 20 million black lives lost by abortion since 1968.

As a result of abortion, blacks have now fallen behind hispanics as the largest minority group in the US.

Planned Parenthood’s founder, Margaret Sanger, was a racist and eugenicist who wanted to rid the world of “defective

and feeble-minded minorities” and other so-called “breeders”. To do so, she targeted, among others, African-Americans. She founded the “black project” to encourage blacks to use birth control or become sterilized, and wrote that citizens should be required to obtain a “birth permit” from the government before giving birth. She wrote in 1939; “we do not want word to go out that we want to exterminate the Negro population”, which she referred to as “human weeds”.

The organization BlackLivesMatter (BLM) is fixated on police violence involving African-Americans. They should, instead, be protesting Planned Parenthood and abortion which is ending so many black lives. There is considerable hypocrisy in the leftist progressive organizations, such as BLM, with this disproportionate slaughter of black unborn lives carried out in pursuit of so-called “reproductive justice”. Why is BLM blind to the enormous number of black deaths caused by abortion? †

TRUDEAU APPOINTS EXTREMIST JUDGES

In order that courts function properly, it is critical that there be wide-spread trust in the appointed judges. Prime Minister Justin Trudeau has destroyed that trust.

In June, 2016 his Liberal government announced fifteen new appointments to the Bench, ten of whom were female, including a known lesbian and also hard-line feminist activist, (both appointed to Alberta courts). Included as well, was an Aboriginal and an individual from an Asian visible minority, together with former Liberal candidates and supporters. It is apparent from these appointments that, judicial “merit” under Trudeau is determined by the candidate’s ideology and colour, rather than his/her capability.

Judges occupy high public office, making decisions that affect people’s liberty and the quality of their community life. In holding such enormous power, by way of their high public office, they must deserve their position. Trudeau’s recent appointments to the judiciary indicate they do not deserve their appointments. They are clearly intensely partisan, and have been appointed to their position because of their left-wing ideology and activism. These appointments were made in order to support and ensure Trudeau’s determination to change Canada’s values to match his own personal, “progressive” perspective.

Oddly enough, the Conservatives under Prime Minister Stephen Harper seldom played this partisan game in making judicial appointments. It did occur in some instances, but these appointments were noteworthy by their rarity. On the other hand, Liberal prime ministers over the years have, with few exceptions, used judicial appointments to promote their friends and supporters. An egregious example of this was Liberal Justice Minister Irving Cotler, who, in just two years as Justice Minister (2004-2006), appointed to the Bench his former Executive Assistant, his former Chief of Staff, the wife (Rosalie Abella) of his good friend, Irving Abella, who was a fellow member of the Canadian Jewish Congress, plus an assortment of Liberal fundraisers, campaign workers, defeated Liberal candidates and other partisans. (Source: Lawyers Weekly, May 20th, 2005).

Canada has also experienced over the years, a parade of feminist lawyers appointed to the Supreme Court of Canada. During the tenure of these women on the Supreme Court, they have promoted their feminist agenda to the detriment of men, non-feminist women and Canadian society. These extremist feminists on the Supreme Court include:

1. Bertha Wilson - She was the first woman appointed to the Supreme Court in 1982. Her appointment was recommended and approved by the radical feminist organization The National Action Committee on the Status of Women (NAC). Her judgment in the 1988 *Morgentaler* abortion decision was a feminist polemic, lacking entirely in legal merit or reasoning. Judge Wilson gave a speech in 1990 at Osgoode Hall in which she claimed that the criminal law had a “distinctly male perspective” leading to legal principles that

were “not fundamentally sound”. She recommended that the criminal law should be changed to accommodate “the nature of women and women’s sexuality”.

Judge Wilson also chaired a \$400,000 task force sponsored by the Canadian Bar Association about discrimination against women in the legal profession.

Her report, released in August, 1993 made 250 sweeping recommendations: she provided no factual evidence to support her allegations that women lawyers experienced discrimination by men.

Some female judges in B.C. described Judge Wilson’s report as “preposterous and offensive”. They also officially issued a statement in which they discounted the survey’s conclusions and recommendations.

An editorial, on August 24th, 1993, in the *Globe and Mail* claimed that Judge Wilson’s report was more “interested in exaggeration or outright invention, the better to justify the spinning of fresh webs of directives, rules and regulations.” The latter is typical of feminist activists.

2. Rosalie Abella – Before Judge Abella was appointed to the Bench, she had a very dim view of the objectivity and fairness of judges. In 1987 in an article included in a feminist book, *The Dynamic Nature of Equality*, Abella wrote,

Every decision-maker who walks into a court room to hear a case is armed not only with the relevant legal text, but with a set of values, experience and assumptions that are thoroughly embedded.

Once she was appointed to the court, however, she had a conversion similar to that of Saul on the Road to Damascus by which she became so enlightened by her appointment as a judge that she regarded judges as “saviors of the public”.

In 1998, in the case *Regina v. Rosenberg*, dealing with same-sex couples’ entitlement to benefits under the *Income tax Act*, she stated:

... elected governments may wait for changing attitudes in order to preserve public confidence and credibility. Both public confidence and institutional credibility argue in favour of courts being free to make independent judgments notwithstanding those same attitudes.

She repeated her unusual understanding of the role of judges in a speech at Osgoode Hall in April, 2000 in which she stated:

The judiciary has a different relationship with the public. It is accountable less to the public’s opinions and more to the public interest.

In short, she believes that judges know best what is in the public’s interest. As a result, she imposes her own views on the public, apparently for their own good. The Imperial Crown sits heavily on her head.

3. Claire L’Heureux-Dubé – She was appointed to the

Quebec Court in 1973 and, even while sitting on the Quebec Bench, continued with her feminist activities. This included being a founding and board member in 1976 of the radical feminist organization, Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women (CRIAOW). In the 1980's while sitting on the Supreme Court of Canada, Judge L'Heureux-Dubé served as the vice-president of the feminist organization, International Federation of Women Lawyers (FIDA).

In 1998-9 Judge L'Heureux Dubé brazenly gave public speeches promoting homosexual rights - especially same-sex marriage. She became the most prominent lobbyist for homosexual activism in Canada during her tenure on the Supreme Court of Canada.

4. Chief Justice Beverley McLachlin – In a speech delivered in Calgary before the feminist organization, The Elizabeth Fry Society, in April, 1991, Judge McLachlin criticized specific areas of the criminal law which, she claimed, were the result of a “male-dominated Parliament” which did not include the “female perspective” – i.e. feminist perspective.

On December 1st, 2005 Judge McLachlin asserted in a speech that “judges can render their opinions based on ‘unwritten’ constitutional norms, even in the face of clearly-enacted laws or hostile public opinion” (Emphasis ours). She explained that judges have this right because of their “judicial conscience”, founded on the judges’ “sworn commitment to uphold the rule of law”. Such idiocy.

Judge McLachlin was appointed to the Supreme Court of Canada in 1989. Her time in office has resulted in considerable harm because her judgments have changed the country to suit her own personal, secular, anti-life agenda, which is not necessarily in the public interest. Thankfully, she will be required to resign from the Bench in 2018 when she turns 75. By that time, she will have sat on the Supreme Court for a period of 29 long years. This long period of time has given her the opportunity to cause much damage to society. Term-limited judges (that is, appointment for only a specific period of time) must be put in place to prevent a repeat of the long, unaccountable power yielded by Judge McLachlin.

The question that arises is - who do these feminist women think they are? By virtue of their appointment and oath of office, they apparently believe that they have miraculously become Goddesses of Wisdom. Their overweening arrogance has corrupted the justice system.

The legitimacy of the judicial system in Canada has always been its ability to remain aloof from political debate and to objectively interpret the law, not involve itself in public policy. Feminist judges, as well as other judges today, rather than Parliament, are with impunity, setting public policy in Canada. This country is no longer a democracy because of these activist, unaccountable, appointed judges. The rule of law means nothing to them in their enthusiasm to impose their will on the country. †

THE EU HAS MORE TROUBLES THAN JUST BREXIT

The 28-member European Union (EU) is one of the most influential anti-family/life voices at the UN. Even if a member country of the EU does not approve of such policies, it is prohibited from speaking out against them.

The EU, however, is experiencing some troubling times. Not only has the UK in a referendum, in May, 2016, decided to leave the Union, but other members are refusing to bow to these left-wing, anti-life policies of the EU. These policies have mostly been arbitrarily determined by the EU bureaucrats in Brussels and by the Council of Europe for Human Rights. However, some of the member countries of the EU are now refusing to implement these policies within their own jurisdictions.

For example, the European Human Rights Council recently instructed Poland to decriminalize abortion, remove conscience protections for doctors and medical personnel, and enact mandatory, comprehensive, sex-education.

Poland's reaction, in effect, was “You've got to be kidding!”

Poland stated that its constitution, which respects human life, would take effect, not the European Commissioner's decisions. Poland accused the Commissioner of basing his decisions on reports from International Planned

Parenthood, which Poland claimed had a conflict of interest in seeking financial profit from abortions and the sale of contraceptive drugs. In a word, Poland said “No!” to the outrageous and unreasonable demands of the EU.

Hungary is another member of the EU openly defying the EU's anti-life, anti-family policies by refusing to implement them because they are contrary to its Constitution.

Several EU member countries are further refusing to accept the large scale open immigration policies set by the EU bureaucrats. Instead, they have been literally building walls to keep migrants out.

It seems that the EU has pushed its members too far and, in righteous anger, some of them are justifiably rebelling.

A further problem for the EU is that some of its member countries are in deep financial trouble. Italy, for example, is in a very precarious economic position, as is Spain. The EU has already bailed out Greece - mostly by Germany and to a lesser extent, France, which are the economic engines of the EU. How much longer will the German and French taxpayers be willing to cover the financial problems experienced by individual countries within the EU?

The dreams for a united Europe seem to be dimming – along with its demands to establish a secular, anti-life society. †

THE CANADIAN MUSEUM FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

The Museum for Human Rights is a white elephant situated on the Red River in Winnipeg. It is a never-ending waste of taxpayers' money.

It started out in 2007 with a budget for building the museum set at \$265 million. The museum ended up costing \$357.5 million mostly paid by the taxpayers, although it did have private donors.

In September, 2014 this over-budget museum opted to spend \$1.89 million to mark its opening. Since private sponsors could not be found to cover this cost, the museum went ahead and spent the money anyway!

The operating costs for the museum are substantial: In

2014-15, total expenses came to \$25.5 million, while revenues were only \$1.8 million. The museum, as predicted, is far from being a financial success. The museum provides locations for exhibits promoting the supposed success of such groups, among others, as feminists and homosexuals and the questionable success of Pierre Trudeau's Charter of Rights. It receives \$21.7 million in annual funding from the federal government.

Even with this cash benefit, the museum is unable to balance its budget. The Museum for Human Rights, apart from a few exhibits such as the Holocaust or the Ukraine Holodomor, serves no purpose but to support a left-wing interpretation of human rights. †

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE



Welcome to the September/October 2016 issue of REALity.

Let's be honest, we don't always have good news to report in REALity! We are committed to reporting the truth, however, especially truth that you will not see in the main stream media because the truth is usually not politically correct. This issue, we DO have good news to report. First, there are countries in the European Union that are standing up to its anti-life/family demands. They are not letting themselves be intimidated by Goliath with its secular, anti-life policies.

Second, REAL Women has launched a petition to protect religious freedom for Christians in Canada. Our petition will be presented more than once in the House of Commons, by MP Michael Cooper (St. Albert-Edmonton). Every time it is presented, the petition will be officially recorded in Government proceedings (Hansard), so that history can never say that there was no opposition to the discrimination Canadian Christians are experiencing. Every time it is presented, the profile of the issue is raised and parliamentarians are reminded that the current situation is unacceptable.

This petition is part of the ongoing philosophy of REAL Women of Canada that we will never be intimidated by the elites, whether it is academia, the courts, main stream media, or left-wing groups/minorities who try to tell society what we must think. We will continue to follow good judgement and stand firm with our common sense, traditional values. So never become discouraged, continue to fight the good fight on behalf of all the good that is in the world.

Thank you for being women and men building a better society.

Pauline Guzik
Pauline Guzik
National President

MESSAGE BOARD

- Action Item: Please circulate our [petition](#) in the October issue of REALity on behalf of religious freedom for Christians in Canada. The [article](#) in this month's issue provides background information. WE NEED SIGNATURES!! Signatures must all be on the same page as the text of the petition, not on a separate sheet.
- We recently published a pamphlet that explains who REAL Women of Canada is. <http://www.realwomenofcanada.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/RWaboutusprint.pdf>. Copies are available by contacting our Ottawa Office. The pamphlet is free but a donation to defray the printing costs would be greatly appreciated. This pamphlet is a great tool to inform others about REAL Women and recruit new members. It is surprising how many women still have not heard of us. †

SUPPORT REAL WOMEN OF CANADA

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

Membership \$30/year • Groups \$50/year • Donation _____
Contributions, unfortunately, are not tax deductible.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

Province _____ Postal Code _____

Tel _____ Email _____

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

REALity is a publication of REAL Women of Canada

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

PETITION TO THE HOUSE OF COMMONS IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED

WE THE UNDERSIGNED RESIDENTS OF CANADA, draw the attention of the House of Commons to the following:

WHEREAS, equality means that all people are treated fairly, without discrimination.

AND WHEREAS individuals holding Christian beliefs in Canada are experiencing discrimination in that some laws are contrary to the practice of their religious or conscience beliefs. They are confronted, as a result, with restrictions on the practice of their religious beliefs and have been subjected to penalties for failure to conform to certain laws, whether within their place of employment, educational institutions, or other areas of the public sphere, or during public discourse.

AND WHEREAS Section (1) of the *Canadian Bill of Rights S.C. 1960, c. 44*, recognizes and protects freedom of religion; freedom of speech; and freedom of assembly and association, and Section (2) provides that every law of Canada must be construed and applied so as not to infringe any right or freedom recognized in the *Canadian Bill of Rights*.

AND WHEREAS the practice of the Christian faith is protected under the guarantees of freedom of conscience and religion s.2 (a); freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression in s. 2(b); freedom of association in s. 2(d) and s.15 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and in s.3 (1) of the *Canadian Human Rights Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c H-6.

AND WHEREAS the law on assisted suicide, *An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to make related amendments to other Acts (medical assistance in dying)*, S.C. 2016 c. 3 provides insufficient protection for physicians, nurses and pharmacists and others who are unable to comply with the provisions of this Act because of religious or conscience reasons.

AND WHEREAS the law legalizing same sex marriage, the *Civil Marriage Act (2005)*, S.C. 2005, c. 33 provides protection for officials of religious groups to refuse to perform marriages that are not in accordance with their religious beliefs, but provides no protection for church-run facilities such as daycares, parish halls, schools and universities, nursing homes and other housing facilities, hospitals, and adoption and counselling services, among others. Therefore religious groups are required to provide services in these institutions contrary to their religious or conscience beliefs.

THEREFORE, we the undersigned residents of Canada call upon the House of Commons to permit Christians to robustly exercise their religious beliefs and conscience rights both in their private and public acts, without coercion, constraint or discrimination by

1. amending section 241 of the *Criminal Code (medical assistance in dying)* and the *Civil Marriage Act* to provide Christians and their faith based institutions, protection from its provisions that are contrary to their religious and conscience beliefs; and
2. enacting a policy to provide a review of any new legislation as may be in future brought forth by the government to ensure it does not impinge upon the religious rights of Christians in accordance with the historic continuity of the Canadian Bill of Rights and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

First and Last Name * Please Print	Full Mailing Address *including postal code	Email Address	Signature

Please mail petition with original signatures to REAL Women of Canada PO BOX 8813 Station T Ottawa ON K1G 3J1