



CANADIAN  
HUMAN RIGHTS  
COMMISSION

COMMISSION  
CANADIENNE DES  
DROITS DE LA PERSONNE

Investigations  
Division

Division des enquêtes

**PROTECTED**

**XPRESSPOST**

**File N°.: 20080748**

Mr. Ezra Levant  
c/o Mr. Thomas W.R. Ross  
McLennan Ross  
Legal Counsel  
1600 Stock Exchange Tower  
300 - 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue S.W.  
Calgary, AB T2P 3C4

Dear Mr. Levant:

This is to apprise you that the complaint filed by Mr. Rob Wells against you will be proceeding shortly to an upcoming Commission meeting for decision.

Please find attached a copy of your submission that will be submitted to the Commission. You will note that we have blacked out some lines because they contain personal information that is not relevant to this complaint.

You will be apprised of the Commission's decision by letter shortly after the meeting.

Yours sincerely,

N. Dagenais  
Director, Investigations

Encl.: Respondent's submission

August 28, 2008

Natalie Dagenais  
Canadian "Human Rights" Commission  
344 Slater Street  
Ottawa, ON K1A 1E1

Dear Natalie,

Re: Rob Wells v. Ezra Levant

I received your letter dated August 8, 2008. At first I wasn't sure it was yours, because you didn't write your name on it, and your signature was illegible.

I can understand your shyness. It has become an embarrassment to publicly admit to being a "human rights investigator" in Canada, because Canadians have caught on to what you really do: you don't actually protect human rights, you violate them. At least you didn't sign it as "Jadewarr", or any of the other false names that your office uses when surfing the Internet in the guise of a neo-Nazi, spewing anti-Semitic and racist venom.

In Alberta, Shirlene McGovern, the human rights investigator who pursued an Islamic fatwa against me for publishing some cartoons, received such a backlash from the public that she actually quit my case. It is my hope that you have a revelation as to the odious nature of your work.

Come to think of it, if I worked for the CHRC, I'd use an alias, too.

As to the substance of your letter, I object to your Assessment Report because it is hypocritical, it demonstrates the corruption of the CHRC, and it is unfounded in law.

### **Hypocritical**

It is hypocritical because the bullies at the CHRC have already found that the exact words at the center of this complaint are contrary to the section 13 "hate speech" provision of the Canadian Human Rights Act. In CHRC investigation number 2005-2462, you decided that a Christian pastor, Rev. Stephen Boissoin, had contravened the law by publishing the exact same words in an Alberta newspaper.

I republished the same words as Rev. Boissoin and yet you have recommended that the CHRC not proceed against me.

There is only one reason for this: the CHRC is anti-Christian, and thus you excuse in me what you condemned in Rev. Boissoin.

This is not the first indication of a deep-seated bigotry at the CHRC. You have mercilessly persecuted other Christians in Canada for merely expressing their faith, such as Fr. Alphonse de Valk of Catholic Insight magazine and Ron Gray and the Christian Heritage Party to name just two others.

I note that the CHRC has never once prosecuted a "hate speech" complaint against any non-Christian, though there is plenty of non-Christian bigotry in Canada. No Muslim extremist, no Tamil extremist, no Sikh extremist has ever been prosecuted, though those communities are wracked with internecine hates between radical and moderate camps, that sometimes spill over into violence. But you'd rather pick on a seventy-something Catholic priest for publishing a newsletter.

That's why you're letting me go – I'm not a weak, penniless Christian clergyman.

That's hypocrisy, but it's not surprising coming from an organization so sick that its staff perpetrate racist slurs through their own vile posts on the Internet. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The fact that everyone from the Chief Commissioner on down hasn't been fired for this scandal is amazing to me.

### **Corruption**

One of the tenets of Canadian law – a real human right, not one of your counterfeit human rights such as the "right not to be offended" – is equal justice under law. That means that rich or poor, powerful or powerless, everybody is treated the same way before the law. It's a legal tradition that dates all the way back to the Magna Carta signed by King John. I know he's a dead white man, and Christian to boot, so the CHRC would regard him as the enemy. But Canada still follows those rules.

But not over at the CHRC. Your own staff commits heinous acts of online bigotry, publishing the worst filth imaginable. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Yet every complaint to the CHRC about [REDACTED] hatemongering has been rejected.

That's a form of corruption – just like it's corrupt that the CHRC refuses to comply with its statutory obligations to disclose records to respondents; it's corrupt that the CHRC refuses to comply with access to information laws, despite an order by the Information Commissioner; it's corrupt that your own little squad illegally solicits and receives police evidence obtained in criminal search warrants; it is corrupt that you release inaccurate transcripts of CHRT hearings, with embarrassing facts about the CHRC left out.

A few years ago, the CHRC underwent a confidential internal government audit. You received a failing grade when it came to ethics. You don't even have a written ethics policy – let alone anyone to enforce that ethical code. The only question is why it took so long for the CHRC to fall under an RCMP investigation.

The Commission is rotten to the core. And you and your commissioners don't give a damn about it. [REDACTED]

That's the standard of ethics at the CHRC. [REDACTED]

**Incorrect law**

My contempt for the CHRC and its political masters is deep. [REDACTED]

But when it comes to your "reasoning" for acquitting me but convicting Rev. Boissoin, it is laughable.

In paragraph 31 of your letter, you try to distinguish my acquittal with Rev. Boissoin's conviction by saying the context is different – and that for the CHRC to find material illegal, it must appear in vile forums, like neo-Nazi websites. I know you're pretty familiar with those neo-Nazi websites, as half of your office has membership privileges. But Rev. Boissoin's publication didn't appear in any of your favourite neo-Nazi sites. It appeared on the pages of the Red Deer Advocate, a moderate and mainstream newspaper.

In paragraph 33, you state that my republication of Rev. Boissoin's words were "more likely" to generate a debate, than to promote "hatred". Again, that's a fabrication: Rev. Boissoin's column generated an enormous debate, both in the pages of the Red Deer Advocate and elsewhere. The debate is still going on, six years later.

But putting aside this factual falsehood, you falsely imply that hate speech jurisprudence grants an exemption for publications that create a debate. You just made that up, as a fig leaf to cover up your double-standard against Rev. Boissoin.

In paragraphs 14 and 33 of your letter, you distinguish my publication from Rev. Boissoin's by asserting that mine had a "social purpose". So did Rev. Boissoin's – he was a Christian pastor promoting his social views in a public forum. Again the conclusion is hypocritical. But the point here is that you're just making up an excuse. You've concocted it out of thin air. Truth, fair comment and the defence of "reasonable journalism" have not been treated by the CHRC as defences to section 13 of the Canadian Human Rights Act.

### **Why did you do it?**

Why would you write such a letter? You did it because the Commission doesn't want to proceed against me. You'd rather pick on poor Christians like Rev. Boissoin. Because you know that, unlike him, I'm going to expose you and the CHRC to be the inconsistent human rights violators that you are.

I object to your reasoning because it's false. I deliberately republished a column that I knew had been condemned as "hate speech" by the Alberta human rights commission. You have made up excuses to let me go that no other target of the CHRC has been able to use as a defence for themselves. You are making a special exception for me, for political reasons. That is inappropriate and cowardly.

However, the truly odious parties here are the CHRC commissioners themselves, who condone and enable your actions and – in Jennifer Lynch's case – publicly excuse your actions. You should all be fired.

Signed,

Ezra Levant

P.S. Stop sending your correspondence to my father.