

**IN THE MATTER OF AN INTENDED PROCEEDING**

WARREN KINSELLA

Intended Plaintiff

- and -

EZRA LEVANT

Intended Defendant

**NOTICE OF LIBEL**

**TAKE NOTICE THAT** Mr. Kinsella will commence proceedings against you seeking general and special damages for defamatory statements published by you on your web site ezrlevant.com (the "Site"). The particulars of the defamatory statement published by you are as follows:

**The October 28 Post**

The intended plaintiff states that the bolded words in the October 28 Post as set out

below are defamatory of him:

**Disgraced Liberal lobbyist Warren Kinsella tries to destroy me**  
 By Ezra Levant on October 28, 2008 12:28 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Comments \(81\)](#) | [Trackbacks \(2\)](#)  
 This latest lawsuit comes from the disgraced Liberal lobbyist, Warren Kinsella. You can see his statement of claim here.  
 It's a frivolous suit, but it will cost me money to defend against all the same. It's a SLAPP suit – strategic litigation against public participation. The public participation is my criticism of Canada's abusive human rights commissions.  
 Earlier this year, Kinsella met with the bigoted Canadian Islamic Congress, the people who hauled Mack Steyn and Maclean's magazine to three human rights commissions on charges of "Islamophobia". On his website, Kinsella bragged about meeting the CIC's complainants, and he helpfully published a press release for them. I linked to Kinsella's site, and called his aid and comfort to the CIC "repulsive", since Kinsella sits on a committee of the Canadian Jewish Congress which is supposed to fight anti-Semites, not give them political advice and do PR work for them. Here's exactly what I wrote, and here's the original post where I wrote it:  
 Farber's newest recruit to the CJC, Warren Kinsella, has provided political and media advice to the CIC's young bigots-in-training, the "sock puppets". Farber just verbally supports Elmsry. Kinsella -- on the CJC's legal affairs committee -- actually rolls up his sleeve and helps the anti-Semites out a bit.  
 This is the Canadian Jewish Congress in 2008. How repulsive.

But there is another part to a defamation trial: the value of the reputation of the plaintiff. Just how much is Kinsella's reputation worth - and how badly was it hurt by my mild comment? That's an interesting and dangerous question for any highly political plaintiff. But in Kinsella's case, it's suicide. Kinsella was named a dozen times by a judicial inquiry into government corruption, and was legally found to have engaged in "highly inappropriate conduct". When he was a ministerial aide, Kinsella had written to the civil service demanding that they steer government advertising and polling contracts through Chuck Guité, who was convicted of five counts of fraud, and sentenced to 42 months in jail for his stealing money through fake ad and polling contracts. the kind of contracts Kinsella demanded be sent to him. I'm not sure how it's even possible to hurt Kinsella's reputation after that. I repeat my comment: for Kinsella to assist the anti-Semitic Canadian Islamic Congress is discreditable enough on its own, but for him to do so as a member of CIJA's Canadian Jewish Congress is repulsive. His lawsuit against me is the same sort of thing.

The intended plaintiff pleads that the bolded words in the October 28 Post were meant to mean and were understood to mean that the intended plaintiff:

- (a) has been disgraced;
- (b) has met with and done work with the CIC;
- (c) Supports anti-Semitism and anti-Semites;
- (d) took part in a criminal conspiracy to defraud Canadians

The intended plaintiff will rely on the entire October 28 Post at the trial of the within action.

**The November 14 Post**

The intended defendant published the following words on the Site on November 14, 2008 (the "November 14 Post"):

**"Highly Inappropriate" Adscam figure joins Michael Ignatieff's campaign**

By Ezra Levant on November 14, 2008 1:21 AM | Pinnalink | Comments (30) | [Trackback](#)  
For all of his flaws, the selection of Stéphane Dion as leader of the Liberal Party represented a step away from the corruption that was rife in Jean Chretien's government. Dion had other unfortunate Liberal traits -- elitism, arrogance, socialism in his veins -- but he was not a thief like so many others who inhabited the Liberal Party in Quebec, several of whom have since been sentenced to jail terms for their roles in Adscam, the scandal that saw \$250 million in public money siphoned off by Liberal-connected crooks. Which is why it's so surprising to learn that Michael Ignatieff, the leading contender to succeed Dion, has allowed Warren Kinsella to join his campaign team. Kinsella was a key embarrassing figure in Adscam. The judicial inquiry into the matter, in a chapter titled "Who is responsible?" mentioned Kinsella by name over and over again, calling his conduct "highly inappropriate". In short, Kinsella was a political staffer at the time, and he wrote to

a senior member of the public service demanding that government advertising and polling contracts be steered through Chuck Guite. Guite was later convicted on five counts of fraud, as the central figure in the scam.

Kinsella had tried to get even more public money steered through Guite; fortunately, the brave public servant who was on the receiving ends of Kinsella's demands didn't give into the bullying. I'm stunned that Ignatieff would allow himself to be seen in public with such a figure as Kinsella. But perhaps Ignatieff and Kinsella have more in common than it first appears.

Ignatieff famously denounced Israel as a "war criminal" for its response to the 2006 Hezbollah terrorist attacks on its civilians.

That fits in rather nicely with Kinsella's decision to give advice and help to the Canadian Islamic Congress -- whose president-for-life, Mohamed Elmasry, has publicly declared that every adult Jew in Israel is a legitimate target for a terrorist attack.

With Kinsella securely on board, can it be much longer before Ignatieff taps Jean Lafleur as his Quebec lieutenant, and Elmasry himself as a candidate?

Nov. 18 update: Today Kinsella told my friend Mike Brock that he didn't agree with my characterization that he was a "key" figure in Adscam. He was more of an Adscam B-team, definitely not in the big leagues like Guite or Lafleur. I think that's a matter of opinion and interpretation. There were two sides to Adscam: those shovelling the money out of the government, and those receiving the money -- though, of course, much of the money was cycled back to the Liberal Party in Quebec. Kinsella was the chief of staff to the Public Works Minister, and he ordered a civil servant to do some shovelling out. Sounds like a pretty big fish to me, tying a pretty brazen scam -- though, thankfully, the civil servant refused. I have no doubt there were people more senior than Kinsella on the inside, too -- but none of them were stupid enough to put their corrupt instructions in a written memo, like Kinsella did. That said, I'm open to a debate on the question: how big of an Adscam player was Kinsella? Big? Really big? Medium sized? I originally used the word "key" above, but I've edited it out, replacing it with embarrassing. Because, really: anyone mentioned a dozen times in the judicial inquiry, anyone caught red-handed trying to funnel government money to a criminal, anyone dumb enough to put it in a memo, and anyone legally found to be "highly inappropriate" is an embarrassment whether he was "key" or -- as he claims now, in the first recorded instance of Kinsella trying to take *less* credit for something -- a bit player in the corruption scandal of the decade. I'm really quite surprised Ignatieff would let such an unethical person on his team.

The intended plaintiff pleads that the entire November 14 Post is defamatory of him.

The intended plaintiff states that the November 14 Post was meant to mean and was understood to mean that he is a criminal who illegally funnelled money to Mr. Guite for illicit reasons.

The November 14 Post was also meant to mean and was understood to mean that the intended plaintiff, as a criminal, should not have been hired by Mr. Ignatieff's campaign.

**The November 20 Post**

On November 20, 2008, the intended defendant once again wrote about the intended plaintiff on the Site and stated the following (the "November 20 Post"):

That's the great man's standard of public ethics -- the police couldn't lay charges, despite a six-month investigation, so obviously everything's fine! It sounds like Burny has been taking lessons in government ethics from his friend Warren "Adscam" Kinsella.

The intended plaintiff pleads that the November 20 Post is defamatory of him as it states by its innuendo that he is unethical and teaches others to be unethical as well.

**The November 24 Post**

On November 24, 2008 the intended defendant once again wrote about the intended plaintiff on the Site and stated the following (the "November 24 Post"):

Of course, the most embarrassing thing is Burny's fetish for book-burning. It's not surprising that his latest recruit is Warren "Adscam" Kinsella, who joined the CJC as a consolation prize after he was **fired from the National Post**. It's fitting, because both Burny and Kinsella believe in the 21st century analog to Nazi book burning: Internet censorship. The fact that Kinsella is a **partisan Liberal hack** means he fits right in with Burny and the CJC; the fact that a judicial inquiry found that **Kinsella's unethical conduct during the Sponsorship scandal** was "highly inappropriate" means that, like Burny, **he has no problem with the corruption of the Canadian Human Rights Commission**. And the fact that Kinsella sees a Nazi under every bed -- and in some boys' bathrooms -- fits in with the CJC just fine, too. Kinsella and Burny will do anything to avoid seeing the evil in radical Islam -- **Kinsella actually gave help and advice to the anti-Semitic Canadian Islamic Congress**. But they think Canada is overrun with Nazis -- including anyone who dares to criticize them.

...  
And even if Jews wanted to support censorship (there might be a few, though they probably all work for the CHRC), would it really make sense to send money to an organization with Kinsella on board? This was a man who, when he was chief of staff to a Liberal cabinet minister, demanded that the civil service divert money to Chuck Guite, the criminal at the center of Adscam. Even if I were a Jewish censor like Harvey Goldberg or Ian Fine, I'd want to make sure Kinsella had no control over the CJC's budget.

The intended plaintiff pleads that the bolded portions of the November 24 Post are defamatory of him because they falsely state as facts that:

- (e) He was fired from the National Post;
- (f) He is unethical;
- (g) He condones corruption; and

(h) He assists anti-Semites.

The intended plaintiff also pleads that the innuendo of the entire November 24 Post is that he is a criminal.

The intended plaintiff states that all of the defamatory postings set out above either refer to him directly or are capable of referring to him and that they are false and defamatory of him.

The intended defendant was actuated by malice when he published the words complained of above and it is a pattern of conduct by him to seek to destroy the reputation of the intended plaintiff through falsehoods.

The intended plaintiff states that the defamatory postings were calculated to injure him and that he has suffered damages as a result of their publication.

The intended plaintiff will seek punitive and exemplary damages.

The intended plaintiff demands a retraction and apology from the intended defendant.

Date: December 8, 2008

**SHILLERS, LLP**  
Barristers & Solicitors  
Suite 202  
445 King Street West  
Toronto ON M5V 1K4

Brian Shiller  
Tel : (416) 363-1112  
Fax: (416) 363-5557

Solicitors for Warren Kinsella

DEC-08-2008 MON 10:47 AM

SHILLERS LLP

FAX No. 4163635557

P. 007

- 6 -

Ezra Levant  
c/o Christopher Ashby  
  
Counsel to Ezra Levant