

SELECTED DOCUMENTS RELATING TO CENSORSHIP AND CANADIAN  
HUMAN "RIGHTS" TRIBUNALS:

January 31, 2008

Dear Dr. Martin, M.P.

I wish to both compliment and thank you for your Bill to repeal Section 13 relating to Internet censorship stemming from the misnomered Canadian "Human Rights" Act. I attach several documents which I have written on the subject of censorship in general and more specifically relating to the arrogant, ignorant, arbitrary, punitive and unconstitutional conduct of Human "Rights"" Tribunals in this nation--institutions which have had the unprecedented effrontery and hypocrisy to formally declare that truth is no defense in their hearings. More accurately these tribunals should be described as classic kangaroo courts bearing a close semblance to the Bolshevik "People's Courts" wherein sentences were political, predetermined and devoid of fairness.

Rather than comment further, I paste below for your reference several documents which will, I am sure, be self-explanatory.

Sincerely  
Wallace Klinck  
(780) 467-4885

-----  
Letters to Solicitor General and Attorney General of Alberta:  
December 28, 2007

Office of the Attorney-General  
Dear Mr. Lindsay:

Attached hereto in PDF format is a letter composed in response to CanWest columnist George Jonas's recent article, "Turning Out the Lights on Liberalism" (Dec. 20, 2007) which was a severe criticism of the nature and actions of Canadian Human "Rights" Commissions. Mr. Jonas drew inspiration for his criticism in part from a commentary expressing similar views by one Melanie Phillips of the British *Spectator*.

I believe the message conveyed in my letter will be self-evident. My conviction is that Canadian Human "Rights" Commission are being used primarily, illegally, extra-legally or unconstitutionally, to promote a political agenda and have more to do with eliminating legitimate and hard-won historic human rights than with upholding them. Moreover, my belief is that the intention so to use them existed

from before the time of their institution. Their conduct is a blatant and smug violation of the most essential principles of British justice and denies the most elementary established rights of defense in their hearings--where they now formally and disgracefully claim that truth is not a basis for defense! Human Rights Commissions are, in my opinion entirely incompatible with, and destructive of, the basic essentials of a free and open society. Moreover, they are subject to the most outrageous abuse at the expense of defendants and are an instrument of political and economic terror. They put a deadly chill on meaningful debate within a rational and democratic society, which, inevitably, can only create an increasing reservoir of ill will in society. As such, I believe they should be subject to a thorough judicial investigation with the objective of closing them down and providing the public with a clear educational explanation as to why they are irredeemably incompatible with the basic principles of justice and a free society as we in the British sphere of influence know them and have sacrificed much to develop and secure them.

Essentially, the role of Human Rights Commissions appears to be the eradication by psychological and economic terror of all culture, religion and independent thought. This works toward internationalism through the eventual destruction of all national sovereignties and would appear, therefore, to be seditious. The result can only be an intellectual and spiritual prison reminiscent but potentially even much worse than those of the past totalitarian states of history--only extended progressively beyond national jurisdictions toward a world tyranny where immanent sovereignty is subsumed and essentially eliminated by enforced servitude to the state from which there can be no escape. Do we never learn?

Yours sincerely  
Wallace M. Klinck  
(780) 467-4885

-----  
CanWest Publications

Dear George Jonas,

Thank you so much for your recent devastating article (Dec. 20/07) condemning the activities of Canada's Human "Rights" Commissions. With your European background surely you recognize their similarity to the classic kangaroo Bolshevik Peoples Courts. I wrote to the **Alberta Report** years ago when these monstrous institutions were being promoted, declaring that we would need God to help us if they were ever instituted. Of course, consequent to the pervasive corrupt and treasonous nature of party political politics and the general deliberate educational degradation of an understanding of our long historic struggle to free ourselves from arbitrary and unaccountable power, going back

before the *Magna Charta* in 1215 and henceforth, their establishment was a virtual inevitability.

Anyone who understands the nature of genuine freedom in the Christian sense, as the British best, if not perfectly, defined it and developed constitutional measures to defend it, could not fail to see the transparent intent of such Commissions. They have now become so desperate in their attempts to use their arbitrary powers for blatant political agendas--which properly should be the subject of popular and protected public debate rather than being imposed by tyrants--that they have decreed that truth is no defense in their hearings! Truth is no defense! And no usual established rights of defense as in a proper court of law! This is madness and a complete violation of our historic British system of justice under the Common Law. These Commissions should be abolished outright with a ringing denunciation explaining to all citizens their essential threat to a free and advancing society.

And what have the politicians done to correct this situation? Nothing! It is to their lasting disgrace that they will only act if they think it might adversely affect their political aspirations to ignore it. Considerations of power are supreme. Principles be damned! Nor is it very impressive that the established media has done almost nothing until it has become obvious that this policy of state censorship is backfiring upon them. What about the fate of the procession of defenseless victims who have been abused by these tyrannical and fanatical Commissions since their establishment? Shame again!

But better late than never and I hope that the recent criticisms by yourself and others marks the beginning of the end of these kangaroo courts with their suppression of speech and association in this country. Not only suppression of these but the denial of the right also to hear, to know and to make conclusions--indeed, to think--especially feared by the censors.

Whether these Human "Rights" people act with complete hypocrisy or assume arrogantly that they are the repository of all virtue and knowledge, the rest of us being either morons or naturally bent toward every evil, is irrelevant. The bullying has to stop. We must have an open society.

We have plenty of laws to protect persons and property both in criminal and civil courts. We do not need, and cannot afford, to have irresponsible and immature people with fragile egos incapable of sustaining criticism, supported by dictatorial censors, exercising an arbitrary influence over the nature of our society. Critical examination is the basis for both personal and social development and honest citizens

should welcome it. Thank God that I have been criticized during my lifetime. Crimes against others can be justly dealt with for what they objectively are without being defined by subjective, and deceitful so-called anti-"hate" legislation. I find it difficult to believe that some of the people who promoted this sort of outrage were not fully aware of what they were perpetrating. Now some of them seem to want to "back off" gracefully. I am afraid that this does not wash.

Please excuse this long tirade--but I like many others have "had it!" If anyone should be hauled into court for reasons relating to speech, it should be those who have conspired to deny freedom of it to their fellow citizens.

Sincerely  
Wally Klinck  
December 27, 2007

-----  
Dear Prof. ....,

Many thanks for your reply and comments with which I concur. I understand fully that your opinions are expressed as yours alone. At one time before the advent and ascendancy of the Censor, we, as individuals, were actually permitted to have and express opinions of our own.

For one having been born into and lived in the context of values and institutions of British origin based upon essential Christian love and respect for others, and empirical, elevation of truth insofar as it can be determined in an open society where maximum information is available to all citizens, this current censorial environment or "regime" has become positively surreal. I was warned many years ago by others who had gone through the fires of totalitarian oppression and could see that the growing lack of understanding and personal responsibility would ensure that the day would come when our freedoms also would be so endangered. Having studied these matters both privately and formally I understood the fundamental nature and underlying intent of human "rights" commissions and tried to sound the alarm in a letter published by the *Alberta Report* during the time of their promotion.

People who have been denied a proper understanding of the historic evolution of our institutions designed to enhance the freedom and creativity of the individual by releasing him or her from the tyranny of absolute, unaccountable and arbitrary authority are essentially helpless in defending themselves through lack of knowledge. Unfortunately, they all too easily fall prey to those who are skilled at manipulating public

"opinion" to the detriment of reason through the use of emotional labels, catch-phrases, accusations, slanders and denunciations, etc. and are swayed into supporting policies alleged to be just and beneficial when in actual fact they merely enhance centralized power over the individual by or through the state. We have designed constitutions to limit what otherwise would be the overwhelming, oppressive power of the state which under the British legal sphere of influence--as opposed to that represented by the Continental Roman Law--is allowed to do only that which is specifically authorized while the individual citizen is permitted to do anything other than that which is specifically prohibited. Politicians, most of whom have probably never even studied our written or unwritten Constitution in context of the Common Law, seem to have an increasing dislike for anything, including constitutions, which restrains their actions, inasmuch as they seem shamelessly anxious to enhance their power to exercise arbitrary action through the fiction of "the supremacy of parliament." The whole system seems to have become thoroughly out of control. I cannot imagine why we still retain a Governor (and Lieutenants) General when they seem incapable of carrying out their proper functions of disciplining governments which are in violation of our historic Constitution as evolved under the Common Law. I remember only one case some years ago when the Governor General in Australia did take the almost unprecedented action of dissolving the Canberra Government and calling for a general election when that Government arrogantly proceeded to authorize spending in a manner contrary to the Australian Constitution. I cannot give the exact attribution at this moment, but I understand that the Roman Senator Cicero observed that politicians were not born, but came into the world via another channel. Admittedly strong words, and perhaps somewhat unfairly generalized, but not, I think, without some justification coming from a personage having considerable experience in the political arena.

In any case, I agree without reservation that the depredations of Human "Rights" Commissions must stop--and they must stop promptly by having these institutions disbanded without the usual disgusting endless political discourse involving prevarication and compromise of principle. A wonderful and uplifting example has been set by a few brave souls who have taken up their pens to put an end to the outrages. Now, is there enough spirit and awareness in the populace to ensure that the task is accomplished with lasting maximum effectiveness and minimal delay? Surely, we must not rest until such resolve can be mustered and the objective is achieved.

The *Calgary Herald* editorial makes a number of good points and makes some of them in a refreshingly candid and forceful manner. Unfortunately, we live under an increasingly unsound financial system of

cost accountancy which requires that production costs must be recovered exclusively from incomes distributed via the act of production-- something which is impossible under the present credit system which is administered by a banking system which enjoys a monopoly of credit creation. Until this monopoly is broken by an issue of non-cost-creating consumer credits to balance overall prices with supplementary global effective income issued not by new bank loans (i.e., debt) but by outright grant in a form which confers upon each citizen (increasingly as capital replaces labor as a factor in production) an inalienable beneficial (not direct) share in the communal capital, the problems of unnecessary and unjustified state intervention in the lives of citizens will escalate, unabated. Where a society of consumers are expected by final purchase to liquidate the financial cost of production--when they are increasingly short of the purchasing-power required to do so in each cycle of production, because while they are properly assessed capital depreciation via final price they are improperly not credited with capital appreciation--and are held to the moral imperative that all income must be derived from cost-creating participation in that productive system--access to the fruits of industry can only be had through contraction of escalating, accumulating and inflationary financial debt. The reality is, of course, that the physical cost of production is met as production takes place and is fully met when it is completed for consumption or final use. Yet consumers must pay financially five, ten, twenty, fifty and hundreds of years into the future for goods produced and consumed in the past. Society runs at an increasing pace while slipping back on an upward tilting tread-mill of financial costs in a futile attempt to meet these financial costs, embodied in prices, which mathematically and increasingly cannot be liquidated. So long as we attempt to achieve social well-being and viability through earned income (i.e., "work") alone, unsupplemented by general inheritance there can be no social stability. And, being required to gain all financial income via "jobs" in the formal economy, while subject to increasing insecurity without such "work", consumers will evermore exhibit an unnatural, unhealthy and obsessive concern about "jobs", leading to ever increasing demands for protection of them through state intervention. Hence, the unfortunate, inevitable and inexorable evolution of malevolent institutions such as "human rights" commissions. These matters are of underlying fundamental relevance--but, as would be expected the *Herald* and the established media in general studiously avoid any reference to them. This is, no doubt, because the state policy of "full-employment" serves some very vested and sinister, power-centralizing interests which are bent on maintaining the deception that leisure is anathema. Attached for your interest are two brief documents in PDF format.

That you have received intimidating communications aimed at imparting

maximum fear by threatening your basic source of sustenance, is a indicator of the base nature of your opponents who obviously have neither the intelligence, courage nor decency to engage in civil debate. Disgusting--but typical and expected.

Sincerely  
Wallace Klinck  
January 28, 2008

-----  
CANADA'S 'HATE' LEGISLATION AND FREE SPEECH

By Wallace Klinck

[Written in reply to a commentator from the United States who had critiqued on the Internet Canada's repressive laws restricting freedom of speech.]

There is no doubt in my mind that the purpose of Canada's anti-"hate" legislation has little or nothing to do with promoting legitimate and beneficial social ends. The legislation was not brought in because of any popular demand and almost certainly was the result of specific small minority pressure. Its seeming intent, and practical effect, is to penalize and intimidate anyone who has the temerity to speak out against establishment domestic and internationalist policies, and in favour of the preservation of national sovereignty, etc. Most especially it has the effect of making perfectly justifiable and relevant criticism of "public" policy, all too often initiated by minority pressure, an "illegal" act. In other words it means the suspension of open and meaningful (or even non-meaningful, for that matter) political debate - in effect the end of the democratic process. Over time it virtually guarantees the erosion of the existing culture - not by natural evolutionary change but by "legal" force imposed from "on high," regardless of the actual desires of the general public. I and other citizens do not need the state to tell us what to think. As citizens the responsibility rests upon us to think independently and to give instructions to our representatives--not the reverse. "Hate" is a subjective matter and the courts can hardly read an individual's mind. Further, one person's "hate" may often be another person's "love". Again, if we can know love, we must be able to distinguish

and criticise that which is in opposition to it. Such criticism may actually be rendered out of genuine consideration of the best interests of those criticized and/or of society in part or in whole. To brand this as "hateful" and therefore criminal is pure nonsense, deceit and/or hypocrisy--a mischievous strategy enabling the elimination of political opponents before an issue is even subject to public consideration.

The interests who promote this sort of outrageous policy appear to assume that their position of power is impregnable and that their moral and intellectual infallibility justify the assumption that "might makes right". If the state interferes with the free flow of information it, in effect, attempts to control what citizens think because without access to all available information one cannot make realistic assessments. The whole concept of democracy is therefore subverted. This is blatant totalitarianism--more than reminiscent of Bolshevism.

In Canada, Human "Rights" Commissions, effectively constitute kangaroo tribunals (where the accused does not have the usual Constitutional, common law and historic rights of defense provided in regular courts), assist in this totalitarian process by rendering arbitrary judgments and penalties on unfortunate selected citizens deemed to have spoken or acted in a "politically incorrect" manner.

These Commissions respond to complaints lodged by individuals who claim to have been subjected to "insult", "discrimination" or whatever (or who may just wish to neutralize someone they do not like for political or other reasons) similarly to the communist "peoples" courts. So corrupt and desperate have Human "Rights" Commissions become that in the face of their absurdity and injustice, they have recently declared that truth is no defence for a defendant in their hearings!

Bureaucratic decree based upon the specious or tenuous notion of "a balance of probabilities" replaces "proof beyond doubt."

Breathtaking arrogance:

Of course, Canada's Anti-"hate" legislation has given Canada Customs the power to intercept a wide selection of political, theological, historical and philosophical books, tracts, audio and video recordings, etc.--which they regularly do, either delaying or prohibiting delivery.

Needless to say most of these Customs personnel are not educationally or intellectually qualified to assess the merit of such publications even if they had a legitimate right to do so. They are sent to an office in Ottawa where one or perhaps several "experts" pronounce on the validity or acceptability of the content of these publications-- apparently as if they know the final truth of matters, which real experts and amateurs have debated for centuries. The sheer arrogance of all this is breathtaking! Canadian "Human Rights" legislation is a violation of citizens' rights and protections derived essentially from Christian principles and going back to the British Constitution as evolved from the Common Law, from the Magna Charta, the British Bill of Rights, etc. Much effort and sacrifice has been expended over history to secure these rights and protections and to let them go by default is a betrayal of everyone present and of those who struggled historically to secure them. Canadian criminal and civil law has long been established with adequate measures to deal with anyone who perpetrates or advocates violence or fraud against any individual or individuals. Individuals and groups who take part in the political process must have their policies and actions open to full public scrutiny. The suggestion that Canadians are so irresponsible, ignorant and fundamentally vicious that they cannot be allowed to access information and debate matters which relate to public policy is simply outrageous. It is a denial of even a pretense of recognizing the full democratic process as a legitimate and proper function and right of the citizenry. Such a position allows the possibility for a minority to usurp, without critical examination and with impunity, the rights and powers of citizens to determine policy in a democratic state.

Canada: a Constitutional Monarchy with Representative Government: Technically, in Canada, of course, we do not have a "democracy" but rather a Constitutional Monarchy with Representative Government. This in no way negates the validity of the above comments, however.

I know that recent developments in the United States have created similar, if not identical, problems-- problems resulting, in my opinion, largely from seriously flawed and ill-advised, if not outright illegal

foreign policies and aggressive military action. We Canadian citizens, of course, have a responsibility to manage our own affairs and it is embarrassing that citizens from other nations should have to come to our assistance. The failure of our educational system to impart to students a thorough understanding of our past Constitutional and Common Law history and institutions has led to an inability to defend them. That is our problem. Nevertheless, we need to be encouraged by the positive inputs to counteract the nature of totalitarian policies with which we are beset-- policies which not only rob our citizenry of their rightful freedoms, but which in the end lead to increasing cynicism which discredits those very historic constitutional, legal and political institutions which should protect us. This is evidenced by the growing popular disillusionment and contempt for politicians and the political process in general."

JULY, 2004 – *THE NEW TIMES SURVEY* (Australia)  
Pages 2 and 3

-----  
***The Calgary Herald***  
Letters to the Editor  
P.O. Box 2400, Stn. M  
Calgary, AB  
T2P 0W8

Dear Editor:

Re the recent conviction of an Alberta man under the Federal Anti-"hate" legislation, some important things to consider are: Did the accused actually promote or engender any "hatred?" Was any evidence produced to show that anyone was actually influenced by such alleged inducement of hatred or that anyone intended to act illegally upon it? And what is hatred in any objective sense? Is not hatred a subjective matter, i.e., is not one person's object of hatred often another's object of love? Who has the moral or legal right, or ability, to adjudicate or enforce action against subjective opinion? The presiding magistrate is cited as accepting that the accused genuinely believes the content of his website. Is it just or reasonable to prosecute an individual for expressing publicly what he genuinely believes? Most especially when the law under which he is tried makes an exception when statements are made in a sincere effort to contribute to a

matter of public concern? Is it probable or even possible that outlandish expressions are to be taken seriously by any rational mind or likely to be viewed with anything other than skepticism, disapproval, amusement--or even concern for the party making the statements? Indeed, the more outlandish or rabid such statements may be, will they generally not be even more likely regarded as less credible? Surely, to think otherwise is to adjudge the population at large as mentally incompetent and undeserving of intellectual freedom.

The Crown apparently solicited representation from a minority group to demonstrate offense allegedly experienced by that "group." Can that representation actually legitimately claim to represent or speak for such a group? Indeed, can such a group actually be defined--inasmuch as realistically it may be subdivided into differentiated or even dissenting subgroups and/or individuals? In a society professing even a semblance of freedom is it appropriate, just or reasonable, to confer upon unqualified legislative or judicial officials the power to pronounce upon philosophical, historical and theological matters which historically have challenged the best minds in areas of open debate reserved for philosophers, theologians, historians--professional and amateur academics, political commentators and ordinary citizens? Does the politico-judicial system possess a natural and legitimate right to dictate the content of public enquiry--or is this the inherent and sacred right of the individual citizen in pursuing his civic responsibility? Surely we have had sufficient evidence of, and experience with, the disastrous consequences of allowing the state to determine public opinion by force of law, while simultaneously repressing the expression of dissenting or alternate ideas. Simply put, that is the acceptance of totalitarianism. Historically, the governing political and judicial establishment has been explicitly denied the right to determine by force or intimidation ideological thought and communication--and has been expected to protect these latter above all as inherent sacred rights of citizens at large. Willful neglect of this responsibility demonstrates flagrant contempt for the intelligence and decency of the population at large and is a blatant denial of democratic freedom in any meaningful sense. The last thing Canadians need, or can permit as a supposedly free people, is dictation by the state of what we may think or communicate among ourselves as citizens.

Canada's relatively recent adoption of anti-"hate" legislation and "Human Rights" tribunals (whose naked political nature is exposed by their disallowance of truth as a means of defence) is a patent violation of historic protections achieved at

considerable sacrifice under the British Common Law. It exempts politically active and influential minority interests from general public scrutiny and criticism--giving them relatively free reign without accountability. This is reminiscent of the Bolshevik Peoples' Courts where if the state, or a personal enemy, wished to destroy personally or politically those who were disliked or opposed, all that was necessary was to lodge a fabricated complaint of "anti-social" expression or behaviour and the politically motivated kangaroo court would ensure the ruination of the accused individual. Such destructive consequences are the inevitable outcome of anti-"hate" law, which, properly identified, is actually anti-opinion legislation--the very foundation of tyranny. A public intimidated into silence will become a society based upon lies promulgated by an evermore arrogant and oppressive establishment.

We have established a historic body of both criminal and civil law which, with occasional appropriate revision, would appear to be quite proper and adequate to preserve our historic freedoms while discouraging and/or punishing objectively provable illegal acts of violence, coercion, defamation, fraud and theft or damage committed by individuals against the persons or property of other citizens. Our precious inheritance of Constitutional protections against state persecution, as evolved under British Common Law, must not be sacrificed because of hypothetical, speculative or abstract anomalies or allegations. Canada's contrived anti-"hate" laws are an insult to public intelligence and a menace to our historic traditions of freedom. A properly outraged public should demand their immediate elimination.

Yours sincerely  
Wallace M. Klinck  
P.O Box 3003  
Sherwood Park, AB  
T8H 2T1  
Tel. (780) 467-4885  
October, 2006

END OF DOCUMENTATION