

Free Speech Monitor

P.O. BOX 332, STN. B, ETOBICOKE, ONTARIO M9W 5L3

The Free Speech Monitor is published ten times a year by the Canadian Association for Free Expression, Inc.
Subscriptions to the Free Speech Monitor are \$15.00 per year.

TELEPHONE: (905) 274-3868

FAX: (905) 278-2431

e-mail: cafe@canadafirst.net

Webpage: <http://cafe.canadafirst.net>

Number 178

May, 2010

Speaker Rules Harper Must Provide Documents Requested by Parliament

Canada, at every level, is obsessed with secrecy. **Prime Minister Stephen Harper** likes to treat both citizens and Members of Parliament like mushrooms – keeping them in the dark and feeding them cow manure. Neither citizens nor our elected parliamentarians can do their job if they are denied necessary information. “National security” and “privacy” are the two most frequent dodges to keep the populace ignorant. Thus, an important blow was struck for access to information, April 27, when **Speaker Peter Milliken** ruled that **MPs** were entitled to access to correspondence they’d requested on **Afghani detainees**. “**Prime Minister Stephen Harper** and his Cabinet simply do not have an unconditional right to refuse Parliament’s request for documents on the transfer of detainees to Afghan authorities. Such a right ‘would in fact jeopardize the very separation of powers that is purported to lie at the heart of our parliamentary system and the independence of its constituent parts,’ Mr. Milliken ruled. ‘Furthermore, it risks diminishing the inherent privileges of the House and its members, which have been earned and must be safeguarded.’ ... It should not be beyond the ability of both sides to find a way out of this impasse. One possibility would be to swear in to the **Privy Council** the members of the **House Committee on Afghanistan**. The United States does something similar with its congressional intelligence committee, providing some transparency and oversight without jeopardizing the nation’s security. Surely, parliamentarians who receive security clearance and understand what is at stake can be trusted to respect their oaths, and not give out defence secrets or harm relations with other governments.” (**Globe and Mail**, April 28, 2010)

Israeli Firster Kenny Banned Anti-Zionist Brit MP From Canada

Give cantankerous, leftist, anti-Zionist peace campaigner British **MP George Galloway** top marks for persistence. He’s challenging being banned from Canada last March, after having made numerous previous speaking tours of the Dominion, without incident. Galloway’s court challenge was to be heard April 26, but has now been postponed because Galloway’s lawyer **Barbara Jackman** fell and injured herself on the way to court. Court filings reveal that Galloway was banned on the word of ultra-Israel **Firster and Immigration Minister Jason Kenney**. “It took less than two hours for **Canadian Border Services Agency** officials to declare controversial British **MP George Galloway** inadmissible to Canada. There was little doubt that’s what **Immigration Minister Jason Kenney** wanted. Though last year’s decision to bar Mr. Galloway from Canada for allegedly supporting banned Mideast group **Hamas** fuelled headlines for weeks, it was a decision that was pushed through the bureaucracy at record speed. ... From the first e-mail that Mr. Kenney’s communications director, **Alykhan Velshi**, sent on March 16, 2009, at 2:09 p.m. to immigration bureaucrats – the subject line was ‘inadmissible’ – only 102 minutes passed before an official in the National Security section of the **CBSA** had agreed that Mr. Galloway should be barred for being a member of a terrorist organization. ... Mr. Galloway insists he was never a member of **Hamas**, and he’s being barred for his political and pro-Palestinian views.

But the court record has already revealed much about how the Galloway affair began: not in routine work by security officials, but because it was triggered by political aides, then pushed quickly by high-ranking officials, and approved by the **Prime Minister’s Office**. A year ago, Mr. Kenney insisted it was a **CBSA** decision, and portrayed it as one that came up through the channels of bureaucrats. That’s not what an immigration officer in London told

Mr. Galloway’s assistant, **Kevin Ovenden**, according to records the government filed with the court this week.

I stated that Mr. Galloway has been deemed inadmissible by Canada’s **Immigration Minister, Jason Kenney**, and that he [Mr. Galloway] would be denied entry at a Canadian port of entry,’ **Robert Orr**, the Immigration official in London, wrote in an e-mail to Canada’s High Commissioner to Britain, **James Wright**. It was Mr. Kenney’s communications’ aide, Mr. Velshi, who set the wheels in motion a few days before, on March 16. He sent an e-mail at 2:09 p.m. to the **Immigration Department’s Director-General of Communications, Edison Stewart**, saying he had a media call asking “why we’re letting in the following person even though he’s publicly called for money to go to a banned terrorist entity in Canada [**Hamas**] and that makes him inadmissible.” ... Mr. Velshi chimed in that if it came up to Mr. Kenney, “I can fairly predict that he will not ever give a [entry permit] to someone who advocated the kind of things **George Galloway** advocates.” (**Globe and Mail**, April 26, 2010)

In an interview with Galloway, the **Globe and Mail** (April 26, 2010) asked: “The thrust of the ban is that you support terrorist organizations. What do you say to that?” “Well, I’m five times elected to the **British Parliament** and I travel freely and widely in the **United States of America**. So that can hardly be true, can it? The **British Parliament** would not have a terrorist in it and the **United States of America** would not admit a terrorist. So, to be banned from Canada, it’s just preposterous,” said Galloway..

“The Canadian government says you gave about \$45,000 to **Hamas** and that’s part of why you shouldn’t be allowed here,” the **Globe** asked. “I didn’t give any money to **Hamas**, I gave it to the ministry of health in Gaza to pay for the salaries of the doctors and nurses who hadn’t been paid. By the way, we’re talking about 20 odd thousand pounds, not millions. It’s a symbolic donation. I gave it to the ministry of health in Gaza and I’m proud to have done so,” Galloway responded..

Kenney’s high-handed, vote-hustling censorship actually gave the controversial Scotsman a larger audience: “Well, I addressed all the audiences and more than I was going to address if I had been allowed into Canada. I just did it by the technology that is today available. And I achieved the remarkable thing, really, of packing thousands of people into halls and churches to watch a video screen and watch someone broadcasting from New York. And the irony was not lost – I’m banned from Canada, but I’m broadcasting from New York. It’s just ridiculous,” Galloway adds.

It’s not the first time Kenney has shown himself to be no friend of free speech. In October, 2007, on the eve of a **CAFE** press conference denouncing the practices of the **Canadian Human Rights Commission**, **CAFE Director Paul Fromm** and his associate **Alexan Kulbashian** learned that they had been banned from the precincts of Parliament on a motion by **Jason Kenney** and unopposed by any of the few members in the House at the time. The **CBC** told Fromm, at the time, that Kenney had expressed concerns that the free speech duo “might” make hateful comments.

You Can Pay, but You Can't Say

Part of the politically correct’s mortal hatred of traditional Christianity is an utterly hysterical intolerance of any opposition to abortion. The absolute right to the mass slaughter of our own unborn is a “core” principle to these people. Last December, “activists with **Campaign Life Coalition** were shocked to find themselves accused of playing pro-life politics with Christmas. All they wanted to do was

honour an aging, beloved priest, said the head of **Campaign Life's Gethsemene Ministries**. 'I was quite surprised,' **Suresh Dominic** told The Catholic Register. After written complaints reached **Mayor David Miller's** office, city officials asked Dominic to remove a sign from the back of the creche display in front of Old City Hall. The sign on a laminated 8x11 sheet of paper said the statues in the scene had been anonymously donated in honour of 'pro-life hero **Fr. Ted Colleton**.' The sign was removed the day Dominic received the complaint and the Nativity scene remains in place with a small plaque stating that it is sponsored by **Gethsemene Ministries**. Dominic said he had no intention of stirring the pot on abortion access. ... The Nativity scene had been vandalized a number of years running, and Gethsemene Ministries found itself renting a Nativity scene at a cost of \$500 per year. With the help of anonymous donors the group decided to buy new statues and house them in a two-metre high manger behind plexiglass. The new manger cost about \$5,000, and the donors were offered the opportunity to either take credit themselves or pay tribute to whomever they chose, said Dominic. (The Catholic Register, December 20, 2010)

Political Correctness and Multicult Have Failed, Says Dosanjh

As far back as 1991, I warned that multiculturalism would cost Canadians key freedoms including freedom of speech. My then employer, the Peel Board of Education, listed this comment as one of my sins and a statement that was not to be repeated. I believe it even more firmly today. It is obvious and I was right. Multiculturalism is a form of mental AIDS. Like those with AIDS, its followers have lost the ability to protect our rights from minority threats, fixated, as they are, by the notion that all cultures are equal. It makes the illogical leap and proclaims that all cultures are equal. [They're not. Third World immigrants acknowledge as much when they leave failed lands with their failed cultures to come to Canada.] Then, multicultural doctrine says newcomers should be allowed, nay encouraged, to keep and practise their failed cultures. Hence, we have turbans in the police force, *kirpans* in the schools and *burqas* and *niqabs* in abundance. If you object, you are wrong: who are you to criticize someone else's culture? Thus, in the face of the most absurd or dangerous practices our political establishment is crippled by its own ideological nonsense. Sikhs are prone to violent intracommunal squabbles. These have frequently degenerated into brawls at *gurdwaras* (temples), with *kirpans* (which dullard Canadians were assured were 'ceremonial' daggers) flashing merrily and hacking up opponents. Sometimes the violence has escalated to murder. **Tara Singh Hayer**, a moderate Sikh publisher who opposed radical and violent Sikh supporters of Khalistan (the same crew that blew up two planes originating from Canadian soil in 1985) was shot and maimed and, then, some years later murdered.

The April 18 *Vaisakhi* Parade (an annual Sikh festival and must for ambitious politicians) posed a problem in Surrey, BC, this month. This year a float celebrating Sikh terrorists and who are so labelled by the Canadian government caused much consternation. **B.C. Premier Gordon Campbell** and federal Liberal Opposition leader **Michael Ignatieff** refused to attend the parade: "Concerns about the appearance of the controversial float came after **B.C. Premier Gordon Campbell** and ... **Michael Ignatieff** had already issued statements calling for parade organizers to apologize for apparently threatening comments. Last week, Inderjit Singh Bains, a parade organizer, said on a Punjabi radio station that Liberal MP Ujjal Dosanjh and BC MLA Dave Hayer (the slain publisher's son) weren't welcome at the event and, if they showed up, they would be responsible for their own safety. Both Mr. Dosanjh and Mr Hayer have been critical of those who support violence to create a separate Sikh homeland." (Globe and Mail, April 19, 2010)

Former **NDPer** and B.C. Premier presently resurrected as a Liberal cabinet minister and opposition critic, Sikh **Ujjal Dosanjh** now has serious doubts about multiculturalism and political correctness. "*Ujjal Dosanjh ... says Sikh extremism is on the rise in some parts of the country, and blamed, in part, 'politically correct' Canadians who let it happen in the name of diversity.* Mr. Dosanjh, who was savagely beaten in Vancouver in 1985 after speaking out against religious violence, said Canadian multiculturalism has allowed extremism to take root in Sikh and other ethnic communities. Mr. Dosanjh's comments shocked some Sikh organizations, including the influential **World Sikh Organization of Canada**. Meanwhile, Mr. Dosanjh blamed what he described as Canada's polite brand of multiculturalism for giving extremists the space to nurture old grudges brought from their homelands. At the same time, Canada has failed to instill its own values on new immigrants. I think what we are doing to this country is that this idea of multiculturalism has been completely distorted, turned on its head to essentially claim that anything anyone believes – no matter how ridiculous and outrageous it might be – is okay and acceptable in the name of diversity. Where we have gone wrong in this pursuit of multiculturalism is that there is no adherence to core values, the core Canadian values, which [are]: That you don't threaten people who differ with you; you don't go attack them personally; you don't terrorize the populace. ... I think Canadians need to engage in this cultural diversity debate," he said. "And we actually have to say to each other: 'Hey what you're doing is wrong. What you're doing here is right.' We should stop being politically correct and have a debate." (Globe and Mail, April 14, 2010)) But a "debate" is precisely what political correctness and multiculturalism have prevented us from having. A discussion is a great idea, but political correctness and multicultural have stifled any critical debate about the "diverse" and bad behaviour of newcomers or even of whether it's a good idea to replace the founding/settler European population with "diverse" conflicting and contradictory cultures. – **Paul Fromm**

Landmark Case for Internet Privacy

On April 8, 2010, a precedent-setting case regarding Internet law was heard in the Ontario Divisional Court in Ottawa. The case was an Appeal against a lower court decision in the case of *Warman vs Fourniers and John Does*. The ruling being appealed stated that the defendants were to turn over personal information such as IP addresses and e-mail addresses for anonymous posters who were alleged to have defamed the plaintiff (the ultra litigious Richard Warman). The defendants' position is that online anonymity should be protected until it is clear that there is a strong case that a "John Doe" has broken the law. People post anonymously for many reasons. They discuss politics, spiritual issues, health problems and relationship problems under pseudonyms. Revealing the true identities of the people behind these usernames is an unspeakable invasion of their privacy, and should only be done when it is absolutely necessary. It should never been done simply because someone makes an accusation of libel. Intervening at the hearing were the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, and the Canadian Internet Policy and Public Interest Clinic. Both of these organizations argued that there is a duty to protect online anonymity, and that is it not addressed in the law, as it currently stands. The issues in this appeal have far-reaching implications for people who post anonymously on the Internet, and for forum and blog owners who have a duty of care when it comes to the private information of their posters. The Internet is changing the way we live our lives in Canada, and this case will be one of the first to address the changes that need to be made in our laws to accommodate new technology. The Court reserved its decision.