

Kari D. Simpson  
PO Box 12014  
Murrayville Square  
Langley, BC V3A 9J5  
Email: driveforjustice@gmail.com  
Tel: 604.514.1614/Fax:604.514.1669

---

Supreme Court of Canada  
301 Wellington Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0J1

Attention: **Ms. Barbara Kincaid, General Counsel SCC**

January 8, 2013

Re: **Matters related to the Chief Justice & notice to remedy publication of  
defamatory words.**

Dear Ms Kincaid;

Just prior to Christmas I wrote to Norman Sabourin, Executive Director of the CJC, regarding an important legal matter. I advised him in that correspondence that I would be providing you with a copy of my December 20, 2012, letter, as I believe as legal counsel to the SCC it is your duty to advise the Chief Justice that I have very publicly stated, as fact, that she is a liar and judicial cheat. With this registered letter, I have enclosed a copy of my correspondence to Mr Sabourin, which has already been distributed widely.

I will take this opportunity to also advise you that contained within the SCC's judgement in *WIC Radio Ltd. V. Simpson* are numerous defamatory statements and words, innuendo and false innuendo about me that have caused irreparable harm to my reputation. Some examples:

I would condone violence by others against gay people.  
This is untrue.

I am opposed to any positive portrayal of the homosexual lifestyle.  
This is untrue.

I was involved in opposing the three books to be placed in the Surrey schools.  
This is untrue.

I am anti-gay.  
Another lie.

There are more examples, but I believe you can appreciate the serious consequences of publishing these and other defamatory statements.

I invite you to take a few minutes to view a video at [www.driveforjustice.com](http://www.driveforjustice.com), episode 26 and titled [Our Ermine-Clad Masters Decide](#). This video will provide you with a few clips of my very public position on matters relating to my promotion of tolerance and protection of rights for all— including gays and lesbians. Be assured I have many more examples that will suffice in proving the SCC, ignored the facts, manufactured evidence, lied, and failed to apply the proper legal rigours required in determining defamation cases. One key point to remember as you review this matter is that the defendant Rafe Mair testified to never having heard me speak on these matters.

It is my understanding that you have a large staff at your disposal - twenty two other lawyers according to an article in the Canadian Lawyer Magazine - and that you acknowledge personal responsibility for the publication of the SCC decisions. Repeating and publishing libellous statements is a serious breach of the law and public trust. Certainly there is at least one individual at your disposal that is capable of doing simple fact checks. You can start by asking for factual evidence about my supposed involvement in the three book case, or the facts associated with my support of removing a young boy from the influence of militant sex activist teacher James Chamberlain. My application for a Re-hearing before the SCC provided more than a few of the details about the unprofessional conduct of this so-called teacher. I believe the most ignorant of individuals will agree that my support for the parents was based, indisputably, on this teacher's overt unprofessionalism, religious bigotry, ignorance, lies, and his willingness to abuse his role as a teacher to impose and indoctrinate young children with his political activism within the classroom, contrary to the policies of the Ministry of Education, and the Code of Conduct upon which all teachers in BC must adhere to. If the information about Mr. Chamberlain in my application for a Re-hearing isn't sufficient, you can go to this link on the Drive for Justice website for more details: <http://www.driveforjustice.com/2012/08/09/the-gay-teacher-james-chamberlain/>


I would also like to believe that there is at least one legal mind in your midst that knew, or ought to know, that I am entitled to know the legal test I was required to meet and that by "modifying" the test the SCC moved the goal posts, or perhaps as in this case, changed the game. This "modification" might have been acceptable if my case had been sent back to the trial judge to be heard under the new test, but it wasn't, as you are well aware. To pronounce judgement in this

circumstance is of course unlawful and tantamount to obstruction of justice and exceeds the jurisdiction of the SCC justices judicial authority. You are responsible for not only the publication of hateful, vile defamatory words, but for knowingly publishing a judgement that is unlawful and violated my Constitutional right to a fair hearing.

Intrinsic bias, stupidity and/or wilfully turning a blind judicial eye is not a defence or an excuse.

Failure to sufficiently remedy this matter will result in legal action against you.

Govern yourself accordingly.



Kari D. Simpson

Encl/ Letter dated December 20, 2012 to Norman Sabourin, Exec. Dir., CJC

Copied and distributed generally to Canadians, judicial and other legal associations and their members, public interest groups and associations, the Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, elected representatives, members of the Senate and media.