

## Grounds of Discrimination

The Respondents, Neil Macdonald and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), did publish a publication that perpetuated myths designed to incite hatred and contempt, and to foster discriminatory practices against the Complainant because of her religion, ancestry and place of origin.

The Complainant, Kari Simpson, is a member of the protected groups viciously attacked and vilified in the toxic publication central to this complaint—the “opinion” piece that was written by Neil Macdonald and published by the CBC, entitled:

**“Andrew Scheer says he won’t impose his religious beliefs on Canadians. We’ll see.”**

The Complainant identifies as a Christian, Conservative, Evangelical Christian, social and religious Conservative. Further, she is both a Canadian and American citizen as holds dual citizenship in those identified countries, both of which are also targeted in this publication.

The Respondents have intentionally published words that promote hatred and contempt in violation of Section 7, specifically Section 7 (1)(a) and 7(1)(b) of the *BC Human Rights Code*.

The Respondents, Neil Macdonald and the CBC, published words that blatantly contravened the Code by violating the Complainant’s rights—as a Christian and a Conservative—to free and full participation in the social, political and cultural life of British Columbia.

By publishing the words that promulgate discrimination, incitement of hate and contempt, the Respondents intentionally strove to mislead readers about Canadian and American Christians and Conservatives in general, but specifically Canadian and American religious Conservatives; and to vilify such persons, including the Complainant. This violates not only the Complainant’s section 7 rights, but has contravened the spirit and purpose of the *BC Human Rights Code* as stipulated in part (b), specifically to:

- (a) to foster a society in British Columbia in which there are no impediments to full and free participation in the economic, social, political and cultural life of British Columbia;
- (b) to promote a climate of understanding and mutual respect where all are equal in dignity and rights;
- (c) to prevent discrimination prohibited by this Code;

## Respondents' Conduct.

### Overview -

On June 1, 2017, the Complainant was working late in her Langley, BC office, catching up on the news after a long and troublesome day involving the exposure of the millions of dollars of taxpayers' money being given to so-called "not for profit" organizations to fund projects that include creating hard-core gay porn videos, 'education' sessions on 'fisting,' 'electro shock play' and 'puppy play' (men dressing up as dogs, and engaging in wrestling matches while their "Masters" watch), and sponsoring a 'bondage-play' weekend in Coquitlam, BC. Her attention had also been directed to researching the "Sex at Lunch" program at one of the local secondary schools, that had its 200 (mostly-student) participants singing *The 12 days of STDs* (a parody of the Christmas carol *The 12 Days of Christmas*) with condoms hanging from the school auditorium ceiling at a mock-Christmas "celebration," according to a news report that also quoted a 16-year-old girl's enthusiastic declaration that her favourite study is "porn;" and that now she knew that porn stars have, on average, a 9-inch penis versus the more typical 4.5-inch. Vital information for a 16-year-old?

It is the Complainant's practice to check her social media forums before leaving work. Through her Facebook feed she became aware of an opinion piece written by Neil Macdonald and published by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

The publication date was May 30, 2017 and titled:

***"Andrew Scheer says he won't impose his religious beliefs on Canadians. We'll see."***

The Complainant became distressed as the Respondent publishers, throughout the publication, attacked, vilified and specifically targeted Christians in general, evangelical conservatives, Catholics, U.S. Christian conservatives, Canadian social and religious conservatives and political supporters of Andrew Sheer—all of which groups the Complainant is a member, except for the reference to "Catholics"—many of whom are her good friends and fellow citizens.

The Complainant read each crafted word—words designed to advance the incitement of hatred, contempt and a very deceptive view of Christians—who, as citizens, are rightfully involved in the democratic process.

*Attached is a copy of the publication, with numbered paragraphs to convenience the linking of published words to this complaint.*

### **1. What did the Respondent(s) do?**

At paragraph 6, Respondent Macdonald incited contempt and active discrimination by using words that seem to advocate and promote the prohibition of the aforementioned protected groups from any involvement in the political process. The Respondents advocate discrimination by asserting that Christians should be relegated to their "...place of worship, with the door closed."

Respondent Macdonald states:

#### **"Religion in politics**

"To be clear here, I am all for a person's right to believe in whatever he or she desires, to embrace foundational myths of aliens, or miracles, or extreme positions of love or hatred, as long as it remains in a place of worship, with the door closed."

*Respondent CBC published and widely distributed this discriminatory statement.*

### **What is the adverse impact on you?**

This is a direct assault on the Complainant's dignity, and also implicitly advocates limiting her right to engage in the democratic political process. The "sting" associated with this comment is exacerbated by the fact that the Complainant has been the target of another vicious campaign of hate by another journalist who held the same view. In Canada in recent years, it has become open season on Christians—and even more so for politically active Christians (like the Complainant), who have to endure verbal assaults and deceptive statements made about them that result in death threats, threats against their children and businesses, hurt, pain and suffering.

### **How was each ground of discrimination a factor in the adverse impact?**

Such a statement perpetuates hate, incites contempt, and openly implies that Christians should not be allowed to participate fully in our shared democracy. This creates attitudinal barriers that discriminate against the Complainant's right to participate fully in a respectful society, free from having to continually debunk the anti-Christian/anti-conservative stereotyping, such as here perpetrated by the Respondents.

## **2. What did the Respondent(s) do?**

At paragraph 8 — Respondent Macdonald makes this anti-Christian statement,

designed to bolster his desire to vilify and facilitate the discriminatory disengagement of Christians and religious conservatives from the political process:

“Religion most often involves a deep commitment to telling other people how to live their lives.”

*Respondent CBC published and widely distributed this discriminatory statement.*

### **What is the adverse impact on you?**

As a Christian, the Complainant believes that God has given human beings free will—that is, the right to live according to one’s personal perception of life’s lawful journey. The Complainant has never held, nor would she ever aspire to have, a “deep commitment” to orchestrating any other person’s life.

As a Christian Conservative, the Complainant has a public record of advocating *less* state intrusion, and that she resists “big government” telling citizens what to do or how they should think. The Complainant promotes a fiscally conservative, socially conscious society where individuals act in accordance with being personal and socially responsible. The Complainant finds the Respondents’ assertion abhorrent, offensive and utterly contrary to her stated positions, which are on the public record. In fact, the Complainant believes that individuals should even be free to engage in activities that adversely affect their own lives, but that governments should quit demanding, or “dictating” to her, that she must pay for the repercussions of their flawed decision-making, through taxation or other communal channels. The Complainant’s feelings, dignity and self-respect have been adversely affected by the statement published at paragraph 8.

### **How was each ground of discrimination a factor in the adverse impact?**

Such a statement perpetuates hate, incites contempt and advocates the idea that Christians should not be allowed to participate fully in democracy. It tries to defend this invidious position by making a host of allegations that falsely portray Christians as anti-intellectual and fascist in nature—in spite of the well-established history of Christian intellectuals as leaders in science and philosophy, and the historical record of Christians as opponents of fascism and other totalitarian regimes. This anti-Christian propaganda evokes barriers that would discriminate against the Complainant’s right to full and respectful participation in society, free from having to continually debunk such anti-

Christian/anti-conservative stereotyping; and free of enduring the hate—which has included death threats, threats against her children, and other antics that result from the lies, misinformation and the vilification such as the Respondents are propagating.

### **3. What did the Respondent(s) do?**

Paragraph 9 — The next statement made by Respondent Macdonald has the effect of inciting fear-based hate and contempt. He states:

“They push for laws that amount to moral dictation, often using their tax-free status to amass funding for their activism.”

*Respondent CBC published and widely distributed this discriminatory statement.*

### **What is the adverse impact on you?**

The Complainant is a Christian social activist, and finds this assertion grossly offensive, hurtful and untrue. It is designed to instil fear of Christians, and implies that Canadian Christian religious organizations engage in illegal behaviour.

### **How was each ground of discrimination a factor in the adverse impact?**

Such a statement is defamatory, perpetuates hatred, and incites contempt toward a group to which the Complainant belongs. This vicious attack on important and protected institutions, to which the Complainant belongs, stifles debate and hinders the transmission of information through those institutions, for fear of losing tax-free status which has been accorded to such institutions by Parliament in recognition of the importance of the charitable social work they perform. This bigotry and bias inevitably results in anti-democratic discrimination.

### **4. What did the Respondent(s) do?**

At paragraph 10, Respondent Macdonald’s anti-Christian/anti-Conservative tirade next relies on fake news to propagate his contempt and his willingness

to incite hatred; he asserts this hurtful, offensive and untrue statement:

“As a result, abortion, which the U.S. Supreme Court legalized decades ago, remains effectively inaccessible in several states. If Christian

conservatives had their way, there'd be precious little access to contraception, either. Just look at the current assault on Planned Parenthood.”

*Respondent CBC published and widely distributed this discriminatory statement.*

## **What is the adverse impact on you?**

The Complainant’s position as a conservative Christian is the very antithesis of Mr. Macdonald’s carefully-crafted vilification of her and the groups she identifies with, whose rights are protected by the *BC Human Rights Code*. The Complainant is deeply offended that the Respondents would publish such lies and deceptions about her, her religious beliefs and her political activities.

Such spiteful rhetoric is designed to promote contempt, and so cultivate discrimination. As an American and Canadian Christian conservative and a humanitarian, the Complainant does not support the killing of innocent unborn babies, nor the devaluing-of-human-life psychology that flows from a societal perspective that says murdering unborn babies is OK. Murdering babies is **not** “OK.” Respondent Macdonald’s use of the word “abortion” is an attempt to use evasive terminology to sanitize his message.

The Respondent goes on, in an attempt to bolster his “hate-the-Christian” mini-manifesto, by dovetailing abortion to the issue of access to contraceptives as an “assault on Planned Parenthood.” But it is the Complainant’s wallet, as a taxpayer, that is being assaulted.

The Complainant has no position regarding those who want to pop birth-control pills—they can. But the Complainant does have a position on taxpayers being forced to pay for it. Likewise, the Complainant maintains the same position regarding current lobbying efforts to dictate that taxpayers must pay for the drug Truvada. Her openly stated position is and has always been: If you are a horny guy who wants to engage in risky sex with men you don’t know, go ahead; but don’t ask the Complainant to pay for your \$900.00 per month pill regime, in an effort to diminish the possibility of contracting life-threatening diseases that are 100% preventable.

## **How was each ground of discrimination a factor in the adverse impact?**

The statement made by the Respondent at paragraph 4 perpetuates hatred and myths about the Complainant and other Christians, and incites contempt towards them. This creates barriers that discriminate against the Complainant’s right to

full and respectful participation in society, free from having to continually debunk such anti-Christian/anti-conservative stereotyping, and enduring the hatred that such stereotyping engenders.

### **5. What did the Respondent(s) do?**

Paragraph 11 — The Respondent, ramping up his misinformation as to why readers should ***hate the Christians***, makes these broad and contemptuous assertions about the Complainant and ***all*** other Christians and referenced groups therein:

“They fought bitterly against same-sex marriage, speciously and viciously arguing that it would somehow contaminate heterosexual marriage, or lead to pedophilia and bestiality.

“They oppose transgender rights (transgender people are apparently freaks of nature or charlatans who must at all costs be restricted to a bathroom of society's choosing).

“Their political lobbies want to force prayer back into school, and replace—or at least match—the teaching of science with superstition. (Yes, superstition. The word is defined as a persistent belief in something despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary, and there is overwhelming evidence of evolution. Humans and dinosaurs did not co-exist, as creationists would have us believe, and the Earth is a lot more than 10,000 years old despite what the so-called young earthers say).”

*Respondent CBC published and widely distributed this discriminatory statement.*

### **What is the adverse impact on you?**

These assertions are not published as opinions, but as statements of fact. And they are, in my case and in the case of many of my fellow Christians, untrue. The Complainant is deeply hurt and offended that Respondents Macdonald and the CBC would publish such a vile compilation of hate-fueled fake “facts” about the Complainant as a Christian conservative and a politically engaged citizen.

The Complainant has never held the opinion nor promoted the notion that same-sex marriage would lead to pedophilia and bestiality, nor held the

opinion—nor published information—that transgendered people are “freaks” or “charlatans.” Nor has she ever promoted through any political lobby or

otherwise an agenda to “force prayer back into the schools...”

The Complainant’s position on public education is to let it self-destruct. Technology-enabled learning and other available institutions of education are better choices for preparing students to be critical thinkers and enlightened citizens.

### **How was each ground of discrimination a factor in the adverse impact?**

Statements such as those found in paragraph 5—and throughout this propagandist’s tirade—are tactics typical of those who seek to promote hatred against Christians. The result is to deter or impede people like the Complainant from meaningful participation in society.

### **6. What did the Respondent(s) do?**

Paragraph 14 - Concerning Mr. Macdonald’s assertion regarding the judiciary, he asserts:

**“A matter of faith**

“Faced with legal barriers to some of these efforts, they decry judges as ‘activist’ and seek to install more religious judges.”

*Respondent CBC published and widely distributed this discriminatory statement.*

### **What is the adverse impact on you?**

This statement is false, vile, hurtful, hateful and degrading

### **How was each ground of discrimination a factor in the adverse impact?**

As a Christian, the Complainant has had first-hand experience with the judicial activism that poisons some of our Canadian courts. But the Complainant has never sought to “install more religious judges.” She has worked hard to expose political activism within the courts—activism that brings the administration of justice into disrepute. The Complainant continues to work to advocate civilian oversight of the courts, and to ensure that judges apply the law as written, rather than create law from the bench. As someone who has been a victim of activist judges—a well-documented case of injustice that can be found online at [DriveForJustice.com](http://DriveForJustice.com)—I find this



published statement vile, hurtful, hateful, degrading—and untrue, even beyond being wilfully ignorant of the facts.

Such a statement perpetuates hate, incites contempt and contributes to interdicting the Complainant from accessing societal information platforms that should be available and accessible to all. The CBC is notoriously anti-Christian, and stifles the voices of many, including the Complainant.

### **7. What did the Respondent(s) do?**

Paragraph 15 — I found this next round of published hateful contempt to be particularly disturbing, and a blatant attack on my dignity as a Christian conservative:

“And whenever someone calls them on what is often plain old hatred-laced bigotry, they smile and say, ‘No, no, you don’t understand. It’s a matter of ‘faith.’ ”

“ ‘Faith,’ apparently, confers licence to discriminate, bully, marginalize and deprive someone of liberty (such as the liberty to end an unwanted pregnancy).”

*Respondent CBC published and widely distributed this discriminatory statement.*

### **What is the adverse impact on you?**

Hurt, pain, righteous anger—and my personal dignity has been assaulted.

### **How was each ground of discrimination a factor in the adverse impact?**

I have often been the target of such anti-Christian and anti-Conservative hate and bigotry. I have endured riots by university rent-a-mobs trying to shut down public forums at which I was speaking. I have been a target of media bullies using their pulpits to propagate delusions and hate against me, simply because I am a Christian—and as such, I’ve been denied the right to access the mainstream media, thus resulting in many one-sided, discriminatory information forums that frequently target the protected groups affected by this publication and those Canadians who value family, liberty and a robust, informed democracy that includes the full and protected participation of those who belong to the religious community—free from hate, contrived contempt and discrimination.

The Respondent CBC is a Canadian corporation and is assigned the same

complaint as that of Neil Macdonald. CBC owes a higher duty of care due to ensure it operates free from discriminatory conduct. The “Mandate” of the CBC states:

**Mandate**

The 1991 *Broadcasting Act* states that...

"...the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, as the national public broadcaster, should provide radio and television services incorporating a wide range of programming that informs, enlightens and entertains;

**...the programming provided by the Corporation should:**

1. be predominantly and distinctively Canadian, reflect Canada and its regions to national and regional audiences, while serving the special needs of those regions,
2. **actively contribute to the flow and exchange of cultural expression,**
3. be in English and in French, reflecting the different needs and circumstances of each official language community, including the particular needs and circumstances of English and French linguistic minorities,
4. strive to be of equivalent quality in English and French,
5. **contribute to shared national consciousness and identity,**
6. be made available throughout Canada by the most appropriate and efficient means and as resources become available for the purpose, and
7. **reflect the multicultural and multiracial nature of Canada."**<sup>1</sup>  
[Emphasis writer's]

Section 3 dictates the CBC's broadcasting policy.

**Section 3(D)(i)** serve to safeguard, enrich and strengthen the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada,

The bolded sections of the mandate in conjunction with Section 3 reflect the directive that the conduct of the CBC in all forums is to create an inclusive, harmonious and respectful society. The fact that the CBC belongs to, and is the “People’s Media” allowed for and provided a high-profile platform for such a poisoned publication, a publication that violates the CBC’s own mandate and the statutory directives contained within the legislation, aggravates and compounds the level of harm inflicted upon the Complainant and the culpability of the Respondent CBC.

*Respectfully Submitted,*

Kari D. Simpson

## BC Human Right Code

The purposes of this Code are as follows:

- (a) to foster a society in British Columbia in which there are no impediments to full and free participation in the economic, social, political and cultural life of British Columbia;
- (b) to promote a climate of understanding and mutual respect where all are equal in dignity and rights;
- (c) to prevent discrimination prohibited by this Code;
- (d) to identify and eliminate persistent patterns of inequality associated with discrimination prohibited by this Code;
- (e) to provide a means of redress for those persons who are discriminated against contrary to this Code.
- (f) and (g) [Repealed 2002-62-2.]

### **Discriminatory publication**

7 (1) A person must not publish, issue or display, or cause to be published, issued or displayed, any statement, publication, notice, sign, symbol, emblem or other representation that

- (a) indicates discrimination or an intention to discriminate against a person or a group or class of persons, or
- (b) is likely to expose a person or a group or class of persons to hatred or contempt because of the race, colour, ancestry, place of origin, religion, marital status, family status, physical or mental disability, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, or age of that person or that group or class of persons.