

# Sodomites and the Supreme Court of Canada



**Chief Justice McLachlin (bum left) of the Supreme Court of Canada vigorously defended free speech for Nazis in the 1990s, but sided with disingenuous censorship in the Whatcott case on Feb 27, 2013. Justice Marshall Rothstein (bum right) wrote the ungodly Whatcott decision.**

Dear Friends,

The Supreme Court of Canada has ruled that my fact based and Biblically redemptive flyers distributed throughout Saskatoon in 2001 meet Canada's "objective" definition of "hate speech." Of course there is nothing "objective" about the Supreme Court's definition of so-called "hate speech." North American Christians from various denominations and walks of life who are not hateful at all like my flyers enough to support them. Three Saskatchewan Court of Appeal Justices looked at my flyers and decided they did not meet the definition of "hate speech." Six Supreme Court justices, one who previously defended free speech rights for Nazis, have decided my flyers constitute "hate speech" and should be censored.

The reasoning for ruling that two of my four flyers should be deemed "hate speech" is specious and fantastical at best, or dishonest and totalitarian at worst. My two flyers deemed "legal" by the "learned ones" were photocopies from a homosexual magazine's classified section of a "28 year old man seeking boys... exchanging videos, pics and more... age not so relevant." The probable homosexual pedophile has never been investigated as far as I know. I got prosecuted for exposing this ad, but at least our Supremes have decided that

showing verbatim photocopies of men seeking boy ads is legal for the time being.

My two flyers deemed “hate speech” were arguments against the promotion of homosexuality in Saskatchewan public schools. The Supremes didn’t like that I used the Biblical word “sodomite” to describe folks who commit sodomy and they thought using statistics showing the down side of homosexual behaviour, even if backed up with peer reviewed studies, should be censored if it could cause someone to get a negative impression of homosexual behaviour. I described some disturbing events that actually happened in American public schools, such as the “Fistgate” scandal where homosexual “educators” had children exposed to graphic instruction and vulgar language. The homosexual educators were taped promoting anal sex, oral sex, sadomasochism, fisting and a host of other high risk perversions to school children.

The Supremes did not like my facts, as truth about sexually deviant behaviour gets in the way of imposing a politically correct take on homosexuality, so they came up with this excuse for censorship in their Whatcott ruling.

Rothstein writes, “Truthful statements can be presented in a manner that would meet the definition of hate speech, and not all truthful statements must be free from restriction.”

There you got it. Label truthful statements you don’t like “hate speech” and therein lies your excuse for censoring the statements you don’t like.

Christian activists like myself point to high disease rates endemic to the homosexual lifestyle as a vindication of God’s word that homosexual sex is contrary to His will and a violation of natural law.

**“For this reason God gave them up to vile passions. For even their women exchanged the natural use for what is against nature. Likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust for one another, men with men committing what is shameful, and receiving in themselves the penalty of their error which was due.”**

**Romans 1:26–28**

I don't have to make up statistics to make my point homosexual sex is a bad idea. The Centre for Disease control, as pro-homosexual as they are, can't escape publishing the obvious:

“For gay and bisexual men, HIV, hepatitis, and other STDs are of particular concern. For example, the rate of new HIV diagnoses among MSM is more than 44 times that of other men, while the rate of primary and secondary syphilis among MSM is more than 46 times that of other men.” <http://www.cdc.gov/msmhealth/for-your-health.htm>

Well facts are facts, so the Supremes have simply ruled in their Whatcott decision that if facts meet the “Hallmarks of Hate” they are illegal and liable to prosecution. In addition to disregarding facts about homosexuality's downside, the Supreme Court decided to engage in politically correct fantasy to justify shutting down my flyer ministry.

Rothstein writes, "Hate speech lays the groundwork for later, broad attacks on vulnerable groups that can range from discrimination, to ostracism, segregation, deportation, violence and, in the most extreme cases, to genocide."

Keep in mind we are talking about flyers disagreeing with homosexuality being taught in public schools in my decision, not a call to genocide. In the past dozen years, I have put out more than a hundred thousand flyers on various troubling aspects of the homosexual lifestyle and agenda. Of course I want to persuade people homosexuality is a bad idea, for obvious reasons! In the absence of any evidence of violence (except the occasional angry homosexual or sympathizer threatening and assaulting me) the Supremes simply create a fantasy that my flyers could potentially lead to genocide!

Rothstein further writes, “Hate speech can also distort or limit the robust and free exchange of ideas by its tendency to silence the voice of its target group.” Anyone living in Canada during the last dozen years of my flyer campaign know the homosexual activists have not had their speech or ideas limited. This is another Supreme Court fantasy devoid of supporting evidence. We know

homosexuals get to show off their bums while marching in “Gay Pride” parades, their “Gay Straight Alliances” are not only implemented in public schools in every province, they are now being forced on private Christian schools in some provinces. Homosexuals have favourable and frequent coverage in all major media, while pro-family Christians are either ignored or maligned. The idea my flyers are preventing the free exchange of ideas is simply rubbish. It is the Human Rights Tribunals and Supreme Court that is preventing debate and the free exchange of information.

Rothstein falsely writes in the Whatcott judgement I compare all homosexuals to pedophiles. I did no such thing, I have simply stated and continue to state pedophilia and its acceptance is more prevalent in the homosexual subculture than in mainstream culture. I’m not the only one who says this. Steve Baldwin, a former California Assemblyman cites sources similar to mine in this article written for the Regent University Law Review: [http://mail.famguardian.org/Subjects/Se ... aldwin.pdf](http://mail.famguardian.org/Subjects/Se...aldwin.pdf)

Rothstein writes, “The prohibition on further distribution of Flyers D and E, are reinstated.” I guess it’s illegal for me to print my flyers and show them to you in my defense; none the less the Supreme Court put my flyers on its website and if you scroll to the bottom of my judgement, you can see them for yourself. You can decide if they equate homosexuality with pedophilia, are hateful, potentially genocidal, or something that should be illegal: [http://scc.lexum.org/decisia-scc-csc/sc ... 6/index.do](http://scc.lexum.org/decisia-scc-csc/sc...6/index.do)

Rothstein writes, “Given that Mr. Whatcott was found in contravention of the Code, the Commission is awarded costs throughout, including costs of the application for leave to appeal in this Court.”

In actual fact I had a partial victory. The two flyers exposing a homosexual magazine that allowed ads for “man... seeking boys... age not so relevant” were exonerated and the Human Rights Commission was found to be overzealous in its censorship.

Karen Selick writes in the Ottawa Citizen, “The final ugly blemish in this SCC decision is the order that William Whatcott pay the legal costs of his

opponent... The costs order departs so markedly from what would normally occur under circumstances of divided results that it appears purely spiteful. It was definitely unworthy of our highest court.”

The fine for the flyers you can see on the Supreme Court website is \$7,500 and the court costs will be somewhere in the tens of thousands of dollars. Christian activists are generally not rich and having sacrificed my nursing career to fight for the unborn more than a decade ago, I am certainly considered poor as far as earthly possessions go. I have no way of paying such costs and my conscience would never allow me to submit to such an unjust order anyways. Christians who speak too strongly against the sin of homosexuality should take note the Canadian judicial system will use its power to destroy you.

Homosexual activists are historically not kind when they succeed in bringing one of their opponents down. My future is uncertain and I will ask that my fellow Christians who read this flyer to pray for me. I won't stop speaking the truth and am prepared to lose my freedom and what few assets I have, rather than be silenced and reject the cross my Saviour has for me. The good news is God is still in control and truth which is rooted in Scripture and natural law has a way of prevailing, even when courts with supposedly learned men and women seek to suppress it.

In Christ's Service

Bill Whatcott, Ph: 306-861-6140, e-mail: [billwhatcott@gmail.com](mailto:billwhatcott@gmail.com), website: <http://www.freenorthamerica.ca>

**Contact Premier Brad Wall and demand he defund the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission!**

Telephone: (306) 787-9433

Facsimile: (306) 787-0885

E-mail: [premier@gov.sk.ca](mailto:premier@gov.sk.ca)

**“You, O Lord reign forever, your throne endures to all generations.”  
Lamentations 5:19**