

Subject: Fwd: Addendum to Submission
Date: October 1, 2007 6:50:38 PM ADT
To: dougchristielaw@shaw.ca

Begin forwarded message:

Date: October 1, 2007 6:49:47 PM ADT
To: sylvie.dempsey@gnb.ca
Cc: keith.ward@dpp.gc.ca
Subject: Addendum to Submission

Judge R. Leslie Jackson
Chief Judge
Provincial Court of New Brunswick
506-325-4415
c/o Sylvie Dempsey
sylvie.dempsey@gnb.ca

Dear Judge Jackson,

Due to some time confusion and miscommunication between Mr. Christie and I, the attached material was not submitted by September 30, 2007. May I ask as the defendant that this material be included in our final submission for your consideration.

Respectfully,

David T. Little

COPIES TO:

Douglas H. Christie
Barrister, Solicitor and Notary Public
810 Courtney Street
Victoria, British Columbia
V8W 1C4
Telephone: (250) 385-1022
Facsimile: (250) 479-3294
Email: dougchristielaw@shaw.ca
Counsel for the Defendant

Keith Ward

Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions
Atlantic Regional Office
Suite 1400, Duke Tower
5251 Duke Street
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 1P3
Telephone: (902) 426-6080
Facsimile: (902) 426-1351
Email: keith.ward@dpp.gc.ca
Counsel for the Director of Public Prosecutions

Court File No. 07878605

Judge R. Leslie Jackson
Chief Judge
Provincial Court of New Brunswick
Woodstock, NB

Your Honour,

I referred to many of the following points in court. As a Christian, it clearly constitutes scandal for me to cooperate with the evil the government is involved in by using tax money to murder unborn children. My Church teaches that the first and proper theological meaning of scandal is to do or omit something which leads others into error or sin.

I testified in court that I was, among other factors, urged in conscience to give good example to my 5 young children, my 3 grown children and my 8 grandchildren, my entire extended family and to all the Canadian people.

I believe deeply in my conscience that complicity whether direct or indirect, whether material or formal cooperation with such grave evil as paying for direct induced abortion/murder must be strenuously avoided at all cost. Even that of suffering incarceration; for the unborn suffer much more: execution at the dawn of life. The educative effect of law causes many to fall into grievous error, the "if the government says it's OK, then it must be so..." attitude. It references the truth that evil taught by example to some also reaches others. If a word, action or omission leads another into error or sin, there is scandal, whether the person who is led astray knows that he has been scandalized or not. Those who assert that the government does a lot of good with our tax money, could be choosing to be willfully blind or hypocritical to participate as beneficiaries of morally repulsive conduct.

It is a well known empirical asserted fact, that nearly all people of all faiths at all times have regarded abortion as killing - and this has gnawed at me for decades. In response, in the 1980s, with the help of Blessed Mother Teresa of Calcutta, I established Crisis Pregnancy Centres in Moncton, Toronto, Timmins, Calgary, Edmonton, Brooks AB and Washington DC, many of which still save babies from abortion even today. But I could never get over the fact that my own beloved country, deeply rooted in Christian heritage, was setting such a scandalous example to the world, by forcing its people to pay for these horrific killings, indeed murders of the most vulnerable among us.

"What if it was me in the womb?", was a thought that constantly haunted me; would I not want someone to stand up for me, to stop my slaughter and shout from the highest rooftop, "NO, NO, NO, DON'T DO THAT, PLEASE DON'T DO THAT TO ME!" By the end of the last century, I was sick in my soul over my own complicity in giving money to someone who I knew without doubt was going to use my money to kill innocent little children in the womb. I, who was for so many years close friends with Mother Teresa and Pope John Paul II, if I could not do more, than who could? I would get so very angry whenever I thought about what they were doing with my own money, especially since I was always self-employed and had to sit down and write out a check and sign it with my own signature.

I remember once signing a check to pay my income tax and stapling a note to the check which read something like, "Whomever cashes this check is guilty of cooperating in killing innocent children by medicare funded induced abortions." What a hypocrite I WAS, I was GIVING the money voluntarily and ACCUSING the civil servant. Even though I had done so following the advice of a close spiritual advisor, it did little to assuage my conscience. Dozens and dozens of letters of protest, with-holding token amounts, filing for some years and refusing to pay, none of this caused me any serious sacrifice, even the forced bankruptcy and ruined financial life could never compare with even one life.

Worse, nothing I did changed a thing, not in the slightest as far as I could see.

I kept preaching to others, 'what if you were in the womb?', to convince them of the rightness of being prolife. But I could not get away from my own thought, "What if I was in the womb? Am I doing enough....?" By 1999, before the Jubilee Year concluded in 2000, I committed to do more, never to file again until the law was changed. It would be my gift to the King of Kings for His 2000th Jubilee Birthday. "Let the children come to Me, do not hinder them," Jesus said in Mark 10,14. My responsibilities to my wife and little children gravely concerned me, yet my wife greatly supported me in this decision, no small support given that she renounced several hundred dollars per month in family allowance/tax credits for our children. We decided together and it was done. I prayed for grace.

The government ignored me for 4 years. I started to feel that I was taking advantage of the tax free income, even though I was giving away large amounts to the needy and to charities. My experience with the federal government gave me a firm belief that they would do nothing to me for fear of making me a martyr. Polls since 1968 and a very recent poll (2004) had reported that the vast majority of Canadians (more than 70%) did not want public funded abortion. I had to do something. I didn't have the money to launch a constitutional legal action against them. Then providence stepped in. Prime Minister Jean Chretien was campaigning for same sex marriage and clinging to the Liberal abortion position in public speeches. This was my chance. I wrote a strong letter to Mr. Jean Chretien.

Tuesday, July 8, 2003

Mr. Jean Chretien
Prime Minister of Canada
80 Wellington Street, Ottawa
K1A 0A2 Via Fax: 613-941-6900

Dear Mr. Chretien,

Though I know correct protocol is to address you as Right Honourable, I cannot bring myself to do so, because I am so utterly ashamed of you, so terribly scandalized by your words and actions. You are an extreme embarrassment and humiliation to millions of practicing Catholics not only in Canada but throughout the world. It is mortally sinful for a Catholic to promote moral views contrary to formal Church teachings, which are of course the irrefutable teachings of Christ Himself. It is doubly wrong when one is a leader of a nation for the sin of scandal is so much greater. You have declared yourself a Catholic who believes in abortion. You sir, are no Catholic. You have declared yourself in favour of "marriage" for persons of the same gender, a position totally barren of even the slightest semblance of common sense, truth or historical integrity, let alone Catholic doctrine. You Mr. Chretien are assuredly no Catholic.

For 2000 years Christ has taught through His Church that abortion is the murder of an innocent child and that the sanctity of sexual intimacy is reserved solely for a man and woman who embrace and are bound by the bonds of matrimony. Yet while claiming Catholicity, you sanction homosexual acts and publicly promote murder of the most innocent in the womb. You have the gall to call yourself a Catholic as you promulgate and support 'laws' that denigrate matrimony, promote perversity and slaughter unborn human beings! Such astonishing hypocrisy!

Here is the simple unvarnished truth, Mr. Jean Chretien. You sir, are quite certainly not even Christian, let alone a Catholic. Please abandon the gross hypocrisy of calling yourself a Catholic for it is a most apparent lie. As a leader,

you have done incalculable harm to the souls of not only Canadians but humanity at large. You sadden and sicken me. You are a disgrace to simple decency and I fear for your soul. You try to clothe yourself with the sanctity of Catholicism while your words and deeds reek with the stench of evil.

I implore you to repent before it is too late, for you will be judged, as will we all, by every word that comes out of your mouth. I will pray for you.

Sincerely with sadness,

David T. Little 1208 Hwy. 105, Douglas N.B., E3A 7K1

Less than 6 weeks later an agent of Revenue Canada knocked on my door demanding that I file my returns. Still the government was not anxious at all. It took another letter to P.M. Paul Martin, another 16 months later before they finally charged me. That letter and other material related to this case and issue and be found here:

<http://www.stmscanada.org/>

As I stated in my letter to the Minister of National Revenue (this court has a copy) in November of 2004, and quoted sections in court, direct induced voluntary abortion is infallibly condemned as gravely immoral by my Faith. 'Gravely immoral' means mortal sin, an offence so grave that if one dies unrepentant of this sin, one suffers eternal punishment in hell and while in this world, such a one cannot receive Holy Communion (the Eucharist) without receiving absolution in the Sacrament of Confession (for any mortal sin on the soul). To do so would be committing a sacrilege, an even worse offence. (1 Cor 11,27-29)

For complete clarity I submit here the most recent (the first was in the first century in the 'Didache') reiteration of this doctrine of the Catholic Church promulgated in Evangelium Vitae (Gospel of Life), an Encyclical Letter, by Pope John Paul II on March 25, 1995:

This encyclical contains three solemn passages regarding specific moral issues. In Catholic theology, the italicized portions of the following quotations passages are considered infallible teachings.

The first passage, in Evangelium Vitae § 57, concerns murder:

Therefore, by the authority which Christ conferred upon Peter and his Successors, and in communion with the Bishops of the Catholic Church, I confirm that the direct and voluntary killing of an innocent human being is

always gravely immoral. This doctrine, based upon that unwritten law which man, in the light of reason, finds in his own heart (cf. Rom 2:14-15), is reaffirmed by Sacred Scripture, transmitted by the Tradition of the Church and taught by the ordinary and universal Magisterium.

The second, in *Evangelium Vitae* § 62, concerns abortion:

Given such unanimity in the doctrinal and disciplinary tradition of the Church, Paul VI was able to declare that this tradition [regarding abortion] is unchanged and unchangeable. Therefore, by the authority which Christ conferred upon Peter and his Successors, in communion with the Bishops -- who on various occasions have condemned abortion and who in the aforementioned consultation, albeit dispersed throughout the world, have shown unanimous agreement concerning this doctrine -- I declare that direct abortion, that is, abortion willed as an end or as a means, always constitutes a grave moral disorder, since it is the deliberate killing of an innocent human being. This doctrine is based upon the natural law and upon the written Word of God, is transmitted by the Church's Tradition and taught by the ordinary and universal Magisterium. (*Evangelium Vitae*, § 62)

The third, in *Evangelium Vitae* § 65, concerns euthanasia:

.... in harmony with the Magisterium of my Predecessors and in communion with the Bishops of the Catholic Church, I confirm that euthanasia is a grave violation of the law of God, since it is the deliberate and morally unacceptable killing of a human person. This doctrine is based upon the natural law and upon the written word of God, is transmitted by the Church's Tradition and taught by the ordinary and universal Magisterium. (*Evangelium Vitae*, § 65)

In the very first century, the Church taught clearly that abortion was murder in the 'Didache', herein quoted, "Chapter 2. The Second Commandment: Grave Sin Forbidden. And the second commandment of the Teaching; You shall not commit murder, you shall not commit adultery, you shall not commit pederasty, you shall not commit fornication, you shall not steal, you shall not practice magic, you shall not practice witchcraft, ***you shall not murder a child by abortion nor kill that which is born.***

The Didache is a very brief document and can be seen here in original Greek and in translation.

<http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/didache.html>

The latest formal teaching is that of Pope Benedict XVI, when as Cardinal Ratzinger, he wrote a memorandum to the American Bishops in 2004 quoting further from this encyclical concerning whether Catholic politicians could receive the Sacrament of Holy Communion after public support of abortion and

quoted his predecessor.

"Abortion and euthanasia, therefore, are crimes which no human law can make ratified. Laws of this kind not only do not bind the conscience; truly they gravely and expressly compel that the same be opposed because of repugnance to conscience." "Abortus ergo et euthanasia crimina sunt quae nulla humana lex potest rata facere. Huiusmodi leges non modo conscientiam non devinciunt, verum graviter nominatimque compellunt ut iisdem per conscientiae repugnantiam officiantur." POPE JOHN PAUL II, Encyclical Letter *Evangelium Vitae*, 25 March 1995, AAS 87 (1995) 486, n. 73a.

Mr. Ward suggested in cross examination that I am inconsistent because I do not oppose war or the death penalty in all circumstances but there is a principle here: the diversity of moral weight between abortion on the one hand, and war and the death penalty, on the other.

"There may be a legitimate diversity of opinion even among Catholics about waging war and applying the death penalty, but not however with regard to abortion....With respect to the activity of legislatures and courts, the principle makes it clear that Catholics must oppose judicial decisions or civil laws that authorize or promote abortion or euthanasia." Memorandum from Cardinal Jos. Ratzinger, June 2004, to U.S. Bishops (cf. nt. 52), 133-134.

For decades I have been astonished that Christians remain largely silent or indifferent to the complicity we share by cooperating with a government that uses our money to pay doctors to kill unborn children. I have two answers. Fear and confusion. The fear is of consequences in confronting the government over this issue, and they excuse themselves over the truth that Christians are to support and obey legitimate civil authority and pay their taxes. The confusion is over patriotism, though it is a false patriotism. Pope Pius wrote an Encyclical Letter on June 29, 1958, "Ad Apostolorum Principis", and some quotes will clarify Catholic teaching in this area:

20. And since these crimes are being committed under the guise of patriotism, We consider it Our duty to remind everyone once again of the Church's teaching on this subject.

21. For the Church exhorts and encourages Catholics to love their country with sincere and strong love, to give due obedience in accord with natural and positive divine law to those who hold public office, to give them active and ready assistance for the promotion of those undertakings by which their native land can in peace and order daily achieve greater prosperity and further true development.

22. The Church has always impressed on the minds of her children that declaration of the Divine Redeemer: "Render therefore to Caesar the things

that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's." [5] We call it a declaration because these words make certain and incontestable the principle that Christianity never opposes or obstructs what is truly useful or advantageous to a country.

23. However, if Christians are bound in conscience to render to Caesar (that is, to human authority) what belongs to Caesar, then Caesar likewise, or those who control the state, cannot exact obedience when they would be usurping God's rights or forcing Christians either to act at variance with their religious duties or to sever themselves from the unity of the Church and its lawful hierarchy.

24. Under such circumstances, every Christian should cast aside all doubt and calmly and firmly repeat the words with which Peter and the other Apostles answered the first persecutors of the Church: "We must obey God rather than men." Acts 5,29

What about Romans 13,1-8? (Let every person be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God.)

Romans 13:1 says that when anyone claiming authority or power that is not observant of the Law of God, then that one is, in fact, not a lawful power or authority. This is VERY explicit, in that it says "Let EVERY person be subject to the governing authorities." This does not mean that citizens must be subject to God's Law, and the politicians and judges may do as they wish, and still claim God's seal of approval on their right to rule and judge. Unless those in secular authority are in reality, subject to God, then those in secular authority are not legitimately ruling over us. The Charter preamble says that "Canadians believe in the Supremacy of God and the rule of law." This sets the tone, measure and means by which to discern how the following sections of the Charter are to be interpreted. And since our civil and common law is rooted solely in the Judaeo Christian heritage, then (the phrase in Romans, 13,1-8, "those that exist") had their authority instituted by God in the strict sense that obedience could not be demanded if laws instituted contradicted God's Law. In such cases Acts 5,29 applies. The fifth Commandment is not a suggestion or an invitation. It is a demand. "Thou shalt not (kill) do murder."

I ask if this is a COMMANDMENT, then how can ANYONE cooperate with any entity that does such evil against God and man.

As Dr. Lugosi writes before footnote (136) in his article, "Political and judicial institutions have the power to reject and hopefully the wisdom to recognize clever arguments that ask them to condone and sanction immoral acts. The story of the Emperor's New Clothes is an apt reminder of the wisdom and power of an innocent child who spoke the truth that grown-ups lacked the

courage to say."

(136) Hans Christian Anderson, The Emperor's New Clothes, at <http://www.deoxy.org/emperors.htm>. Anderson wrote:

Everyone said, loud enough for the others to hear: "Look at the Emperor's new clothes. They're beautiful!" "What a marvellous train!" "And the colors! The colors of that beautiful fabric! I have never seen anything like it in my life!"

They all tried to conceal their disappointment at not being able to see the clothes, and since nobody was willing to admit his own stupidity and incompetence, they all behaved as the two scoundrels had predicted.

A child, however, who had no important job and could only see things as his eyes showed them to him, went up to the carriage. "The Emperor is naked," he said.

"Fool!" his father reprimanded, running after him. "Don't talk nonsense!"

He grabbed his child and took him away. But the boy's remark, which had been heard by the bystanders, was repeated over and over again until everyone cried: "The boy is right! The Emperor is naked! It's true!"

The Emperor realized that the people were right but could not admit to that. He thought it better to continue the procession under the illusion that anyone who couldn't see his clothes was either stupid or incompetent. And he stood stiffly on his carriage, while behind him a page held his imaginary mantle.

In further argument for moral consistency, Dr. Charles Lugosi writes these paragraphs in his article already submitted to your Honour:

"It was not long ago that European Jews were legally defined as non-persons in law and murdered in the Holocaust or forced to be subjects in Nazi medical experiments (141) In the United States, descendents of liberated slaves suffered harm despite their legal status as persons. In Tuskegee, white doctors deliberately withheld medication that could have cured African-American males suffering from syphilis. (142) Both of these historical events resulted in public outrage and the creation of ethical codes of conduct to prevent these kinds of unethical conduct from happening again. The Nuremberg Code (143) responded to the Nazi experiments, and the Belmont Report (144) responded to the Tuskegee experiment."

"Anyone who commands, directs, advises, encourages, prescribes, approves, or actively defends doing something immoral is a cooperator in it if it is done

and, even if it is not in the event done, has already willed it to be done and thus already participates in its immorality." (195) (John Finnis, Abortion and Health Care Ethics, in BIOETHICS: AN ANTHOLOGY¹³, 18 (Helga Kuhse & Peter Singer eds., 1999).

Prudence suggests that when it comes to irreversible decisions of life and death it is better to be morally safe now than sorry later. (243) (243) Ludger Honnefelder, The Concept of a Person in Moral Philosophy, in SANCTITY OF LIFE AND HUMAN DIGNITY 139, 155 (Kurt Bayertz ed., 1996).

Even the death of one unborn child makes a difference. (254)

Consider the following case histories:

1. [There is] a preacher and wife who are living in dire poverty. They already have 14 children. Now the wife [discovers she is] pregnant [again]. Considering their strained [financial] circumstances and the excessive world population, would you [recommend] an abortion?

2. A [man] is sick with syphilis. [His wife] has [tuberculosis]. They have four children. The first is blind, the second was stillborn, the third is deaf, and the fourth has TB. [Now their mother is] pregnant again. Given the high probability that the baby will be born congenitally handicapped, would you recommend abortion?

3. A teenage girl, 14-15 years old, is pregnant. [She is] not married. Her fiance is not the father of the baby, and [he is] very upset. Would you [recommend] an abortion?

How did you answer? In the first case, if you said yes, you have just killed John Wesley, a great evangelist of the 18th century and founder of Methodism. In the second case, you would have killed Ludwig van Beethoven. If you said yes in the third case, you [would have] consented to the [death] of Jesus Christ.

Francis Marsden, Credo For Catholic Times, at http://stjosephsl.homestead.com/files/Ctime453_Holy_Family_Sundayhtm (Jan. 1, 2000)

"Whoever saves one, saves the whole human race; whoever kills one, kills mankind." (261) (261) EDMUND CAHN, THE MORAL DECISION: RIGHT AND WRONG IN THE LIGHT OF AMERICAN LAW 71 (1955).

In Conclusion;

What of Mark 12:17? "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's."

Oftentimes, only the first half of this verse is quoted: "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's." This gives the impression that Jesus wants us to offer loyal support to our government, the Queen or King, the Prime Minister and Parliament, the Supreme Court, the Fatherland, the nation-state. But then comes the second half of the verse: "and to God the things that are God's." It confronts us with the challenge of figuring out what are the things of Caesar and what are the things of God.

The context gives some more specific clues: Jesus is asked whether or not the Jews should pay taxes. In response, he asks for a coin. "Whose likeness and inscription is this?" he asks, and they tell him it is Caesar's. It is then that he issues his puzzling command: "Render to Caesar . . ." The puzzle is solved, as St. Irenaeus, the second-century bishop of Lyons, pointed out, when we come to see that just as Caesar's image is on the coin, so God's image is on each human being. The coin belongs to Caesar. Each human being belongs to God.

This truth is the keystone of conscientious objection to abortion and cooperating with a "Caesar" who demands we file signed papers that everyone knows lead to paying for abortion. I am made in the image and likeness of God; I belong to God; therefore, Caesar has no right to hinder my belonging to God. Moreover, just as I am made in the image and likeness of God, so is everyone else; so who am I to take the lives of others or cooperate with those who pay for this unjust killing, this murder?

John Milton once stated, "My conscience I have from God and cannot give to Caesar." And Dorothy Day remarked, "If we gave God all that belongs to God, there would be nothing left for Caesar." Clearly, Mark 12:17 calls for anything but unquestioning service to Caesar. Instead, Christ invites us to discern the extent to which we render all that is God's to God. And it challenges us to live in God's likeness, as revealed to us by Jesus Christ through His Word and teachings discerned and interpreted by the Holy Spirit through His Church.

[END OF SUBMISSION]

Respectfully submitted,

David T. Little
122 Carlisle Rd.
Douglas, NB
E3A 7N4

Defendant

