

## Parliamentary Privilege

Currently there is debate on who has the ultimate control in Canada: the Parliament through common law or the courts based on the Charter statement that the Constitution of Canada is the supreme law of Canada making the courts the judge as to what stands as law.

This debate is deceiving however, because in our democracy the people are the sovereign, and they have the ultimate control through elections and juries. We have appointed Members of Parliament to act on our wishes and interests. And the court is there to arbitrate with the use of juries to be sure the courts issue decisions from independent impartial persons on the jury. Common sense shows that courts are not independent or impartial from the government because they are part of the government. This is a dangerous thing without juries to curtail this power.

So we have to stop this move to the courts for ultimate authority or the people will no longer be in control leaving us with a totalitarian government.

## Some background to the Issue

### Parliamentary Sovereignty or Supremacy

**Parliamentary sovereignty**, also called **parliamentary supremacy** or **legislative supremacy**, is a concept in our constitutional law of our parliamentary democracies. It holds that the legislative body both federal and provincial has absolute sovereignty and is supreme over all other government institutions, including executive or judicial bodies. It also holds that the legislative body may change or repeal any previous legislation and so it is not bound by written law. In Canada Parliament is bound by common-law precedents.

In Canada parliamentary sovereignty includes separation of powers, which limits the legislature's scope to general law-making and makes it subject to judicial review, where laws passed by the legislature may be declared invalid in certain circumstances by the court. However, in Canada the legislative body still retains the sovereignty by the possibility to alter the constitution. However, Canada is a common law country therefore the Parliament is bound by common law precedent and properly constituted courts must also respect common law.

**Parliamentary privileges** is one of common law cornerstones of our "Rule of Law" in Canada. It stands as a crucial aspect of the legislative system, providing lawmakers and legislative institutions with essential rights and immunities vital for the effective functioning of democracy. Rooted in constitutional provisions and historical common law precedents, these privileges empower parliamentarians to carry out their duties without fear or hindrance, ensuring the autonomy, integrity, and efficiency of legislative bodies.

### Nature of privilege

According to the Erskine May, "Parliamentary privilege is the sum of certain rights enjoyed by each House collectively... and by members of each House individually, without which they

could not discharge their functions, and which exceed those possessed by other bodies or individuals. Some privileges rest solely on the law and custom of Parliament, while others have been defined by statute. Certain rights and immunities such as freedom from arrest or freedom of speech belong primarily to individual members of each House and exist because the House cannot perform its functions without unimpeded use of the services of its members. Other rights and immunities, such as the power to punish for contempt and the power to regulate its own constitution belong primarily to each House as a collective body, for the protection of its members and the vindication of its own authority and dignity. Fundamentally, however, it is only as a means to the effective discharge of the collective functions of the House that the individual privileges are enjoyed by members.

“When any of these rights and immunities is disregarded or attacked, the offence is called a breach of privilege and is punishable under the law of Parliament. Each House also claims the right to punish contempt, that is, actions which, while not breaches of any specific privilege, obstruct or impede it in the performance of its functions, or are offences against its authority or dignity, such as disobedience to its legitimate commands or libels upon itself, its members or its officers.”

### **Senate and House of Commons Parliamentary Privilege**

In Canada, the Senate and House of Commons and provincial legislative assemblies follow the definition of parliamentary privilege offered by the British parliamentary authority, *Erskine May's Treatise on The Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament*, which defines parliamentary privilege as "the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament, and by Members of each house individually, without which they could not discharge their function... the privileges of Parliament are rights which are absolutely necessary for the due execution of its powers. They are enjoyed by individual Members, because the House cannot perform its functions without unimpeded use of the service of its Members, and by each House for the protection of its members and the vindication of its own authority and dignity." Parliamentary privilege can therefore be claimed by Members individually or by the House collectively.

The rule for when parliamentary privilege is to apply is that it cannot exceed the powers, privileges, and immunities of the imperial parliament as it stood in 1867, when the first constitution was written.

Individual parliamentary privileges include:

1. Freedom of speech
2. Freedom from arrest in civil action
3. Exemption from jury duty
4. Exemption from appearing as a witness
5. Freedom from obstruction, interference, intimidation, and molestation

Collective parliamentary privileges include:

1. Power to discipline: this includes punishing persons who are guilty of breaches of Privilege or of contempt, and the power to expel Members guilty of disgraceful conduct. Punishment can include the removal of an individual and imprisonment until the end of session;
2. Regulation of its own internal affairs: Parliament does not have to abide by the interests or recommendations of external bodies, such as the courts;
3. The right to make inquiries, call witness, and demand the order of documents;
4. The right to administer oaths to witnesses: the oath is administered by the Speaker of the House, their chosen replacement, or a Committee chairperson;
5. The right to publish papers containing defamatory material.

The Supreme Court of Canada has previously dealt with the question of parliamentary privilege in [\*New Brunswick Broadcasting Co. v. Nova Scotia \(Speaker of the House of Assembly\)\*](#). In that case, the Court made these observations about parliamentary privilege:

"Privilege" in this context denotes the legal exemption from some duty, burden, attendance or liability to which others are subject. It has long been accepted that in order to perform their functions, legislative bodies require certain privileges relating to the conduct of their business. It has also long been accepted that these privileges must be held absolutely and constitutionally if they are to be effective; the legislative branch of our government must enjoy a certain autonomy which even the Crown and the courts cannot touch. The privileges attached to colonial legislatures arose from common law. Modelled on the British Parliament, they were deemed to possess such powers and authority as are necessarily incidental to their proper functioning. These privileges were governed by the principle of necessity rather than by historical incident, and thus may not exactly replicate the powers and privileges found in the United Kingdom.

Recent cases of parliamentary privilege in Canada adjudicated by the courts include:

1. [\*1993: New Brunswick Broadcasting Co. v. Nova Scotia \(Speaker of the House of Assembly\)\*](#), where the courts held parliament could restrict who could enter the parliamentary precincts.
2. [\*1999: Zundel v. Boudria, et al.\*](#), where the courts held parliament could restrict who could enter the parliamentary precincts.
3. [\*2001: Ontario \(Speaker of the Legislative Assembly\) v. Ontario \(Human Rights Commission\)\*](#), where the courts held the actions of the provincial legislative assembly were immune from review by other government bodies including the Human Rights Commission.
4. [\*2005: Canada \(House of Commons\) v. Vaid\*](#), where the Supreme Court of Canada analyzed the scope of parliamentary privilege and the role of courts in deciding its existence.

5. To try and avoid being arrested Liberals are making moves to limit the scope of “Parliamentary Privilege” regarding their free speech., They passed a piece of legislation section 12 of the *National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians Act* (the Act) that gave them the right to limit the “Parliamentary Privilege” regarding their right to speak freely about anything they think the public should know.
6. [Alford v. Canada 2022](#) On May 13 2022, the Ontario Superior Court of Justice found section 12 of the *National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians Act* (the Act) unconstitutional. Section 12 of the Act removes committee members’ ability to raise parliamentary privilege as a defence in the event that they contravened the Act by releasing confidential national security information in parliamentary proceedings. The Ontario
7. Superior Court of Justice found parliamentary privilege was established by common law based on article 9 of the British Bill of Rights and cannot be removed by legislation because legislation cannot be used to override common law. This ruling defeated the liberals move to pass legislation removing parliamentary privilege leaving this right intact.
8. [Alford v Canada In 2024](#) the Appeals court of Ontario overturned that decision and found the Liberals could limit the speech of Senators and MP’s which left “Parliamentary Privilege fully intact.
9. Leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada has been filed by Alford.

The Common Law right for Senators and MPs called “Parliamentary Privilege” is under attack in Canada. This privilege is accorded to all members of parliament both senate and house to be used to protect Canada from government tyranny such as we are experiencing from the Liberals since the onset of the Covid 19 measures. With “parliamentary privilege” all members of the parliament can say in the house whatever they believe the public needs to know without any retributions such as being sued, fired, charged etc. And they can also arrest anyone who threatens parliament. They exercised this right in 1913 when they performed an arrest on someone who refused to provide information requested of parliament.

Executives of the Government have currently been deemed guilty by parliament of committing treason. In addition to having a right to speak about the treason the lower magistrates, Senators, MPs and police have the power to arrest them but they need our consent to encourage them to act. We elected this government, so we need to consent to the removal and arrest of traitors in our government.

The Liberal executives have been accused of conspiring with Foreign / Chinese Communist Party regarding Election Interference where among other things the Liberals received funds from China for their election campaigns. Plus they are accused of breach of National Security (Winnipeg Microbiology lab sharing Bioweapon + Gain of Function research secrets)

To try and avoid being arrested Liberals are making moves to limit the scope of “Parliamentary Privilege” regarding their free speech., They passed a piece of legislation section 12 of the *National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians Act* (the Act) that gave them the right to limit the “Parliamentary Privilege” regarding their right to speak freely about anything they think the public should know.

In spite of the appeal court victory for the Liberals in *Alford v. Canada* 2024 the information given to parliament about the evidence of treason including the names has not been placed under section 12 secrecy,

And in addition to the right to speak freely about the treason, “Parliamentary Privilege” gives them the right to arrest anyone who threatens parliament. They have exercised this right in 1913 by arresting a man for refusing to give information to the parliament when instructed to do so,

Conservatives have told us they know who the traitors are and have the evidence and they are going to hold the traitors accountable which can only mean arrest..

We have therefore created a petition to give public consent to the Conservatives arresting the traitors. This petition can track the numbers of people providing consent. And we can demonstrate a large public outcry which will encourage the lesser magistrates to take action and arrest,

Since we have been given information that the Conservatives know of this treason, if we do not speak up and say we consent to the arrest our silence is our tacit consent for the Conservatives to abdicate their power to arrest. If they do not arrest the traitors, they have abdicated their “Parliamentary Privilege” by consent of the people which will bring us one step closer to courts gaining ultimate authority with no ballot box or jury box to keep it in check.

And if this happens this country will no longer have protection from tyranny that this “Parliament Privilege” protects us from.

Canada is a democracy therefore the people are the sovereign. If we get enough numbers, this petition gives consent from the sovereign for the Conservative MPs to use “Parliamentary Privilege” which is still in effect to arrest the traitors.

Petition link: <https://www.change.org/arrest-the-liberals>

QR code for The Sovereign’s Petition:



10.

11.

MPs accused of contempt of Parliament may be suspended or expelled, however expulsion is extremely rare/ They may also be committed to the clock tower of the Palace of Westminster, although this practice has not been used since Charles Bradlaugh was detained in 1880. Since the passage of the Recall of MPs Act 2015, if an MP is convicted of certain crimes or suspended from Parliament for more than 10 days, they may face a recall petition and subsequent by-election.

Strangers (those who are not members of the House) may be committed to prison during the life of the Parliament. The House of Lords has the power to fine as well as to order imprisonment for a term of years.

In the United Kingdom, it has been alleged that arresting a Member of Parliament in the course of carrying out their duties may constitute contempt of Parliament although immunity from criminal arrest was removed by the Parliamentary Privilege Acts of the 18th century.

The Supreme Court of Canada once **described** it like this:

*“Privilege” [...is] the legal exemption from some duty, burden, attendance or liability to which others are subject. It has long been accepted that in order to perform their functions, legislative bodies require certain privileges relating to the conduct of their business. It has also long been accepted that these privileges must be held absolutely and constitutionally if they are to be effective; the legislative branch of our government must enjoy a certain autonomy which even the Crown and the courts cannot touch.*

In other words: in order to do their jobs, they need a little leeway.

Then, there are two basic kinds of privilege: individual privilege and collective parliamentary privilege. Individual parliamentary privileges include: freedom of speech; freedom from arrest in civil action; exemption from jury duty; the exemption from appearing as a witness; the freedom from obstruction, interference, intimidation and molestation. Collective parliamentary privileges include: the power to discipline; the regulation of the House's internal affairs; management of employees; authority to maintain the attendance and service of Members; the right to institute inquiries and to call witnesses and demand papers; the right to administer oaths to witnesses; and the right to publish papers containing defamatory material. Ever wondered why politicians can say such nasty things inside the House: things they would never say outside the House? Now you know.

So what exactly does this have to do with *contempt* I hear you ask? Well, one of the most important rules about when parliamentary privilege applies is that no privilege can exceed the powers, privileges and immunities of the imperial Parliament as it stood in 1867, when the first Constitution was written (that what it says in section 18 of CA 1867). So.... there are limits (and we have known what those limits are for quite some time). A member cannot push it too far. Result: if s/he does push it too far, there are consequences. For example, if a member violates a privilege, s/he can be in “breach of privilege” and s/he can be disciplined by the House. In addition...here it comes... if a Member goes beyond the limits of privilege, s/he can be

determined to be in “contempt”, and disciplined by the House. Also, if the government as a whole goes beyond the limits of privilege, it can be determined to be in “contempt”, and disciplined by the House.

In other words: a little leeway, yes; too much leeway, no. The reasoning: too much privilege would actually get in the way of the House doing its job. So: you guessed it, it is the oh-so-Canadian question of “balance”, yet again.

In some Commonwealth countries, this “contempt” is included in criminal law. In Canada, the issues stay within the House. Specifically, the rules about it can be found in the House of Commons Procedures and Practice Manual (the “Manual”) and similar documents relating to the Senate and provincial/territorial legislatures. Here is an excerpt from the House of Commons Manual:

Any disregard of or attack on the rights, powers and immunities of the House and its Members, either by an outside person or body, or by a Member of the House, is referred to as a “breach of privilege” and is punishable by the House. There are, however, other affronts against the dignity and authority of Parliament which may not fall within one of the specifically defined privileges. Thus, the House also claims the right to punish, as a **contempt**, any action which, though not a breach of a specific privilege, tends to obstruct or impede the House in the performance of its functions; obstructs or impedes any Member or Officer of the House in the discharge of their duties; or is an offence against the authority or dignity of the House, such as disobedience of its legitimate commands or libels upon itself, its Members, or its Officers. [...] The rationale of the power to punish contempts, whether contempt of court or contempt of the Houses, is that the courts and the two Houses should be able to protect themselves from acts which directly or indirectly impede them in the performance of their functions.

The result: there is no specific list of things that amount to contempt. We just know that if a Member/government goes beyond privilege, they might be found in contempt. This is how a lot of the law works, really: you have to have a little direction, but you don’t want to tie your hands too much, as you want to be able to examine each case on its facts, and you want to leave yourself some flexibility to deal with new types of things you could not have anticipated in advance (in 1867 – who knew about Twitter?).

That said, actions which can amount to a contempt of Parliament vary, but typically include such things as: deliberately misleading (i.e.: lying to) the House or a parliamentary committee; refusing to testify before, or to produce documents to, a House or committee; and attempting to influence a member, for example, by bribery or threats. The penalties for contempt of Parliament can include jail time, and, in the case of a minority Parliament, usually result in a vote of non-confidence.

OK...so given how much politicians are known to “spin” things, this contempt sanction should come up all the time, right? Wrong.

The use of contempt is quite rare. Think about it: nothing would get done if this were used all the time. There is, in essence, an acceptance by all sides that this is not to be used as a knee-jerk reaction or a partisan tactic: it is to be used only in the most serious of

circumstances. This has to do with the very core of democracy, and it is not to be used lightly. As noted in the Manual:

The reluctance to invoke the House's authority to reprimand, admonish or imprison anyone found to have trampled its dignity or authority and that of its Members appears to have become a near constant feature of the Canadian approach to privilege. Even the procedures around how this finding gets made ensure that a concern about possible contempt is treated with the utmost care. Specifically, it has been the practice of the House in such instances to refer the matter to committee for investigation to determine if a contempt has been committed and therefore not prejudice the findings of the committee.

That is what occurred in this case. It started with a request from the House finance committee asking to see detailed cost breakdowns for jets, and the impact of corporate tax cuts and crime bills on the federal treasury.

Initially, the government said it could not release these details because they were protected by cabinet confidence, a principle that allows information to be kept secret and exempts it from access-to-information laws. The Opposition argued that once a government announces its intentions publicly, the information is no longer protected by cabinet confidence. On March, 9, 2011, the Speaker issued a report declaring two possible charges of contempt of Parliament. The first was against the Minister responsible for the Canadian International Aid Agency. It alleged that the Minister added the word "not" to a funding memo for an aid agency, resulting in the request being denied and lied about in testimony before a committee. The Speaker also ruled that Cabinet itself could also be in contempt of Parliament for not disclosing the cost of its crime policies and new fighter jets. He sent this report to a committee, which, on March 21, 2011, ruled that the government was in contempt of Parliament. More specifically, it found that the government's failure to produce all documents that had been requested from it or to provide a satisfactory explanation for withholding them impedes the ability of Members of Parliament (MPs) to carry out their duties, thereby resulting in contempt. On March 25, 2011 the finding of contempt then led to a vote on a motion of non-confidence, which resulted in the conclusion of the 45<sup>th</sup> session of Parliament, and caused the government the first to fall on a charge of contempt.

So why does this matter? Either way you cut it, this was an historic vote. Only five other non-confidence votes have happened in Canada's history, according to information on the Library of Parliament website. This is the first time it has occurred because a majority of MPs voted that they believed the government was in contempt of Parliament. It is a rather large moment in Canadian history and it is our obligation as citizens and voters to understand it.

Respecting Parliament is key to making Parliament work. As voters, the question for each of us is: in that eternal Canadian question of balance, where is the line? At what point does "spin" become disrespectful? The answer may be different for each of us. The point is, we need to think about it and decide. That is the beauty of our democracy! For more information:

<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/const/page-2.html>



<http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/story/2011/03/25/pol-defeat.html>

<http://www2.parl.gc.ca/marleaumontpetit/DocumentViewer.aspx?Sec=Ch03&Seq=4&Lang=E>

### **1913 case:**

#### **The R. C. Miller Case**

In the spring of 1912, the House of Commons Public Accounts Committee inquired into whether there had been any bribes for government contracts involving the Diamond Light and Heating Company. They summoned its former president, R. C. Miller, to appear as a witness. He ignored the summons.

A year later, in early February 1913, he finally appeared with counsel, was sworn in, but refused to answer any questions because his answers might prejudice ongoing litigation. The Committee reported this failure to cooperate, and the House ordered Miller to appear at the bar. On February 18, 1913 he appeared with counsel, was sworn in, but again refused to answer questions.

The House then ordered Miller's committal until such time as he agreed to answer questions, or until the House ordered his release. He was taken to the Carleton County jail. There is no entry in the Journals of any order for his release, and he did not reappear at any time to answer questions. It is assumed that he remained in jail until the House was prorogued on June 6, about three and a half months later.

Liberal government was found in contempt of Parliament several times in their 9 years in power. The most recent case is the case of fired Winnipeg lab scientists where information was withheld where required by the House of Commons.. Liberals were also involved in the Arrivecan fraud and the SNC Lavalin obstruction of justice allegations by former Attorney General of Canada Jody Wilson Reblot. Not to mention CSIS has stated the Liberals have breached national security with the Chinese Communist Party and they had their elections paid for by the Chinese government and allowed the establishment of Chinese police stations and so on.

The current situation with Parliament is the Public Health Agency of Canada in 2021 was brought before committee struck to investigate CSIS allegations that the Liberals committed a breach of national security by releasing sensitive information to the Chinese Communist Party who were involved in the Winnipeg Virology Lab. PHAC refused to release an employee file for 2 Chinese employees who were fired when CISIS made these allegations and returned to China. The matter was subsequently presented to the House of Parliament who asked again for the files and were refused. Therefore, the PHAC representatives were found in contempt of Parliament; they were admonished by the speaker of the house. No discipline was given and the matter was referred to the court. The court eventually ordered that the file be given to Parliament. Pierre Poilievre announced that the file confirmed a breach of national security, yet no action was taken by parliament to discipline those involved. What is being referred to here is High Treason yet nothing official done to those involved.

PHAC may be a private agency as I and several others have done extensive research on the matter of whether it is government or private and we cannot find information to clarify this

matter either way. Regardless they need to be disciplined for their part in the treason that is being committed. We also had Chinese police stations set up and we have top officials like Teresa Tam who are Chinese. Tam was appointed by the Minister of Health to the position of Chief Medical Officer of Canada at PHAC. However, I cannot find information on who appointed Heather Jeffery president of PHAC who Tam answers to. All things considered Canada is experiencing a Communist occupation which is attempting to take over the country.

Now we have another new situation where the Parliament has admonished and not disciplined. One of the partners at Government of Canada Strategies Kristen Firth who took a 60 million dollar contract for the Arrivecan also refused to give information to an investigative committee and the matter was referred to the House of Commons where he again refused to give information and was admonished. There have been fraud charges laid by police but Parliament has not disciplined Firth.

Now it is being discussed who has ultimate authority in matters of breach of national security is it Parliament or the Court.

Can the government rely on provisions in national security legislation to refuse to provide unredacted documents to a House Of Commons committee when ordered to do so by a resolution of the House? Should, or can, resolution of this question be made by the courts, or only within the House? In a current case, Canada's House and courts face these questions.

Common. Law is clear that the Parliament has the ultimate authority to deal with contempt of Parliament.

Apparently, the Charter is being cited as why it should be the court that has the ultimate authority because it says that the Constitution is the Supreme Law of Canada. However, this argument ignores that the preamble of the Constitution says it is based on the principles of the UK. Article 9 of the British Bill of Rights is what assigns parliamentary privilege and this cannot be override by legislation such as the Charter. This was confirmed in the Alford V. Canada case law.

[https://www.jccf.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/2022-ONSC-2911-CanLII-\\_-Alford-v.-Canada-Attorney-General-\\_-CanLII.pdf](https://www.jccf.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/2022-ONSC-2911-CanLII-_-Alford-v.-Canada-Attorney-General-_-CanLII.pdf)

And the Charter is unconstitutional because:

1. Charter was passed without public consultation.
2. Charter was passed without parliamentary debate.
3. Charter was **NOT** passed into Canadian law; it remains part of United Kingdom law that was also not debated by the UK Parliament.
4. Charter section 1 gives the court the right to limit our rights including our inalienable rights protected under Common Law/Constitution and Canadian Bill of Rights and other legislation to life, liberty, security of person, enjoyment of property, religion, free speech, assembly, press, privacy, and informed consent. The intention of the Charter was to 1. give the state the right to limit our rights (section 1) and 2. to full on remove property rights as both provisions are necessary for Communism to be established.

5. Charter section 24 gives the court unfettered discretion to ignore common law precedents and the Canadian Bill of Rights and other legislation that protects our inalienable rights.
6. Charter section 11 (f) is responsible for unconstitutionally initiating the removal of our Common Law/Constitutional right to a jury in all claims made against us established by the Magna Carta (the Great Charter). The jury puts the people in control of the courts which helps protect all of us from arbitrary use of police and courts; Juries have the sacred responsibility to try the facts to prevent unfair or unreasonable application of the laws and have the authority to nullify unfair or unreasonable laws.
7. Charter by claims the Constitution is the Supreme Law of Canada which if true would strip the Parliament of its ultimate authority derived in Common Law under article 9 of the British Bill of Rights which binds Canada in the preamble of the Constitution.
8. Charter's most serious deviation from Common Law/Constitution calls for the court to be the supreme authority in Canada rather than Parliament as established by Common Law at article 9 of the British Bill of Rights which binds Canada by way of the preamble of the Constitution. This parliamentary privilege given by article 9 includes the authority to discipline those who are found in contempt of Parliament. Common law cannot be overridden with legislation such as the Charter which is confirmed in the *Alford v. Canada* 2022 decision which found that legislation meant to eliminate parliamentary privilege was unconstitutional because legislation cannot be used to undermine common law.

If we allow the Parliament to abdicate its ultimate authority to the court we will have lost our two necessary pillars of democracy and the country will officially be a communist style authoritarian state.

The two pillars established in common law for the people to be in control of the parliament are:

1. **Parliamentary privilege** giving ultimate authority to the Parliament and
2. **Elections** to be sure Parliament acts in accordance with our wishes and interests. We have been complacent and vastly uninvolved which is why the government has gotten out of hand. But under this structure we can bring it back on track by simply
  - a. Holding them accountable through the courts when they act contrary to our interests and campaign against them in subsequent elections.
  - b. Stop allowing the media to manipulate the elections by simply by making sure that everyone has access to the websites of all candidates in every election
  - c. Maintain non electronic hand counted voting especially at the Federal level and make sure we use our right to scrutinize the polling stations.

All we have to do to maintain these pillars is demand that the Parliament discipline those who threaten parliament with contempt. Currently that would be the Liberal executives disciplined for treason colluding with Communist China and PHAC for high treason sharing state secrets with Communist China and GC Strategies for fraud and contempt of Parliament.

The way we control the court is through the jury. The jury represents the people, and we have a common law right (from the Magna Carta) to a jury in all claims made against us. The jury is the trier of the facts to make sure the state is not acting arbitrarily against someone. The jury can also rule the law invalid if they find it unfair or unreasonable. Jury is a very powerful tool that we have to control the court. Since Pierre Elliot Trudeau a known communist was in power the state has been neglecting to assign juries including the grand juries which sit prior to charges being laid to make sure there is enough evidence for a charge. Juries are a common law right so the Charter being that it is legislation is not sufficient to reduce the frequency. All we have to do here is demand the law be followed.

We can see the regression in the operation of the courts as our juries have been disappearing. They have also created an unconstitutional court in each province regulated and judges appointed by the province rather than by the Federal government under section 91.27 of the Constitution. These courts have no inherent jurisdiction; they only derive authority from statute, unlike the proper courts have to deal with common law and the Canadian Bill of Rights and other legislation that protects our rights that recognizes and commits the government to protect our human rights and fundamental freedoms. I call these bastard courts such as the Ontario Court of Justice. All our provincial offenses, family law and 95 percent of criminal cases go through this court where you have no rights recognized. There are no juries in bastard court whatsoever.

The court design makes it easy for the government or even foreign governments to control.

We need to get rid of bastard courts and demand juries be assigned to all cases to get back control of the courts before it is too late.

If they make the shit from Parliament to the courts for ultimate control we will have lost control of both permanently and the courts.

What we need to do to protect our country is demand that the Senators and MPs act in accordance with their common law/constitutional authority and duty to protect the country from traitorous conspirers. And demand the dismantling of bastard courts and that juries be provided for all claims made against us as per common law/constitution.

Canada is worth protecting from falling into communist style totalitarian government structure. The grooming and restructuring for communism has been going on for many years now and we are in pretty deep. One of the main tools used to bring us this far was to keep the masses ignorant of the protective provisions of our common law based constitution and the power there to protect our human rights and fundamental freedoms. It was by design that Pierre Elliot Trudeau, our first communist prime minister, removed civics from the classrooms for grade school all the way up to university. Civics is the study of the rights and obligations of citizens in society. The term derives from the Latin word *civicus*, meaning "relating to a citizen". With this knowledge removed, they have been able to convince many people through propaganda that we have no rights and freedoms and of course the Charter (which allows the government to limit rights and has removed property rights) issued decisions in regarding covid measures and the convoy charges has given support to this false notion that we have no rights. This is one of the standard methodologies of a communist revolution is to demoralize the people and make them think there is no way to fight back. They also work on destabilizing the country which demoralization helps because demoralized people do not trust or support the government making it easier to defeat. If the people believe that the government, courts and police cannot protect them they do not even request much less demand protection.

It is true that knowledge is power and in this case it is critical that people understand that democracy in Canada is on the brink of defeat so we must get to the knowledge of our rights and freedoms and the duties of Parliament to protect those rights and freedoms in order to save us from the ultimate defeat. Make the demand of the Senators and MP's to respect their duty and protect our democracy.

## References

1. [https://www.ourcommons.ca/procedure/our-procedure/parliamentaryprivilege/c\\_g\\_parliamentaryprivilege-e.html](https://www.ourcommons.ca/procedure/our-procedure/parliamentaryprivilege/c_g_parliamentaryprivilege-e.html)
2. [https://www.ourcommons.ca/procedure/procedure-and-practice-3/ch\\_03\\_1-e.html](https://www.ourcommons.ca/procedure/procedure-and-practice-3/ch_03_1-e.html)
3. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parliamentary\\_privilege](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parliamentary_privilege)
4. <https://www.constitutionalstudies.ca/2014/01/parliamentary-privilege/?print=print>
5. <https://sencanada.ca/content/sen/Committee/412/rprd/rep/rep07jun15-e.pdf>
6. <https://www.hansardsociety.org.uk/blog/canadian-conflict-over-contempt-of-parliament-and-national-security-creates>
7. Alford v Canada Superior Court of Justice  
[https://www.jccf.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/2022-ONSC-2911-CanLII-\\_-Alford-v.-Canada-Attorney-General-\\_-CanLII.pdf](https://www.jccf.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/2022-ONSC-2911-CanLII-_-Alford-v.-Canada-Attorney-General-_-CanLII.pdf)
8. Alford v. Canada Ontario Court of Appeal Ontario Court of Appeal  
<https://www.canlii.org/en/on/onca/doc/2024/2024onca306/2024onca306.html?resultIndex=2&resultId=f319f3be240b4f53bfdd652c3dc493af&searchId=2024-07-08T00:31:23:391/e58f66e5525b4b89936590872f57f150&searchUrlHash=AAAAQAUQWxmb3JkIHYgQ2FuYWRRhIDIwMjQAAAAAQ>

The Alford v Canada is being appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada,