

David Kelly Teertstra vs. The Corporation of the City of Peterborough and Its Directors.
Charging Them Based on Evidence and Circumstance with Multiple Counts of Fraud, Theft and
Extortion of Essential Human Needs Threatening the Life, Liberty and Security of My Person by
Criminal Negligence, Obstruction of Justice and Forming a Criminal Organization within Government
Advocating Genocide, Offending Public Order and My Safety by Acts of Sedition and Treason.
These being Violations of the Criminal Code of Canada Sections 380(1), 380(2), 322(1), 346(1),
219(1), 219(2), 221, 139(2), 318(1), 59(1), 59(2), 59(3) and 59(4) and 46(2a), respectively.

A Charter Section 11 Public-Hearing Document For Open Distribution, December 7, 2022

PLAINTIFF STATEMENT WITH CLAIMS AND CASE SUMMARY

Victim Impact Statement Claiming Actions Taken Against The Life, Liberty and Security of the Person
of the Reverend Dr. David Kelly Teertstra by the Directors of Peterborough City Hall with Further
Evidence of Systematic Crime and Human Rights Abuses Threatening Personal and National Security

Claim: On Monday, December 5, 2022, the Mayor and council of the City of Peterborough made public their detailed plans for totalitarian control of the lives of Peterborough residents, expressed great concern that a citizen advisory committee might microscopically diminish their powers, and then claimed the right to hold the power of life and death over citizens despite being informed by myself and dissenting council members that their actions have already caused misery and death by complete removal of citizen self-determination by (Charter rights violations summing to violations of Criminal Code of Canada (CCC) *Section 139(2)*) by extortion of essential human needs (a CCC *Section 346(1)* violation) and would continue to do to. In decision-making processes fully rejecting citizen rights to make fundamental decisions of profound importance to their lives, councillors expressed their right to make arbitrary decisions critical to life and death based on personal bias and whim and without a basis in fact, evidence or knowledge. They further described the characteristics of the group they deemed worthy of forcing into conditions of immense hardship and struggle with low odds of survival, this fitting the CCC *Section 318(1)* definition of genocide. They aimed to include me in this group, though I lack their defining characteristics of addiction to drugs, thus intending to force me into circumstances of intentional deprivation of my Charter *Section 7* rights to life including my *Section 1* rights to decide. At this meeting, the Mayor said he could not find a consistent basis of decision making, and was either lying or admitting incompetence and thus abdicating his right to decide. They made the effects of their anti-Constitutional bylaws so sweeping as to include an entire generation of young Canadians along with any citizen unable to pay the extreme debilitating life expenses imposed on them by the directors of City Hall working in explicit collusion with private corporations aiming to control every essential human need. City Hall operates by force, fraud (with multiple counts of systemic CCC *Section 380(1)* violations), fraud affecting major markets (a CCC *Section 380(2)* violation) and theft of essential human resources required for survival (CCC *Section 322(1)* violations). Numerous Criminal Code and human rights violations occur as a direct result of these actions against the purposes of government

defined in the Canadian Constitution Act (1982), to the extent that I have much evidence that the following directors have replaced our local government with an authoritarian State aimed at totalitarian control of the lives of citizens (CCC Sections 59(1-4) violations), aiming this night to effect the worst possible outcome of mass human deprivation, a CCC Section 46(2a) violation including incidents of attempted and aggravated negligent manslaughter (violations of CCC Sections 219(1-2), 220 and 221): Jeff Leal, Kevin Duguay, Lesley Parnell, Don Vassiliadis, Gary Baldwin, Keith Riel, Andrew Beamer and Dave Haacke. This council meeting provides a clear indication of the state of mind of the incorporated person of the City of Peterborough and its intent to act against citizens in unlimited manners far beyond the scope of legitimate government and well into the territory of a forceful oppressive regime working systematically against life itself.

Circumstantial Overview: I arrived in Peterborough on Thursday, November 3, 2022 coming by bicycle from Trenton, Ontario under emergency circumstances fleeing a tyrannical Mayor that has destroyed the basis of the economy and by collusive removal of all manner of social care is actively worsening an abusive situation of personal and social indentured servitude. I was also drawn here by love, and with significant plans for a healthy life by green job creation inclusive of social care. In this larger city, I had hoped for more possibilities of making a living than could be gained in a small town. I knew the housing market was tight, but did not realize that it was best described as a state of emergency. I came with funds I thought to be sufficient for first and last months' rent, expecting to rent a room quickly. I came with deeply developed plans for multiple types of social business startups, some already market tested. Initially, I stayed with a friend until that became untenable, as her landlady decided to use my presence as a force for evicting my friend in order to put the unit on the housing market for a much higher price.

Due to the extreme prices for rentals and the extreme shortage, within a few days I found myself unhoused with exceedingly low odds of becoming housed. I specifically reject the term homeless, for I am not homeless. Canada is my home. In Peterborough, I encountered organized State actions taken against me originating in City Hall threatening life, liberty and security of the person by complete removal of any freedom, any place to go, or any form of self-determination by equality under the law. The directors of Peterborough City Hall have written bylaws with the purpose and effect of removing any possibility of my taking actions critical to saving my own life. When I try to save my life, they act to destroy it. Their bylaws have created conditions far worse than can be found in any Canadian prison. In my assessment, Peterborough is best described as a humanitarian disaster zone requiring emergency UN relief efforts and I have contacted the UN and Canadian Ministry leaders concerning that.

Through most of November and ongoing, I have found myself under unrelenting attack with respect to having a place to exist to survive. I was quickly informed by professionals in our net of Social Services that the source of the problem is City Hall, with the Mayor and council having written bylaws against our very lives and survival. I personally experienced this as concentrated State efforts to remove my fundamental rights to take actions to save my life, and found them further devoted to forcing me into situations likely to cause bodily harm and death by removal of essential resources critical to survival.

Whereas I understand that by law they are required to defend my life, defend my freedoms to take needed actions critical to saving my life, and to work with me by equality under the law to ensure the balanced maintenance of social, economic and ecological circumstances allowing reasonable *Section 7* security of the person within reasonable limits (under *Section 1* of the Charter). On investigation, I found City bylaws and activities entirely devoted ripping society apart for the purpose of totalitarian control of essential human needs, complete with many mechanisms of removal or recourse that in sum amounted to complete and utter rejection of our Canadian Constitution Act (1982). I found the directors of City Hall to be fully engaged in outright rejection of equality under the law and actively creating an illegal authoritarian State aimed entirely at totalitarian removal of personal say and self-determination, the Criminal Code of Canada violation here being Sedition. I further found significant intentions of Treason in their aims to force the extermination of an identifiable group and to push into that group entire vulnerable populations, myself included and including the young people and children of Canada.

To state this simply, if you do not have enough money to pay the income extremists in banking, business and government, working in provable collusion to strip people of all the resources required to live, via the policies and actions of City Hall it is their full intent to give you no place to go and let you die. The law is a tool, just as a knife is a tool. Most people use it for good intent, but some do not. Here, in Peterborough, by circumstances thrust on me and not of my own will or doing, I understand this intent of malice from the effects of bylaws of City Hall and the actions taken by the representatives of City Hall, not just against my life but against the lives of many thrust into the same circumstances they do not wish to be part of.

Considering my equality under the law coupled to my rights to free self-determination, which have been interfered with vastly by certain bad actors within the State falsely claiming rights and authorities they do not have, I know perfectly well that the Supreme Court has ruled that the purpose of recognizing equal rights and freedoms is to allow the individual to make fundamental decisions about their lives free from State interference. There is nothing more profound than having a place to exist, and removing that right is equivalent to removing a right to life. An attack on the land is an attack on our lives, this being the basis of life itself and all economic activity, wherein denial of a place to exist is denial of my right to life. They aimed to force my death, simply because I did not have enough money to pay them. In rent and work, when the effects are to create a situation of permanent life insecurity, their clear intent is to unfairly take the proceeds of labour by rejecting all citizens efforts to attain self-reliant self-determination of essential human needs. The removal of freedoms to the extent that citizens have no say about what is most essential to their lives and are further allowed no escape from the debilitating systems imposed on them is an accurate description of slavery.

I know perfectly well that the courts have ruled that Canadian land belongs to the Canadian people and must be used for our mutual benefit. *Section 7* is also clear, as the requirements of both life and life security are well known, their core being work, shelter and food security. Without the right to fundamental work to support one's own life, and without trade, lives collapse and the core of the economy collapses, and that is exactly what is happening in Peterborough. An example. Why do

workers in government want money? One reason is to buy food. If you prevent people from growing food, or from stop people from engaging in self-sustaining work and trade, we cannot earn enough to pay workers in government and further enter into a food security crisis of unaffordable life. Land is a critical resource essential to life needed to meet essential human needs, whereas the directors of Peterborough City Hall have instead launched an all-out attack on the basis of our lives and the basis of life itself. This is going nowhere good and will not end well.

I have taken great pains to fulfill my obligations to careful due process, as directed by the Supreme Court of Canada, doing root cause analysis and considering both the beneficial and deleterious effects of the law. I cannot obey a law I do not understand, particularly when its authors have refused to provide a sound basis for its reason, purpose, intent and application based on presentation of fact, evidence and reason within the context of justice as required by their Constitutional obligations under *Section 1* of the Canadian Constitution Act (1982). Further, when I find no basis in law for their City bylaws and actions, and those bylaws and actions are clearly against the purposes of good governance and the justice system, unconstitutional and against the lives and life security of myself and all other Canadians, under *Section 52* of the Charter such “laws” can only be regarded as having no force or effect, for they are laws at all but based on biases, personal preferences, whim and will. Specifically, certain directors of City Hall, past and present, have considered themselves to be the law and determined that all of society must obey them. The concern here, and the charges, is the illegal creation of an authoritarian state within the boundaries of Canada dedicated fully to the rejection and destruction of our Constitutional monarchy. The criminal code charges I am pressing here thus include Criminal Code of Canada *Sections 59 to 61* charges of Sedition, for I can show that the directors of City Hall have worked ceaselessly and tirelessly against all of the essential principles and practices of our Canadian Constitution Act and further aim to reject and defeat entirely entirely any realizable form of recourse and due process.

Most urgently, however, and critical to the preservation and protection of my life, are the Criminal Code matters of fraud (CCC Section 380(1)), theft (CCC Section 322(1) of resources critical to life including life-sustaining Charter work and decision-making that that belongs to the community, criminal collusion (under the Competition Act) aimed entirely at removal of Freedom of Association from groups intending harm, false claims of land ownership (emerging from root cause analysis), and this matter of attempted negligent manslaughter, pursued here in its gentler form of criminal negligence of duty (covering the range of CCC Sections 219 to 221). Multiple other charges, from the War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity Act to the Competition Act, are included here to provide the critical context and establish patterns of behaviour consistent with persons with mental illness making them unfit for duty or positions of power over other persons under the Ontario Mental Health Act. The intent and purpose of *Section 1* of our Charter is clear: the mentally ill do not have the right to rule over the healthy majority.

I also take my obligations to the Articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights seriously. In particular, I do not wish to commit an act of war by in any way, shape or form by effecting damage to a

persons reputation. What is one to do when the directors of City Hall reject fully my rights to equality under the law and do not allow reasonable debate of discussion of the laws they have created, when they reject any and all forms of engagement to the extent of making my participation in the democratic process meaningless, and when in doing so force their beliefs on me to the extent of completely and utterly denying any means of self-determination? It is not the meaning and purpose of my life to be a servant, when I am born equal in rights and have far greater purposes than can be found within the limited ideologies imposed on me by force by the directors of City Hall. I do not exist to serve them, and yet they have aimed to control my every essential human need and action to the extent that I am forced into permanent indentured servitude and find myself not free at all to meet my own needs by the work I do in a healthy, caring connected community of free trade.

City Hall has created policies aimed entirely at fracturing and tearing apart society by the purposeful removal of rights and freedoms. They have denied of me access to the critical resources required for my survival, based entirely on false claims of authority and land ownership, further working in intimate collusion with bankers and developers (provable in contracts they wrote and signed) specifically designed and purposed to remove essential rights and freedoms without compensation. In this manner, Freedom of Association from groups aiming to damage my life has been removed. Let me be clear. Bankers are devoted entirely to the removal of all public lands for public benefit. City Hall then claims falsely that public land belongs to them for their benefit alone.

The direct result is the totalitarian removal of all land Canadians have a right to be on, even for purposes of fighting to preserve their own lives. We know this is planned and purposeful, and have the full set of evidence for that, and the intent is to declare to Canadians that Canada is not your home. We know exactly who benefits, bankers, big business and City Hall, and know motive and opportunity. Whereas under Canadian law, the requirement and obligation of City Hall is only to do work that benefits those paying for the service, the standard of assessment is not falsified land and home valuations but the core elements of life, liberty and security of the person. The law is clear on this. Here, we are dealing with illegal taxation, whereas the requirement is *Section 7* analysis because the reason people want government jobs is to gain life security. *Section 15* is clear, that this cannot be obtained by destroying the basis of life security of those who are paying for the services of government. At the core of life security is work, food and shelter. This means shelter of one's own choice, not an imposed form of shelter, for the imposition of shelter not meeting the full spectrum of needs is also an imposition of risk striking at the heart of life security.

In an emergency situation, the risk is this. Even if you have enough money for first and last months rent, and there is no housing without this requirement, and you cannot work without a stable home base, then in exactly two months if you do not also land a job with significant pay you will be in a worse position than when you started, this time depleted of all funds and recourse whatsoever. Furthermore, even if you manage to attain work and shelter simultaneously, you find yourself in a position of permanent life insecurity under conditions of forced indentured servitude in which you can never work hard enough to pay for the life expenses imposed on you. The denial of basic shelter, from

a tent to a UN-style emergency relief tent to a small cabin, when completely and utterly denied by the directors of City Hall, without a doubt reflects the mindset of the directors in not allowing anyone escape from the bank-run City-Hall-supported housing model. In this model, the core belief system is that of complete corporate control and ownership of the land and every essential human need and action, a totalitarian state operating from the ideology of infinite exponential growth with no reasonable limits. So I find myself under an imposed ideology I do not believe in, which is a *Section 2* fundamental rights violation and act of tyranny. I further find from the full set of fact and evidence available that the idea of infinite growth has no factual basis, but am most alarmed that no alternative or escape is allowed from this ideology, meaning that my multicultural rights are denied. Therefore, I am obliged by Supreme Court directives to reasonably predict the outcome of such actions and bylaws, and find them extremely damaging to my person to the extent of direct threats to my life and further have high certainty of massive damage to my future. The outcome of the complete removal of reasonable recourse and options, when a place to exist is utterly denied, is expected and predictable. It is nothing less than the creation of conditions people are unlikely to survive.

It is the purpose of criminal law to address such egregious matters robustly and expediently, knowing these acts against the person also acts against society. However, I do not wish to cause harm to any person by laying charges that would lead directly to their arrest. My primary purpose is urgent discussion and debate to under the law and under the principal tenets of engaged democracy, these being vastly preferable to useless protest. We have solutions, all of which are vigorously denied, delayed and blocked by City Hall even as the bodies pile up. I personally have I have encountered only tactics of delay and diversion coupled to false claims of authority and direction to laws and Acts having nothing to do with the issue. For these reasons, and many more described in the full case below, I vastly prefer a summons process wherein my case is handled by a judge or justice of the peace primarily concerned with the full Constitutional range of application of law. It is ridiculous to have to go to such great lengths to force certain people within the government to obey the law and do their jobs.

It is truly sad that these are the extents to which I must go to have a fair and just life in Canada wherein I can earn a living while developing a new type of medical scanner of profound importance to all manner of personal and national security. I understand this as my Universal Declaration of Human Rights Right to Development, which if opposed by those aiming for maximum profit from all my essential human needs, also acts to gut the basis of the economy based on one's personal capacity to make and sell things. By denying people any place to live, to work, to make and sell things, which is the purpose and effect of the societally-fracturing land use zoning policies of City Hall using strategies and land use maps and plans identical to those used in North Korea, that this constitutes a profoundly corrupt anti-competition strategy whose sole purpose is to crush at the grass-roots level any possibility for those with little to even begin to start a business. This horrific interference in free trade, acting against an entire generation of young Canadians, is accomplished directly by these crushing land use policies aimed fully against any form of free-trade self-determination. It is not the purpose of government to run the business plans of private enterprise because this removes Freedom of Association and replaces it with force. This is a direct violation by the directors of City Hall of the

Competition Act.

In sharp contrast, the “demonstrably justified” test of legitimate government includes our history from our Pioneer Rights to take risk and carve out a life for ourselves in response to crisis at local to national scales. At present, there is undeniable evidence for a large-scale humanitarian crisis in Peterborough, with people dying on the streets under circumstances they do not want and did not choose, that they were forced into. Here, I present strong evidence that City Hall is the source and cause of our work, food and shelter security crisis. Strong evidence that the directors of City Hall not only refuse to do anything about it, as is their duty, but vehemently oppose all reasonable solutions known to work that also meet all Constitutional requirements of equality under the law. In Canada, we do not just have the right to Freedom of Speech, but we have the right to Freedom of Expression, which takes us from the realm of ideas to the realm of action. We are allowed to act under the law, if we have good reason based on fact and evidence in the context of justice, but find ourselves continually blocked in taking the actions needed, not only to save our own lives, but to save the lives of others. This is the ridiculously appalling situation I mean to address in putting forward this case and these charges.

I can of course just shut up and take only the actions necessary to save my own skin. However, in the course of interacting with the good people in various social service organizations, I found a widespread problem that each person, although expert in their field and knowing what to do, was restricted from doing what was obvious and needed and within their capacities to do. Specifically, if these government workers dared defend the lives of Canadians using the principles and practices of the Canadian Constitution Act, which they are legally obliged to do, they would be attacked and fired instead of being protected and defended under the umbrella of the law. In Peterborough, when the directors of City Hall create bylaws and policies without basis in law and in conflict with the Canadian Constitution, the Peterborough Police are then put in conflict with the law. In essence, they are ordered by the Mayor and council to take actions they know are wrong, actions that are against our highest laws to defend life, liberty and security of the person, actions that they know will push someone into a high-risk situation likely to lead to bodily harm or death, and thus open to accusations and charges. This is the war crime of being ordered to act against your own conscience, to commit acts you know are wrong. The police are pushing people along to their deaths, knowing they are on their last legs, knowing they have no place to go and no resources left.

After two world wars, the world was unanimous in putting together a short list of things we must not do under any circumstances. Here, we find the directors of City Hall directly engaged in many of these activities. This cannot happen in Canada. When the Mayor and council act outside of the law and claim rights and authorities they do not have, being outside of the scope of legitimate government defined in the Constitution Act, and those actions are against the lives of citizens and our top laws, taxpayers supporting this can be charged with aiding and abetting. Worse, they are forced to pay for work done against their lives, work that further guts the basis of life security and will knowingly and provably lead to the creation of miserable conditions for their own children. Which it already has. I must therefore testify about what the Mayor and council have done to me, knowing that they are doing this to

everyone and understanding these as crimes against society.

The directors of the City of Peterborough, the Mayor and Council have taken illegal State actions causing me bodily harm to such extreme extent and with such obvious and predictable effects that it is clear they intend to commit Aggravated Negligent Manslaughter. Since this is done by policy, further directing the Peterborough Police to act against the life security of extremely vulnerable individuals and push them further into circumstances likely to cause their death, though many have died as I personally do not consider this culpable homicide since the circumstances are calm and considered, planned and calculated acts of hate that are not immediately violent. Therefore, since I have so far survived their actions, but only by my skill and will to survive, it seems to me that the appropriate charges are those of the Criminal Code of Canada (CCC) descriptions of bodily harm caused by negligence of duty, CCC *Sections 219 to 220*. Further, as it is not the purpose of government to commit such actions against people at such large scale, I understand these as not only war crimes, for we have not seen such despicable actions and activities except in war and extremely oppressive states, I have further found much evidence of systematic work against the government and have no choice but to note that these are acts of Sedition, violations of CCC *Sections 59 to 61*. Here, we are dealing with multiple systematic violations of the Canadian Constitution Act (1982), which I have experienced as multiple purposeful violations of my Charter rights, exerted to such extent as to force me toward directions of hardship and death against my will.

I therefore charge the City of Peterborough with these crimes, knowing their pens to be the source and cause of much misery and woe inflicted not only on myself but on many others to the extent of creating a clear humanitarian crisis which City Hall could certainly ameliorate but refuse to do so. In the Canadian Constitution Act, bodily harm is covered under *Section 7* of the Charter, life, liberty and security of the person. What is the basis of life, and of life security? In answering, I use *Section 1* depositions of evidence for the courts to consider. The core components of life security are easily understand by imagining a scenario of survival, thus mapping out essential human needs in order of priority depending on the circumstances. Primarily, we need a place to exist, land we have rights to be on. Removal of this fundamental right, the removal of all possibilities of a place to go, is a statement of clear intent that you have no right to exist. I understand that such intent can only have originated from a psychopathic mind, for this is the only mental health pathology known to have a verifiable physiological basis generating complete and utter lack of conscience. In fact, such persons take pleasure in causing harm to others.

In denying a person a place to exist, the direct result is completely and utterly predictable. We know this from the creation of internment camps in which the intent is to create the most miserable deplorable conditions of torture and misery that can be conceived by the psychopathic mind. We know such a mind is at work within government, for such persons purposely seek positions of power over others. Under *Section 7* of the Charter, we understand this as the totalitarian removal of personal and social choice and freedom to such extent that we are not allowed to change the deplorable circumstances and if we try we are threatened. This is exactly what is happening in Peterborough. Our

lives are lived locally at the constitutional level, and in all these matters there is only one group responsible for the maintenance of healthy social, ecologic and economic conditions protecting life, liberty and security of the person.

When the fundamental rights to life based on having a place to exist are removed, the outcome is completely predictable. First, one can only attempt to exist with what they are wearing and carrying. They have no place to leave anything. The clothes you wear are your main life security protection. The problem is you cannot maintain healthy, because you have nothing to wear of you can find a place to do laundry, and for that you need to get there, which drains you energy when you have no food, and you also need money for the laundromat. If all that comes together, what will you wear as you wash your clothes? Wet feet from poor footwear will further drive you to disease and death, for what happens when you cannot walk? If you get wet, or cannot generate enough heat to survive a freezing night, you die or become so exhausted the entire next day must be spent in recovery.

Furthermore, when you are labelled homeless, you are put in an identifiable group which becomes the subject and object of personal, social and State oppression. You are undesirable, unwanted and people want you out of sight, gone, dead. You should not exist. If the solution is to get a job, and you have essentially lost all the resources required for survival, how is getting a job possible? We can easily list the requirements of getting and keeping a job, which is essentially impossible without a place to exist, shower and wash clothes, sleep and cook. Your core life security is gone, this being shelter, work and food. When the conditions are far worse than to be found in prison, and you are given a group identity toward which hate can be directed, and it is by City Hall when they send out officers to deprive people on the brink of life of what little they have, we must refer to *Section 12* of our Constitution which prohibits treatment and punishment by the state that are cruel and unusual. This includes torture, excessive or abusive use of force by law enforcement. At the scale at which this disaster is occurring in Peterborough, we must refer to *CCC Section 318(1)* Every one who advocates or promotes genocide of an identifiable group is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years. A study of the operations of City Hall thus is a close match to the *CCC Section 467(1)* definition of a criminal organization. And here I also refer to the United Nations standards for corruption, in which the characteristic effects are social, economic and ecologic devastation fully purposed to remove the rights and freedoms of entire populations, giving them no recourse and no hope for a future.

In this context, I must further refer to another group starting life with little and also facing a grim future with a high risk of dire circumstances that this Mayor and council are accelerating even though we have known solutions, this entire generation of young Canadians, and in that specific context the negligence of duty by the directors of City Hall is a major contributor to the genocide of this specific identifiable group. Again the Mayor and council drive both the destruction of my life but the lives of those I care about by the removal of Freedom of Association from groups driving our destruction. Furthermore, in written contracts with those groups, they signed off on the removal of rights critical to life. Knowing the state of the world in full factual detail, and what faces this generation, and what they

are already trapped in, extends the damage to me into the realm of spiritual and psychological distress, well documented to have significant impacts on the health of the body.

I use the word shelter here rather than housing, because clothes are a shelter. Having a safe place to sleep is a shelter. Having a place to grow food is a shelter. In the positive sense, we know these as your Pioneer Rights to seek and build shelter of your own choice and devising, and to build a life by the labour of your own hands. This requires a place to exist, a place to start, a place to build up, and make something to sell by free trade with others. These are your rights to life as well as your development rights. To remove these rights to learn, grow, sustain yourself and develop is a well-known war crime, unanimously Articled in the Universal Declaration of Human rights, and we are appalled by the State actions of war against people by the directors of City Hall in attacking our lives and the foundation of our lives to the extent that we have no place to go and are moved along and driven to our deaths. We have not seen such actions and Crimes Against Humanity since World War II, and in this we can specifically compare the policies and land use maps of Peterborough City Hall to those used in North Korea, currently the worlds largest concentration camp with the policies of an oppressive State fully dedicated to the complete removal of all essential freedoms critical to life.

In each critical area of life security, the directors of City Hall have taken clear actions against my life and life security, removing all possibilities of securing my essential human needs by ensuring I have no place to go to live, to grow foods, to make and sell things, and to enter into the free market. It is not just me they have done this to, but they have done this to an entire generation of young Canadians, by the following means and mechanisms. Bankers want all land privatized, and they want complete removal of public land and any public institution providing public benefit and care. We can present as evidence if need be a land map of Peterborough and of Ontario, showing what little public land remains. When the directors of City Hall claim this land as their own and a review of their salaries, budget and operations reveals they are the main beneficiaries, the direct result is the creation of a totalitarian state with complete removal of options and freedoms for the use of public land for public benefit to meet essential human needs.

The directors of City Hall say this is not the purpose of land, whereas our Canadian Constitution Act explicitly says it is. Furthermore, the Supreme Court of Canada has in many rulings consistently stated that Canadian land belongs to the Canadian people and must be used for public benefit. It is further illegal for any level of government to run the business plans of private corporations through government, because that removes Freedom of Association, forces us into the hands of those aiming to cripple and drain our lives and results in multiple and major CCC crimes of collusion, racketeering, fraud, theft, extortion of essential human needs, and is further work against Ministry Mandates and multiple Acts of Parliament, specifically the Competition Act. Whereas we know the mandates of each Ministry, and have also read the Mandate letters of the Prime Minister specifically directing all Ministries and the government workers thereunder to devote themselves entirely to the Charter directives of citizen self-determination.

Whereas the Mayor and council have decided independently of the law to tear apart the basis of the economy and the fabric of society by taking actions of deep anti-competition ensuring people cannot sustain themselves by engaging in free trade. This specifically removes the firm life-supporting basis of an open pool of community work for attaining basic life security. I have a food security crisis specifically because as a non-land-owner I have been denied the right for a place to grow food to sustain myself. We have a world food security crisis, and plenty of land and water and people wanting to work and respond to crisis, but instead find plans at City Hall to completely deny this. On a balance of probabilities, and by following motives and money trails, as well as ruling out other options, one can only conclude that those with existing food-related businesses have worked closely with City Hall to ensure people cannot feed themselves and that no competition at all arises. We can further find throughout government organizations a widespread and concerted effort to force individual isolation and suppress social connectivity on the issues. Stalin used the same tactics, and we refer to Stalin because we have a good understanding of the personality type that assumes rights and powers for themselves and abuses the lives and rights of others. This is the DSM-5 description of sociopathy, a mental health illness in which the person is unfit for positions of power over others. To the extent of great human suffering, which is happening right here in Peterborough, a situation into which I have been thrust, not because I lacked sufficient funds for rent, but because nothing is available.

A bylaw which denies Canadians the right to use land they own for matters of survival is not only heinous, but when a specific group has been identified as undesirable and not worthy of basic human needs or dignity, to the extent of becoming the subject of hate and attacks on their lives, that bylaw acts explicitly to advocate genocide. The Mayor and council wrote that bylaw, then directed the police to act against citizens on their last legs deprived of everything even though they knew that to be an act against their highest directives to protect life, liberty and security of the person.

Nothing is more fundamental to the right to life than having a place to exist. Land you have rights to be on, then provides much more as the basis of life, for from it stems all we have and all that grows. To be deprived of a place to exist is to remove my right to life itself, for where will I go? On private land, in the open market, the economic requirement is that you must have money, first to get the land and then to pay for taxes and more. Without starting life as a landowner, if you lack sufficient funds to pay the income extremists for your right to have a place to exist, as soon as the City says public land is not public but belongs to them you have no place to go. Along with this removal of place comes removal of the essential right to make fundamental decisions about your life, for what is more important to life than those critical decisions on how we relate to the land that supports us?

The Mayor and council got the land they need to work on for free, and further got buildings and all the social and material infrastructure for free, from which they receive great material benefit. We are paying for services of care for us, but can hardly call such actions of deprivation of a place to exist care. The removal of care extends from negligence to malice and to an act of hate characteristic of a state of war. But I am clear and the Supreme Court is clear concerning *Section 24 Enforcement of Rights*, that *the purpose of affording constitutional protection against the deprivation of liberty is to*

safeguard the entitlement to make decisions of fundamental importance free from state interference (R. v. Harrison 2009 2SCR 494 at [53]).

Under the law, when I have clear and compelling reason for the best land uses possible, complete with a full set of evidence in the context of justice, I have equal rights to decision making particularly on matters concerning the life or death of my person. And yet to date all reasonable appeals to justice and remediation of this appalling situation have been fully rejected by City Hall for no good reason. We are not allowed to have shelter of our own choice. We are not allowed to have UN-style emergency crisis relief tents. We are not allowed to have cabins. And yet we know why we are denied this, having followed the money trails. There is not enough money in it for City Hall and their beneficiaries in banking and business, for to allow us any escape from their systems might also allow self-reliant self-determination rather than crippling dependencies. Yet if we cannot sustain ourselves, how can we sustain our employees in government?

The Mayor and have further acted against me by life-fracturing zoning policies that make sure I have no place to make things and no place to sell things. How can those starting life with little then even begin to make a living and engage in free market enterprise? The point of this is that they cannot. One must have enough to own a home or rent a place to live, but here you cannot make things. You cannot work with wood, metals or plastics at the required scale needed to make a living. In the zoning used by City Hall, you must not only be able to afford a place to live, but a place to work and a place to sell from. They say you are free to do this in the open market, but as soon as land is zoned commercial it is bought by speculators who do not use it to work for a living. It is clear they do not want to work, but want to get money from the labour of those who do want to work. In this manner, an entire generation is locked out of the free market, and this is deliberate and planned. To force me into the hands of those acting against my very life is reprehensible, for it is not the purpose of my life to enter into a state of permanent month-to-month life insecurity in a state of indentured servitude in which I can never earn enough from my labour to meet my essential human needs, even if minimized to the state of edge-of-life deprivation. I know perfectly well this is done by City Hall by the forced removal of options.

City Hall has not only threatened my life by its direct actions, but in creating social conditions that further make it impossible to gain basic life security no matter what you try. We find at City Hall policies purposed to control our lives down to the finest detail, each of which is coupled to full strategies aimed at completely and utterly denying recourse.

It is further a statement by the Mayor and council that they have determined the purpose of your life, by removing the fundamental freedom and Pioneer Right to start life with little and build up a life for yourself by the labour of your own hands. We know this is entrapment, because the rule or bylaw created by the directors of City Hall removes Freedom of Association. There is only one choice left, and this rule is designed to force people into the hands of people we would never choose to associate with, for they have written plans and public statement of their intent to gain income without labour by the plunder and destruction of my life. In doing this, they have gutted the entire basis of the economy to

create critical personal and national security issues of an incredibly vulnerable population lacking the capacity to grow food to feed themselves or make the things that they need.

In doing this, the directors of City Hall have acted against me and against my life, for not only do I have no place to go to live but I have no place to go to make things or sell things, which completely cripples my capacity to rise out of my circumstances and defeats all my rights and possibilities of self-sustenance and self-determination. In other words, my life is determined for me by the removal of critical rights and freedoms. If I look closely at the bylaws and operations of City Hall, and I have, what I find are a group of directors working consistently against me by working consistently against the justice system and each critical component of the Charter, which is their written job description. Having documented this, and its direct effects on me, the Criminal Code charges against them include Sedition, for in operating by baseless personal whim and arbitrary rule against all the principles and practices of the Canadian Constitution Act (1982) they have established an illegal authoritarian state within the boundaries of Canada working against the purposes of government.

At the root of this case are false claims of land ownership by City Hall. If they own the land, they have declared it private so that no land belongs to Canadians for public benefit. Did they pay for the land, or the buildings, or all the infrastructure they use for great benefit for themselves? No. In fact it was taken land, in an illegitimate coerced treaty, either sign or die. If they claim to be stewards of the land, then we ought see a healthy balance of social, ecologic and economic interests at play protective of all citizens under the Charter, but we do not. Whereas we can point to the Charter as their job description and our legal contract, which in my case I see they have fully broken in multitudinous ways to the extent of threatening my life and disbaring me from taking part in any actions that would elevate my circumstances. In fact they are quite against this. City Hall has nevertheless admitted they do not own the land, saying “We respectfully acknowledge that we are on the treaty and traditional territory of the Mississauga Anishinaabeg. We offer our gratitude to the First Peoples for their care for, and teachings about, our earth and our relations. May we honour those teachings.”

And yet now we find the directors of City Hall engaged in exactly the same actions of forced deprivation of essential human needs as was done in the original forced Williams Treaty of 1923 and Rice Lake Treaty #20 of 1818. Our only recourse here is to refer to Supreme Court rulings, found throughout many Charter rulings, that Canadian land belongs to the Canadian people and must be used for mutual benefit, this also being the purpose of government. On these matters of land use indistinguishable from our rights to life, individuals and communities have equal say and decision making power under the law as do the directors of City Hall, the difference being we lack the human cognitive self-serving bias along with mechanisms to direct great wealth and power to individuals, which the directors of City Hall have clearly abused to the extent of massive violations of Section 15 Charter law. To the extent that this threatens my life as well as the lives of many others to whom I am integrally connected by care and trade without which I cannot live, I must make these claims of defense.

I can personally testify to these matters, and provide substantial evidence, and further call in at least 200 witnesses ready and willing to testify, most of no fixed address, along with many workers in various social services identifying City Hall as the source of obstruction of justice consistently blocking remedy of unhealthy to dire circumstances. Who will further testify that their work and lives are under threat when they try to fulfill their duties to the Canadian people as authorized across the full range of the Constitution Act. Who know what to do but are blocked and find themselves not protected under the umbrella of the law in performing their legally obliged duties to Canadians. In addition, I can bring in many Canadians outside government, paying for it all, who will testify that they paid for services under their Charter Contract but did not receive these services. Quite to the contrary, they experienced government against them. However, I found government to be good extending to great with respect to the vast majority of workers I encountered. I can thus say with a high degree of certainty that the source and cause of the problem is a very small number of people directing City Hall, claiming authorities they do not have, and taking actions against me and local citizens.

Here in Peterborough, I encountered PCH as a major criminal organization working systematically to seize control of my life and make me work for them. They further tried to force me into the hands of slavers who immediately acted to seize on my life-critical finances, which would have devastated my life and put me in conditions of extreme hardship. When I refused, they tried to put me into a group against whom they have extreme prejudice to the extent of systematically planning their destruction by taking actions to remove all resources critical to survival including a place to exist. Whereas I am aware that Canada is my home, and I have a right to exist. I am a free man, and I will be a slave to no one.

The slavers could not get to me directly, so instead they worked in collusion with this criminal organization. This organization being fully engaged in efforts to control every essential human need and action with the full intent to remove all rights and freedoms critical to life along with access to all resources required for my survival. It is only by skill and wit that I survived their attacks on my life, though not without harm, which I document here.

I am a free man, with a clear mission and purpose in life. I am not under anyone, but equal in dignity, rights and standing. I will not be made subservient. I will not be forced into conditions of slavery. To do my work, I must be free. I will not be put into forced labour, forced to pay those who do not want to work, or who work continually against my life aiming to remove my freedom. I will not be pushed along destructive paths. I am a free man, and I have work to do. Good work, of great service and benefit to humanity, which I must complete, for the benefit of all. I cannot be stopped in my purpose.

Here, I have identified these organizations, and taken significant pains to reveal their plans and actions against life, liberty and security of the person. Actions they have taken against me, against the law, and against the justice system. Actions taken against the purposes of our country, and against our Ministry directives. Actions aimed entirely at removing critical rights and freedoms essential to our lives, to the extent that we cannot live. Actions taken against our Constitution, aiming to replace good government

with a cruel authoritarian state intent on giving no hope for a future for an entire generation of young Canadians, pushing them also along a path to destruction. I cannot abide by this, and must contend with those who have directed their wrath against my life and against the lives of your children.

In considering the many PCH State actions taken against me, I have written this case of David Kelly Teertstra vs. The Corporation of the City of Peterborough and Its Directors. Charging Them Based on Evidence and Circumstance with Multiple Counts of Fraud, Theft and Extortion of Essential Human Needs Threatening the Life, Liberty and Security of My Person by Criminal Negligence, Obstruction of Justice and Forming a Criminal Organization within Government Advocating Genocide and Offending Public Order and My Safety by Acts of Sedition and Treason. These being Violations of the Criminal Code of Canada Sections 380(1), 380(2), 322(1), 346(1), 219(1), 219(2), 221, 139(2), 318(1), 59(1), 59(2), 59(3) and 59(4) and 46(2a), respectively.

In test of justice and sanity, I ask this: would any caring parent ever have created these laws or taken these actions concerning the lives and future of their children? Would we ever create a society that their own children would not want to live in, or could not survive? No, we do not want to live like this. I certainly do not. This is not a life I would ever choose for myself, it has been imposed on me against my will. I most certainly will not waste my time engaging in futile protest, when the law is clear and I have equality under the law. No, I will state my case and concerns in writing, understanding after having read many Supreme Court Charter cases that the hearts, minds and values of our Supreme Court justices are closely aligned with the hearts, minds and values of Canadians.

In a case summary of their actions against society, I say this:

The Mayor and council of the City of Peterborough are actively operating an organized web of crime that is gutting our lives, destroying our economy and removing the essential rights to life of an entire generation of Peterborough youth. These are planned and persistent hate crimes committed by complete rejection of our Canadian legal system with major violations of criminal code, Charter law and fundamental human rights. The Mayor and council, operating by fraud, theft, extortion, illegal taxation, corporate collusion and price fixing, have created an abusive hateful system devoted to bullying, taking by force, silencing citizens and denying recourse. They simply refuse to obey the law. By criminal negligence of duty and by acting against citizens in distress, they have set a course of reckless endangerment. By attacking our democratic form of government and replacing it with the working mechanisms of an authoritarian state, the charges include sedition and treason.

Citizens charges of bullying and abuse by this Mayor and council are substantiated, with clear evidence for obstruction of justice. City Hall ranks high in indicators of pathological behaviour and low in indicators of care consistent with our Canadian Constitution. Acting as authoritarian rulers with little regard for law, the Mayor and council are the source of significant consistent human rights abuses, degrading our lives and denying our rights to save ourselves from a provably grim future. Actively denying our Constitutional rights to self-determination. Our children have no future here.

This Mayor and council, as the source of our work, housing and food-security crisis, continue to commit social, economic and ecologic acts against our lives and survival. By refusing to represent and defend citizens in distress, refusing to act on our most urgent issues, and purposely removing our rights to life essential to survival, this is a purposeful act of reckless endangerment. By force, threat and bullying, this Mayor and council aim to remove all citizen rights to self-determination. Their intent is to attack *Section 15 Charter* law by rejecting our *Section 1* rights to reason and our *Section 7* rights to life, liberty and security of the person. An entire generation of Peterborough children, well aware of the direct threats to their lives, are also well aware that an entire older generation is doing nothing about it. By preparing genocidal plans that threaten our lives and inflict cruel and unusual punishment on children, a serious *Section 12* hate crime, this Mayor and council are unfit to govern.

We have strong and compelling evidence of fraud, theft, extortion and collusion with improper use of power to write policies with no valid land use or social purpose. We say that bylaws with no *Section 1* legal basis in fact, evidence or reason cannot be regarded as law, have no *Section 52* force or effect and are furthermore *Section 15* discriminatory hate crimes. As caring parents, we are legally obliged by numerous sections of our Charter to address these issues of survival and to not pay into systems designed by this Mayor and council to degrade our social, economic and ecological health. We reject their policies to silence us, deny recourse and remove the rights to life of our children. *Section 15* Charter law was designed specifically to deal with such extreme discrimination toward an identifiable group. I understand the group requiring special protection is this generation of young Canadians, and in writing this case I speak also in defence of their lives knowing exactly what the directors of PCH have planned for them.

I hereby swear that to the limit of my abilities all I have said here has a firm basis in verifiable fact and evidence, and further that my biases toward the protection of life and people is clear. Who stands on behalf of this generation of young Canadians in defence of their lives and future? Someone must, and if it takes an individual to put themselves in harms way to save them, so be it. I stand against this Mayor and council, and say no, this will not happen on my watch.

Best regards,
David K. Teertstra
PhD University of Manitoba
Discoverer of rubicline and sylvialite; inventor of a new type of medical scanner.
Working in association with the Alliance of World Scientists, the United Nations and caring parents everywhere to save this generation of young Canadians from the despots determined to ruin our lives.
en369@ncf.ca
613 243 5798
HoursBank.ca
Company of Canadians

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page	
1.	Plaintiff Statement with Claims and Case Summary
17.	Table of Contents
<i>PART 1 – STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES OF INVESTIGATION</i>	
18.	1.1 Introduction and Overview
30.	1.2 About This Document
32.	1.3 Investigative Process
42.	1.4 Behavioural Standards and Social Reference Points
45.	1.5 Legal Requirements of PCH Conduct
50.	1.6 PCH Response Requirements
<i>PART 2 – HATE CRIMES AND HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES</i>	
55.	2.1 Investigative Tests of Competency
61.	2.2 Investigative Tests of Mental Health
71.	2.3 Extreme Bias Extending to Malice, Intent to Enslave
77.	2.4 Force, Bullying, Threat and the Use of Human Shields
87.	2.5 Means and Intent to Violate Section 15 Charter Laws
101.	2.6 Cruel and Unusual Punishment, a Section 12 Hate Crime
117.	2.7 Social, Ecological and Economic Impacts of Systematic Abuse
<i>PART 3 – CRIMINAL CODE VIOLATIONS</i>	
124.	3.1 Means, Motive and Opportunity with Money Trails
132.	3.2 False Claims of Ownership: Fraud, Theft and Extortion
144.	3.3 Illegal Taxation, Corporate Collusion and Price Fixing
158.	3.4 Criminal Negligence and Reckless Endangerment
163.	3.5 Obstruction of Justice Related to Fraud and Sedition
<i>PART 4 – SEDITION AND TREASON</i>	
168.	4.1 Acts of Sedition Against Our Constitutional Monarchy
180.	4.2 Removal of Reasonable Recourse, Rights and Freedoms
182.	4.3 Burden of Proof, Refusal to Work, Refusal to Represent
184.	4.4 Acts of Treason with Plans to Kill the Children of the King
194.	4.5 City of Peterborough Bylaws Allowing State Oppression
<i>PART 5 – CASE SUMMARY AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE</i>	
196.	5.1 Case Summary Closing Arguments
193.	5.2 Social Context Summary
202.	5.3 Constitutional Citizen Crisis Response
208.	Documents Cited for Evidence and Witness Contact List

PART 1 – THE CASE AND ITS CIRCUMSTANCES

1.1 INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

[1] Prior to Covid lockdowns that crippled our economy and left many in dire need and distress, citizen complaints of corruption at Peterborough City Hall (PCH) had reached the highest levels of authority. Subsequent investigation substantiated these significant charges of fraud, bullying, collusion and crime, but the full extent of their operations was not simple to assess. This case covers only a fraction of the crime. Significant study and examination was required, tied to a good understanding of the role, function and purpose of government. PCH, along with every other government institution, is a complex maze of people and personalities, bylaws and regulations. There is blame and misdirection and much uncertainty of purpose, function and responsibilities both within City Hall and with regards to other organizations locally, provincially and federally.

[2] From the perspective of citizens feeling multiple assaults on their lives, with rising bills and food costs, the total impact of which is a degradation of life with much uncertainty as to the prospect of any form of a secure future, one hardly knows where to begin. We find many things in life that make no sense at all, on first glance and also after closer examination. Our biology functions to take all this in and assess it as a sum of factors letting us know whether life is working or not, whether something is good for us or not, or if we are dealing with a friend or foe. Does PCH help or hinder our lives?

[3] In some cases this assessment is quick, whereas in other cases considerable education, experience and study is required. Gradual degradations and infringements on our lives are particularly pernicious, as they do not evoke a distinct event of violation as an adrenaline response. However, a point is reached at which life simply does not work at all, the odds are stacked against us, all reasonable options have been removed and what remains is a clear sense of outrage wherein we can make no progress on even the simplest issue. We end up with protests in which the protesters cannot even begin to clarify what is wrong, except everything, and cannot begin to clarify what needs to be done. Concerning PCH, the violations against us have been so numerous that we simply do not want to go near the place, and the sum of actions against us do egregious we hardly know where to begin. Our sense is that of government against us, and yet we see many essential services being provided. What is the problem?

[4] Some problems are clear and blatantly obvious. We see a problem and want to know why. We find it curious when we get no answer, or the answer seems made up on the spot, or seems reasonable but later we find it does not satisfy, or we find no one has an answer, or at all points there is refusal to answer, or we dig and dig and find no basis in policy whatsoever. Quite to the contrary, there seems to be a deliberate plan to block and obfuscate all inquiry, and to give appearances of justice and process, and to never allow under any circumstances resolution of the problem. Now what will you do?

[5] Other problems are more complex, requiring extended study and examination tightly tied to a firm basis in the physical reality of our lives and requiring a strong moral compass with a keen sense of understanding of life and law. It is one matter to point out a problem, quite another to sort out the factors, find root causes and propose reasonable alternative solutions. Even if this is done, what happens when those who benefit from maintaining worst practices fiercely oppose all fair, reasonable and needed actions critical to solving our most urgent issues? And further reject all discussion, taking steps to control all communication and deny recourse?

[6] What are they doing? What is their intent? Why do the Mayor and council absolutely refuse to respond to citizens in crisis? Negligence of duty is one thing, for we know it is the job of government to represent us, and profound interference in the most critical aspects of our lives is another, but denying us the right to solve the most urgent issues in our lives makes very clear their intent to work against us. And yet we know it's not the staff. It's not the basic operations of City Hall, run by people we know, who we know to be honest, hardworking, ethical and honest. By logical process we know the source of the problems, but it is still a conceptual leap to say "this is not City policy. This is the policy of the Mayor and council", and to go further to say "the Mayor and most of council" knowing that some vehemently opposed the policy, or did not understand its full ramifications or its context in life and law.

[7] Citizens were alarmed recently to find that PCH had been turned into an investment company to be run by financial directors. What they did not know was that the Mayor and most of council have been working hard behind the scenes for many years against all the principles and practices of our Constitution Act, rejecting the law and taking advantage of the lack of public oversight during Covid to overthrow our local government. Planning and preparing for years to replace our working democracy with the full working mechanisms of an authoritarian state.

[8] The Mayor and council are running illegal business operations. Creating policies with no basis in law and applying them unfairly for the sole purpose of unlimited monetary gain. Fully rejecting legal Constitutional purposes of care and social benefit. The investigative process has been slow because of the extent of PCH operations requiring examination of many documents, policies, plans and procedures, money trails and impacts violating numerous laws, human and Charter rights, and criminal code. The sum of their activities is ultimately shocking and contrary to any legitimate government purpose. This Mayor and council have produced detailed plans for the destruction of the lives of an entire generation of Peterborough youth, a foreseeable act of genocide, a Criminal Code *Section 318(c)* hate crime complete with multiple tactics to obstruct justice and deny citizen rights to self-determination. No caring parent would ever take these actions against our children.

[9] Considering the urgency of our crisis, we considered that it might be self-defeating to delve into who did what. We need to act immediately at significant scale to make good working policies of benefit providing real solutions to the problems we face. We end up pointing to reality-based law as a reference point for good decision making, which is far more important than PCH personalities because we are all equal under the law and concerned with equal benefit of the law. The urgent issue in our broad and deepening crisis is meeting our mutual *Section 7* requirements to secure essential human needs by the work we do using the resources of nature. Nevertheless, it was necessary to clarify the exact nature of the many problems at PCH in order to clarify solutions.

[10] In life, we see many things that do not make sense until illuminated in the proper context. We provide that context here. Considering how we are to live our lives locally, we have strong and compelling evidence for fraud, theft and extortion by improper use of power within PCH to write policies with no valid land use or social purpose. Rights have been removed without reason, fact or evidence, violating *Section 1 Charter law*, a serious matter of federal concern. Citizens charges of bullying and undue use of force by the Mayor and council are substantiated, with clear evidence for obstruction of justice. City Hall ranks high in indicators of pathological behaviour and low in indicators of care compatible our Canadian Constitution Act (1982), and has been identified as the leading local source of systematic crime and injustice. We can prove beyond the shadow of a doubt they are the

source of our housing, work and food security crisis, vastly interfering with our lives illegally, unreasonably and to no good intent. The Mayor and council of Peterborough are the source of consistent Charter law and human rights abuses, consistently breaking criminal code for illegal gain and colluding with organizations also exhibiting reckless disregard for the lives of others.

[11] Under *Section 467.1 (1)* of the Criminal Code, a criminal organization means a group, however organized, that is composed of three or more persons in or outside Canada that has as one of its main purposes or main activities the facilitation or commission of one or more serious offences that, if committed, would likely result in the direct or indirect receipt of a material benefit, including a financial benefit, by the group or by any of the persons who constitute the group. Here, we say that the Mayor and key members of council have formed a gang that actively inflicts disproportionate harm on the youth of Peterborough, gutting our lives and forcing them into the hands of unscrupulous organizations with the same intent to violate numerous Charter and human rights for gain.

[12] It is widely known that Peterborough youth have no future here. They are born into damaging systems created centuries ago by bankers and business owners writing government policies designed explicitly for unmitigated control, exploitation and plunder. This Mayor and council sponsor and perpetuate these damaging systems because they benefit, and they purposely act against citizens by removing rights and resources critical to our lives and survival. Our kids are now born into a world degraded to such extent that their very lives are under threat. We are now in crisis, but the Mayor and council refuse to do their legal duties of defending our lives, responding with care and concern for essential human needs. As we fall into crisis, they escalated activities aiming to gut our lives, our local economy and the critical ecosystems that sustain our lives as the sole basis of our economy. Refusing to respond to citizens already in crisis, instead they have accelerated the damage to our lives, actively destroying land critical to our survival. They have rejected both the law and our legal form of democratic government.

[13] Law-abiding Peterborough residents are correct in addressing these systematic abuses of life and law in Canada. Bylaws with no basis in fact, evidence or reason cannot be regarded as law and have no force or effect (*Charter Section 52*). The Mayor and council, by abdicating the duties and responsibilities of their position and by writing bylaws expressly against the purpose of law and our Constitutional directives, have put citizens in conflict with the law, open to charges of collusion, aiding and abetting crime and corruption. We must not pay into systems designed for our destruction. When citizens cannot act without breaking one law or another, and Freedom of Association has been removed without reason, they must choose to obey the higher law to avoid the more substantial charges. *Citizens are obliged and legally justified by numerous sections of our Charter to not pay into systems designed and purposed to degrade our social health, rights and freedoms.*

[14] *Case Structure.* This case consists of major violations of the Canadian Constitution Act, human rights and Charter law abuses committed by the directors of Peterborough City Hall (PCH) against citizens, so extreme as to define these as crimes against humanity, hate crimes that directly threaten our lives and the lives of our children. The Mayor and key members of council have formed a criminal organization within City Hall routinely committing multiple Criminal Code violations including fraud, theft, extortion, collusion and price fixing. They have created an abusive hateful system of illegal taxation devoted to bullying, taking by force, silencing citizens and denying recourse. By criminal negligence of duty, obstructing justice and subverting our legal Constitutional democracy, setting us a course of reckless endangerment that now directly threatens the lives of our children. By refusing to

represent citizens in distress, by rejecting our Canadian legal system, and by replacing our democratic form of government with the full working mechanisms of a harsh authoritarian state, fully rejecting self-determination, the charges include social enslavement, sedition and treason.

[15] *Historical Overview. Section 1* of our Constitution Act requires provision of historical and present context. At present, we cannot distinguish between banking, business and government. Our lives are completely controlled by these three groups to the extent our finances are completely drained and we have no say about anything impacting our lives and the future of our children. We know the purpose is complete control of every aspect of our lives. Throughout history, certain individuals seeking immense wealth and power for themselves have seized control of people, land and resources to such extent as to create degraded unjust social situations ranging from miserable to unsurvivable. World War II was caused by sociopathic income extremists in banking, business and government intent on taking the resources of other countries as their own. The same situation existed in the 1500s. Prior to the reformation, the Pope controlled all aspects of daily life from finance to food in collusion with other income extremists claiming positions of authority. The same situation exists in Canada now, wherein citizens cannot distinguish between banking, business and government. Canadians have no say about anything that impacts their lives and future, as persons of the poorest character with the worst ideas are seizing all critical resources, driving global destruction and preventing us from doing the work needed to secure and save our lives.

[16] Canadian law was developed in England centuries ago for the sole purpose of seizing control of villages to harness labour and extract wealth, and was imported into Canada for the same purpose in the British North America Act. Beginning with the vile banker-driven Enclosures Acts in England centuries ago, the same zoning bylaws developed centuries ago to fracture and control society are still present and active within PCH policy, working to the same destructive ends. As slavery and the slave trade ended in England, those that built major businesses on the backs of slaves collaborated with each other to ensure continued complete control of land, money, work, wages and every essential human need, a situation of a bank-run government in collusion with business that continues to this day. With anti-slavery laws in place, a slaver could be directly charged. However, with collusion of interests (today called diversification of a portfolio), statistical indentured servitude could be actualized with no one person held accountable. This was done by the creation of a corporation as a legal person, with its directors not held liable. In Canada, this means that individuals cannot enjoy the economic and social rights that are critical to healthy integrated society. These rights are enjoyed within families, and between friends, within government and within corporations, but are not allowed in communities. Our lives are thus tremendously damaged when politicians do not represent us, but instead creates policies aimed at controlling, isolating and silencing citizens, and workers in government are silenced and threatened when they speak out.

[17] After WWII, we gained a clear understanding of the mental state of this small percentage of people who cannot control themselves around people and money, who take what does not belong to them. Who do so in disregard for the lives of others, disregard for law and in disregard for our democratic freedoms. Who cause disruption, damage and chaos everywhere they go. Some are extreme narcissists with low intellectual capacity who remain trapped in a juvenile stage of cognitive development and moral reasoning, while others exhibit personality traits of sociopathy or psychopathy. On this spectrum of poor human behaviour, mental illness in government, our main concern is with certain persons seeking power over others who exhibit all the symptoms of anti-social personality disorder (ASPD).

[18] Social predators actively dismantle all structures of social care to benefit themselves in purposeful contempt and disregard for the lives of others. They profit from driving our destruction, but can be recognized by their characteristic traits and underlying incompetence. They can't help but write who they are into bylaws that make no sense, complete with money trails and pathological lying to commit fraud. At PCH, the directors wrote the case against themselves. They simply cannot control themselves around people and money, and have significant propensities to abuse the rights of others. Such persons cannot help writing who they are into bylaws, plans and policies, making our case easy. The only problem is defining the extent of their illegal and deeply antisocial activities, which may never be fully known.

[19] Our Covid crisis provides a clear example of sociopathy. A handful of people seeking massive profit for themselves (billions per person) have claimed publicly funded world knowledge as their own and refuse to use even a fraction of that money to prevent global crisis. Their clear intent is to promote crisis for continued profit. Such claims of ownership of what is not theirs are ludicrous and provably false, but encouraged by corrupt politicians also suffering from ASPD intent on exerting complete power and control over the lives of citizens. Politicians who completely reject the very idea of democratic engagement. Who refuse to ask for the involvement of our massive talent pool of highly educated skilled Canadians on this critical matter of self-determination and right to survival. Because they feel they alone have the right to determine the destiny and future of Canadians.

[20] Here in Peterborough, a handful of people also claim this right to rule without reason over the lives of 84 000 residents (an estimate, after the 2021 census). Who are actively removing our essential rights to life and actively gutting our economy and rejecting any possibility of healthy personal and community self-determination critical to survival. A handful claim to own our downtown. A handful in Peterborough City Hall seek to completely control and dominate every essential aspect of our lives. A handful of essentially inept people with very poor mental health are intent on controlling the lives of 84 000 residents who are not free in any way to solve the most urgent issues in their lives that also threaten the future of their children.

[21] *We define hate as the lack of care.* We know what parental care looks like, and it is the exact opposite of the lack of care definitive of a state of war. We know the state of war brings out the worst human behaviour, whereas peace suppresses the worst human behaviour by encouraging care. So we have these models. We have a short summary of the abuses that happen during war and define a war-like attitude; this is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). We know exactly what disrupts society and drives our ruin, and we now have an excellent handle on human behaviour with good descriptions of both mental health and the dimensions of personality. We know war is driven by persons with ASPD. We also have an extensively encoded legal system with exact descriptions of both risk factors and severity of crime, which couples quite closely to human rights documents as a description of the worst human behaviour indicating what must be encouraged in a healthy society. The litmus test for writing a law or bylaw or creating a system is this: is this something any caring parent would ever inflict on their children? We can also ask, by *Section 15* tests of reciprocity, could anyone inside government survive outside under the rules they created?

[22] We have a simple social test of good government. It is not that hard to make pizza. But if we try to sell pizza, we encounter mountains of obstacles so severe as to make the process of business creation take years. Which is not government helping people. We further encounter economic obstacles tied directly to PCH policy so severe as to make it impossible to even begin. An entire generation cannot

even begin to gain a foothold in life, because government is acting against them and driving them into the hands of income extremists also aiming to control every essential human need and action. We know this is a massive anti-competition plan entirely devoted to removing essential freedoms to ensure statistical indentured servitude. Yet the Canadian government claims hate crimes do not exist in Canada and neither does slavery. They have also worked hard to completely deny and block all forms of *Section 24* recourse. The PCH directors are most definitely not working in defence of our lives. This is not democracy. This is not representation. This is not defence and care of our lives using the principles and practices of our Canadian Constitution. This is sedition, rejection of law and replacement of democratic government with an authoritarian state reflective of their own personal character and mental health issues.

[23] We understand *Section 1* of our Charter as a test of sanity, requiring that all law has a firm basis in fact, evidence and reason, fully in the context of justice. Law not based in reason firmly rooted in the reality of our lives and the observable state of the world has no valid basis, indicates arbitrary rule, and we cannot regard it as law (*Section 52*). Each law must have a reason, and furthermore be reasonable with clear purpose constrained within reasonable limits. It must be demonstrably justified, tested and proven for societal benefit, and be far removed from degradation and abuse. All valid actions of government must respect our lives and the basis of life, operating under defence of our prime directive, our universal *Article 3* and *Section 7* right to life, liberty and security of the person.

[24] Citizens are clear and the Supreme Court is clear concerning *Section 24 Enforcement of Rights*, that *the purpose of affording constitutional protection against the deprivation of liberty is to safeguard the entitlement to make decisions of fundamental importance free from state interference* (R. v. Harrison 2009 2SCR 494 at [53]). When the Mayor issues edicts based on whim with no basis in fact or reality that vastly interfere with all critical aspects of our lives and are legally defined as fraud, directly threatening the survival of our children, we take this as strong evidence of intent to break the law, to work against citizens and to work against the intent of our democratic Constitution Act. We are further alarmed by issues of competency and mental illness, all of which is evident throughout PCH documents, actions and operations. In essence, we did not write this case, they did. Here we are simply comparing what they did with the law.

[25] Concerning care versus hate. Within all languages we have words expressing certain states of being and the polar opposite. Love and hate. Friend and enemy. Care and neglect. Freedom *versus* slavery. Each word is defined by others to create a context of understanding. We understand language as tied directly to biology. A person aiming to be honest, for example, has many supportive characteristics. The trait of honesty cannot be replaced with an unrelated trait such as kindness, and the those two traits do not support one another. If one does not believe honesty, for example, they can only believe in dishonesty thinking that is the only way to receive benefit. Honesty is further the search for truth, which is why evidence in the context of justice is critical to decision-making, law and good human relations. We understand this as the intent and purpose of *Section 1* of the Charter, to have reason based on fact coupled to justice. Specifically, these are left-brain right-brain functions such that in conscience one part of the brain observes the other part. One part asks ‘does that make sense?’ while the other part asks ‘is that right, fair or just?’. Fair and balance decision making occurs naturally in healthy balanced people who have good cognitive development coupled to capacities of moral reasoning, in particular considering how their actions impact others. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights also refers to reason coupled to care, knowing what happens when there is neither reason nor care. The state of war, for example, is described as chaos, disruption, madness and the

general breakdown of trust and healthy social relations leading to revenge, rape, murder, torture. The state of good parental care for children relates to many positive personality traits of care including play, training and education with major focus on work done to meet essential human needs. The work we do to attain personal and social security of essential human needs based on healthy human relations is our *Section 7* right and prime directive.

[26] However, even in peace there are certain personality types who view all others with contempt, disdain and hate, and who use tactics of war in relation to others. Personality traits of extreme narcissism, sociopathy and psychopathy are of particular concern because the strong tendency to control and manipulate others is commonly coupled to disdain and contempt for the law and disregard for the lives and rights of others. These abusive personality types seek positions of power over others, but are unable to control themselves around people and money, are low in competence, are unable to overcome the self-serving bias, create chaos and damage everywhere they go, and make life hell for everyone around them. It is this personality type, a type of mental illness affecting about 1% of the population, claiming unlimited ownership of anything and everything, that removes freedoms, creates slavery, has caused two world wars and is currently driving planetary destruction. They simply do not care.

[27] Here in Peterborough, a handful of people believe they have the right to control the lives of 84 000 residents in fine detail, giving residents no say whatsoever about the most critical matters of their lives and future. Another small group claims complete ownership of our downtown, saying citizens have no right to a healthy downtown as a mutually beneficial social enterprise. The two groups collude to ensure complete control in an absolute anti-competition policy so harsh and extensive that if a child dares try to sell lemonade they will be forcefully removed. The economy and any possibility of a business startup has been completely crushed and our downtown lies in ruins, yet millions pour into a Department of Economic Development without effect. This is of course illegal, but the Mayor and council have little regard for the law and the lives of others and have no interest in doing the job they were elected, hired and paid to do, which is to represent and defend the lives of citizens. As a result, Peterborough youth have no future here and our gutted economy cannot recover as long as these abusive and devastating policies remain in place. Policies with no basis in law, created centuries ago in another country for the sole purpose of control, exploitation and plunder.

[28] We can of course quickly prove this. It is not that hard to make and sell pizza. It does not cost that much to get set up. But if anyone tries, they are immediately attacked by the rich who already have everything. Banks, insurance companies, City Hall. We are driven into massive debt long before we even have a chance to start. There is no place to go to avoid these criminals who seek extreme income by harnessing the lives and labour of others. Freedom of Association has been denied along with the pioneer rights to each new generation to start a life from scratch and build it by the work of their own hands. Instead, we face a fully integrated system of statistical slavery and indentured servitude, where we are forced into falsely created debt for essential human needs including shelter, that we can never escape. Yet we have a litmus test for justice: would any caring parent ever inflict this system on their kids?

[29] Now our kids face a grim future in which the rich sociopaths who control our lives are also driving the destruction of the planet, meaning that our odds of survival are quite low. And we are not allowed to change that, not even to save our own lives. We are being driven to ruin by sociopaths rejecting the rule of law and keen to commit human rights violations to benefit themselves. Here we present strong

and compelling evidence that the Mayor and council of the City of Peterborough have broken the law, they have no regard for our lives or the law, and they are the primary local cause of our work, housing and food security crisis.

[30] Since we are not in a state of war, we refrain from calling these actions against the lives and future of Peterborough children and youth a war crime. Yet we know these as crimes against humanity because we can verify significant PCH violations of several *Articles* of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a short list of the things not to do lest we create a hopeless state of despair in which the only recourse is revolt. But it is this Mayor and council that have revolted against the government and rejected the law and their duties of care and concern for the health and well-being of citizens. Refusing to respond to many citizens who are in dire distress as a direct result of the policies PCH created.

[31] In broad context we are shocked that the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal has been gutted in its capacity to deal with the full spectrum of Charter abuses in Canada. We say by law the OHRT is obligated to fulfill its Charter-directed mandate, for to do otherwise is obstruction of justice, removal of *Section 24* recourse. We say again this is a hate crime committed by an older generation against an entire younger generation whose lives and future hang in the balance, a most extreme violation of our prime directive, our vow to protect life itself, our *Section 7* Charter right to life, liberty and security of the person. This is our universal right to defend life and the basis of life recognized by all civilized nations. The components of security of the person include each and every essential human need, all of which come from Nature by the work we do. Yet somehow this Mayor and council seem to insist that shelter is not a right to life, that personal food security is not a basis of national security, and that our local ecosystems cannot be used to support these urgent issues. We take this as strong evidence of either malice or mental illness, or both, coupled to uncaring incompetency. We know what our children face.

[32] It is the purpose of our *Section 15 Charter laws of equality* to protect the most vulnerable people and groups from persecution and attack. Now, an entire generation of Canadian youth need urgent protection from this older generation driven by politicians and corporate criminals who refuse to make the changes needed to permanently secure the *Section 7* rights to life of our children. On this matter, the Mayor of Peterborough has expressed his contempt and disdain many times, and has further expressed his illegal, unconstitutional and hateful beliefs in bylaws, plans and policy, in writing and speech, working actively against our critical rights and freedoms. This massive interference with the most essential matters of our lives is illegal and criminal, extending far beyond any legitimate purpose of government, well into active malice consistent with diagnostic symptoms of ASPD.

[33] *Concerning Organized crime at Peterborough City Hall.* Citizen complaints of corruption within Peterborough City Hall (hereafter PCH, City Hall or the City) due to illegal actions of the Mayor and council (the directors, meaning the Mayor with the support of most of council, the Mayor as figurehead, or You or They) have reached the highest levels of authority. An initial investigation confirmed the poor reputation of City Hall and the allegations of systematic illegal actions taken by PCH against citizens. A detailed investigation into all aspects of City Hall operations made clear the extent of their illegal operations; this was first done in a lengthy process of investigation of Quinte West City Hall, understanding that the problems are systematic at all City Halls. Here, I detail their web of crime as it has hurt and damaged me, knowing that these crimes affect many and are social. Therefore, I use the word We (or Us, the residents of Peterborough), and further boldly use We when I agree strongly with the minds of the Supreme Court, since reading their writing is an act of engaging in

a conversational manner with their thoughts. I am further informed by many Canadians over the years as to these common concerns. Here I detail the web of PCH crime citing numerous ongoing violations of criminal code and contract law along with substantial consistent abuses of Charter law and human rights. The broader context of PCH actions is relevant as it speaks to character, intent and attitudes of widespread disregard for law or concern for negative impacts on residents. The culture created at City Hall by its directors is toxic, characterized by threats, bullying and taking by force, coupled to extensive measures of silencing and denial of just recourse. I, and We have a substantial case on an urgent matter of pressing concern, a matter of life or death requiring urgent attention and emergency response. I specifically claim, in agreement with the preamble of our Constitution Act, two significant authorities. One, I claim the authority of God in commanding that these wrongs end. Two, I claim quality under the law, in presenting the necessary and voluminous scale of comprehensive knowledge which I have access to across all of society, further claiming an excellent understanding of many matters significant and relevant, large and small. Specifically, I claim that those with poor cognitive development and moral reasoning must not be allowed to rule of the healthy sane majority, particularly not when clearly exhibiting full-blown symptoms of mental illness making them unfit for positions of responsibility over others. Authoritative decision making must be based on knowledge, the concern being that citizens taking reasonable actions are continually rebuffed by those that lack knowledge and a sense of justice and yet still want decision-making powers based on like/dislike and whim alone, unable to explain themselves or present reason and thus providing no basis in law for their actions. The problem is lack of competency coupled to desires for control, money and exertion of powers. They say we have no right to be involved in matters critical to our lives and futures, whereas I say that under the law I do.

[34] The majority of their bylaws and policies are unfair, biased, illegal and illegally applied to the extent that they cannot be regarded as a law and must be regarded as crime. In accordance with *Section 32* of the Charter, an action for damages for a breach of Charter rights is a public law action directed against the state for which the state is primarily liable. The nature of the remedy is to require the state (or society at large) to compensate an individual for breaches of the individual's constitutional rights.

[35] These ongoing actions of PCH against us remain a direct threat to the lives and work of Peterborough residents, by multiple *Charter* violations. The Mayor and council have continually refused to respond to citizens whose lives are in crisis, going to great lengths to block communication and deny justice. By urgent necessity of responding to the social and economic crisis in our lives, immediate action must be taken to divert disaster and restore the local free-market economy that has been crushed by the Mayor and his beneficiaries in business. We have strong evidence that their policies cause major social and economic damage to our lives and are consistent with broader land use policies purposed to the same effect. We find no basis in law for these actions, but do find significant evidence of purposeful intent by the directors of PCH to break multiple laws for monetary gain.

[36] We find multiple ongoing violations by the directors of City Hall of Articles *1, 5, 10* and *11* of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that are acts of war against citizens. Massive, ongoing violations of *Sections 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 15* and *24* of our Constitution aimed at forceful unilateral economic mining that represent direct threats to life, liberty and security of the person aimed at complete removal of personal and community self-determination.

[37] This document summarizes the concerns of Peterborough residents I have spoken with. I found unanimity with respect to the meeting of common essential human needs, with widespread concerns of

government as the most significant threat to their lives. Attempts were made to retain common colloquial expressions based in both knowledge and our acute sense of justice. The language has been toned down here to a scale far less than that used regularly by the Mayor and council in writing policy, bylaws and parking tickets. We experience this abuse daily, but what laws were broken? As each expression of citizen concern must correspond to a legal principle and be validated by evidence, the concerns of citizens have been summarized here using the language of our most understandable, accessible and highest law, our 1982 Constitution Act with its well-known summary the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. We believe Canada's top laws are crystal clear, having been written for close correspondence with our inherent senses of justice as principles and practices that naturally arise within families. Our claims thus closely correspond to Supreme Court of Canada (SCC) rulings based on the fundamental principles of justice and natural law.

[38] The policies of PCH contribute to the destruction of our lives and downtown, which is a social, economic and ecological disaster zone that completely crushes any opportunity for Peterborough youth starting life from scratch. The Mayors' anti-tourism anti-competition strategy run on behalf of existing big business is the complete opposite of a healthy caring shopping experience. The Mayor and council, seeking only money for themselves and their beneficiaries in business, have made our downtown the most hostile unfriendly place to be, with officers waiting to strike by applying unfair laws unreasonably. All their actions are insanely convoluted and expensive, and they reject all reasonable and economic community solutions. Everything of value to the community has been seized on, taken from us, and handed over to unlimited profit companies. Aiming to grow themselves, the policies of PCH create the problems they later pretend to solve, rejecting root cause analysis or any basis in law, fact, evidence or reason critical to real solutions. We say this is a classic conflict of interest characteristic of fraud, as the person(s) writing the policy clearly stand to benefit instead of the person impacted.

[39] The Mayor essentially says cities do not belong to citizens. That Canada is not our home. Writing a bylaws saying the word public means private, then committing fraud by issuing press releases saying this is for public benefit. Bylaws saying that all public land and public assets are for the sole benefit of the small group at City Hall, for their benefit alone, and the 84 000 residents under his rule have no say at all about anything that impacts our lives and future. He has completely rejected our Canadian democracy and illegally put in place the full working mechanisms of an authoritarian state. This is not a claim. This is not an accusation. This is a direct description of the structure and operations of City Hall. It's a system of bullying and taking by force. The Mayor and council write edicts with no basis in law. Why are we not free to shop without threat and harassment, subject to government parking-meter panhandling? Why do the hungry have no place to grow food, on land we own? Why do we have no place to make and sell things? Why is PCH organized in complete violation of legal requirements for social benefit, with the Mayor and council actively against Canadian law, against the critical social role of government? Why are we not free from the rule of tyrants and bullies seeking an insane level of control down to our every last dime, willing to say and do anything to get more money for themselves?

[40] Why do citizens have no say at all about the health of their own downtowns? What is the actual problem? How is it best solved? Our downtown looks like war-torn Beirut, a disaster zone, and all the money clearly goes to making City Hall rich. Why are millions pouring into a Department of Economic Development with no obvious results? Another pocket-lining department that has proven itself useless. At their rate of pay, we could have bought and built an entire new downtown by now! Is any of the money going toward solving the problem? The Mayor and council refuse to respond and instead have

put much effort into ensuring complete silence on any and all issues complete with strategies, means and mechanisms to deny just recourse at all points of contact.

[41] So we make clear here what the law is and how multiple categories of Canadian law have been broken. We cite multiple ongoing human rights violations that we experience as acts of contempt against Peterborough residents whose only crime was wanting a healthy life in the Peterborough region.

[42] When City Hall does not obey the law and rejects the basis of law (*Charter Section 1*), further exhibiting constant contempt for the lives of citizens, as Canadians who obey Canada's top laws we are put in a bind. When we cannot act without breaking one law or another, we must choose to avoid the most serious charges (collusion, aiding and abetting corruption) recognizing that these low-level bylaws inconsistent with the Charter have no force or effect (*Section 52*). We thus feel confident in taking this public case to court to the effect of forcing the Mayor and council to obey the law.

[43] Illegal parking policy is just one issue in the vast interference of PCH in the most fundamental aspects of our lives, one of many acts interfering with trade. In avoiding downtown like the plague, and in our inherent resentment at being forced to pay to shop, and in what we do to get away from this, and in our willingness to fight the injustice of tickets, *we say all this expresses our legal obligations to not pay into systems designed to degrade life, liberty and security of the person (Section 7) and attack democracy (Section 1). The illegally gained funds are used to break Section 15 Charter law or are fed to businesses also intent on breaking the law.*

[44] We do not wish to make these charges, and prefer that the Mayor and council obey the law, but they have consistently denied all means of possible recourse, refuse all discussion, and have put in place systems to that effect. We are in economic and social crisis precipitated by Covid lock-downs, and cannot recover without dealing with these issues.

[45] At the root of the problem, we have significant evidence in the bylaws, structure, statements and actions of City Hall of significant incompetency in part related to an anomalous concentration of persons with pathological personality disorders in positions requiring good mental health and attitudes of social care. Here, we consider legally-based diagnostic tests of competency and mental health as being highly relevant to questions of character, credibility, intent and motive.

[46] To be clear, we have no interest in the actual persons directing City Hall to these poor behaviours, but we are profoundly interested that City Hall itself does not have these characteristics, as it is required by law to have the behaviours and characteristics indicated in our Canadian Constitution Act (1982). We show that a poor personality type acting illegally and without our consent has given our local City Hall a damaging reputation of systematic bullying and taking by force without say with no basis in law. We have experienced this and find much evidence of it throughout City Hall documents and operations.

[47] The Mayor and council of claim not to know that we have top laws they must obey. Instead, they are busy writing their own laws and policies to give the appearance of justice, and yet every problem is viewed as a new fine, fee, rule, regulation or tax, to be perpetuated and not solved. Creating new government programs while completely rejecting sane, reasonable and economic community solutions, fully rejecting our Charter rights to self-determination.

[48] This is a big deal. In reference to the British system the Mayor wishes to continue, the American Declaration of Independence states it thus: “*He has sent swarms of officers out to harass us and eat out our substance.*” In Canadian law, in our own declaration of independence, our Charter, we call this our right to Freedom of Association (*Section 2*) from those who intend to harm us. When such Freedom of Association has been removed, and it has by PCH, we have the right not only to know the reason (*Section 1*) but to debate it, for all law must be debatable based on fact, evidence and reason. The law is clear: the burden of proof is in the person (City Hall) that has removed the right or freedom, with all forms of democracy requiring consent of the governed. Without that, we live in a state of tyranny in which we are not free to solve problems, address issues and reasonably direct the course of our lives to the best possible outcome (*Section 1*). We say here to the Mayor and council, you do not have our consent. Having removed our Freedom of Association, the burden of proof is on PCH to explain and justify their actions, for refusal to do so is abdication of duty. This is our right to representation.

[49] We specifically say that our *Section 4* Freedoms of Belief closely correspond to the principles of law and justice and the intent of our Charter, and that the Mayor and council reject the majority of this outright. They have gone rogue, refuse to obey the law and are direct threat to our life security. Instead of simply doing the work required of them, they have worked hard to put in place systems that give the appearance of justice but which actually work to obstruct justice. Throughout all the documents of City Hall, and in their words and actions, the Mayor and council claim to be completely unaware that in 1982 we won the democratic right to personal, social and national self-determination. In 1982, we became a nation of laws, free from the arbitrary rule of tyrants acting as lords over serfs. Rejecting this, the Mayor spits in the face of our top Canadian judges of the Supreme Court, spits in the face of the law, spits on us and spits on the graves of our Canadian soldiers who fought with their lives for our freedoms. We are fed up, locally and at the highest level with these despicable actions taken daily against us, and have made a considerable case for justice with much evidence that the directors of PCH are unfit to govern.

[50] The Mayor and council claim, in words, actions and writing, using an insane level of threat, bullying and foul language on parking tickets and in bylaws, that only they have the right to determine the lives and future of Peterborough residents. This must be about the sheer exertion of power, taking pleasure in the pure use of force for the sole reason of demonstrating that they can. That is the sociopathic trait of a controlling authoritarian ruler who says there is no law but his own.

[51] We know that in a lawless country, it takes very little for a small gang to arm themselves and stop people along roads, asking, with guns and other threatening behaviours, for a toll before allowing travellers to pass. It also takes very little for this group to realize that if they put on a uniform and designed badges, they would look official. So what is the basis of law? In Canada, we say the basis of law is fact, evidence and reason. Here in Peterborough, almost any excuse will do as a reason for a rule, fine or fee (see City Bylaws giving a summary of fees and charges), with the sole purpose being to ensure cash-flow compliance. One can quickly normalize gang behaviour, but no matter how far this goes, those on the receiving end will always see this shakedown for exactly what it is. The brute use of force by a bully to take your lunch money. When the thugs wear suits and claim to be government, what is the basis of law? Well, we have a basis and it is our top law, our Constitution Act, and it is above these local thugs at City Hall.

[52] Here in Peterborough, the Mayor and council play a balancing act to sense how much they can get

away with without causing too much outrage. Our lives are a game to them and in council meetings they treat our lives as a joke, something to be tested and played with. The culture they created is not the culture we want in Peterborough, for we have defined our Canadian culture explicitly in the principles and practices of our Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, our Constitution. We call these our Cultural Rights to a healthy society.

[53] The actual anger expressed colloquially by residents has been significantly toned down in this document. The common language with regards to City Hall is crooks, thieves, liars.

1.2 ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

[1] In the structure of Canadian government, local complaints not responded to locally become requests for justice from higher authorities, primarily as letters and email to Members of Parliament and to the Office of the Prime Minister. Matters of national importance are dealt with at the federal level, largely by referring citizen inquiries to existing law or to the relevant agencies, or by writing new law and taking new initiatives. The task of responding to the sheer volume of letters to the Prime Minister is in itself a major endeavour, as each letter may contain multiple related issues, and because of this there are policy teams, teams to categorize, organize and summarize, and teams of individuals with significant skill and knowledge of government to respond to citizens.

[2] The concern, locally and nationally, has been not only the sheer volume of complaints about this local government, but of significant charges easily verified by investigation. There is a significant body of fact and evidence within the documents created by the directors of Peterborough City Hall, verified by tests and direct interactions, that indicated an urgent need for an immediate and extensive investigation of both conduct and operations. Systematic and planned violations of criminal code and contract law were found along with major violations of Charter law extending to human rights abuses. Broadly speaking, the Mayor and council refuse to follow the best directives of Ministry leaders, refuse public directives from the Prime Minister to obey the law, and refuse to respond to the most urgent and dire needs of citizens in distress. City Hall has a poor reputation as a place to get anything positive done, and all their actions come at the greatest expense and complexity. They are the source and cause of much ill will and trouble. Under the direction of the Mayor and council, disregard for law and contempt for citizens has been institutionalized within the operations of Peterborough City Hall. As a result, City Hall has been under active investigation at the highest level of authority.

[3] However, each concern and alarm bell raised by residents must be assessed for validity, basis in law and effective means of recourse. Ministry leaders, for example, cannot dispense legal advice, and citizens cannot afford lengthy legal processes. Both groups are thus frustrated and aware of the problems at City Hall, along with the dangers posed to the lives of Canadian citizens by the economic impacts of Covid-19 lockdowns. The only reasonable solution is City Hall response to community questions and issues, but this is rejected and no effort has been made to provide an understandable and realistic legal basis for policy. At a time when many residents are on emergency economic relief, having entered into a period of crisis requiring speedy response, the unnecessary economic escalations of City Hall can only be viewed as a significant threat to social and economic stability. The cost and complexity of dealing with what are essentially local matters, along with questions of appropriate role and jurisdiction of provincial and federal authority, have also been the source of significant high-level debate.

[4] Throughout the highest levels of government are sharp and clear minds fully conversant with Canadian law who are also completely fed up with the attitudes and disregard for law displayed by certain people within low-level government. You will see within this document, therefore, many references to the rulings of the Supreme Court of Canada relevant to restoring law and order at PCH which also require local residents to deal with these local matters in a safe, peaceful and healthy manner of effective social, economic and ecological community response to crisis. From the Ministry of Education, for example, comes the requirement that this document be informative and educational. Social workers have the responsibility to maintain social health across all of government. The Supreme Court of Canada sends a message, encapsulated in this document, that our top Canadian laws are not restricted to punitive affairs but are purposed to direct and inspire all Canadians to act freely and justly on all matters of urgency and common concern.

[5] A legal question is posed from these discussions. Can the heart sue the liver for not functioning? If the government is one body with federal, provincial and local parts, can one part sue the other? No, these local issues of poor governance must be dealt with locally by residents that have been directly impacted. Peterborough residents are the claimants suffering the damage. It is, however, too much to ask an individual Peterborough resident to gain a comprehensive understanding of both law and the full operational workings of their local City Hall, despite being well aware of each specific incident of injustice that has damaged their lives. PCH is the source and author of much ill will. Considering the context of our current social and economic crisis, with many residents concerned for both their immediate well-being and future, a concerted effort of fair justice is required to immediately address the issues and repair the damage caused by corruption of the office of Mayor and council.

[6] Under provincial authority, municipalities are non-partisan entities with the power to raise taxes and enact bylaws solving local issues aimed at building resilient communities. The law, structure and purpose of government is clear, municipalities work at the Constitutional level of our daily lives. However, PCH guts our lives, destroys any capacity for self-sustenance critical to national security and fails to have any legal basis whatsoever for taxation that reflects the reality of our lives consistent with the legal principles and practices of our Charter. This is illegal tax collection aimed at infinite growth and violation of *Section 15* law without reasonable limit. Whereas *fair proportionality* requires minimum wage increases at the same rate as government wage increases, because to not do so guts our capacity to live and pay for it all. The underlying claim is that the purpose of our lives is to serve government, whereas we declare most vehemently that it is not. Instead, City Hall has created a huge army of servants working to support their extreme lifestyles. If someone outside government earns \$15 an hour, we expect a worker in government to be 4 times as productive. This is highly unlikely. Instead, what has happened is that a large number of people in struggle lacking life security are supporting a small number with guaranteed life security, who further act to impoverish and restrict our life-supporting work in what is a Charter-protected core economy of essential human needs.

[7] Therefore, I present here the concerns of local residents in the form of public preparatory notes for a class-action lawsuit backed by Supreme Court rulings on civil applications of Constitutional law. Though my specific concerns are Criminal Code violations taken against my life, defined under *Section 7*, I maintain the overall class-action concerns here to give the overall context in which attacks on my life, freedoms and life security are especially egregious. I present the arguments along with the general body of evidence as a public document (though I am limited in what I can do concerning the many details of PCH actions against me and others), thus allowing local debate and response to occur

amongst those whose lives have been damaged by the Mayor and council of the City of Peterborough. Under Charter law (our Union contract), all PCH documents and bylaws are public documents that the public, as the owners of public property (having paid for these by taxation) and as employers (having paid for work done by our civil servants), can directly access and change by fair due process. These are our rights and freedoms, defined by law as being above the whim and will of politicians. And in that, I can call on many witnesses willing to testify as to what City Hall has done to them.

1.3 INVESTIGATIVE PROCESS

[1] The refusal of these City Hall directors to fulfill their legal duty to respond to citizens in distress during a time of national crisis is most alarming. Instead of acting in care, they decreased services, escalated expenses and created policies against us. The Mayor and council have turned against our democratic form of government, uprooting our democracy and replacing it with the full working mechanisms of authoritarian state. Even before Covid, they planned for this, writing many policies against us, against the law and against the principles and practices of our Constitution, in preparation for its overthrow. Unsatisfied, they also created plans to completely control our lives, force us into the hands of income extremists and set us on a path leading directly toward the death of our children. Their uncaring behaviour prompted this investigation. They literally told us that if we wanted justice to get a lawyer. So we obeyed their commands, making our complaints public (a *Section 15* requirement noting that the Prime Minister consistently cites our Charter principle of inclusion and aims for our self-determination). The case was easy to make. We simply contrasted what the Mayor and council have done with the law. We use both common language and legal language to make this open public case clear to all. We contrast their bylaws which seem fully focused on telling us what we cannot do with our Charter of Rights and Freedoms, inspiring us to do all the great caring things we must do. In this context, we understand the state of the world and its dangerous trajectory, we understand our basic human needs of food, work and shelter, and we understand that these are coupled to care and concern for the lives and future of our children with clear actions required to permanently sustain their lives.

[2] We found significant evidence that the Mayor and council of Peterborough are fully immersed in deeply deceptive practices of fraud and corporate collusion. Spending millions systematically obstructing fundamental justice to such extent as to make our participation in the democratic process meaningless. Consistent misconduct that brings this local government into disrepute. Taking actions that are neither reasonable nor justified, and therefore illegal, with no basis in law. We are fed up. This not representation, this is organized crime. We know City Hall as a major source of distress in our lives, the primary source of our local housing, work and food security crisis.

[3] It takes almost no effort to find evidence of crime and fraud at City Hall. Significant, compelling evidence of activities that are not legitimate purposes of government, directly linked to a leadership team aiming to undermine the integrity of our justice system. Using the legitimate services of government as a cover, they created a mantle of crime aimed at abuse of public funds, obstructing justice, undermining our democracy, profoundly interfering with our lives and leaving us with no faith at all in their leadership. It's not the workers who provide legitimate essential services, it's the Mayor and council that have revolted against government, acted against us and issued extensive and detailed plans for the death of our children in policy and land use maps.

[4] Making our case was easy. The Mayor and council have effectively built the case against

themselves, complete with documents, evidence, means, motive and opportunity along with money trails. On the public record and throughout City documents, the Mayor and council have provided evidence admissible in a court of law of contempt for law and disregard for the lives of Peterborough residents. In essence, we are not making claims and charges that need verification but the case is made simply by contrasting what these directors have done with what the law is. Our case is open and public such that anyone can look up the PCH documents and compare them with the law.

[5] As these are significant charges, a simple example is needed. When systems are created, they are applied to all matters large and small. We know who wrote the policy, the Mayor and council, so we know who is responsible. What they wrote is an expression of their beliefs. A significant matter is house price fixing, a criminal offence in which the taxable valuation of houses is not based on real value tied to time and materials, but on speculation tied a desire for income without labour. So we have the problem of taxation without a legitimate legal basis done by a complete rejection of *Sections 1* and *7* of our Constitution Act, with major impacts on *Section 15* and removal of rights and freedoms.

[6] A smaller matter is dog licenses. We are most curious when we ask why we need one and get no response. Is any legitimate service provided? Asking that creates open hostility from the PCH directors, and we soon discover a refusal to answer questions at all points of contact. Clearly a system has been emplaced, because a normal person would simply provide a reasonable answer. Probing further, we discover a system designed to silence citizens and deny recourse at all points of contact and by all means of communication. A system designed to hinder not help. Bylaws with no basis in law, each with threats if we do not comply, each with fees if we dare as a question. A quick calculation confirms their suspicious behaviours and reveals what they have to hide. There is a dog tag licence fee of \$30, which escalates if we are late, with steep fines if we disagree with policy. This fee may seem reasonable, until we do a simple calculation. The dog population in Canada is about 7.7 million. The human population is about 38 million. The Peterborough population is about 84 000, so the number of dogs is about $84\ 000 * 7.7 / 38 = 17\ 021$. The City aims to take in at least \$510 631 for \$30 dog licenses, and at least \$425 526 for \$25 cat licenses, there being a similar number of cats as dogs. PCH thus aims to take in about \$936 158, meaning that 20 people can be hired at \$46 808 yearly to take care of the “dog problem”, whatever that is. What is the basis for cat licensing? Where are the funds going? What service is provided? Why can't we, as a community, take care of this and do the work ourselves more effectively? We see powerful incentives here and throughout PCH policy to not answer any questions even on these most simple matters. So we are concerned not only with fraud, but with purposeful rejection of legal community involvement, which is completely and utterly denied, which raises our suspicions, which are confirmed quickly and simply by external access to information. Now we know why we are denied access to information at all points of contact. There is a strong motive for fraud, silencing citizens, denying recourse and obstructing justice.

[7] We also know motive. We know that people enter government to gain life security, and that some will say and do anything to get money. We know that in crisis, governments react by seizing more for themselves and in doing so contribute to societal and economic collapse by a profound lack of care for the lives of citizens. As these are broad charges consisting of multiples breaches of law, human and Charter rights, each a case in itself, we made significant efforts to consider these matters from multiple perspectives and from distinct comparative social reference points. We aimed to be comprehensive, fact-based and fair, with a reasonable balanced consideration of all factors. Our primary focus was critical concern for the individual components of our *Section 7* rights to life security as the greatest threat to our lives and the lives of our children. In this context, we say a reasonable person is a caring

parent critically concerned for the lives and future of their children. We say unreasonable actions against care are hate, and therefore see the dimensions of personality with factors of competency and mental health as highly relevant to this case.

[8] An important part of this case concerns the actions of the Mayor and council to gain life security in great excess on the behalf of themselves and their beneficiaries in business by taking inequitable and illegal actions against the population that will predictably drive the destruction of our lives. These serious *Section 15* violations are done at PCH by subverting the legal Supreme Court of Canada plan to such extent that our rights and freedoms can never be significantly realized. The root of the problem is profound contempt for our lives, taken to the extent that we have no say whatsoever about the course of our lives, even as we are pushed to ruin.

[9] Here, the curious refusal of the Mayor and council to sufficiently respond to simple questions is an observation that prompted our investigative process. In response to this unusual human behaviour, we naturally formed a hypothesis as to why and tested it for truth by additional investigations that revealed consistent patterns of behaviour. One hypothesis is this: their refusal to respond or provide the legal *Section 1* basis of policy is to cover up fraud; hence the practice of multiple layers of fraud to silence and keep at bay those impacted. This gives a model that can be tested for truth with a legal basis in fact, evidence and reason. Investigation then consisted of following money trails while considering means, motive and opportunity, using the SCC legal process. After considering the systems created to subvert justice, consistent with instances (and being apparent in summaries of bylaws), it was easy to test for systematic application. In the simplest cases (*e.g.* dog and other licensing, various bylaws), we can prove systematic fraud and specific examples beyond the shadow of a doubt. We found multiple layers of fraud along with significant abuse of public funds aimed at undue self-promotion and obstruction of justice. At the level of systems, there are several factors to consider in fair balance using the legal concept of living tree doctrine (required, for example, in assessing the sum of impacts determining life, liberty and security of the person; known colloquially as the household budget of a working family). Is PCH healthy? Do they help or hinder?

[10] We thus arrive at a process of investigation in which model patterns of behaviour are tested for fit with the evidence. Are the actions of the directors of PCH consistent with the law? Are their claims true? Here we are considerably aided by the Canadian Supreme Court *Section 1* processes with crystal clear descriptions of the considerations of investigation, the standards of evidence and data collection required, and clear directives for assessing meaning, purpose and intent, scope and impact. We know that if a person acts reasonably, fairly and honestly, with concern and consideration for impact on others, they need not know the details of the legal decision-making process specifically required by all workers in government. The average person can easily justify what they've done and why they've done it, and we find it curious that the Mayor and council refuse to answer or cannot. We also note that this is poor behaviour for an employee.

[11] The data and observations collected concerning the behaviour of the directors of QWCG were then compared to the required Supreme Court of Canada legal directives clarifying legitimate purposes of government. In this, we tested the fit between our models based on observation and well-known social reference points as standards. The principles of fact-based honesty and hard work, for example, are used to distinguish between the character of a fraudster and a Supreme Court justice. Concerning appropriate behaviour at PCH, we considered the dimensions of personality, particularly the traits of care and competency required for any position of authority. We considered the legal-basis reference

point of the actions of a reasonable person, the state of mind of a Supreme Court justice, the social reference point of a caring parent, and the *Charter Section 1* definitions of reasonable limits with a firm basis in a clear process of sound decision making that also defines good mental health. It was also necessary to consider the legal DSM-V descriptions of poor mental health.

[12] For each bylaw and action of City Hall, we considered its purpose, intent and impact in an exhaustive process of elimination of possibilities across broad categories of social, economic and ecologic concerns. Each was tied to realistic work done to meet essential human needs using the limited resources of Nature. We considered federal and provincial Ministry mission statements, and the mandate letters and directives of the Prime Minister. We found that each topic of consideration has easy entry level principles that are either intuitive or found quickly by discussion and information searches. This allowed a quick assessment of the simplest cases meeting the legal standards of preponderance of the evidence as the most likely case. As noted, a speedy case for fraud is quickly developed for many bylaws in which the evidence is so clear and compelling as to attain a higher standard of wrongdoing beyond the shadow of a doubt. Entire sets of PCH bylaws are consistent with a second layer of fraud. We also delved deeper as needed because some foundational principles only appear after paying significant attention to the matter or by multivariate analysis.

[13] Concerning our parental obligations as legal guardians of our children, we also questioned them as to their state of knowledge on matters impacting their lives, as appropriate to their stage of development. For example, most can easily handle all manner of discussion of pets and pet problems, which is valuable information to contrast with the work done (or lack thereof) on dog licensing by the Mayor and council. This being an excellent reference point for their state of education and assessing moral development, cognitive function and reasoning skills. We were thus able to establish that the entire Mayor and council, with their all their skills combined, were rarely able to attain Grade-school standards of math, language, logic or reasoning or exhibit even a basic understanding of the role of local government in our Canadian democracy. Somehow, democratic voting by council on the issues must have failed, because the entire team combined voted to consistently break all manner of laws. So we considered our democratic duty as parental legal guardians, that the concerns of our children may be heard in our democracy and considered in all manner of decision making. Interestingly, the ridiculously low levels of competency in these PCH directors gives us great faith in the capabilities of our children as future leaders. Teenagers could do a better job. And so we strongly support the CSS plan for full societal democratic involvement in securing the world for our children.

[14] Concerning the problem of corporate collusion, we also compared the purpose, intent and effect of PCH bylaws with the intent and interests of corporations that significantly impact our lives, work and social-economic ecologies and also have significant impact on our monetary systems, critical resources and living ecosystems.

[15] Here, our concern is the health of the relationship between residents and local government. Peterborough residents claim the relationship is unhealthy due to the actions of specific individuals in PCH who have clear motives for consistently disregarding the basis of law, consideration of impact on others. Workers at the highest levels of authority are also concerned that the due process of law based on fundamental justice has been obstructed locally. This is a local matter requiring local resolution, but many citizen complaints are also matters of national concern at the Constitutional level. In this context, we define health as the ability of people and communities to respond to crisis. And yet we find in the PCH Official Plan no planned capacity to deal with change or crisis, even with regards to a

homelessness crisis quickly alleviated by inexpensive UN-style insulated wood-floor lockable tents, but instead of justice we get a profound determination to not let anyone escape the bankers model of housing from which City Hall receives major benefits. And a totalitarian determination to completely and utterly deny personal and community self-determination by equality under the law.

[16] The Supreme Court of Canada (SCC) has ruled that any review process dealing with resident-government relations must be plain, clear and understandable, for law that cannot be understood cannot be followed. Therefore, the foundational principles of justice that appear in the Charter are closely matched to those arising naturally in family relationships or are the result of simple logic based on fact and evidence. *Appeals to fairness, for example, arise so early in the childhood development of language that fairness may be defined as a demand for equitable access to the resources required for survival.* By considering a scenario of survival, for example, we can define essential human needs and understand the meeting of these needs as an expression of care tied to actions and work done to meet those needs. The law must be robust and clear, and practical in application, for there is indeed no justice if societal structures are damaged to the extent that it becomes difficult to meet human needs.

[17] The SCC judges further argued that if the principles of justice arise naturally in families, then the vast majority of individuals can conduct their lives freely without interference and without any particular need to know the exact basis of law or its structure and process of application. The summary of these SCC judgments is how we interpret and use our union contract, our Canadian Charter, determining government-citizen relations, in close correspondence with our natural senses of justice. Even in unhealthy families a great clarity of justice arises in those negatively impacted and this too is a driving force for justice. Because the understanding and expression of these essential matters of life and law depend on our biological stage of development (and specifically as skills of language, logic and reason that are matters of teaching, training and education), the parental defence of the lives of children must occur by their recognition as legal guardians, with the significant defence mechanisms being the practices and principles of our Constitution Act.

[18] A set of laws, principles and practices were thus laid out in our Charter so that parents can freely and justifiably use their rights freely in defence of the lives of their children. In this manner, children have the right to have a say in all matters that affect their lives and future, as appropriate to their unique aptitudes, interests, character and level of understanding. Our Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms allows individuals, families and groups to represent Canada in their unique expressions of universal principles and common or fundamental beliefs. Amongst other countries, we purposely chose to be a cultural mosaic that celebrate differences, and in doing so head off differences of belief, religion, language and culture well known to cause conflict and war in many other countries without such resolutions.

[19] In creating a structure of government aimed at meeting essential human needs by placing the health of individuals and caring social structures of families and friends first and foremost and above the whim and will of persons of ill intent, Canada is ranked high amongst nations in peace, care and prosperity.

[20] The ideas and words appearing naturally in descriptions of families in relation to government (for example, “legal, guardians, care, defend, represent, parents, children, family, friends”) are keywords tied to the practical realities of daily life, work and meeting essential human needs that could be used to assess health. There was no need, the SCC argued, to explicitly include rights such as communication

that are naturally implied or explicit in Sections of the Charter as part of due process. The Charter is a set of interacting cohesive rights, not a list of requirements. If one person were to take just one principle, for example, honesty, by a natural process of language and logic the related supportive principles would arise to create an intuitive package of rights that also defines the legal process. Use of the word Freedom, for example, naturally agrees with the UDHR *Article 4* statement that no one shall be held in slavery or servitude. This is done by removal of essential rights and freedoms critical to self-determination and work needed to meet essential human needs. This must not be an activity of government, and yet we see the Mayor and council as directly engaged in these activities. One problem of many is the specific intent to violate *Section 15* Charter laws to gain anomalous benefit, with disparities so extreme as to cause levels of citizens distress that are in many cases life-threatening.

[21] In this manner of fairly assessing all things in balance, legally termed *living tree doctrine*, the holistic world view of our First Nations could find a place within the previously imposed European view of the world as a broken-down list of things to get. The Charter was a declaration of our personal, social and national right to self-directed self-determination (*Section 1*). As a declaration of freedom, it contains several strategies allowing citizens to freely and justifiably respond in peaceful debate against all actions of tyranny both local and national (*e.g. Section 52*). Quite frankly, since this is Anishnaabeg land, we'd rather live under Anishnaabeg law than under this tyrannical life-threatening Mayor and council.

[22] The charges of Citizens concerning the actions of the Mayor and council are thus quite serious as they concern very important matters of life and how residents choose to live. Economically, socially and with regards to the local ecosystems that sustain our lives as the sole basis of the economy. We take pains here to define explicitly what is healthy and legal as a means of assessing actions taken by PCH that citizens have described as unhealthy and illegal, at odds with what is wanted and needed. Most seriously, the Mayor and council aim to take us on a course already proven to cause significant damage to our lives, economy and future, and has colluded with organizations with similar goals. Forcing us against our will into the hands of unscrupulous corporations, thus removing our Freedom of Association. We don't want parking meter machines capable of surveillance and purposed to control our lives by defining crime, dispensing justice and denying recourse automatically because such actions are not justifiable in a free and democratic society.

[23] In this matter of illegal and damaging policy, our primary model of assessment allowing the broadest inclusion of perspectives is the citizen-government relationship in which the views of those writing the law must be considered from the point of view of those impacted by the law, on the receiving end. We can break this down into the Mayor and council (the directors) and those doing the work (the staff), and those impacted by being forced to pay for it all, further threatened if we disagree based on valid *Section 1* arguments. We consider other impacts (economic and social) and related interest groups (landowners and insurance companies) as relevant.

[24] We found significant evidence of a poor personality type acting within City Hall focused on removal of healthy caring social structures and their replacement with destructive economic and social practices characteristic of nations using models of government as a force against people and the ecosystems critical to their survival. For that reason we have carefully defined the caring social fabric of life in Canada along with our legal structure of peaceful democratic engagement allowing parents to act as legal guardians in defence of the lives and future of their children.

[25] A Grade-school student is fully capable of quickly grasping the core issues of pets, or parking policy, and finding fair solutions. An educated adult can certainly do this too. It might take a day to write the rational core of a parking policy, with the main issues being so evident and apparent that speedy resolution of the issue must be possible. So why has this not happened?

[26] We know that one person as an individual is capable of dealing with such simple matters fairly and economically at great speed. And that two minds set to the task will add perspective correcting individual errors and adding details not thought of. When the problems and issues are clear and evident, a survey or poll is also an effective means to include the voices of those impacted. However, when the law is clearly broken and wrong, one individual is all it takes to set things straight.

[27] Almost every topic has easy entry-level ideas allowing a quick grasp of the situation. It is possible that on closer examination the problem has complexities and details requiring a closer look. Surely a City Hall leadership team given their time and resources should be able to combine their skills and knowledge to generate a low-cost best-ideas resolution to the problem that minimally impacts the budgets and rights of residents. Peterborough residents have formed a legal contract in which a small team is paid to perform this task, yet years to decades have passed and the entire team at City Hall is not yet up to the task they have been paid to do. Which is breach of contract, negligence of duty. Furthermore, when pressed, they refuse to do or present the work. Which is refusal to work and refusal to represent.

[28] These are questions of social inclusion and cost, of economics and law, of fairness and reason, and of a contractual process of engagement allowing individuals to use what they know in social relation to others. In other words, a legal and caring social and democratic structure respecting the right of individuals working alone or in groups to bring forward the best ideas for a healthy, fair and functioning society. The tool we have to do that is our Constitution, for within it are the legal and fair principles and practices of effective decision-making made clear, simple and easy by our Supreme Court.

[29] Canada has created a structure of government reflecting our personal and social needs in which Ministries and levels of government are assigned essential tasks of common concern (*e.g.* work, food, health, transportation, communication). In that structure, teachers are charged with maintaining basic standards of education ensuring the accurate use of language, math, reason and logic. Social workers are charged with maintaining healthy social structures, not just in their workplace, but in the broader community and wherever they see significant damage to the healthy functioning of society. The Mayor and council reject all this outright, along with the basis of law.

[30] Thus we are forced to say to PCH that all persons paid by tax dollars are legally obliged to do their job using the principles and practices of our Canadian Constitution Act along with its well-known summary, our Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This is the law. This is our Union Contract. PCH, your *employer* is the Canadian people, you are civil *servants*. The law is written from the perspective of caring parents. Regardless of your specific duties, you are legally obliged to larger responsibilities ensuring our mutual well-being in all areas of life. This is the context in which we consider the issues, and the means by which we resolve them.

[31] *We Desire Fair Process*: We have seen the ease with which one person can accuse another of bullying or misconduct to great effect with damage to reputation (a serious act of war as defined in

Article 12 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights). We've seen how social media campaigns unleash hate crime. When the accusers lurk in the shadows, and present neither evidence nor consider due process with fair consideration of all aspects, they have taken the law into their own hands. Someone could act for selfish reasons or simply be wrong, but they have removed from the healthy majority their right to have a say on matters that impact them. The person labelled 'bad' may have been under the influence of someone much worse. Considering that every individual is complex, and also doing much good, we believe in a balance of considerations as legally required by living tree doctrine. We have made this logical assessment of all factors, ranked by relevance and importance, in making our case.

[32] We have patiently waited nearly 4 decades for City Hall do the simple work needed to write bylaws consistent with the basis of law made clear in our 1982 Constitution Act. We now know with certainty that “phase it in” means never. That this is a small and easy task they simply will not do sheds light on their aim to continue corrupt practises. We act here only in light of the crisis our lives are in, which City Hall has failed to respond to and has often caused by their policies.

[33] The actions of government officials are subject to the Charter, with *Section 32(1)* defining the scope of the Charter’s application. The text of *Section 32(1)* provides “a strong message that the Charter ... is essentially an instrument for checking the powers of government over the individual”: *McKinney v. University of Guelph*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 229 at 261. Ministers and government officials acting pursuant to legislative authority are subject to the Charter (*Slaight Communications Inc. v. Davidson*, [1989] 1 S.C.R. 1038 at 1078; *McKinney, supra*, at 264-5). The Charter applies to municipalities and their actions (*Godbout v. Longueuil (City)*, [1997] 3 S.C.R. 844).

[34] We have practical concerns. Removing the person that wrote the bad bylaw does not change the bad bylaw. Our focus is the bylaw not the person, on the solution not the problem. We know it is easy to be misguided, hard to think through all the basic principles when you are busy, and harder still to muster the arguments and moral courage to do the right thing - especially when obeying Canada's top laws puts City Hall workers under directly threat by “higher-ups” intent on breaking the law. So we also aim to protect the workers within City Hall who have legal obligations to do the work they are hired and trained to do. Who are legally obliged to defend our lives using the principles and practices of our Charter and Constitution.

[35] Therefore, we do not intend to attack an individual here. We do not lurk in the shadows and make false accusations. We do what is required by law, considering all things in fairness and balance. We know people are complex, with limitations and flaws. Instead of using the word stupidity, knowing it is important to not hurt the feelings of the intellectually challenged, we say that it is our goal to move ahead using our best ideas to address the issues we face and ensure a fair and sustainable future for our children. We say it is only by assessment from a variety of perspectives, by considering in balance the numerous principles in our most important legal documents, in rank with a sound definition of healthy behaviours, and with a solid basis in law and the reality of our lives, that we bring these matters up into the open for consideration, debate and discussion, for all law must be debatable. Yet the directors say no.

[36] We know these are not the actions of an individual. There are a few people, one on staff and the rest on council, who created this abusive culture of taking by top-down force, threat and intimidation. A handful of individuals aiming to control the lives of 84 000 residents in fine detail, has created a local

culture quite in contrast to the Canadian culture legally required by our Constitution Act. Purposely aiming to undermine democracy and replace it with a harsh regime of authoritarian rule, viewing citizens as a means to an end. This PCH team created land use policies that caused our work, housing and food security crisis, as part of a broader land use policy aimed at removal of all options and places to go, denying weary travellers rest and refuge, denying free access to Nature trails on land we already own. We know only persons of the poorest character would perpetrate these acts, and so we consider legal DSM-V descriptions of character as highly relevant to the case. By urgent necessity, we address these most important questions of home, safety and belonging, all in the context of removing barriers to green job creation and creating a caring future for our kids.

[37] We refer here to the person of City Hall, artificially created by incorporation, as being required to meet basic legal and behavioural standards of decent human behaviour as outlined clearly in the principles and practices of our legal contract with PCH, our Canadian Constitution Act. We refer only to figureheads acting as the Mayor and council, addressing the bylaws not the people.

[38] Our top laws are not perfect, and we know that; we lack social, economic, ecologic and work rights. We lack clear definitions of risk rights fundamental to life and critical to law as an infused theme and over-arching principle. Our fundamental human rights were defined three centuries ago under circumstances of torture and we have learned much since then about fundamental human needs, but all that basis-of-law supportive science is absent in our Constitution. The Supreme Court has ruled that we must apply our top laws generously and fairly, and with much tolerance, care and flexibility, in keeping with our Canadian character. In contrast to the pre-1982 British laws aimed at complete dominance, control and plunder of our lives and natural resources, which the Americans were willing to go to war to reject, we chose pen over sword and over time developed the practices and principles of caring concern that constitute our Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

[39] We say most gently and generously that the bylaws of Peterborough have not been updated to meet our modern circumstances, though the actual abuses of our lives require stronger language. We have in our Charter the full set of rights and freedoms to respond, as individuals and in caring community, to any crisis we face. The law is clear. We not only have the right to personal, social and national self-reliant self-determination, but are obliged to respond to crisis at all scales and under any circumstances. But the Mayor and council reject all forms of caring community involvement. And we find ourselves with no local capacity to grow food or make and sell things we use daily. There aren't enough trees left to build furniture, much less protect our future. Which is a problem of personal and national security.

[40] This is in many ways a simple case of the right to representation and consent of the governed. We have been continually subject to ongoing abuses in multiple categories of life. We don't want to live like this. We never agreed. You, City Hall, do not have our consent. Our case for justice is not merely preponderance of the evidence, for we have investigated this matter fully from all perspectives with much evidence for *significant wrongdoing beyond the shadow of a doubt*.

[41] Investigation has revealed that the core of City Hall is good. It's not the workers. Considering the various forms of government around the world, we love Canada, we love City Hall. We speak in its defence and in its strengthening by smart and caring democratic community involvement to benefit our lives, for this is required by democratic duty under Charter law. We are quite concerned by the actions of the PCH directors, who have directed it to behave as a person of the poorest character, inconsistent with our needs and the reality of our lives, inconsistent with our Canadian character of brains and

bravery, care and kindness defending of our lives, our children, and anyone in distress here and around the world. Suppose PCH has posted signs saying it will not tolerate abusive behaviour. I say these signs violate my Charter rights to be presumed innocent, and further say that only a specific mindset viewing the average person as not good and a threat would have posted these signs. A shopper or tourist seeing these signs might think there is a major threat, when there is not. I say the sign itself indicates threat of the use of State force. I will not tolerate abuse from City Hall, but differ from PCH in providing evidence of that abuse.

[42] Inherent to our biology is a capacity to see patterns. In typical cognitive processing, our senses intake much information which is then processed to generate a solution to a problem which arises as a thought. We then backtrack to fill in the logical stepwise processes to get from the basis of what is known to this new revelation. The danger here is the mental shortcut of leaping to conclusions, or applying an over-arching concept without having a firm basis in evidentiary fact. If we don't know all the facts, we are often wrong and must re-adjust our encompassing idea. In a web of crime model, for example, the claim is that each bylaw and action of City Hall relates to another under an encompassing idea. The Canadian Charter is a typical example in which the claim is to support freedom and democracy, but if someone just wants to look good and maintain superficial appearances but does not actually want democracy, they make sure that no recourse or remedy is available for any action removing freedom. This is a pattern of behaviour that reveals the mind and intent of fraud which is testable. If a parking bylaw, for example, is taken to totalitarian extent aiming for no escape from the system and it is coupled to an experience of citizens of being systematically hunted down, cornered, trapped and bullied, and this is coupled to an observation of widespread removal of public places of rest and refuge, the odds are quite low that a process of democracy is occurring within the leadership team that voted for this. In democracy, a group of people voting on an issue have a considerable range of points of view and further a range of personality types. If out of this, a distinct personality type has emerged, one with a punitive mindset aiming for inescapable systems of totalitarian control, then we know the democratic process has been subverted. If that is the overarching idea generated at this stage, then we look again for evidence across a broader dataset for application of this idea. If we find no evidence, further including others in the analysis to remove personal bias, we reject this idea and admit we are wrong. In evidence collection, for example, we can ask people if they are free to grow food. If they want to grow food, what stops them? We can quantify this removal of rights and freedoms in a slavery index wherein when democracy has been removed one has no say at all about the most critical aspects of their life and is blocked from responding to any personal or social food security crisis. We can then ask, who has done this to you? In this process, I found the key group responsible for this are the directors of PCH, and wondered if the democratic process had been subverted to such extent as to make our participation in it meaningless. I then tested the idea of PCH as the most significant threat to my life and found strong and compelling personal and social evidence using other web-of-crime factors (*e.g.* human rights abuses, strategies of war, working against Ministry directives, money trails) that this is indeed the case.

[43] Here, we show that certain practices of PCH are wrong, destructive to our lives and economy and against our Canadian principles of law and justice. Against the support structures of caring healthy societies, and grading into actual acts of hatred and degradation of society. All our reasonable caring solutions critical to a healthy life and future have been rejected, all reasonable options removed. Here, we clarify exactly what fundamental rights and freedoms have been removed or attacked, showing the steps the directors have taken to reject the law and deny all forms of reasonable recourse. We have documented multiple categories of consistent and persistent Charter and human rights abuses by City

Hall.

1.4 BEHAVIOURAL STANDARDS AND SOCIAL REFERENCE POINTS

[1] Covid has shown that it is not necessarily easy to get good information. We need a firm basis on which good decisions can be made. What is most important, real, known and evident? We need proven and tested, tried and true, easily verifiable behavioural standards as models to use with respect to well-known social reference points that can be easily understood as being *demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society*.

[2] This is the situation. With stay at home orders, a large percent of the population was at home not working causing major losses to our real economy based on labour. Money is simply being printed with the expectation that the labour of citizens will support the growth plans of banks, business and government. The real value of the dollar has been reduced drastically. Now speculators seeking income without labour are escalating prices so severely as to collapse our lives and the economy. The result is vacant lots that no one can use. Those that do not want to work but want money are prioritized over those that do want to work. When prices increase without any real value being added, the goal is to harness to labour of others. To profit from that work while doing no work is a form of slavery using the land as leverage against essential human needs. The effect is to create a large population in dire circumstances with no means to work directly to build their lives, make things and sell what they made. Rejecting root cause analysis has the effect of creating a large population in need of other government services. The actual PCH plan is to refuse to solve problems in order to grow government. There is no realistic plan to get out of this crisis. The PCH official plan is a fraud, a purely political document containing no realistic *Section 1* elements of substance giving it legal validity. However, we submit it as evidence of incompetence and work done against us, setting us on course to disaster and rejecting our rights and freedoms of personal and social self-determination.

[3] PCH benefits from extortion. Their plan is to deny of critical work in our core economy of essential human needs on behalf of income extremists. Taken to abusive extremes with significant human rights violations, our local economy has been crushed. They represent only people seeking extreme income without labour, and have completely and utterly rejected the Supreme Court of Canada plan for a sane and rational course of care for our lives and economy. In crisis, surely we should be able to deal with these critical issues of basic life security easily and quickly, following our *Section 7* prime directive and parental obligation to protect this generation of Canadian kids from a known impending disaster already impacting farms, forests and fisheries. The directors of PCH created this local disaster zone by favouring fraud, theft and extortion over their legal obligations to represent people.

[4] Here we follow the SCC plan, producing realistic social reference points as the basis for a caring social response to crisis. Imagining a scenario of survival as a social reference point, we can quickly and easily define essential human needs ranked in order of urgency and importance depending on the situation. We can quickly prove that all essential human needs come from Nature. We can link each need and action needed to an essential activity and right to life. We can quickly find practical applications of the principles within our Constitution, with clear examples of how to apply law fairly. These obvious and intuitive principles and practices arise so naturally there is very little reason to believe we cannot act without integrity, by an unmitigated link between what we believe and how we act, as the expression of honesty in fair trade relations operating within the realistic limits of Nature.

But what we often forget here is that banks have colluded with government to ensure there is no free land we have rights to be on. Banks want all land private, and City Hall ensures that public land is not for public benefit and cannot be used to meet urgent and essential needs even if critical to survival. This collusion controls all land, the purpose being to force us into their systems without alternative. The fundamental claim is that land does not belong to Canadians, this is not our home, and we have no right to touch, use or care for the land, and in this we have no self-determination. All reasonable alternatives are denied. PCH is liable because they have removed our Freedom of Association from bankers.

[5] For behavioural reference standards, we present a simple five-friends model as a social and economic reference point establishing what healthy dynamic relations look like. Five friends decide to buy and split a pizza. Someone proposed it, asked around. Is this a good idea? There was a lot of give and take. Wanting this or that, amounts, ingredients, questions of sharing and splitting, compensation for those not too hungry or who happen at the moment to have little money. Flexible deals concerning fair inequity were made quickly, fairly and effectively. We can take this apart from a variety of perspectives and find all sorts of underlying behaviours and principles that are not trivial but deeply rooted in beneficial relationships of care. We can also say this is not a political system wherein one person decides everything for everyone else including what pizza is or is not. It is not an economic system wherein one person seeks control of an essential ingredient as their own and leverages over others. We don't have ideologies imposed on this scenario so such extent as to be damaging by being out of touch with reality. Quite the opposite, as the ideas and principles arise naturally and flexibly as part of good human nature. So no one can say that we do not have a good understanding of what healthy social and economic activities look like. Which when considered closely define much of the basis of law. No one can say we lack good definition of healthy inter-personal relations or social behavioural standards. We have plenty of experience working with others in a natural and intuitive package of rights, freedoms and social responsibilities that express flexible care and consideration within realistic reasonable limits.

[6] Imagining the rights and freedoms needed to create a pioneer village is another Canadian social reference point, but one in which we work with others to make, build and do things. Some things cannot be done alone, and there is a limit as to what one person can possibly do in a day. Some types of work require significant skills, pointing out a social need for specialization within fair trade economic relations based on beneficial work. Here, we tie our scenario of survival to the set of skills and access to resources required to make a pizza from its origins in seed and soil to harvesting and processing, storage and sales outlets. We need land, access to tools and supplies, repair and storage facilities, places to live, water, energy and transportation. Are we locally self-sustainable, or incredibly vulnerable? Can we even begin to make a living in this core economy of essential human needs? Most of what we buy is not that hard to make. But here in Peterborough, as a direct result of the policies of the Mayor and council, all parts of this process are blocked. We cannot actualize the critical rights and freedoms needed to make life function, specifically due to the immense interference in our lives from PCH, specifically land use policy. We cannot grow food on the land most critical to our immediate and long-term survival. We are crushed, as is our economy, and our kids have no hope for a future.

[7] In this context of removal of critical rights to life, we understand the social reference point of prisons where the purpose is to deliberately remove rights and freedoms as a form of punishment. Everything is controlled, we have no self-determination, and yet basic human rights to food and shelter are protected. Whereas the brutal system the Mayor and council have designed aims to remove fundamental access to food and shelter from those in greatest need. Many in Peterborough envy the

basic protections prisons offer. Our pioneers had the right to shelter themselves, and to grow food. No caring society would ever deny access to this critical work fundamental to social security. Why, when we bring our concerns of fundamental human rights to shelter as an obvious *Section 7* right to life to City Hall, are we continually frustrated? Why, whenever we try to do reasonable things necessary to make our lives function well, or to prevent personal disaster, are we continually blocked and financially drained? Why are we not free to change this course in our lives and communities, which is obviously controlling and destructive, even in crisis? We see that the Mayor and council have designed land uses as an economic prison, leveraging essential human needs to starve us into compliance and force us into the hands of controlling interests seeking income without labour, to harness our labour, or to speculate based on the fraud of falsely created inescapable debt. I reject this brutalitarian rule. As only our labour adds real value to otherwise worthless printed notes, this is a form of theft by harnessing labour, a type of statistical indentured servitude. We are all paying rent to bankers, a form of taxation for the use of our own money. Why are we not free? Did we not win our Charter rights to personal and social self-determination in 1982?

[8] The mayor does this by zoning, controlling land uses to make deals with banks, investors and construction companies explicitly written to remove rights and freedoms critical to life. If we look at life in an apartment tower, which PCH approved, the list of things we cannot do as rights removed is shockingly long. What options do renters have for self-determination? If they cannot afford food, there is no place to go to grow food. There is no room or place to make anything, and no place to sell anything. This is a direct result of zoning that has removed rights without compensation. The intent of this fractured zoning is to fracture life, so that each aspect can be controlled. If one cannot grow food, one is forced into the hands of grocery store owners. If access to a place to make and sell things is removed, or these are made separate, that option is removed and one is forced into the hands of corporations. According to PCH zoning policy, we must have a place to live, a place to make things and a place to sell. How is this possible? How can a recent graduate starting life from scratch ever begin to gain a foothold in life? The point is, they cannot. These are deep anti-competition policies aiming to fracture, control and plunder society, quite against any form of socially acceptable caring community. No caring parent would ever do this to their kids, remove the critical options essential to life. Only a psychopath would. We have been on economic lock-down for years, with PCH purposely removing all reasonable options for the purpose of forcing us into the hands of those aiming to control our every essential human need. Furthermore, the Mayor has an extensive program to prevent any form of social connectivity allowing those with little in life to pool time, talents and resources to create small start-up businesses. Our kids don't stand a chance.

[9] We include in our social reference points the means and mechanisms by which authoritarian states operate to produce working models of statistical indentured servitude and slavery in which citizens have no say about anything that impacts their lives and future. Political systems aimed at totalitarian control of the lives of people. Slavery, as the complete removal of any form of self-determination, in which every aspect of life is controlled without say, with punishments applied for non-compliance. War, in which a social order has been created encouraging the worst human behaviours in a state of lawlessness. In complete contrast, our Canadian soldiers fought and died to defend our lives and freedoms, their principles forming much of our Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Yet who at City Hall has the moral courage to do the right thing, defending our lives by the principles and practices of our Constitution Act? Who there has the courage to defend the rights of this generation of young Canadian pioneers, now facing a devastated landscape? We put this case forward boldly, knowing that the bullies directing City Hall are cowards, completely lacking the moral courage to do the right thing.

[10] As a direct result of these well-known social reference points we have throughout our Constitution Act many anti-tyranny mechanisms available for free use by citizens. We have in our Constitutional structure and system of government fantastic systems of effective strategical organization and engagement designed to get people and supplies to the right place at the right time that were developed and tested in times of our greatest crisis, war. We have excellent triage systems in place in our Constitution to tackle in order of urgency any and all issues and matters of concern at any scale. We can respond robustly and in care to any crisis, social, economic or ecological. Our Constitution even prevents war based on religious differences! And now we also have the internet, an unexpected and great system of access to knowledge and information readily available for all sorts of informed decision making. Here, we firmly reject the PCH plan for our lives as setting us on a course of reckless endangerment. We already have excellent tried and tested models that are *demonstrably justified to be strongly beneficial to social health, safety and security in a free and democratic society*.

[11] We are a country filled with educated people, sharp and intelligent, strong and fit, of good heart with backbones of steel, and with spirits of courage, care and resolution. In crisis, we know what matters most, protecting the lives and future of our children. This we will do, not just because it is right but because *the Constitutional defence of the lives and future of our children is required of parents in their role as legal guardians*.

1.5 LEGAL REQUIREMENTS OF PCH CONDUCT

[1] Two people buy a parcel of land. Unrelated, each wants their own house and property. Just starting out, it is smart and economical to build and use a common road, maintain it and plow snow. It may also be smart to use a common well, or do garbage runs. If the land has a lake, and a need is seen to reserve or share this special part of Nature, the choice could be made to make that area common. These are the roots of community and the basic functions of local community-directed government. We have here a clear and concise model for community development with features of cost-savings, involvement in decision-making, and caring intelligent concern for good relations with others based on mutual well-being. Electing or hiring someone to build or plow that road in no way implies the loss of decisive rights.

[2] We understand that these two people need not to like each other to work together. They may have vastly different world views and ways of doing things, and yet by retaining a firm grip on reality based on the need to work to meet essential human needs, choose to be decent and reasonable neighbours for the sake of smart economics. The fact is, were these two forced to work with each other on a task, a mutual respect might grow as a result, for people generally have far more in common than what they have in difference. We share in common our essential human needs (protected under *Section 7* Charter law), and if that is the focus then we are unified. We call these our civil codes of conduct. The common code of conduct required in Canada is explicit in the practices and principles of our Constitution Act, which is our Union Contract as the basis of law and all decision making. A legal social contract making clear the required behaviours of all workers in government paid to provide specific needed services. We do not have a pirate code of conduct, wherein the Mayor and council as Captain and crew split the plunder and pay off their buddies in business.

[3] The key service we expect from elected representatives is representation. We are paying for the

defence of our lives using the natural basis of law and the principles and practices of our Charter. All paid workers in government are required not only to do the work they are trained to do, but to do it smartly and freely remembering who paid for the work to be done. We are your employers and we have a legal contract. No one is allowed to interfere with the work you do for us without very good reason. *By reciprocity, the SCC has ruled that government must not interfere with the essential work of our lives which is required a priori to pay for the services of government.* If our paid employees are defending our lives by following the easily understood principles and practices of Canada's top laws and acting honestly with good intent, using good ethics and smart sensible work habits, then your work and life is protected under the umbrella of law when you use the principles and practices of our Constitution. It is not hard for the average person to work fairly and with integrity.

[4] Those working in local government are required to be of service to local residents, assisting them and doing the community work needed to make our lives work well. The tasks are not complicated. There should be a clear explanation for the work you do. It must provide societal benefit and be of service, for all of government is a service. You must have the freedom you need to do the job you are hired, trained and fully qualified to do, on behalf of your employer, the local community. Will you be able to stand before a judge and explain clearly, concisely and truthfully why you do what you do? Any honest and just person can do this easily without fear. But the specific question is this: why, when you saw something clearly gone very wrong, did you not stand up and say something? Surely you can stand in peaceful defence of the lives of our children, considering that others put their lives on the line in war in defence of your life and freedoms?

[5] *Section 1* of our Constitution is not hard to understand. Does the government manufacture products, making things for sale in the open market? No. Does a business provide social services such as childhood education, or run a hospital on the side while producing steel pipe? No. The role of government is clear and distinct from the role of business. Government is not the place to run your business, and it is not the place for businesses to run their business plans. One is public and for public benefit; the other is private and for private benefit. Only an incompetent and corrupt Mayor would confuse these clearly distinct roles, aiming purposely to remove Freedom of Association from persons and groups aiming to cripple and gut our lives.

[6] We have a code of conduct. We have a natural code of conduct that is intuitively just and sensibly flexible, that is tightly aligned by integrity with our actual ethics and values. We have a lot of room for forgiveness, difference of character and personality, skill sets, aptitudes and interests. Our standards are sensible, caring and easily achievable because they were designed to be inherent to our being and understandable for use by the vast majority of the population, practically and regardless of age, race, education or skill. Some of our obvious and inherent rights have been recognized in our Canadian code of conduct, based on care, hard work and honesty, in our Charter. We find it unfortunate but necessary to provide a brief description of the *Section 1* conduct requirements of PCH directors concerning the writing of laws, bylaws and policies that directly impact and interfere with our lives. *The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees the rights and freedoms set out in it subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society.*

[7] We have expressed our Canadian sense of care and ethics in our Constitution, in our Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Within it are the legal obligations and directives for all workers in government to defend life, liberty and security of the person (*Section 7*) for all by working only on matters of common concern that help us and minimally interfere with our lives. That must not generate terrible extremes of

iniquity as *Section 15* violations, generate human rights abuses or cripple our capacity to live and pay for government. Our code of conduct is plain and clear, designed for all caring Canadians of might and muscle, trained and smart with backbones of steel, the brave, strong and true. We are parents. We are seniors and children. We are friends and family. We know who we are and we know exactly what is worth fighting for. We care. We are Canadian, and we do indeed have a code of conduct. We reject this false, misleading and self-serving code of conduct invented at PCH as complete and utter nonsense, as a waste of our time and money, as a fraud designed to give the appearance of justice, as subversion of justice and an act of sedition.

[8] The values and principles which guide decision-makers in applying *Section 1* include the inherent dignity of the human person, a commitment to social justice and equality, accommodation of a wide variety of beliefs, respect for cultural and group identity, and faith in social and political institutions which enhance the participation of individuals and groups in society (*R. v. Oakes*, [1986] 1 S.C.R. 103 at page 136). We also cite the Department of Justice Canada mandate *to promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all, and build effective, accountable, and inclusive institutions at all levels*, which is essentially a re-wording of our Constitutional principles and a UN Sustainable Development Goal (SDG #17). Whereas all our citizen efforts towards these healthy *Section 1* relations with PCH have been rebuffed.

[9] *Section 1* effects a reasonable balance between the rights of the individual and the interests of society by permitting limits to be placed on guaranteed rights and freedoms. Most modern constitutions recognize that rights are not absolute and can be limited if this is necessary to achieve an important objective and if the limit is appropriately tailored, or proportionate. (*Canada Attorney General v. JTI-Macdonald Corp.*, [2007] 2 S.C.R. 610, at paragraph 36). Parents understand this, for they do not do many things they could do for the sake of their children.

[10] The onus of proof under *Section 1* is on workers in government to justify the impact of their actions on others, especially concerning actions that interfere with essential activities of life by removing rights and freedoms. The standard of proof is not particularly high, being the civil standard or balance of probabilities (*Oakes*, supra). Any law or infringing measure must have a clear purpose with a pressing and substantial objective of importance and benefit to society, consistent with the principles integral to a free and democratic society (*Vriend*, supra; *Figuroa v. Canada (A.G.)*, [2003] 1 S.C.R. 912).

[11] We know that our Charter protection may not be engaged if we are unable to establish using the tests developed in the jurisprudence that our right in question was infringed (*Ktunaxa Nation v. British Columbia*, [2017] 2 S.C.R. 386 at paragraph 75; *Trinity Western University v. Law Society of Upper Canada*, [2018] 2 S.C.R. 453 at paragraph 63). However, the Mayor and council refuse to submit a *Section 1* reason for their actions, and further deny substantial communications allowing discussion of our infringed rights including massive interference in our lives by PCH policy that are also major contributors to extreme hardship in our lives. No matter what we say in the minutes allowed makes no difference whatsoever and we get no substantial response at any point of contact. We make this case due to a complete rejection by PCH of the *Section 1* basis of legal decision-making.

[12] In *Section 1*, "demonstrably justified" means a strong and realistic foundation in fact, evidence, proof and reason as the basis of sane and rational decision-making. Cogent and persuasive evidence is generally required (*Oakes*, supra), and here we consider the principles of fundamental justice to be relevant. We desire fairness, logic, reason, fact-based discussion and debate, care and concern for

impact on us as part of good human relations, and we reject hostility, arbitrariness, vagueness, overbreadth and gross disproportionality. Where scientific or social science evidence is available, it will be required; however, where such evidence is inconclusive, or does not exist and could not be developed, reason and logic may suffice (*Libman v. Quebec (A.G.)*, [1997] 3 S.C.R. 569; *RJR-MacDonald Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, [1995] 3 S.C.R. 199; *Thomson Newspapers Co. v. Canada (A.G.)*, [1998] 1 S.C.R. 877; *R. v. Sharpe*, [2001] 1 S.C.R. 45; *Harper v. Canada (A.G.)*, [2004] 1 S.C.R. 827, at paragraph 77; *R. v. Bryan*, [2007] 1 S.C.R. 527, at paragraphs 16-19, 29; *Mounted Police Association of Ontario v. Canada (Attorney General)*, [2015] 1 S.C.R. 3, at paragraphs 143-144).

[13] Any PCH law or bylaw that impacts our lives must be reasonably and demonstrably justified. The problem the law aims to overcome must be significant, well described and understandable, pressing and substantial. There must be proportionality between the objective and the means used to achieve it. There must be a rational connection between the problem the law or bylaw aims to solve and the objective. And finally there must be minimal interference with the lives of those impacted and minimal impairment of essential rights and freedoms. Is this not a test of sane and caring decision making firmly grounded in the physical reality of our lives? Why do we fail to see any of this in PCH policy?

[14] Here, we require the Mayor and council to show there are no less rights-impairing means of achieving the objective “in a real and substantial manner” (*Carter v. Canada (Attorney General)*, [2015] 1 S.C.R. 331, at paragraph 102; citing *Hutterian Brethren*, [2009] 2 S.C.R. 567, at paragraph 55), for we have many better cost-effective solutions to the problems of optimizing our social, economic and ecological rights to a fair and sustainable future based on Charter rights to life and self-determination. We do not find it particularly hard to find a “Final Balancing” with proportionality between the deleterious and salutary effects of the law (*Carter*, supra, at paragraph 122; *JTI-Macdonald*, supra, at paragraph 45), and we have a right to participatory debate of all law that has significant impact on our lives.

[15] We do not apply the *Section 1* Oakes test in a miserly, limited or mechanistic fashion, but rather with realistic and flexible care and concern, taking into account the factual basis of law and decision-making in a caring inclusive social context sensitive to diversity (*RJR-MacDonald*, supra, at paragraph 63; *Ross*, supra; *Canadian Broadcasting Corporation v. New Brunswick (Attorney General)*, [1996] 3 S.C.R. 480; *Edmonton Journal v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 1326; *Stoffman v. Vancouver General Hospital*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 483; *R. v. Keegstra*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 697; *R. v. Butler*, [1992] 1 S.C.R. 452; *Thomson Newspapers*, supra, at paragraph 87)).

[16] We object to the Mayor issuing baseless edicts, because a law or bylaw without a clear description of the problem and its meaning and objective cannot be understood and we cannot follow it. It cannot be simply a description of the means the legislature has chosen to achieve its purpose (*R. v. K.R.J.*, [2016] 1 S.C.R. 906, at paragraph 63). In all bylaws, the Mayor has simply stated "because I say so" and charges a fee if we dare question his rule. But we say laws without basis cannot be regarded as laws. They do not meet the basic requirements to be called laws. It is our right and freedom to not pay (*Section 52*) and also our democratic duty to not pay for crime and work done against us provably damaging our lives and denying our children any hope of a future.

[17] We also say that fundraising or administrative convenience are not acceptable as pressing and substantial objectives for the justification of a law or bylaw (e.g. *Nova Scotia Workers' Compensation Board v. Martin*, [2003] 2 S.C.R. 504; *Eldridge v. British Columbia Attorney General*, [\[1997\] 3 S.C.R. 624](#) Reference re: Remuneration of Judges of the Provincial Court of P.E.I., [1997] 3 S.C.R. 3; *Schachter v. Canada*, [1992] 2 S.C.R. 679; *R. v. Lee*, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 1384; *Singh v. Minister of*

Employment and Immigration, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 177). The SCC states there is no meaningful distinction between violating a Charter right for the purpose of advancing an otherwise valid objective in a cost-efficient manner and violating a Charter right for the purpose of preserving the public purse. Whereas the Mayor and council write bylaws specifically for fundraising and take many measures to escalate economically on behalf of themselves claiming to be economically free from those struggling to pay for it all. Growing while flat-lining the wages of workers outside government. Workers in government enjoy benefits they claim are essential to their lives and work, but denying those benefits to others, even to those in extreme need. To the effect of massive inequality and creation of a slave nation with no say labouring to pay for it all without benefit of us gaining even rudimentary life security. Life security is not based on considerations of money alone, but on ongoing labour done to meet essential human needs and provide care for one another. Much of our critical economy is non-economic. Our paid economy is based on a mountain of unpaid labour. We can prove (*demonstrably justify by how we freely help each other*) that our social security is based primarily on the work we do tin care and concern for mutual well-being. Canadians naturally and instinctively look out for each other, and this is not simply a family behaviour. It is absolutely insane to create systems violently opposed to this. We powerfully defend real value created by real work and decry all economic systems of PCH and their associates aimed at economic manipulations that undermine the real value of our lives.

[18] We say the means used to attain the objective of a provision must be proportional to the importance of that objective and rationally connected. The measure must not be arbitrary, unfair or based on irrational considerations. The causal relationship between the limit and the objective should be proved, where possible, by scientific evidence showing that as a matter of repeated observation, one affects the other. The Supreme Court describes the rational connection test as not particularly onerous, a matter of common sense and reasoning. For that reason, we see no need for the Mayor to deny reasonable community involvement in decision making that directly impacts our lives. We should not have to go to court to have caring and sensible democratic self-determination concerning the most critical aspects of our daily lives essential to our *Section 7* rights. Whereas this Mayor and council are using bylaws including land use zoning aimed at maximal interference, damage and removal of rights and freedoms critical to life, exerted by force and threat.

[1] We know that governments should adduce evidence as to why less intrusive and equally effective measures were not chosen (Thomson Newspapers, *supra*, at paragraphs 118-119; RJR MacDonald, *supra*, at paragraph 160, Charkaoui v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration), [2007] 1 S.C.R. 350, at paragraphs 69, 76, 86). We say this best-choice model of decision-making is based on a fundamental human ability to understand the past, predict a probable future outcome, and to use that in combination with our current state of knowledge to discourage poor behaviour, encourage beneficial behaviour and make the safest smartest choices concerning a secure future for our children. We see risk rights as a theme throughout law and essential to life. We further understand that a diversity of ideas is preferred over imposition of a single idea that removes choice and option, as this creates a high-risk route for society that removes essential freedoms to learn, grow and evolve.

[20] We completely reject a Mayor and council that has predetermined how we are to live, not for our sake but to serve them and their beneficiaries in business, rejecting all forms of individual and community self-determination to the extent of gutting the basis of the economy and threatening our lives and future. Defining our role in life simply as taxpayers or customers to be manipulated in any way they see fit, as if the meaning and purpose of our lives is to pay them. To force us into that role, PCH works hard to block communication and remove all recourse. Their aim is to control every

essential human need and action by controlling land, money, work and wages, using force to ensure we have no escape from their systems.

[21] Concerning final balancing, the final stage of Oakes testing requires that the salutary effects of the impugned law (e.g. PCH taxation) outweigh its deleterious effects (Frank, *supra*, at paragraphs 38, 76). This allows for a broader assessment of whether the benefits of the impugned law in terms of the public good are worth the cost of the rights limitation (R. v. K.R.J., *supra*, at paragraph 77, citing Carter, *supra*, at paragraph 122). This inquiry focuses on the practical impact of the law. What benefits will the measure yield in terms of the collective good sought to be achieved? How important is the limitation on the right? When one is weighed against the other, is the limitation justified?" (JTI-MacDonald, *supra*, at paragraph 45; see also Lavoie, *supra*; Dagenais, *supra*). In local context, the final balancing is the sum of impacts on our lives, understood as the forced imposition bills that may ruin our household budget and drive us to despair by the removal of reasonable recourse and options. The Supreme Court has repeatedly emphasized that the specific factual and social context of a case plays a key role in justifying a limitation on a Charter right under *Section 1* (Thomson Newspapers, *supra*, at paragraph 87; RJR-MacDonald, *supra*, at paragraph 63).

[22] On judicial review, the standard of review applicable to the decision-maker's balancing of Charter protections and statutory objectives is reasonableness (Canada Minister of Citizenship and Immigration v. Vavilov, 2019 SCC 65 at paragraph 57; Doré, *supra*, at paragraphs 43-45). The decision will be found to be reasonable if it reflects a proportionate balancing of the Charter protections at issue, in light of the nature of the decision, the statutory context and the particular facts (Doré, *supra*, at paragraph 58).

[23] We know that under the law, it is on lawmakers to prepare evidence as to rational connection and minimal impairment at the policy development stage and continue that throughout the life of the legislative provision to determine impact and effectiveness. At the rational connection stage "some evidence" may suffice, provided logic and reason support the existence of a connection (Bryan, *supra*, at paragraph 41). As indicated above, to establish minimal impairment there should be evidence available as to why less intrusive and equally effective measures were not chosen (Thomson Newspapers, *supra*, at paragraphs 118-119; RJR MacDonald, *supra*, at paragraphs 160 and 163; Charkaoui, *supra*, at paragraphs 69, 76, 86). Which is our point with PCH policies that are provably damaging, whereas our ideas are provably much better.

[24] Finally, evidence of proportionality may require continued monitoring to determine the actual negative and positive effects of the legislative provision. In order for legislation to be effectively defended, it is important that the evidence be available in a form which can be made public. PCH has done none of this, they refuse to and they also deny our sane, rational and fact-based input. We understand that this rejection of their legal duties to us is sedition; it comes along with denial of numerous other Charter rights critical to our survival.

1.6 PCH RESPONSE REQUIREMENTS

[1] We say it is ridiculous for us to need to make such serious efforts to get justice on such simple issues. We wonder why the Peterborough Police, who are present at every council meeting, reject law enforcement by equality under the law. We say that not only do the directors of City Hall aim to obstruct justice, but that they have emplaced systems designed to utterly replace and make irrelevant

the justice system, which is the *Section 59(1-4)* federal crime of Sedition requiring a minimum 14 year prison sentence for these treasonous directors of PCH. That this case is needed proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that significant ongoing efforts costing much time, money and thought have gone into constructing and maintaining these anti-social, anti-justice and anti-democracy structures at City Hall. This cannot be the work of one person, there must be a few key players working in an organized, planned and pre-meditated manner with purposeful intent over significant time.

[2] They refuse to explain parking policy. They refuse to explain dog licenses. They refuse to say why we are paying for services we already paid taxes for. They refuse to say why the hungry cannot use public land we own for public benefit in matters of urgent survival, to grow food. We search but do not find any valid legal basis for bylaws. We cannot get anywhere when we try to do reasonable things critical to our lives. We ask why and get no satisfactory answer. Surely such simple things can be solved locally by sane discussion based on fact, evidence, reason and logic?

[3] We must tackle our urgent issues of local economic collapse and precipitated only in part by Covid. The Mayor and council refuse to respond, refuse to address the obvious and urgent issues. Having life security, and the capacity to turn up the tax dial to get even more, they say everything is wonderful and only going to get better. They have life security taken from us and cannot overcome the self-serving bias to see the impact on our lives of extreme taking without reason. We have major matters of critical importance to deal with, but find our every move blocked.

[4] The Mayor says we have no right to address what is damaging our lives, and further claims that everything public belongs to him and his group, for their benefit alone. He has rejected the role of representation and defence of our lives and illegally turned government into an anything-goes unlimited-profit business, making us pay fees for services we already paid taxes for. He has rejected the judicial role of government, rejected his responsibility, and taken great pains to remove all possibility of accountability. He has abdicated his position. *However, in making government an open-market private enterprise and by refusing representation, the Mayor has made the case that we do not have to pay, for in the free market we have that choice.*

[5] In general, a free market characterized by ownership of private assets is open to choice. Whereas government removes choice for public benefit. Freedom of Association is removed, for example, by taxation. A private home is an example of a need for essential protection of what is highly personal, private and critical to a functioning life, and as such is subject to Charter protections particularly those critical to life, liberty and security of the person. To have every human need fully exposed to an escalating market controlled by the rich removes freedom of association, creates conditions of slavery and generates misery and poverty. Private homes also have the effect of generating social isolation, and there is a need to work with others. Public land, for example, has critical purposes of social connection, trade, and access to Nature and common resources, all characterized by open and free public access. A vacant lot in a downtown area, which is social, has almost no functions by which it could be called private land. Downtowns depend on a vibrant social scene. Everything that is public belongs to the public and is legally in our domain, purposed to the common good, for our good and for the benefit of society. Responsible people are assigned the task of hearing concerns of how public assets are used reasonably with basis in arguments, fact and evidence. These are our representatives. The Mayor rejects all of this and claims to own the land. Whereas we know State ownership of the land is characteristic of authoritarian states like North Korea that also interfere vastly with trade and tend toward brutal relations with citizens. Totalitarian states also aim to control every essential human need, interfere

vastly with daily life and remove as much as possible all rights and freedoms critical to survival and self-determination. We are appalled to see these policies aggressively active within PCH.

[6] In contrast to the Mayor, we know that the role of government is distinct from that of business. Trade of essential goods and services requires an open market. What business teaches children, or provides healthcare? These are community activities based on shared human needs, designed around care for people and families. Good government considers what we have in common, allowing involvement and cutting costs by minimizing expenses. It's smarter for 30 families to hire one teacher than to teach individually as parents. It's smarter for adjacent land owners to build a common road they both use. To do that wisely requires having a say, community involvement in what impacts your life, participation, putting the best ideas on the table for use, comment and discussion. But government also writes law, to deal with the small minority of offenders, and if the law applies to all, that means removal of Freedom of Association. This is an open, free and caring society, but if a sociopath takes over, the meaning of everything is reversed. It all gets turned around backward to suit the interests of the sociopath. If it makes no sense, that is because it does not, for these people are mentally ill. Because we care for the Mayor and members of council, we want them to get the help they need, and by the Ontario Mental Health Act, be placed in court-ordered community treatment programs. These are deeply disturbed individuals who make no sense and cannot control themselves around people and money.

[7] Our 1982 Constitution Act lays out how we are to use the principles of law so that citizens impacted by law have direct access to our elected representatives who are obliged to address the issues and write fair and balanced law in accordance with fact, evidence and desired outcome. *We submit our Constitution Act, along with the working Ministerial structure of government itself, as evidence of an aim to address all essential human needs and work for the common good.* In this Act, we see it is our legal responsibility to solve the problems we face by using and maintaining a healthy working public democracy. Within this Act are numerous mechanisms, which we use here, to reject those aiming to replace democracy with the tyrannical rule of an authoritarian state, aiming to replace government with an unlimited for-profit private business. We see numerous statements in the Charter and its case law applications that we are not allowed to pay into systems designed for our destruction, lest we be charged with collusion, aiding and abetting, and criminal negligence. It is ultimately the role of individuals to defend democracy and in doing so defend the lives, rights and freedoms of all, and I am doing here under full authority of God and equality under the law. When put in conflict by the law by a Mayor and council that write laws against us and the Constitution, we must choose to obey Canada's top laws, lest we be charged with much higher crimes. We must respond to crisis, defending all those that are in need. The Mayor and council cannot go around attacking people, pushing them to their deaths, or into a planned destructive future, for such acts have always outraged the conscience of mankind.

[8] We, as caring parents are the legal guardians of our children, obliged to protect their lives and future using these principles of law. We are required to maintain and defend healthy surroundings. At present, an entire generation of Canadian kids, well aware of the state of the world, is charging us with criminal negligence as they face a grim future. Saying, you knew the problem and you did nothing. You tended parking meters instead of trees, instead of us. An entire generation is now are trapped between low wages and high house prices, facing falsely created permanent lifetime debt for essential human needs. As adults we do indeed know the problems. We have no choice but to address this plethora of vile acts committed against our lives by the local Mayor and council. Their land-use policy is not only illegal

but against us, a major factor in creating an ugly, hostile environment in our lives and in our downtown. The costs to of dealing with this are immense, as are the costs to business and a healthy social life. Many groups have solutions. The homeless, desperate and oppressed have solutions. All of which the Mayor and council oppose, we believe, for a single reason. To not let a single person escape their massively destructive housing system providing only benefit to City Hall, bankers and developers, to the great detriment of creating a massive population in falsely created permanent lifetime debt and indentured servitude for essential human needs, tied to a work contract they can never work hard enough to ever pay off. This is not life. This is hate. Whereas we say the Canadian dollar belongs to the Canadian people and must be used for our mutual benefit to free and not enslave us. The specific reason being that with use of a common currency, we lack Freedom of Association. When this is forced on us, the direct result is that private corporations dealing with finance become agents of the government and subject to Constitutional law with reasonable limits and restrictions preventing impoverishment and plunder of our lives and country. Specifically, in writing housing development contracts with bankers aimed explicitly at removal of rights, the Mayor and council have removed our Freedom of choice and Association, making the bank an inescapable agent of the State. As it stands, such collusion devastates our lives and life security, pushing us to ruin along with our entire nation. Many countries have collapsed as a direct result of such actions against the population. Anyone who cannot afford to pay these income extremists attacking our essential rights to shelter and a place to work ends up on the street homeless and subject to further attacks against their person. Much of the population is at risk, and an entire generation now has no hope for a life or future. PCH has plans against their life which we present here in painful detail.

[9] *We say the Mayor is not an important person, for important people say and do important things in defence of our lives.* A real Mayor would responsibly address real issues of major concern and impact on our lives. A real Mayor works with people to solve problems, not create them. A real Mayor defends our lives using fairness and justice tied to practical realism, with sound commitments to defend healthy social structures in which all our essential human needs can be met. At the very least, by not interfering in our lives to the extent that we cannot sustain our lives or pay for the costs of government by the work of our own hands. A real Mayor uses the caring basis of law, consideration of impact on others, and fights for our lives and democratic freedoms using the principles and practices of our Charter. This is our Union Contract. No contract? No deal. Here in Peterborough, the self-serving strategies of the Mayor and council, made clear in the policies they put in writing and action, are precisely those used to tear apart families and communities and create the stresses that drive a country to war.

[10] Here, rejecting our self-determination, our right to make critical changes to stabilize our lives by addressing each element of life security, the Mayor writes bylaws aimed specifically at the removal of rights and freedoms. Why must we pay to use land we already own?

[11] *We say the Mayor has no authority, for authority is based in justice and knowledge.* His policies have no legal basis in fact, evidence or reason. Money is not a constitutionally valid basis of decision making. He does not care. There is no law enforcement. Good policy is based on simple and sound, tried and true principles and practices, tested over time from a variety of perspectives as demonstrably justified. One of those practises is honesty. It takes just one virtue as a goal to bring other virtues into play. In the structure of our Constitution, one good virtue calls into play many others. In PCH policy, instead of honest foundations in justice, we find foundations in corruption.

[12] In continually getting stung, we have simply learned to avoid the hornet's nest that is City Hall.

Every time we get a ticket, we want to know the reason. The entire structure of City Hall is devoted to denying reason. We are fed up. *Charter Section 1 requires clear reason for removal of rights, and that requires thought and communication.* City Hall does neither. They've not done the work, they refuse to, and they have broken our government-citizen contract. Why should we pay?

[13] Instead, we see at City Hall actual insanity distinctly characterized by lack of logic and reason. Using legal DSM-V diagnostic tests of mental health, we ask this: *Do the mentally ill have the right to rule over our lives?* We speak here not of a living person, though we know who wrote the policy, but of the character of City Hall evident in its policies and actions. Anyone can experience this madness at City Hall, see it in the documents, structure and operations. What City Hall has done is in sharp contrast to what we know to be healthy. Anyone can make a diagnosis based not only on what they know but on legal definitions ranging from established mental health standards to our Charter. Definitions of basic law and justice and definitions of human rights, each of which is tied to and firmly based on meeting essential human needs that come directly from the resources provided by Nature. Our downtown is clearly a social, economic and ecological disaster zone, a direct result of the policies of the Mayor and council who are obliged by law in their positions to maintain social health.

[14] Consider PCH parking policy as an example. Why, when we shop, does that experience revolve around parking meters? The language on the tickets is that of systematic institutionalized force, threat and abuse. The jobs created around this activity are horrific. No one wants this, except City Hall, and the costs inflicted on everyone are tremendous. No one in their right mind would ever create a system like this. Will parking meters save our lives or our planet? This is a small city. There are simple, easy, gentle ways of dealing with the few people that park too long. There really is no parking problem, and if there is, it is trivial and does not involve the creation of a full integrated system of authoritarian abuse with an insane level of *disproportional punishment* and vast *over-reach*. The system created by the Mayor and council is crazy. No caring parent would ever have created this system. It is the opposite of what is caring and healthy. We can only conclude it was created by people with poor mental health and hence we consider the DSM-V diagnostics defining the testable traits of ASPD (anti-social personality disorder, commonly known as sociopathy, grading from extreme delusional narcissism to psychopathy), *as individuals who habitually and pervasively disregard or violate the rights and considerations of others without remorse.* In Canada, we care for the mentally ill, and want our friends on the PCH leadership team to get the help they need by assessment and community treatment orders under the Ontario Mental Health Act.

[15] Parking is just one example. Nothing about parking meters builds our lives. Parking meters do not build community. Whose idea was this? We would never agree to this if given real choice. This is not how we address issues. We have studied it closely and found significant damage across our community. The PCH parking ticket system has all the hallmarks of a police or prison state. An actual belief that citizens are the problem and must be controlled, tied directly to the idea of the Mayor as lord and ruler over serfs issuing baseless edicts that we must obey. This is the pre-1982 British system of governance that the Mayor seeks to retain. But in 1982, we won our freedom. Now we are sworn to live freely within the decent constraints of our top laws, open for all to use. We are free under the law. But the Mayor says he is above the law, it does not apply to him, and he rejects all law outright, refusing to recognize its existence anywhere in City Hall operations or documents. There is no law but his own. We say that if the Mayor and council want to define themselves as criminals, and they have proven this in speech, writing and actions, then outside the law there is no protection. Specifically, this parking policy is being used to systematically hunt down citizens and given them no place to go or rest.

Millions are being spent on closing off all areas of rest and refuge providing common citizens and weary travellers rest and respite, systematically tracking and moving people along.

[16] The systems created by the Mayor and council are built on nothing but layers of lies, blame, misdirection, taking by force and bullying. Unending layers of complexity, expenses, costs on costs and crime on crime, force and threat. This is not our claim, but see PCH the Bylaws and ask, is there any government service left that we do not have to pay for again? Is a single one based in law? *Due to the removal of rights, it is the Section 1 legal responsibility of burden of proof for the directors of City Hall to make their case for their bylaws and policies.* Instead, they have made the case for charges against themselves including fraud, theft, extortion, abuse of position and public trust, and use of funds to break additional laws. Why should we pay for services that do nothing for us? Whereas we should certainly not pay for “services” that damage our lives.

[17] This Mayor and council refuse to respond. Instead of simply doing the work required, they have spent millions polishing their image and putting in place systems designed to block and obstruct healthy citizen relations. This is not representation. This is authoritarian rule, with significant plans to silence us, obstruct justice and render our participation in the democratic process meaningless. When we look at the PCH bylaws and documents in detail, we see no evidence at all of any understanding on the part of the directors of PCH of the role of government, the obligations of office, of significant competency or a sound basis in sane and rational decision-making. We address these issues in *Part 2*. Because systems have been imposed, one can pick any bylaw or policy as an example, from a baseless parking policy to a baseless system of tax collection.

PART 2 – CLAIMS AND EVIDENCE

2.1 INVESTIGATIVE TESTS OF COMPETENCY

[1] In the post-1982 structure of Canadian government, teachers are charged with maintaining basic standards of education. This is their legal responsibility as a service to taxpayers to ensure the proper meaning and use of words across all of government, and they are legally certified and trained to examine and grade all public documents to ensure the work was done and the topic adequately addressed. As legal guardians, their children can be assigned this work as part of their interest and education; and they have the legal right and freedom to do so. All public documents are open to the public for this assessment using Grade-school and higher educational standards as well-known tests of knowledge and competency. As an investigative tool, we have examined and graded many PCH documents for basic competency, and considered these competencies required by the Canadian Constitution for all workers in government but in particular those in position to write law and provide fiscal and social responsibility with respect to healthy citizen-government relations as detailed in our Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

[2] Similarly, all social workers in Canada are required to maintain healthy social standards across all of society and government, defending and protecting their lives as well as ours using the principles and practices of our Charter, which we all hold in common as our individual obligations to maintain the healthy functioning of our lives and country. So, what is the problem? We know certain individuals have entered our departments of social services claiming to have the authority to stop social workers from doing the job they are trained to do, even though they must be free to do so under the Charter. They

have removed best practices and insisted that the primary role of social workers is not to take actions of care for the urgent needs of citizens, but to force clients to work for corporations with all other options removed. Whereas we are well aware that their universal constitutional directives and responsibilities are far broader and contain many essential features of justice, human care and human rights central to their jobs as social workers. Those poor actors claiming authority to essentially stop social workers from doing their job of care most definitely did not have the authority to do so, as their actions removed the critical rights and freedoms required to do the job of social care under the guidance and direction of our Constitution. Now the social workers are acting illegally and not in defence of the critical components of the lives of Canadians in such urgent distress they had to appeal to the government for help.

[3] Most people do not want help. Some want to earn enough to get a bike. Others want basic shelter from the elements. Some want to stabilize their core economy by direct access to land to work to grow food. Others want to make something to sell. All want basic *Section 7* protection of their core economy of essential human needs, even at the simplest level, because despite the smartest tightest budgeting, the expenses imposed on them are always greater than what they can possibly earn. Most have experienced government as a major force against them, not useful and not helpful and not ever addressing the fundamental problems critical to life, the core components of their *Section 7* rights to life, liberty and security of the person. Their pioneer rights to build a life by the labour of your own hands, to work freely and directly with others by reasonable access to the critical resources of nature essential to survival. The right to work to grow food. The right to a type of shelter of your own choice suiting your needs and interests. The right to not have that critical choice removed. The right to not have the ideas of another person imposed on you, especially when that imposition is unreasonable, unrealistic and crushes you while it benefits the person who wrote the imposition. The *Section 7* security-of-the-person right and freedom to take reasonable risk as necessary to daily life. The social right to define a normal range of normal risks essential to daily life. The personal right to make your own decisions concerning security of the person. But to not have risks that threaten your life imposed on you (*Canada (Attorney General) v. Bedford*, 2013 SCC 72). This is the right to take normal acceptable daily risk and have injuries covered by basic health insurance, which for-profit insurance companies deny in their insatiable desire for one-way cash flows with no real risk of payout. Whereas the Mayor and council refuse discussion of this and force us into the hands of insurance companies acting against Constitutional law, even though they are now acting as agents of the government. This being one means by which politicians attack rather than defend our lives.

[4] We call these common-sense capacities critical to care for others basic competencies of moral logic that are particularly required of persons in positions of authority. That social efforts are made to give the hungry access to land and tools to grow food directly by the work of their own hands, as a human right critical to national security as issues of work and food security. Without which we have riots. That this fundamental work in the core economy of essential human needs never be interfered with or denied, for to deny Canadians this fundamental right to life is to say Canada is not their home. And further to say that the permanent destruction of land critical to survival is not an act of care, but one of the most grievous hate, and act of war against humanity and act of ultimate hate against life itself for it will drive this generation of young Canadians to dire circumstances with high risk of death. And yet this is what the Mayor and council of Peterborough are doing. Therefore we question their intents, their motives, their character and their basic competencies. And wonder why they stop us from doing what is needed to save ourselves, specifically denying all forms of legal democratic involvement in these urgent matters of greatest significance to our lives. We agree with our top judges; the basic *Section 1*

standards of competency, reason and being reasonable, are set at the lowest level to be attainable by the vast majority. Yet we see little evidence of even this lowest level of competency within PCH leaders with regards to the most critical concerns in our lives, and much evidence of foundational obstruction of justice and perversion of law. Why did this Mayor and council create social policies deliberately aiming to undermine these critical areas of national security? We are having a major crisis of food insecurity, as a direct result of the government printing more money in one year than the entire economy was worth. Effectively cutting the value of the dollar in half and doubling food prices. Yes this Mayor and council have no plans at all to step out of the way and let us grow food in robust response to local and global food crises. In fact, they vehemently resist our efforts to grow food, or to make and sell the things that we need. This is not government, this is planned collusive tyranny aimed fully at gutting the basis of our lives and economy.

[5] The *Section 15* legal requirement is for societal maintenance of social health by equitable active participation of all qualified members of society, using well-defined Constitutional principles and practices. Specifically, all persons running for office need no particular qualifications, making them equal with any other member of society. In provable statistical equality, those working in government are no less qualified by those outside government. Crime rates within government are similar to crime rates outside government. Citizens are just as qualified to write laws and decide how we wish to live, and indeed may be more qualified if no benefit can be gained, by virtue of removal of the self-serving bias and by virtue of our vaster body of best-practice knowledge and experience.

[6] In producing healthy and sound policies, the leadership team at PCH has this large public pool of knowledge to draw on which comes at no cost, which slashes expenses, and which allows our best-ideas best-practises basis of tested knowledge to express itself as our Constitutional right to self-determination under the law. Writers of documents of particular importance (*e.g.* city bylaws), especially those written by one person that impact the entire population, may lack perspective or need good editorial assistance to be consistent with our Charter. In addition, on such important matters, peer review is essential, particularly from the perspective of those impacted. And we would have this, if City Hall had obeyed the law and used the democratic structure of law and government put in place in 1982.

[7] Most bylaws deal with simple problems taking little skill to solve. The average person can find the main ideas and principles in a matter of hours. Only a grade-school level of expertise is required to study the problem and write a report. It might take a skilled person perhaps two days to write a presentable policy which could be looked at and reviewed by a number of people to remove personal bias and provide a balanced perspective. So we fully expect City Hall to have done this work and provide a reason for what they do. For years, streams of people have gone to PCH looking for the fundamental justice of *Section 1* reason for what has damaged their lives to no avail. In instead we encounter walls of totalitarian intent to rule without reason.

[8] Unfortunately, many of the documents of PCH fail to meet Grade-school standards of competency. Often the work was not done. This is the case with parking policy. There is none. PCH has simply issued edicts, and we fail to find any basis in law. There is, in general, no evidence whatsoever of knowledge of the structure of life, law and Canadian government in all the documents, practices and statements made at City Hall. We cannot consider this a simple claim of ignorance (*see Section 19 of the Criminal Code of Canada*), particularly for Charter laws designed to be an intuitive and logical fit to our natural senses and principles. The same clarity of understanding might not be said for real estate laws (requiring specialize knowledge), for example, but every grade-school student is taught the

purpose, intent and structure of Canadian government and learns basic justice in families. We are all well aware of the major change from British control to a system of self-directed self-determination as evidenced by writing our own Constitution in 1982. So this is not a matter of nit-picking details or trivial matters, but of alarm concerning major problems of the role of this local government, its legality, and the integrity and fitness of our elected officials meet their legal social responsibilities.

[9] If here we have not understood the law, such that ignorance of the law is no excuse for breaking it, then is it not the responsibility of government to make clear the law and its intent, also giving clear and understandable examples of its use so that we may obey it? What good is law so complex it cannot be understood, and its application arbitrary? Why do the directors of PCH not obey our top laws by following the easy decision-making processes made clear by our Supreme Court judges in designing our Constitution? For each law must surely have a description of the problem it aims to overcome, along with its basis in fact, evidence and reason to be considered valid? This is our understanding of the need for a common-sense reason for a law, equivalent to the *Section 1* Oakes test. To obey the law, we need to understand its basis. We need fact, evidence and reason, not edicts. But all PCH policy is like this, characterized by critical lack of common-sense competencies coupled to a profound lack of understanding of the role and responsibilities of government with regards to social care. So we are also extremely concerned with personality types entering politics with no interest whatsoever in these topics.

[10] Concerning competency, at PCH *Section 1* is a sanity test to ensure decision makers have a firm grip on reality. As a test for mental illness, it also functions as a moral test of intent to obey the law regarding concern for impact on others. As a test of citizen-engaged democracy, the related principle is *Charter Section 15*, that those within government are statistically as capable and qualified as those outside government, but the latter lack the monetary biases of writing laws that are unfair and biased. When those writing laws also control taxes and can grant themselves wages increases and benefits, the bias is toward making a great life for everyone in government and a hard life for those forced to pay for it all. *Sections 1* and *15*, firmly rooted in the realities of *Section 7*, form the core components of consent of the governed. In a democracy, all law is based on reason, fact and evidence with consideration of impact on others.

[11] We know that in each area of human endeavour there are easy entry-level principles that can be easily understood by almost everyone. We have for example, access to a good general understanding of what defines crime, or the behaviour of a sociopath (a mental health condition in which a person has a long-term pattern of manipulating, exploiting and violating the rights of others). We now have easy access to diagnostic checklists for a variety of pathological behaviours. We can compare these to the behaviour of City Hall, as artificially created person, in contrast to the expected Charter behaviour. When the behaviour is far from healthy and normal, the vast majority can easily understand what the problems are and also provide solutions. This means that almost everyone can in their understanding and decision-making attain good results at the lowest level of a *balance of probabilities*, what is most likely considering the evidence and circumstances. But for certain more complex problems of multivariate analysis requiring a significant time and depth of study, the directors of City Hall must rely on experts in the field to make good decisions meeting the highest standards of critical protection of life. But they reject this also, not understanding the problem and still wanting-making power based on whim and like/dislike alone. This is abdication of duty, when decisions are based on whim and personal preference alone, not on the *Section 1* requirements of fact, evidence and reason within the context of care and justice. This is not a matter of voting, it is a matter of careful decision making. We do not vote,

for example, on the best farming practices, but use reason, work and evidence.

[12] The Mayor and council refuse to obey the law. There are monetary biases and power biases directly tied by poorly developed cognitive functions of moral reasoning to the self-serving bias and the confirmation bias. They refuse to recognize that we rejected the brutal English system of authoritarian rule in 1982 in favour of fair and understandable self-reliant self-determination as individuals, as families, in local communities and as a country. We have the right to direct our course, personally and socially, justifiably and freely if we all act under the law. Our issue here is representation, the matter of having public say on all matters of common concern that directly impact our lives and future, the clearest example being the necessity of a healthy society focused on meeting essential human needs by the work we do. The Mayor and council simply do not accept equal benefit of the law, and they reject the rule of law, and have stated so throughout their policies.

[13] As one example of many extremely biased *Section 15* violations endemic throughout PCH, we cite Bylaw fees for monthly parking on public land we own, whereas PCH workers park free with reserved spots for the most important, by entitlement. We would pay this only if we needed to, for work. Surely our work must be the highest priority because it pays for the work done by PCH workers. Furthermore, our taxes have already paid for the parking; we own it. We know sociopaths claim what does not belong to them, often at large scale. The Criminal Code violation here is theft. As the directors of PCH reject respectful equality, we have no alternative but to emphasize their contractual role as our paid employees.

[14] We find it hard to believe that an entire leadership team cannot attain grade-school standards of proficiency, voting consistently to break the law. We struggle to find any policy or work done based on fact, evidence, reason meeting their basic job requirement of fair and balanced care for our social, economic and ecological well-being. Instead, we see a distinct set of anti-social behaviours so extreme in City Hall policy as to constitute major concerns of competency and mental health. Detailing these concerns by a series of exhaustive tests, we can only conclude corruption with intent to commit fraud beyond the shadow of a doubt. These are not mere suspicions or preponderance of evidence, but systematic working policies, means and mechanisms that could only have occurred by much work with deliberate intent.

[15] We see evidence in numerous City Hall documents of a real lack of skills and knowledge necessary to do the required work. The Mayor and council are simply not qualified to do the job, sometimes not doing it at all, and mostly doing it without any basis in law, life or reason. Exhibiting complete ignorance of the structure of life and law in Canada, with little regard or respect for the lives of others. Unable to distinguish between business and the vastly distinct role of government to represent people, they do not have the authority to issue these bylaws. We find no significant evidence of basic skill or merit amongst the leadership team, and we can test this by looking at the work that was done by various valid measures of competency. The overall result is major damage to our social, economic and ecological health required for survival. To be clear, under their system, it is impossible for children to open a lemonade stand to learn the principles of healthy fair trade commerce. This attack on the basis of the economy is absolutely disgusting and reprehensible behaviour, evidence of mental illness, and the product of people who simply do not care what happens to others.

[16] We have much evidence that the Mayor and council do not have authority, for knowledge is the basis of authority. They are not important enough to claim such an elevated economic and social status,

for important people say and do important things of great import to our lives. Instead we decline as they rise, taking everything from us by bylaws, land use policies and brute economics that forces us into the hands of unscrupulous companies that also have disregard for our lives and disdain for law. Everything of value to our community has been taken from us and handed over to corporations. We colloquially express this corruption of our lives with removal of options and freedoms as collusion, as dirty deals, as an old-boys club. The Mayor and council have no right to do “work” beyond the legitimate purposes of government.

[17] We see within most City Hall documents much evidence that the leadership team struggles with basic math, language, reading and logic skills. Their work rarely meets grade school levels of competency, much less basic social standards of care or justice. Under-performance is a well-known sociopathic trait, as these are unskilled people whose only talent is manipulation of others. Sociopaths seize control of the budget by controlling the work and pay of others, which is viewed to be of little value. We see this in levels of pay that are provably far beyond the possible human range of productivity at any level of skill or aptitude. The desire for income without labour, by entitlement alone, by taking by force, by manipulation and abuse of position, is in direct violation of multiple categories of top Canadian law not the least of which is Charter Section 15 with its many tests and applications of fair and equitable distribution of work and wages. The Mayor has no interest whatsoever in fairness or work, for obvious reasons of receiving major benefit from systems he creates that do the opposite. When it comes to money, regard for us or the law flies out the window. If we have nothing left to pay, and all opportunities for sustenance and self-determination are blocked or denied, then the Mayor and council have devised many means to remove us from our homes and drive us off the land. If we have no means by which to leave, then we find it is the intent of the Mayor and council to commit manslaughter by denying us any form of shelter. We also know the means by which this Mayor and council aim to trap us into their systems and by criminal collusion impoverish us such that the rich can buy us out and force us to move on.

[18] In summary, there is much evidence for abdication of duty, failure to meet basic job requirements and such a lack of basic competencies that we must consider the Mayor and council as having no authority. By *Section 52 of the Charter*, we must regard many of the PCH bylaws as having no basis in law and therefore being of no force or effect. As citizens, we must obey Canada's top laws and not pay into the proceeds of crime. Some citizens are concerned that the Mayor has a histrionic personality disorder, screaming and smashing his hands into tables when he does not get his way, but since this is the behaviour of a child, there is far stronger evidence for this being unsocialized childhood misconduct disorder. Whereas some express concern over pathological lying, for example in making statements in press releases that are quickly verified as untrue, the deeper concern may be mental disorders of cognitive dyslexia. Overlap of traits is possible, however, as certain self-serving and calculating personality types typically abuse public funds for personal promotion, fitting a self-aggrandizing attention-seeking histrionic disorder, and for this have much evidence for this in the PCH budget, policies, public statements and press releases. Of further concern, what are citizens to do when an elected official has symptoms of the onset of dementia, insists they are fine, but acts without self-awareness of their actual behaviour, further not cognizant of evident reality? Here we understand our *Section 12 Charter Rights (that everyone has the right not to be subjected to any cruel and unusual treatment or punishment)* as an extension of our *Section 1* right of the healthy majority to not have their lives ruled by the mentally ill. Especially not when there is significant related damage to our *Sections 4, 7 and 15* rights characterizing government against us, against our lives and future, and against our democracy.

[19] We have significant evidence at the highest standard of law, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the Mayor and council have done this, contributing significantly to activities known to destroy life on our planet. The lives of our children are under direct threat, especially in the *Section 7* area of food security affecting us locally, nationally and globally, and how is this Mayor and council responding? Zero response to our local crisis. The Mayor has stated many, many times that none of this matters. Everything is wonderful. The hungry or their representatives stand before council pleading for their rights to life, and are ignored. This is not just ignorance or lack of care, this is malice. As a result, we can only regard his being out of touch with the reality of our lives and the provable state of the world as strong and clear evidence of mental illness, poor character, incompetence and unfitness to govern.

[20] To say this summarily is not merely the expression of baseless opinion. We understand intent from the effect on our lives, and can quickly perform the rational connection test to know on a balance of probabilities the groups and persons acting against us by seeing who benefits and who does not. *Section 1* of our Constitution Act requires a clear explanation for each action of each worker in government, as the basis on which they are to defend their work and our lives using our top Canadian laws. The *reasonable limits* clause requires both reason based on fact and evidence in balance with a consideration of factors (as the living tree basis of law), and actions that are both reasonable and within limits. There must be a purpose of law, an intent, a limit and a clear explanation. Communication rights between those writing the law and those impacted by it are obvious and inherent to understanding and application of law, without which we have tyrannical politicians issuing edicts based on nothing but their whim and will, whatever they happen to think at the moment. Decision makers must have a firm grip on physical reality, for we cannot be governed by the mentally ill. Our *Section 1* rights to reason, and to reasonable behaviour, are our primary mental health rights, with sanity being directly tied to competent reasoning. When the SCC has already ruled on how our *Section 1* rights are to be used in all decision-making processes, we have a clear means by which to perform tests of the sanity and mental health of workers in government, along with grounds for dismissal based on incompetence and poor mental health. *Section 1* of the Charter is our right to not have our lives ruled and run by the mentally ill.

2.2 INVESTIGATIVE TESTS OF MENTAL HEALTH

[1] Descriptions of sociopathy are relevant to intent. We know the PCH policies are created by the belief systems of individuals, the directors. The character of the person of City Hall is relevant here in speaking to matters of intent, *specifically the abuse of Section 391 of the Municipal Act far beyond the scope and intent of legitimate government, the details of which were made explicit in our 1982 Charter*. We found PCH policies, practices and bylaws to be very much against the intent of most Ministry directives, the causal link being the state of mind of the directors. For example, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing focuses on community inclusion and a wide range of types of shelter and housing suitable to the person. The Mayor and council work against this, further appear to detest the very idea that they must work *under* the legal directives of the *Ministry of Children, Community and Social Services*. They disregard direct public orders by the Prime Minister to obey the law. Nothing in their actions or policies suggests any cooperation with Ministries or intent to involve community. Having abandoned us, they nevertheless oppose our efforts to save ourselves. Note that we consider the matter of pay proportional to proven competency, along with return of illegal gains, in another section as relevant to intent to violate *Section 15* laws.

[2] What could cause such deeply anti-social behaviours? We sought an explanation in personality types that gravitate toward finding positions of power over others. We mapped the behavioural characteristics of the legal person of PCH and found significant traits matching persons with mental health conditions in the narcissist – sociopath – psychopath spectrum centered on personality types with tendencies to disregard and abuse the rights of others. We cannot attest as to the state of mind of the individuals writing policies to give PCH this disreputable personality, these being internal to their belief systems. However, we can submit the written policies as evidence and attest to their effects on us which are most probably tied directly to intent.

[3] Although each of us believes ourselves to be a reasonable person, we may also lack the external perspective to prove that is the case. We therefore rely on the documentary evidence and contrast these with our top laws. When many of us encounter the same problems at PCH, it is quite likely statistically that as a group we can be defined as reasonable people, and we further have taken pains to remove many inherent biases by used of physically well-grounded models as social reference points.

[4] Overall, we are quite alarmed by many PCH policies damaging our lives that lack any firm basis in the physical reality of our lives. By *rational connection*, we are concerned that the authors of such policy have states of mind also disconnected from reality. The PCH belief systems expressed in policy appear to be consistent with fantasies of anomalous and infinitely increasing income without labour, but at odds with the reality of our lives in which we must work very hard to add value to these otherwise worthless printed notes called Canadian currency. We find outrageous the claims by PCH that we somehow owe them for the abuse they dish out and the damaging actions they take against our lives. Of particular concern are their claims to have the unmitigated right to control essential components of our lives to the extent of complete removal of self-determination. We are further alarmed that they find this normal. What is the realistic basis of these bylaws that could be presented as fact, evidence and reason before a judge? Why do the directors of PCH exhibit contempt for our justice system, and complete with callous disregard for the basis of law, consideration of impact on others? Is this an expression of who they are?

[5] A certain personality type rushes to positions of power over others. They have an authoritarian belief system, legally testable as an authoritarian belief scale. Self-serving self-obsessed narcissists grade across a spectrum of behaviours extending to sociopathy, those who take pleasure in manipulating and controlling others. Assuming rights denied to others. Who take pleasure in deciding the fate of others, in punishing those who have committed no crime, who make fees arbitrary and in proportion to what they want, who get exciting by breaking the law, who want to see what they can get away with. The rules apply to others not to them. They are above the law. No one dares question them. There will be silence. Removing rights, controlling the lives of 84 000 others in fine detail. Rejecting not only the law, but the basis of law. Here, we assess the behaviour of City Hall, by incorporation a legal person, using numerous legal documents including criminal code, contract law and legal diagnostic tools to assess mental illness, the DSM-V and the psychopathy checklist.

[6] Although we use the word sociopathy for ease of understanding, the actual mental disorder that makes this handful of people unfit to direct City Hall is ASPD, antisocial personality disorder. This accounts for the removal of systems of social health from City Hall. In the authoritarian belief scale, a small percentage of the population believes they have the right to rule over others based on their belief system alone. Only what they think matters. Commonly this involves denial of reality and delusions of

grandeur. Grand actions, wherein every city building must be an architectural marvel with no expense spared despite the actual activities being humble matters of street cleaning and collecting garbage. Authoritarian personalities with narcissistic tendencies who evolve into totalitarian rulers by seizing complete power over everything, for example, ignore reality and consistently claim that there are no problems, that everything is wonderful and only going to get better. We cite as evidence of this numerous press releases and public statements by the Mayor.

[7] *All government workers are reminded that the legal requirements of their behaviour are written into our Union contract, the Constitution Act and its well-known summary, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.* This is the legally binding job description making clear what their behaviours must be. You are paid to represent and defend us by using the principles and practices of our Canadian Constitution, a constitutional union contract designed to defend life security for all, not just those in government. You cannot deny basic shelter to others while somehow claiming you have the right to a home and a car complete with dental and retirement benefits, for that is not the realistic basis of life security. Food security is a clear example; you must defend the rights of everyone to grow food, for that is the clear and common basis of food security within our common *Section 7* rights to life, liberty and security of the person. When workers in government defend our universal rights to life, their lives are also protected? Why can the Mayor not understand this? We are equal and united in our common needs! Growing food is a low-risk high-reward activity associated with extremely low crime rates because it meets common essential human needs critical to health and well-being. To go any other route is a fundamental incitement of violence consistently against national security, which occurs when people do not have or cannot afford food and are blocked from growing it. Why is this Mayor against us, intent on grinding the lives of the most vulnerable? Those who have little, naturally, simply by graduating high school. Who find all opportunity denied, all healthy social structures removed and the odds stacked against them.

[8] We say that the mentally ill do not have the right to rule over our lives. Those with a profound inability to see past themselves and consider the impact of their actions on others are unfit for the position, as the basis of law is consideration of impact on others. Sociopaths start as schoolyard bullies and quickly evolve tactics to lie, cheat, steal, threaten and manipulate others. They lack empathy, and smile as they scheme to control and disrupt your life, making life hell for everyone around them as they take the budget for themselves. They think that everything, the land and your life, belongs to them, for their benefit alone. Sociopaths are happy and willing to drive people to despair, to drive the lives of many to ruin. World War II was caused by sociopaths claiming ownership of other countries, the people and resources. This personality disorder affecting about 1% of the population grades into full-blown mental illness with complete disregard for law and contempt for the lives of others. They attack all healthy social structures. Attacking people to unlimited extent, when they already have life security guaranteed by taxation. They simply do not care what happens.

[9] We cite principles of honesty, care and morality, matters that residents commonly discuss as absent within PCH to the point of moral outrage. According to the Mayor, we are not allowed to use the correct, exact and accurate language used by our Canadian judges, saying it like it is. That their policies cannot stand the light of scrutiny serves to clarify yet another characteristic trait of sociopaths, that they aim to control communication itself. That they do not care is expressed clearly in policy, and the Mayor and council have effectively blocked all means of effective communication, including on public bulletin boards. Our concern here is institutionalized bullying, threat and intimidation, taking by force. With multiple layers of strategies of silencing aimed at complete removal of recourse. They have a

replaced our Canadian system of caring democracy with the full working mechanisms of an authoritarian state. We did not agree to this. We never will agree to this. This is illegal and contemptuous.

[10] We've run experiments. Take a hundred otherwise normal people, then randomly select a few to call guards, the rest prisoners. The immediate effect is removal of the rights and freedoms. There was no actual crime, but we get an us-versus-them situation that quickly degrades into extreme abuses, into shocking acts against people. Government as separate from the lives of those struggling to pay for it all, government against people, acting against every human need, acting against us. The concern here is a personality predisposition amongst those seeking political positions to view themselves as above others and to view others dimly. We see no real solution to this other than to follow the SCC plan for democratic engagement using the principles, practices and processes of the Constitution Act.

[11] If you add to this mix someone with a serious personality disorder, extreme authoritarian beliefs, extreme narcissism grading into full blown sociopathy or psychopathy, people with actual mental illness and predatory behaviours, who rule by fear, lies, manipulation, sneaky deception, power plays and outright bullying, that creates a sick hostile culture in which no one except the perpetrator does well. This is the culture in operation at City Hall, written into the policies and actually experienced by citizens and staff. It's not us. It's not the staff. It's a good healthy system that has been taken over and twisted by the mentally ill, willing to say and do anything to get power and money. Granting themselves special rights, removing the rights of others. Textbook sociopathy. Toxic work environments. The traits of tyrants and dictators, who in Canada and worldwide turn good government into a despotic force against people. Who twist and reverse all good principles and remove all best practices.

[12] In Peterborough parking policy, for example, parking is free for City Hall, but everywhere else citizens must pay to shop, pay to use the land they already own. What is the reason? What is the principle? They are special, we are not. We paid for those roads and parking lots, why must we pay again? Why are we paying for the full abuse this ticketing system that comes with, a system we neither want nor need, that does not address real problems, that serves no purpose? That is against life, against what we need to do to live? No one wants this vast interference with free trade, not when we have simple and easy ways to deal with the very few people who overstay a visit. City Hall was not the harmed person, yet they get the money along with incentives for harsh, hard and ruthless enforcement.

[13] Our top Canadian judges know this, and in 1982 they wrote the effective remedies against tyrannical practices committed by those in government who aim to take control the work of others and take the budget for themselves. Causing chaos, ruining the lives of everyone around them. But sociopaths reject our top laws outright. They reject all law, and the basis of law, saying that only what they think matters. This is not uncommon. It's about one percent of the population, and they seek positions of power over others and are disproportionately represented in these positions. These are sick, sick people that need testing and treatment under the Ontario Mental Health Act, not to be put in charge of the lives of others and certainly not our money.

[14] We know how bullying and authoritarian rule can quickly change things for the worse. From war, we have a short list of the things not to do, thing that remove community and social health, but the Mayor and council have taken in Peterborough actions against our Ministries, angering us and many at the highest levels of authority. *Canada is signatory to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*

(UDHR) and has devoted itself to neither go to war nor to degrade the social conditions in Canada to the state in which basic human needs for food, work and shelter cannot be met. For many in Peterborough, that crisis is already here. When these urgent issues are brought before the Mayor and council, they sit in stone-faced silence, then move on to trivial matters of what they can do for themselves. And in writing we see this hate tied to tactics of war against citizens, awarding themselves with life security and using land use policies to deny others any chance at all to gain even basic life security by the work of their own hands. This is not representation, to work against those in extreme distress, actively violating Articles 1, 3, 5 and 7 of the UDHR along with major categories of our Canadian Charter. We know exactly what type of person violates *Section 12* of our Charter, because after WWII we took great pains to map out the dimensions of personality specifically the mental health issues of sociopaths who always abuse money, people and the rights of others.

[15] Is this the year 1800 and the country England, that they act as lords over serfs? This is not a joke or insult, but in reference to the pre-1982 laws written two centuries ago, imported into Canada and still in use at City Hall, purposed for oppression and in sharp contrast to the independent Constitutional laws we have written for our own self-directed self-determination, aimed at care, not control and plunder. Our lives are not a joke.

[16] In writing PCH policy, the directors use only the pre-1982 parts of our Constitution Act, deliberately cherry-picking what suits them and ignoring everything post-1982 including the basis of law (*Section 1*). This is the case with all their policy, and we imagine that the Mayor wishes things could go back to the way they were in 1950. But things have changed. We have real problems of climate, population, over-extension of resources, degradation of farms, forests and fisheries to the extent that major ecosystems in Canada have already collapsed. Most recently, the Atlantic smelt. We are in serious trouble. *The most precious land in Peterborough, waterfront critical to our lives, to stores and tourism, is a social, economical and ecological disaster zone, specifically due to policies created by City Hall.* The Mayor and council have slated the most critical land necessary for our survival for irreversible destruction for the sole purpose of taking more money for themselves. This is the only group in society capable of having written these land use policies. Millions are pouring in to a *Department of Economic Development* with no obvious results, so where is the money going? The wise use of land is clearly of public concern by being critical to our rights to life. All of this would be solved by the public use of public land and buildings giving people places to go.

[17] Why do we see at City Hall behaviours that are callous, cold, calculating, unemotional in response to seeing vulnerable people in distress and dire need standing before council, to be met with a later press release by the Mayor saying everything is wonderful? We see, in actual performance and evident throughout City Hall documents, a real lack of skills, the avoidance of real work to which they can be held accountable, and the shifting of work and blame to others. We see in the buildings a vastly over-rated sense of self-importance with delusions of unlimited wealth and power. Actions that are financially and socially irresponsible, impulsive, dishonest and manipulative, all tied to the requirement of undue admiration and attention. Exhibitions of power over others for powers sake, parking policy being just one example of many, the lack of respect and boundaries, the need for complete dominance over the lives and work of others, and a love for working around the rules, getting around the law, breaking the law.

[18] Concerning entitlement, an elevated income by title alone fully divorced from any measures of competency and completely separated from any measurable productivity, with pay far beyond what is

possible for any human to do in a day, we are alarmed by widespread *financial Section 15 violations* within PCH. In the context of mental health concerns, we find these tied to open bullying, in person and on parking tickets containing the most foul and abusive language tied to threats of force, which if addressed directly before council exposes actual cowardice. We find major actions to polish image to be tied directly to schemes to avoid real work. We find the lack of moral courage to do the right thing to be tied to a lack of empathy and sense of fairness, equity, equality or justice. Our concern is thus with a personality type uncontrollably obsessed with money and power to the extent of neglect of all other considerations. As citizens fell into social and economic distress after Covid lockdowns, the PCH directors refused to respond and instead turned PCH into an investment company. This results in giving City Hall the textbook character of sociopathy, in strong contrast to the legal requirements of behaviour of Charter law. Law requiring a firm grounding in justice tied to reality, the provable matters of fact, evidence, reason and logic with care and concern for the impacts of the actions of City Hall on citizens.

[19] The serious concerns of citizens are treated like a joke by the Mayor and council. As an expression of dominance and unilateral decision-making in policy, only their ideas and beliefs matter. Major abuses of Freedom of Belief are of great concern when Freedom of Association has been denied, with Charter law treated with disdain and disregard. We know the reality of our lives, what downtown looks like, what struggles we face, the outlook for our lives, and the future our kids face. When the Mayor rejects all reality, along with the basis of law, and constantly states everything is fine, there are no problems and things are only going to get better, how can we not take this as a true and accurate statement by the Mayor that he either treats our lives and future as a joke or has completely lost touch with reality? This significant difference between what we believe to be the role of government, and the actions of the Mayor is a matter of major concern. Our common beliefs, widely accepted throughout society and backed by a mountain of evidence concerning the state of the world, form the basis of what is considered healthy and normal. As these are fundamental matters critical to life and death discussed at a Constitutional level, a firm *Section 1* basis for our claims is required.

[20] *Concerning our Fundamental Claims for Section 1 Unfitness of this Mayor and Council.* Our fundamental claim is that our beliefs concerning the role and purpose of government differ significantly from the beliefs of the Mayor, along with most of council and certain members of staff, concerning role and purpose. This touches on fundamental Charter matters of Freedom of Belief, Freedom of Expression, Freedom of Association, and Freedom of conscience, with the latter restricted in this context to matters of fundamental justice expressing themselves as common beliefs in rule of law.

[21] Concerning Freedom of Belief and Freedom of Expression, we believe people must be free to believe and say whatever they want, but that these freedoms are limited by considerations of negative impact on others. We distinguish here between baseless expressions of opinion and expressions of opinion based on fact, evidence, reason and logic as the basis of law and good human relations. We understand we are free to have unique beliefs, but must also be free to not have the beliefs of others forced on us against our will to damaging effect. In Canadian context, we understand our Freedom of Belief to be essential to life, law, respect for diversity and the complexity of Nature, and inclusion of different but respectfully related points of view in our cultural mosaic. At the foundational and the Charter level, we are concerned here with what is common to all as forming the basis of language and law, with fact and evidence, logic and reason confirmed as excellent descriptions of physical reality closely tied to our physical senses and perceptions of reality.

[22] We all believe in things we cannot neither see nor prove. We believe in intangible ideas of point,

line and plane, and integers for counting, and written letters to represent spoken sounds used for expression and description of what we see, touch, taste, smell and hear. These common beliefs based on our biologically equivalent common senses are used in drawing and language, as one of several means of communication. We believe in these ideas because they are useful and helpful. We can do a lot with these ideas. In moving from ideas to writing or drawing, and in the close relation between our ideas and our understanding of physical reality, we move from Freedom of Belief to Freedom of Expression. When we then express ourselves physically, the result may be a violin concerto, the invention of a violin itself, a work of art, or a skyscraper. When we see a parking meter, for example, we understand this as an expression of the beliefs of its makers. This is what they believe in. We are thus mightily concerned with any baseless Freedom of Expression, particularly that tied to sheer force of will without basis which harms rather than helps and further lacks integrity with our common basis of understanding. We understand fraud as the lack of foundational integrity, there being a significant difference between what a person says and what they do. At issue here are the foundational principles of fundamental justice, which might be greatly clarified by a scientific basis as required by *Section 1*. Our common beliefs form the basis of math, logic, reasoning and language, allowing us to describe the natural world very well, to such extent as to provide the basis of fact and evidence in a court of law.

[23] These particular sets of common reality-based beliefs are of vital importance to this case. The word water means water and nothing else, the symbol is H₂O, and on this matter there is an incredible database of world knowledge. However, at City Hall, words like public do not mean public, for the Mayor and council are confused about the basic meaning of words. They are also confused about the role of government, which is very clear to everyone else, and they think it is a business, a different role entirely. They deny the law, and the basis of law, and anything to do with reality or the reality of our lives. This is not an accusation, this is what the Mayor says regularly and puts into writing and into action. We are not impressed. We say here, for example, that we do not believe in the significance of the worthless pieces of paper the Mayor puts on our windshields, expecting us to believe their validity as a parking ticket. We request the basis of this belief but find none and get no response. We can also say that we do not believe in the value of the our Canadian currency, particularly as they too are worthless notes when freshly printed and remain that way until our labour adds real value.

[24] We believe we are addressing here the root of verifiable honesty, directly tied to belief in ideas that are valuable in being useful and helpful, directly tied to valuable personality traits of being useful and helpful, directly tied to the role and purpose of good and beneficial government. We believe this package of ideas and their expression in life is not particularly difficult for the average person to attain, with a reasonable person being a key reference point of law. At this level of a primary interaction between citizens and our elected government representatives, we say it is not helpful for them to refer to various Acts as justification, but to use the primary justification of law based on fact, evidence, reason and consideration of impact on others. Nevertheless, when we have investigated these Acts, we have also found the claims of the Mayor and council to be baseless, of distorted interpretation and at odds with our lives and Constitution. We consider this misdirection to be fundamentally not helpful, and in most cases a purposeful act of obstruction of justice. Freedom of Belief matters. What happens if we do not believe in paying tax? That too is our right, particularly when there is breach of trust and abuse of position that directly threatens our lives and future. The role of government is to protect and defend, not gut our lives and destroy our future.

[25] These matters are so important that we must consider them further. Again we turn to our commonly held beliefs, in particular that set of beliefs that are found to be incredibly useful in

describing physical reality and forming the basis of language and law, but now the direction of our arguments is how the Mayor and council have removed our Freedom of Expression.

[26] We all believe in things we can never see, touch, measure or prove to have physical existence. Certain ideas have proven to be very useful in describing the world in close correspondence with our senses. These are the axioms of point, line, plane and time forming the basis of drawing and relating events, math, language, law and the physical sciences. Numbers and letters, critical to counting what we see as separate objects, describing thought and communicating ideas. Comparisons of larger, smaller, in, out and their expression as logical operators. Their use in proofs of measurement and geometry and the mathematics of line, number, addition and subtraction. A package of related ideas, very useful to build things, that closely corresponds how we engage with the natural world by our senses. The inequalities, for example, tie directly to our sense of fairness, equitable access to the resources required for survival. We express these matters here using a language that is as understandable as possible, and yet backed by mountains of verifiable science touching on the roots of physical reality and our understanding of what it is to be human. We say this knowing our Constitution does not contain a modern description of our fundamental freedoms, and so may not have *Section 1* validity, but suffices in this case.

[27] The integrity of this common basis set of understanding is so powerful as to form the basis of all educational systems worldwide. We believe in ideas that provide benefit. We are free, of course, to believe anything, but what we call sanity is a test of the beliefs of one person with respect to our common beliefs. What we know to be true given what we have, based on fact, evidence and proof, the information available, is our foundation of life and law. We have room for extraordinary beliefs, as long as they are testable and firmly grounded in our basis of reason, a full grasp, for example, of the underlying mathematics and language. We understand very well our common essential human needs and their source, and we know what activities bring us life. This basis set is open, not closed. Defining it creates a reference point from which we can address what is missing, what we do not know and the remainder, what we perhaps cannot know (the root of our axioms, the questions of spirit and consciousness, the nature of life and existence).

[28] From these beliefs, our common axioms, we can draw, plan and make manifest our ideas in buildings and architecture. Anything we make or build is a form of expression of our ideas. We understand that business is based on creative problem solving to meet a need. We know this as Freedom of Expression. Concerning bylaws, when both the problem and the solution are undefined, this Mayor and council have denied us Freedom of Expression on critical matters of self-determination where they have maximally interfered with our lives in areas of urgent matters of survival. Our ideas matter and our solutions can be verified as better than the Mayor's for they conform to law and logic and exhibit care and concern for the impact of our actions on others. They could have solved various problems simply and reasonably, but have not done so and deny us our right to change what damages our lives. The Mayor is free to express himself in bylaws, and in showing what he believes in (for example by installing panhandling parking meters), but we say these are immoral, criminal, damaging and illegal. We say these are public documents and it is our Charter duty to work for public good. They are under our domain in the Charter; we directly challenge them, it is our right and duty to do so, and we will change them if necessary using the principles and practices of law.

[29] We believe in democracy, and see communication as natural to debate and a necessary requirement of life and law. We know the lack thereof as denial of essential human rights to solve problems and use

our best ideas to move forward to a fair and sustainable future. Without sustainability, without attendance to essential human needs and their provable source in Nature, our kids face a grim future. That is what the Mayor denies in removing our fundamental rights to have a say in matters directly impacting our lives and the lives and future of our children. On the question of ownership of public land and how we choose to live, we say this is our home. The Mayor says no, you have no right to such fact-based decision making, and you cannot touch the land, but he offers no sane basis for his actions. So we are highly alarmed and with concerns about both sanity and legality must instead consider means, motive and opportunity along with money trails in regards to social and economic crime.

[30] At the heart of our claim, at the moment of our experience with a parking meter, or a ticket, or the first-generation robots that dispense justice by defining guilt, deciding violation and dispensing justice in one unit, we have our human sense of right or wrong, friend or foe, protection or predation. Without our consent, the Mayor has put our lives in the hands of a corporation creating artificial intelligence systems of surveillance and control forcing us to pay into their schemes of unlimited profit. How can these actions which we sense as against us increase safety or life security? We say there are social predators in government, not many, but enough to damage our lives and force us to deal with them based on law, fact and evidence of the damage they do.

[30] Here we claim that the vast majority of people inherently sense that these activities of City Hall have nothing to do with what matters to life and in are fact against life. When we meet the people that created these systems, the Mayor and council, we see a calculated superficial friend, but we have experienced by evidence of interaction and actual working policy a foe. The actual policies are at odds with what they say, and also in contrast to the good intent of our laws. We naturally question integrity, and become quite alarmed when we ask a question but get indirect, convoluted or deceptive answers. Or no answer at all, tied to many tactics to refuse discussion. Again, at the root of our biological wiring, which is a critical matter of survival to which our senses are exquisitely tuned and forming the fundamental basis of justice, we are well aware of the difference between protection (ethics, based on sound skills of moral reasoning) and predation (tactics, actions against us based on strategies of war).

[31] We firmly believe that the purpose of government is protection, not predation. We do not pay for predation, the forceful taking from our lives by denial of reality and rejection of law. We do not pay for abuse activities that are demonstrably against life and the freedoms needed to live – specifically those linked to work done to meet essential human needs. How do parking meters, for example, create food security? We understand that the package of rights in our Charter is by necessity organized into categories, and we do not say that the right to life, liberty and security of the person applies only to arrest and imprisonment, as a prevention, but as a positive force obliging us to at least protect and nurture life, our lives and the realistic basis of life. *We say that national security is based on personal security, and that Section 7 could defensibly be described thus: care for people and the ecosystems that sustain our lives as the sole basis of the economy.* We do not believe in a government against this. We have neither trust nor confidence in a government against our lives, and this is the case against the Mayor and council of Peterborough, parking policy being but one example.

[32] We do have confidence in the people of Peterborough, our families, neighbours and friends, in their sense and sensibility, for not one caring parent would ever propose to do what the Mayor has done. On issues of meeting common, essential human needs by the work we do, we are united and unified, of one heart and mind as a community and as a country. Work unifies us. Food unifies us. Every essential human need unifies us. The right to a survivable future for our children unifies us. Our

fundamental human rights and principles of fairness, reason, law and justice unify us.

[33] Concerning our fundamental freedoms, every right was won in pain and bloodshed, often at massive scale, screamed in justifiable anger and in no uncertain terms. So in reading this, understand the vehemence of our tone concerning the actions of PCH against us. You would not want to hear the actual language used to describe what we think about the actions the Mayor and council have taken against us on this matter and many others. In times past, the charges would be treason and we'd have pitchforks and brooms dipped in tar and set aflame. But we believe in our sane peaceful process of justice, and submit to that, for Canadian law is closely aligned with our values.

[34] Concerning our larger global issues and their impact on us locally, we say we have many solutions that if acted on would work to save the lives of our children. Most of which are friendly community-based activities. Some of which require social organization for effective work at the appropriate scale. We believe it is the role and purpose of government to fulfill this critical social role of care. All of which this Mayor and council resist. Here we are concerned with farms and forests, and to some extent fisheries, and their critical role in health and well-being, social and national security. Work and food security, as the basis of social security. Our capacity to be self-sufficient, rather than vulnerable, and to respond to large impacts such as food security and attaining a local role in responding to larger crisis elsewhere in the world. The realistic basis of life security. Within that is the issue of understanding reality. We know most of viable life exists between the soil level and the height of trees. We know most of the active atmosphere critical to climate extends only to the tops of clouds. We know that both these scales are observable and finite. This is not a big issue beyond our control, but one that may be addressed by local actions such as tree planting that also ensure we have enough wood for furniture. Concerning climate and local weather patterns, we know that plants respond much like we do. We have a powerful basis set in physics for all matters of thermometry directly tied to the boiling and freezing points of water. A parent knows exactly what a 1-2 degree fever means to their child. One degree is the difference between freezing and thawing. We are well aware of a room slightly too cool. We know exactly what this means to us, to crops and to the weather. What are we to do with and Mayor and council that reject all of this, and further deny our rights to save ourselves? In this, we see no option but to follow the SCC plan for a healthy engaged democracy, knowing we have a significant database online and in the scientific literature coupled to significant expertise within our community.

[35] *Section Summary.* We say we have an excellent grasp of the reality of our lives and in particular the meaning, intent and consequences of each and every PCH policy. When we bring these matters up before council, we get no response or are dismissed or mocked. Everything is a joke. Or, if taken seriously, nothing is done. What follows is a continual stream of baseless expressions of opinion (as council chats idly about nothing at all), in person, in policy, as glossy flyers, and as vapid press releases utterly devoid of real content. There is no substance, and we understand this as either avoidance of reality, purposeful distortion of the truth (a component of fraud) or the actual state of mind of someone without a grip on reality that is quantifiably insane.

[36] We say the Mayor and council reject our *Section 16* language rights to use accurate descriptive language as our *Section 1* obligations to describe what we see occurring at City Hall, and further reject their legal duty to respond. We see truthful and accurate response as essential to democracy. Whereas it is true that accurate descriptive language might not sound good, by having moral implications, yet it nevertheless describes the reality of our situation. We know that our use the word 'fraud' will be intensely disliked by those who commit fraud, but when we use that word their recourse can always be

reference to fact, evidence, proof and reason as the basis of law. In this context we understand the use of various silencing techniques for matters that cannot stand scrutiny or debate. Nevertheless, we have the language of law and of judges as social norms used to accurately state what is plainly the case. Here we use the language of law, along with its equivalent colloquial expression to aid understanding of the law, to describe the actual situation in its relevant context. We must do this, for we are required to use our top laws in balance of living tree doctrine to conduct our lives and they have been written for this purpose. We do this easily in our lives, work and household budgets, so why can't the Mayor and council do this as well?

[37] The language we use here is far gentler than the language and level of unmitigated threat the Mayor has written on parking tickets and throughout policy. Here we are addressing far graver categories of crime, those that directly impact our lives and remove from us the possibility of a healthy, fair and sustainable future for our children requiring us to tackle our very real urgent issues in caring connected community. Surely this is the role and function of a local City Hall? Where else can we go to do this? This must be the purpose and role of local government, to address the critical issues facing our lives and future. What are we to think, when the Mayor disregards the law, and even rejects the basis of law, fact, evidence and reason, to issue edicts without basis that clearly damage our lives?

[38] Again, when representatives of the hungry and homeless appear before council, they are met with stone-faced silence, then dismissed as council goes on to discuss trivial matters of no concern to anyone except to themselves. All press releases have to do with what City Hall is doing for themselves, with their growth and it is all talk. For decades now we have seen no real action in our lives and communities to address our very real and urgent problems. Instead, City Hall is widely known to be the source of trouble and crime, not a place of care and justice, *demonstrably against the law and against the goals of the Police and the Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General*. We have many examples on the public record of extreme uncaring to hateful behaviour with zero interest in representation. This is not a claim or accusation, this is how City Hall operates, backed by evidence created by the Mayor and council, with their personal character being described in the policies they wrote. The Mayor has produced much evidence of delusion and antisocial criminal intent in public statements and made clear throughout City Hall documents. In focusing on the complete removal of recourse with rejection of due process, and by refusing to listen to reason, we see the Mayor has no intent to engage in legitimate activities of government expressed by Constitutional representation and defence of our lives. We further see aims to subvert the justice system and reject the basis of law (*Section 1*).

[39] When we in general know the difference between war and peace, order and chaos, good and evil, right and wrong, must we protest in the streets to get justice? No. Protest has gained us nothing and we have care and respect for the fundamental dignity and worth of our person. We make our case based on our legal and moral responsibilities to law and society and express our full confidence in the sane rationality, care and knowledge of our Canadian judges. We trust in our fundamental Freedoms of Belief, expressed as the fair and reasonable principles and practices of evidence-based justice, with all things considered in healthy balance as one would assess the health of a living tree.

2.3 EXTREME BIAS EXTENDING TO MALICE, INTENT TO ENSLAVE

[1] Here we consider the basis of normal human cognitive bias, its worsening by certain personality types and its extension to active malice in PCH activities ranging from social predation to criminal

intent, and intent to enslave. Peterborough used to be a place of healthy natural abundance. Now it is a social, economic and ecological disaster zone. The Mayor says citizens have no right to touch or change anything, and he insists on maintaining the most destructive practices of the past, even as they provably ruin our lives and future. It is well known our kids have no future here. The Mayor says that we have no right as citizens to do the work needed to save ourselves, to secure our lives, to save our children. Only he has the right to direct the lives of 84 000 residents, and to do so in fine detail down to our every last dime, but we say he has such evident biases and limits of knowledge as to make him fundamentally unqualified for that task.

[2] Amongst the many human biases, the two most relevant to this case are the self-serving bias and the confirmation bias. The self-serving bias has origins in human survival, expressed as the desire of an individual to live and not die. This is a force to ensure that the necessities of life and the resources required for survival are present, either sufficiently or in healthy abundance. This grades from a healthy necessity for personal care into selfish behaviours with a declining sense of concern for the well-being of others. The self-serving bias is expressed as a set of actions, beliefs and behaviours ranging from good and healthy to sick and damaging. This bias is so important it is a major subject of ongoing debate in many relationships. It is overcome by outward-focused social care, for example parental care and protection of children. The confirmation bias relates to the response we get from our actions. Is it positive? Negative? Thirty teachers apply for one job. The one getting the job has confirmation bias, often used to assign negative properties to those who did not get the job. Or, someone getting a job in government soon forgets the massive hardships of working outside government, under the expenses and rules government imposes. Increasing pay increases the sense of self-importance, which is a negative feedback loop when not tied to measurable competency or reality-based points of comparison expressed as useful productivity or improved service.

[3] In finance, for example, these inherent biases produce the following inequalities. It is far easier to spend than it is to earn. It is far easier to spend money on yourself than to spend that money on someone else. It is even easier to spend someone else's money, as that incurs no personal risk. It is very easy to spend money on experiences and things that entertain but do not build basic life security. Things that are nice but not needed. When you have a lot of money, it is easy to spend foolishly thinking there is plenty and more to come. Based on your recent past, things will only get better. One grows accustomed to spending, and to overspending with no consequence, with stupid spending "repaired" simply by increasing taxes and adding fees rather than by fixing problems. To spend on things that do not build life security. If one adds a negative view about the value of the work of others, the societal results are disastrous, accumulating to actions of government against people.

[4] These biases generate inherent mechanisms of inequality in government-citizen relations that can only be addressed by sound debate between those paying for the service and those paid to provide the service. Things go awry when someone in government decides to take by force without reason and shuts down all possible means of debate, communication and recourse. As they take more, finding success in these tactics, their sense of power and importance increases with their income. This is the confirmation bias. Those taking without regard to others then lose touch with reality and refuse discussion based on fact, evidence and reason. Fairness, which is the question of reciprocity, is rejected in favour of trickery or brute force. Those predisposed to sociopathy, a character type that runs for office because they easily lie and believe they have the right to take over and tell others what to do, thus create the top-down situations and abuses of power in which their worst human behaviours are given free reign to operate.

[5] This inequitable to abusive situation is worsened by specific personality types that simply cannot see past themselves to recognize the impact of their actions on others. However, consideration of impact on others is the basis of law, as is fairness, ranked high within the foundational principles of justice. Were decision-making to have a factual basis in the practical meeting of essential human needs, then *the biological definition of fairness is equitable access to the resources required for survival*. But this is what the power-hungry sociopath seeks to deny. It would be inherently unfair, for example, to create land use bylaws designed to remove fundamental human needs, for surely in a fair society there should be some means by which a hungry person could access land to do the work required to feed themselves. Surely we could arrange that. We call this protection of work in our core economy of essential human needs such a critical necessity for the survival of civilizations that it is a universal and *Section 7* Charter right to life, liberty and security of the person.

[6] Protection of citizens from what? From those seeking income without labour (IWOL) by controlling the lives of others to such extent that the primary workers who support all of society cannot live. The primary characteristic of IWOL extremists is that they seek lives far richer than they could possibly have built by the work of their own hands. Their “work” is monetary mining of the lives of others, reducing the value of money, goods and services. Persons engaged in this type of work produce nothing of value and add no value to products and services, and could not have enriched themselves without harnessing the skills and labour of others, taking credit for work they did not do. As we work to build life, liberty and security of the person, monetary miners devise all sorts of schemes to drain us. Our lives can be driven to ruin by these activities, the Criminal Code violation being theft. The human rights violation concerns at least *Sections 1, 7 and 15* violations which if done systematically at large scale is the crime of statistical indentured servitude. Large segments of the population can never work hard enough to gain even basic life security of essential human needs or are in inescapable permanent lifetime debt for those needs, all due to the imposition of an unfounded belief in infinite exponential growth which we know to be a provably false fantasy promoted by those who benefit from this belief.

[7] The job of governance, for an elected official, requires the ability to see past yourself and see the lives of others. This is our right to representation. Anyone who cannot do that, and specifically those with types of mental illness who lack the ability or desire to act as representatives, is legally defined on the basis of well-established diagnostic *Section 1* standards to be unfit for the job requirements. The primary concern with respect to enslavement is disregard for equality under the law. Balanced decision making, and the authoritative power to decide, rests on understanding of fact and evidence coupled to the capacities to reason within the context of justice. This is your right to decide the most critical aspects of your life and how you wish to live, in the context of consideration of the impact of your actions on others as the basis of law and relationships. The State must not interfere with your capacity to build up a life for yourself from scratch by the labour of your own hands. Amongst the directors of Peterborough City Hall are certain persons saying you must do what they tell you to do, and you have no say. Persons aiming for complete control of all aspects of your life and every action, and if they do not like it, they stop you. Further, they impose a life on you that you do not want, acting to remove all your rights and freedoms to do even the most reasonable things. The worst are slavers, characterized refusal to do any primary work that creates real value, instead engaging entirely in schemes designed fully to extract the value from your work and undermine your life security. Seeking passive income, income without labour, unfairly harnessing the labour of others, creating convoluted language and mathematics designed to confuse and obfuscate and say that what is untrue is true, reversing intent. The goal is to build a life for themselves far greater than they could have by the labour of their own hands, typically

by legal manipulation and financial schemes coupled to tactics of force and threat, bullying, power plays, attacks, pathological lying and profound distortions of truth. They have no problem with destroying lives, ecosystems, entire countries and the planet for personal gain. If you cross them, they will dedicate their lives to killing or destroying you, putting you out of work, ruining your career. Some say all of society must obey them, claiming the purpose of your life is to serve and worship them. I say no, that is most definitely not the purpose of my life, for I come under two authorities, that of God and equality under the law. It is not the purpose of my life to enrich the already-rich.

[8] There is a strong need, a definite necessity, for those impacted by the law to have equal say and be on equal legal and moral footing with those writing the law, and *this is the intent of Section 15 Charter law*, to have broader equality of citizen-government relations, a legal and moral say in determining the shape and course of their lives. Yet when those in power have no interest in legal equality, or equality under the law, and they despise people and detest democracy, democratic engagement, the law and the rule of law, no means of public engagement is allowed to exist despite us having the technology easily available to do so. Such is the case at City Hall, extreme bias coupled to contempt extending to outright malice, all fully displayed in the character and actions of its directors who have replaced our Canadian democratic system with the full working mechanisms of an illegal authoritarian state. These are acts of treason and sedition, tied directly to multiple ongoing abuses of fundamental human rights, criminal code and Charter law.

[8] This Mayor and council are running an illegal real estate business, fraudulently writing land use policies to speculate in the market and benefit themselves. In writing deals with bankers, the effect and intent is to remove Freedom of Association along with all possible reasonable recourse. The goal of debt-sellers is also to remove all possible options and recourse by subdividing and privatizing all land for purposes of debt creation and IWOL speculation as a means of using force to harness labour. The claim of these debt sellers is some right to control money and land for false debt creation, the imposition of an ideology of infinite growth without basis in fact, evidence or reason. To this end, the Mayor and council say that everything public belongs to them, for their benefit alone, and must not be used for social purposes of care for the Canadian people as made clear by the SCC. We understand this as sedition for criminal intent. *In these actions against us and government, the PCH directors have further removed all reasonable options, which is a violent State action of extortion of essential human needs accomplished by active and ongoing human rights abuses.* If we do not agree, we have no place to go, are exposed to life-threatening conditions and starved into compliance. The directors of PCH wrote this in policy and put it in action, claiming that we cannot distinguish between the meaning of the words public and private, or government and business, or their intent and effect. If they do not know the meaning of these words, this is incompetence and they are not fit to govern. If they do know the meaning of these words, this is fraud, and not only are they unfit to govern but it was their intent to break the law. This illegal real estate business is directly tied to illegal taxation.

[9] We know such extreme bias to be related to character types that are uncontrollably obsessed with money and power, and in this context we understand the basis in mental illness. Psychopathy seems to be biological, whereas the roots of sociopathy may also lie in environmental factors of poor parenting or childhood trauma. As a result, the individual remains trapped in a juvenile stage of development with poor cognitive functions of intellect and moral reasoning. Juvenile behaviour is characterized by poor decision-making, recognized as such only after it is pointed out. That certain segments of the brain are poorly developed and low functioning is indicated by testing. We also have strong evidence from certain strike victims who have lost these areas of brain function. A major limb is not working, but they

believe it is and get very angry when you point out it is not. Similarly, the Mayor and certain members of council get very angry when you point out what is most obvious to all. For evidence in this case, we would like to test their brains for these verifiable functionalities during questioning.

[10] We understand that some workers in government, even if in decent mental health, are there to represent themselves and have no intent to protect and defend the lives of those paying them to do their work. We cite public funds being spent stupidly at PCH on frivolous matters that have nothing to do with the work needed to meet essential human needs or which actually undermine our capacity to create businesses and do work needed to pay for these self-indulgent frivolities. That is, people go into government to get life security, but their actions remove basic life security, or even the possibility of attaining it, from others struggling to pay for it all. Some will say and do anything to get money, and within that are personality types that simply cannot control themselves around people and money. Some enjoy manipulation and abuse of others finding it so natural to their character they hardly notice.

[11] It is one thing to simply not be aware of the impact of your actions on others. That impact could be positive. You may have driven to work today unaware that in last night's storm someone worked hard under difficult circumstances to clear a fallen tree and electrical wires from the road. We cannot know all our impacts, and on this matter we thank all the amazing hard workers at City Hall with the muscle, sense and sensibility to get the work done. We aim here to protect City workers from certain people in power who harm your life and make your work difficult and convoluted to the point of being impossible. This investigation has revealed the workers at City Hall as the backbone of our lives and our country! Here, we address only that handful of scoundrels, a tiny minority, disrupting both my life and yours.

[12] It is another thing entirely to add to these core biases a personality type with the purposeful intent to take essential resources required for survival for themselves, a person with no concern for others to the extent of utterly lacking empathy and taking pleasure in malice. Such a personality type may come into an otherwise well-functioning department, remove all best practices, make life hell for all the workers and take the budget for themselves. About one percent of the population are sociopaths, and they are characterized by their actions to remove all social good. They neither like nor support social care. The diagnostic behaviours typical of this mental illness are well known and documented, and are also characteristic of the worst types of government at present and throughout history.

[13] As caring Canadians, we understand our cognitive biases and the limitations of individuals, and do not expect perfection. We make great allowances for a variety of personalities and perspectives. And we account for that by an interactive process of discussion, debate and democratic engagement to ensure reasonable fairness for all, as guaranteed by our Constitutional rights to a democratic form of government, by using clearly defined and understandable principles of law.

[14] It actually takes very little to gain a good understanding of what constitutes healthy relationships between people and the ecosystems on which our lives depend. We have for example a clear and provable line of evidence that the plants we eat are grown from seeds in soil, that this is an intensely personal matter of health fundamental to our constitution, that it takes water and access to land to grow food, that we have obvious and inherent work, food, seed, soil and environmental rights. So our problem is with people that claim this is not true, that nothing is real, and that only their will matters. To do otherwise puts us on a high-risk trajectory, removes all hope for a future, extinguishes all faith in government and stupidly guts the tax base.

[15] When someone interferes profoundly with the essential work we do to meet essential human needs, damaging, disrupting and interfering with our lives to the extent that our children wonder whether they have a future at all, there had better be very good reason. Our top judges say this: *the purpose of affording constitutional protection against the deprivation of liberty is to safeguard the entitlement to make decisions of fundamental importance free from state interference.* If we have elected a Mayor and council to make decisions on our behalf, they can only legally do so by following the explicit directions of our Constitution Act to work for our mutual benefit. To do otherwise is to break the law, disregard duty and act against us and our Constitution. To rebel and reject the law, and commit acts of sedition and treason.

[16] The meeting of essential human needs requires specialists in growing food, in building shelter, in making clothing, in transportation, tool making and communication, and also in childcare, education and healthcare. We understand the need for fair trade work to make life function for everyone across our life span from infants to elders. The arbitrary interference in essential trade by City Hall is in fact a big deal, and there had better be very good reason.

[17] When no reason for the removal of rights is provided and fact and evidence is rejected to the extent that our common basis of understanding is rejected, citizens are put in conflict with the law. As the caring parents and concerned citizens directly impacted, when the law does not meet the basic requirements to be called law, we have no choice but to disregard it as being of no force or effect. We are legally obliged, by several sections of Charter law, to not pay into systems of corruption that degrade our lives and tear apart our healthy social fabric. As Peterborough residents, we choose to obey our top laws.

[18] That the Mayor and council reject our Constitution outright is a complete and utter disgrace. They do not represent us. They do not respect our lives. And they aim to attack and remove our essential freedoms required for our survival. These are people that can barely manage their own lives, much less ours. Making the ludicrous claim that their small group has the right, knowledge and perspective to rule over in fine detail of the lives of 84 000 residents. Any intelligent person, sufficiently learned to gain self-awareness, who studies just one topic in detail to gain mastery, learns that what there is to learn is far greater than their capacity to learn; they can know only a fraction, and the brain can hold up at most just a couple of ideas at one time. Under-performance is but one characteristic of this specific type of mental illness so strongly evident in personal behaviours and actions that we must unfortunately include in our arguments a strong case for intentional malice, a pleasure taken in harming others.

[19] We understand that in 1982, Canadians rejected a British system of which had been designed by bankers, rich land owners and others who built their fortune on the backs of slavery and then subjugation of people. British laws designed for the purpose of domination, control and plunder were imported into Canada for that intent. Laws suited for a specific personality type (willing to say and do anything to get what they want) ruled Canada for many years, doing exactly what they were designed to do. Right now, right here in Peterborough, we have a ruler that rejects our Canadian laws, wants things done the old way with the old boys club of buddy business owners wanting to control run everything, who believes he is a lord and ruler over all. He's still using the old laws of England, unchanged for centuries, specifically designed for oppression and unresponsive to anything. Since 1982, City Hall has had decades to make their operations legal but have not done so.

[20] In 1982, the Supreme Court of Canada considered this idea of an all-knowing ultimately-wise ruler as fallible, and instead created a democratic system of government wherein people are free to run their own lives as long as they lived within the constraints of consideration of impact on others under the ideas, principles and practices of the Constitution. This is the set of rights that limit us according to how we affect the lives of others, in particular recognizing the limited capacity of any human to do work in a day and the limited capacity of Nature to support us. These are reasonable and provable limits. What is public belongs to the public, and we share in common our essential human needs. All of this is provable and defensible in a court of law, but to make life possible, great pains were taken to ensure that laws are intuitive, easily understandable in practical and moral application.

[20] We rejected a brutal and tyrannical system of control, domination, plunder and exploitation developed centuries ago in England, and put within our Charter numerous anti-tyranny rights that citizens can use directly to defend their lives *within reason but without having to ask permission, as right and a freedom*. We are free to do so, and we have that rights, as long as we have a valid and justifiable reason based on realistic fact and evidence. With direct access to law, and to the principles of law (which we did not have before 1982 but won in 1982), we can now directly defend our lives on par with those writing and applying the law to our lives, as all law is now in the public domain. Concerning our parental obligations, we have the right to defend the basis of life itself. As legal guardians, we are obliged to work under Canada's top laws using our rights and freedoms to defend every aspect of the lives of our children. Safeguarding them against all threats, defending their lives with our own if needed. Top Canadian law is completely on the side of sane, rational caring parents, for it is recognized that our role as parents has the utmost priority. We are parents in government, in banking and business, at home and when shopping, and this role supercedes all lower level roles. That is why these are top laws, above all else, so that we can directly act to be free of tyranny, oppression and destructive forces. Our Charter is the primary job description of all those who work in government or on its behalf by receive income from tax dollars.

[21] It is this system of fair honest caring law that the Mayor and Council of the City of Peterborough rejects. Since they have decided to act outside the law, outside its umbrella of protection and outside the scope of legitimate government activities, they are not protected and can easily and rightly be charged. Which is why they work so hard to intimidate and silence everyone. This is not mere ignorance or stupidity. This is a deliberate and intentional act of malice.

2.4 FORCE, BULLYING, THREAT AND THE USE OF HUMAN SHIELDS

[1] The Mayor and council are using the legitimate services of City Hall as a shield to cover illegal activities. They work by force, bullying, threat and intimidation, not by legal or due democratic process. We begin by considering a typical trajectory of political sociopathy, in which the prospective candidate seizes on what they think is an issue of the day and claims they will solve it without presenting any viable plan. We understand this as election fraud when the cause is used to shield their actual intentions. Typically, someone with a business background sees many features of government that are similar to business and feels they know how to run things better. They have the money to run, or are financed by partners in business with a similar agenda. Once in office, they begin to "clean up" government, imposing their ideas without taking the time to understand the basis of the best-ideas practices already in place. Some think government is about making business deals. They imagine government as a brand and government services as franchise operations to make money. Not once

realizing that the purpose of government is to assist and serve Canadians on all matters of mutual and common concern, smartly and economically and with full democratic engagement as required by removal of Freedom of Association by taxation and regulation. Unable to distinguish between the vastly different purposes of government and business, they begin immediately after being elected to work against the Canadian people. At best, this is simply the case of a confused and befuddled newly elected representative, at worst this “representative” was put in place by business or is an anti-government mole or activist working to destabilize our government from within and destroy our economy. We can see who the Mayor and council work for by looking at their activities and how they impact us.

[2] In purposeful collusive fraud, a business-backed business person claims to represent people but instead acts as a powerful force within government to represent only business not people. When business and government combine forces they consume the vast majority of our earned budget, often driving us to ruin, and we have no say. If both are controlled by bankers such that we have a bank-run government, then we are doomed. We know this to be the case. In Ontario, for example, the CEO Jake Lawrence of Scotiabank’s Global Banking and Markets group runs the Housing Affordability Task Force on behalf of Ontario Premier Doug Ford. We cannot possibly believe that this private CEO represents our public interests, whereas we have primary rights to self-determination on all matters critical to our lives and future. As it is not the role of private enterprise to determine public affairs, this collusion is illegal and we must consider its findings to be illegitimate and of no force of effect. Here, the only claim remaining for use as a shield to justify all actions of force is “growth”.

[3] However, things get worse when persons with personality disorders get into government and act purposely to use all manner of coercion, force, lies, tricks, deception, confusion, misunderstanding, bullying and threat to get what they want. Further using staff and causes as human shields to avoid being directly confronted personally as the primary source of the problems. We understand these to be sociopathic behaviours, to hide in the crowd, to manipulate things from behind the scenes, and to attach themselves to good causes to appear legitimate. They create chaos, reorganize, seize the budget for themselves, interfere with the lives and work of everyone around them, removing all autonomy and freedoms, and make life difficult and miserable for all. In an engaged democracy of respect based on fact-based debate, equal rights and freedoms, the mess they create is vastly different from a clear and open plan driven by how-to knowledge, care, reason and best-practices wisdom allowing processes of participation and inclusion wherein everyone finds a place to work, learn and grow. These being critical Canadian values expressed in our Constitution. Sociopaths want nothing to do with this or our Constitution; they reject both outright. Their values are vastly different from that of the Canadian population, often extending to disregard for life and law. In PCH, this is expressed by the directors as a rejection of their job description written by the Canadian Supreme Court, our Constitution. This is also our code of conduct, whereas PCH wastes millions creating appearances of justice, rejecting actual justice and writing their own Codes of Conduct which are manipulative and deceptive, at odds with our Charter code of conduct and have no effect on actual behaviours. They spend millions repeating work that was already done elsewhere in government better.

[3] The PCH directors who wrote the bylaws also created a system to shield themselves from responding to questions. They refuse to answer (a violation of *Section 1* laws), and have taken great pains to not be held accountable for their actions (using many shields), fully rejecting the basis of law such that we can never have a fair hearing with root cause analysis that effects *real change addressing equal benefit and protection under the law*. Using denial of just recourse to get money, the Mayor

clearly violates basic human rights – see *Article 10* of the UDHR, requiring a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal. Certain people at PCH have worked to ensure no such independent justice exists locally, and at the provincial level certain people have worked to ensure the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal is crippled in its capacity to defend the spectrum of abuses they are legally obliged to respond to across the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The government in general aims to polish its image by saying that certain crimes that are common in countries around the world do not exist in Canada. They also say corporations are exempt from obeying Canada's top laws (*Section 32*) and are free to completely drain the country of its capacity to support life or defend security of the person. The rule of law does not apply, which is why we see that the laws apply to us but not to the rich. The front desk clerks at PCH bear the brunt of all this as human shields.

[4] The Mayor and council use corporations as shields. This is done by using private corporations to do the dirty work, believing them to be beyond the reach of Charter law. However, the directors of PCH remain liable because they directed and commissioned the work, aided in how it was to be done, signed off on it and paid for it with public funds, thus making the corporation an actor of the state as confirmed by removing our Freedom of Association from this organization. In doing public work, the private organization has become public and subject to scrutiny and the requirement to obey all the top laws of Canada and work on our behalf. By law, the Mayor and council remain accountable and liable for all work we paid for by taxation and fees. We say we were forced to pay and would never have given our consent.

[5] Here is a simple example of a cause used as a shield. We don't want parking meters. Parking meters ruin downtowns, interfering with trade. Even PCH admits they are damaging, yet they want the money. The result is an insane idea of *forced donations* to a cause. This cause is a shield, a public relations campaign to avoid solving a real problem. This is a fraud, used to cover the problem they created and deny involvement in human rights abuses. One problem may be collusion. Is it the grocery store owners that do not want a substantial solution to a substantial problem, a robust program freeing citizens to directly tackle their urgent issues of work, health, nutrition and food security which are critical components of *Section 7* rights to life, liberty and security of the person? It is most definitely not the role of government to run the business plans of private corporations. It most definitely is the role of government as a social institution to directly defend the lives of citizens on urgent Charter issues of life, liberty and security of the person.

[6] We have substantial concerns of internal bullying at PCH. We know it is the job of everyone paid by tax dollars to use the principles and practices of our Constitution to defend our lives. To do the job they are legally trained, hired, paid and required to do, and not be hindered in that defence of our lives. It is the job of a librarian, for example, to provide information. Where is the basis of any PCH policy? All we see are edicts based on nothing at all. It is the job of the communications officer to maintain our democratic rights to communication, but the Mayor and Council refuse to answer questions at all scales and levels and regardless of the means of communication and block this person from doing the job they are legally required to do. They simply do not respond, even though we have much evidence of damage caused by their actual working policies. We see multiple strategies for the removal of reasonable recourse, and deliberate strategies to replace our democratic system of government with the actual working mechanisms of an authoritarian state.

[7] As broad evidence of deeply embedded bullying practices, we consider patterns of behaviour that speak to that intent. Prior to 1982, all government was based on taking by force without say. Except for

the peace, order and good government directive, the constitution was entirely devoted to top-down exertion of power. To read it (and its basis, the British North America Act) removes all hope of justice. We understand that in 1982 we switched to a form of democratic government with a firm basis in law, in which we have some hope for protection of our lives and the future for our children. And yet we see bylaws, attitude and practices at City Hall that have not changed since 1982. Each new set of directors simply assumes that unilateral force is the way to go, and we say this is consistent with their personality. Here we cite the forceful and abusive language that comes with all money-related PCH policy along with a level of threat far out of proportion to the problem (which was often created by PCH). In schedules of fees, there are fees if we don't obey immediately, tied to fee and fine escalations and threats of unlimited State force against us if we dare uphold and defend our highest laws, not believing in a valid basis for the bylaw. At all points of contact, our inquiries are rejected, dismissed with whatever excuse the person happens to think of, we are passed on from one person to the next in search of answers, and the person(s) responsible for writing the bylaws refuse the depth of discussion needed if they respond at all. At every point of contact, we encounter humans trained to act as robots, simply repeating, because it's a bylaw, because it's a bylaw.

[8] Concerning forced IWOL schemes, in these systems no work needs to be done to keep the cash pouring in. Everything is automated, including mailing out bills and dispensing justice directly tied to our bank accounts. We call this particular form of bullying by use of force with removal of reason and recourse *cornering*, because we have been systematically hunted and cornered by a group aiming to remove all options and replace them with choke points. This is a hunting behaviour characteristic of gangs.

[9] Concerning forceful gang behaviour, if we request a review of a bylaw misjudgement, for example a baseless parking ticket, it goes to yet another City Hall official with the goal of dismissing us by the fastest easiest means possible. In general, since we have taken pains to protest and may have evidence of the unfair issuance of a ticket, the best course of action is to simply write off the ticket. *A ticket is merely the writing of a note of invented debt in the hope that someone will believe its validity and exchange it for another note, currency with real value.* Hence all the bluster on a ticket, an attempt to make false debt creation look real and with basis. What is the basis of these notes? If we go to court, that is yet another expense and cost directly caused by City Hall writing tickets with neither basis nor reason. We, and the courts, should submit to City Hall the bill for the expenses they are responsible for. The total costs to society are immense. But at no stage do we get what we need, fundamental justice, a sound reason and explanation for parking policy. And we never make it to court, because PCH has now put actual robotic computer controlled systems in place, not just to the same effect, but to broaden and increase automatic force by coupling this to automated systems of surveillance and control. *We want Freedom of Association from those who harm us.* We would never choose to have this done to us, and government must be directed by the will of the people based on Charter arguments. PCH uses brute force and closed deals to ensure the complete removal of Freedom of Association and recourse at all levels anywhere we go. We understand these as tactics of force used to deny and obstruct justice. When in seeking justice all we meet are City representatives, this is their aim to avoid the oversight of independent tribunals and replace justice with kangaroo courts. In each individual case, when we prove the policy to be unjust, unfair and wrong, we only win our case and the policy does not get changed. Nothing changes, despite hundreds to thousands of people proving the policy wrong, with no basis in law and against all the foundations of fundamental justice.

[10] Concerning all policy, we want to know why. Not just the "because its a bylaw" response, but the

root of the actual policy. Access to information critical to our lives. We are well aware a fundamental injustice has been committed against us. But there is no leaflet, no flyer, no pamphlet, no description on the website, nothing. There is no basis, just policy. Because the Mayor and council say so. The poor City clerk we encounter is not the cause of this policy; we know that and take great pains to control our justifiable anger. But Council denies us explanation as well, even though they are responsible for having written the policy and directed its unfair application. What is the basis? There is no response, not in person, not in letters, not in email, for they have taken great pains to deny both discussion and recourse at all possible points of contact. We understand the main weapon used against us in all this is the promise of unlimited State force against us, for that is stated in policy and on tickets. However, we know this to be a bluff, our Constitution being clear, and we call the directors of PCH on it by making this case.

[11] If we consider the character of a person by the system they create, then we see that the person writing the policy has shielded themselves from the consequences and effects of their actions. We understand that no honest person would do this, but would instead truthfully justify the basis for their actions. In trying to find a reason why the directors of PCH refuse to answer questions and also use systems to rebuff all inquiry, we naturally generate ideas and models that we can test for fit with fact and observation. We see at the front desk the creation of a brutal job few people in the world would want to do. Who wants to be a front desk clerk at City Hall trying to explain the actions of the Mayor and council that are clearly wrong, with no basis in law, fact, evidence or reality? In this case, we defend the front desk staff who are being used as human shields. We defend the lives of the enforcement officers, being used like enforcers in hockey, for we have little doubt that each officer knows this is not the intent and purpose of their lives.

[12] We do not use this term human shield lightly, for we detest the use of terms for political purposes, but we do consider a long history of politicians stirring up trouble and then sending soldiers out to battle for them, shielding themselves in an ultimate act of cowardice. And we also know sociologically that bullies are cowards, and based on the balance of probabilities this is likely the case PCH. If this is a behaviour stemming from a personality disorder, then we should see that behaviour exhibited elsewhere. Persons with a sociopathic personality, for example, cannot control themselves around money or people. And they also cannot control themselves from expressing who they are in their words, actions and in the policy they write. When we see shields in use, we know that someone working behind the scenes writing poor policy aims to distance themselves to not be held accountable, to make someone else bear the brunt, and they also using tactics of obfuscation, blame, misdirection and purposeful confusion for that same purpose. A microscopic problem is blown far out of proportion as an excuse for even worse behaviour. We know these as personality disorders.

[13] Some shields are coverups, excuses and blameshifting: "Sorry, we didn't know. Sorry, it's not my fault. It's beyond our control." Others are marketing tactics, used to make things look good: "We used to do that, but we're turning things around. This mess was handed to us by the previous administration, and we're working hard to fix it." Bankers, who deliberately worked with government to create a national program aimed to put students in debt, instead of a program to create and defend jobs for youth, make a lot of fuss and noise about a small grant to a couple of students. The most damaging corporations on the planet with a horrible track record and no intent to change their worst practices, make a big fuss and noise about their philanthropy, which is a drop in the bucket and actually needed for a tax write-off. Their marketing PR campaign is quite literally paid for by government.

[14] PCH desires to have appearances of working for public good, while ensuring that no public power actually emerges. An example of this is the Farmers Market, which seems a good community activity. However, behind the scenes PCH works hard to ensure it never has substantial success, vastly interfering with any form of self-determination, setting hours and fixing prices to ensure there is no real competition with grocery stores. In sharp contrast, owners of orchards outside of town who lack such interference are able to grow substantially, while the whole collective of vendors remains barely functional.

[15] We have a serious problem in Peterborough, wherein those with little find it impossible to start anything. It is not that hard to make and sell pizza, for example, but apparently the first step is raising a quarter million dollars for a vacant lot, and another quarter million for a building. Kids might want to sell lemonade, but will be forcibly removed if they try to do that on City property. There is literally no place to go. This is City policy, to deny the public use of public land for public benefit. Major issues of a dead downtown filled with empty stores and vacant lots no one is allowed to use. But some City Halls in other towns, have in their great benevolence decided to set up a couple of park “pop ups” to allow a couple of people sell a few small items. The benevolent ruler says “Am I not fair? Am I not just?” No, this is not freedom, this is the use of human shields. Holding up a good cause no one could deny is used specifically to stop discussion of our most urgent issues.

[16] The Mayor makes the excuse that the money from parking meters and tickets goes to charities and organizations providing social benefit. Every one of which has practical and caring systems of belief at complete odds with the horrific and illegal tactics the Mayor used to get that money. This is tainted dirty money taken by force and the direct cause of strife, hardship and struggle in our lives. The creation of a problem followed by the claim of solving that problem. This is holding up a cause to cover up the crime. The use of a shield to justify poor behaviour. These are the well-known actions of a social predator, to either hide in a group or attach themselves to good causes to make themselves look good. When the Mayor justifies fee or tax collection for a cause, what fraction actually goes to the cause? When a cause is held up as a front, we look bad confronting the underlying unjust behaviour as we will seem to be against charity. That's not it at all. We are happy to donate directly. We resent the abuse of charity by using a good cause as a shield to cover up wretched behaviour.

[17] The Mayor uses business as a human shield. We need to be clear about this. The removal of rights is an absence. It's hard to spot what's missing. We have this problem with actual working policy that is unstated. What evidence is there for something that is missing? Let's say the Mayor is actually against the public use of public land for public benefit. If he does not benefit, then the use is not allowed. He will not say so, because the actual policy would sound bad. Crime is committed quietly, behind the scenes, with attempts made to disguise, remove trails and connections, cover it up. Buried in bylaws and behind complex language used as a shield to mislead, cover true intent and make its application arbitrary. Made to look innocent, not important, no big deal, difficult to prove. Efforts are made to make things look normal and “that's just how it is” statements are made. Nevertheless, on the receiving end, we know the true purpose, meaning and intent from its deleterious and unjustified effect(s) on us. At the foundational level of natural justice, true intent cannot be disguised.

[18] The removal of rights is a trickier matter to deal with because tests are required to discover real intent. For example, if a child were to open a lemonade stand on public land, would they be forcibly removed? We further discover that it is practically impossible to get a small business started at any reasonable scale suited to our circumstances. We find that most of what we use is not that hard to make.

But zoning does not allow us to make things in residential neighborhoods. We cannot afford a second location to make things. And then we find, as a direct result of policies at PCH that are fundamentally against people, we need a third location to sell things. The odds are insanely stacked against us, with all reasonable courses of action being blocked or denied in many ways. In these matters, all trails lead to PCH and a team of directors working exclusively on behalf of big business and explicitly against us. The Mayor and council, obsessed with money and control and fully negligent of justice and representation, are using business as a shield to protect themselves as the authors of horrendous policies tied to land uses proven to causing incredible damage to society. This is what sociopaths do. They wreak havoc on everyone around them, profiting by creating a disaster zone, disrupting lives and blaming everyone else for the mess. Parasites, killing the host, feeding by draining a steady stream of victims, citizens. No one wants this. This is the opposite of peace, the creation of chaos, and a direct violation of *anything to do with legitimate government purposes*. Any law, bylaw or policy must have a clear purpose with an intended limited effect that proves benefits aimed at greater societal good. That's the law. The Mayor does the opposite, working against the Supreme court and against us in aiming to control and drain all of Peterborough for the benefit of City Hall and their associates in business.

[19] The deliberate creation of complexity is a clear plan to justify increased expenditures and grow government. The creation of a problem is a plan to create more work for government, as is the refusal to solve problems by root cause analysis. The result is the writing of many reports, unread, not acted on and then written again in a later cycle. Each filled with good recommendations that are never followed. The best directive of Ministries are ignored at PCH as irrelevant. Our top laws, giving clear guidance on how to do things simply, cleanly and effectively on behalf of Canadians, are ignored and instead PCH writes its own descriptions. Other parts of government have done things smarter and better, and that is ignored too. There is a constant removal of good systems replaced with untested dysfunctional systems that come at high cost. In all this, the media is used as a shield. We get constant press releases describing good initiatives that are always aimed at growing government, none of which make a difference by visibly improving our lives. Much of this complexity is created at great cost, because it involves large numbers of highly paid people. Millions are pouring into studies, reports, surveys and so on, with all best practices gutted and undercut by those using abusive force with monetary motives alone. Whereas in each case, the problem is often so simple and clearly constrained that any reasonable person could have solved it cleanly, simply and economically to great public benefit. Life is actually not that complicated. Each of us knows the components as a household budget and daily activities. We understand clean thought and reason, consistent with the SCC plan that used a legally-defined reasonable person as the responsible basis of democracy, with each citizen quite capable of doing clean, simple and honest work to the best of their ability. The main problem is interference in our lives and work by persons of poor mental health pathologically intent on disruption of our lives to get money. Such persons create City Plans with no tangibles that can be solved by clear and direct actions with good purpose. We understand why public involvement is vehemently opposed by these directors.

[20] The Mayor and council claim authority they do not have, extending far into realms having nothing to do with legitimate purposes of government. We understand that all these PCH extra-governmental activities take place in the context of taxes and fees taken by force without say. We understand the use of glowing press releases as a shield to cover up real problems. We understand these tactics of misdirection, misrepresentation and cover-up as fraud. We understand integrity as a close match between words and actions. We understand honesty as simple and clear, verifiable responses to straightforward questions. Instead, we get direct violations by the directors of City Hall of *Articles 1, 5, 10 and 11* of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, writing policies that are known acts of war

against citizens. We get massive intended violations of *Sections 1, 2, 5, 7 and 15* of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms as direct attacks on our lives. At the root of it, we despise the very idea of a benevolent ruler who has removed our freedoms but “allows” us to act not by our choice but by his, as an example of benevolence. Seeming benevolence is still force backed by bullying and threats. This is still the creation of system that no caring parent would ever conceive and make their kids subject to. A system that utterly lacks roots in care, kindness, consideration of social benefit, fact, logic, reason, evidence, fairness or any other basis of fundamental justice or law. If we think of PCH purely as a business that utterly rejects the important role of local government to administer justice by writing fair bylaws, what customer would ever pay for this service? We only pay by removal of choice under the threat of force. We cannot justify the massive losses to society of self-serving PCH policy, which the Mayor and council see as “excellent customer service”. We are not your customers and PCH is not a business! What business writes laws that remove Freedom of Association and forces us to pay? If the directors of PCH say it is a business, then we are free to not pay. If the directors say QCHW is government, then they must obey the law and we must pay only for services we paid taxes for. Instead, what we get for “service” are the effects of classic self-serving sociopathic behaviour, disrupting society, creating chaos and conflict, generally generating wretched conditions and insanity all around them.

[21] What we see here at PCH is more akin to the kind of mind that creates police states, and the Mayor has thought of that too. Putting in place a snitch system where neighbours call in offences on each other rather than creating on fair administration of justice or a self-serve system where residents can look online for the reasons for things like dog licenses, parking policy and so on. Knowing the reason, with direct access to the debatable basis of policy, generates reasonable behaviour by freedom under the law. It's also expedient because many people ask the same question. We don't want a job creation program where streams of people come in to ask the same question over and over; we want access to the law, and we won that right in 1982. But the Mayor and council do not want us to know. They refuse to do the work, though it is not that hard, they refuse to explain themselves, they refuse communication and continually deny us the right to representation.

[22] We understand the control of language as a shield. We cannot say anything lest we hurt a sensitive person or group. If City Hall were to erect signs saying “no form of abusive language will be tolerated” we understand this as an accusation. What would a tourist think on seeing these signs downtown? We understand that sociopaths view the public as a threat. We say we are not, and that these signs and their equivalent statements throughout City Hall violate our *Section 11d* rights to be presumed innocent. What would anyone think, seeing the abusive language the Mayor has written on parking tickets with its promises of unmitigated State force, considering that overstaying a parking visit is at best a mere social slight? We know the context of cowardly politicians with a poor history of defending human rights instigating trouble and sending soldiers off to war to fight their battles, as a horrendous use of human shields to grab money, power and resources. We know that language used accurately to describe damaging policies of City Hall would not sound good due and be interpreted by the offenders as offending. We know that those seeking to act beyond the legitimate powers of the State do not like being told in no uncertain terms *no*. We know that those committing fraud do not want clear language used that exposes their fraud. We know that fierce and true expressive language is required from those who are being abused to stop abusers. We know the same language must be used against abusers in defence of those being abused, and furthermore that the language used by judges fits in this category. We know that politicians use language designed to sound important but offend no one resulting in removal of substantial content needed to address and solve urgent and obvious problems, and that some

specialize in lying to get money. As a result, here we are quite concerned that the overt control of language is being used at City Hall to not allow discussion of impropriety on the part of the directors.

[23] *Considering the Constitutional Validity of Expression of Justifiable Anger as Necessary and Non-Abusive.* Because we are dealing with fundamental matters at the Constitutional level, we must address at the constitutional basis of our human biology the purpose of anger and its valid expression in manners that cannot be considered abusive but must be considered as truthful and honest Freedoms of Expression critical to learning and growing. If controllable justifiable anger in responses to injuries done against us cannot be expressed for the purposes of stopping abuse or correcting injustice, such that we can no longer express what we know and feel, then judges can no longer use the appropriate language to make just rulings. For example, we detest liars, cheats, con artists, scoundrels and all personality types aiming to trick, take, bully and deceive. In response, we know two types of anger that are good, being of benefit and based on healthy biological functions. One is tied directly to our cognitive processes of learning and development as we wrestle with problems. Let's say the drive belt on your car breaks, and you must learn how to fix it. You have to learn how it works and devise strategies of repair, which are not necessarily easy and sometimes practically impossible. You get frustrated and try to control your anger. You either quit or gather the determination to continue. We have good evidence that a highly productive use of the energy generated by anger is built into our brain and biological system as a powerful force of creative problem solving that has helped humanity tremendously by invention. Whereas blind rage and anger expressed pointlessly in all directions is closely tied to poor cognitive development and moral reasoning exhibited as poor self-control, fruitless frustration, blaming and the bearing of grudges, intents of revenge and instances and patterns of abuse, many of which are based in fear.

[24] The other type of anger, more closely tied to our emotional systems rather than our rational cognitive systems, is justifiable anger. We understand it goes through two phases. The first is an immediate response against injustice which involves adrenaline response and tones down after emotional and cognitive processing over a period of several days. If the injustice was significant and unresolved, it remains persistently long after the unjust event. At the biological level of personal and social survival, this anger response to the removal of rights and freedoms essential to life, which prior to the abuse were so inherent to life as to not be evident and obvious, turns into a sense of fundamental justice based on fact, evidence and reason and the search for truth and the meaning of existence. A positive response is the repair of injuries and a search for the ideas, principles and practices that support life and healthy relationships. We discover and define what is unjust, what attacks and removes life, and encode these into moral principles and law. If such laws and principles are correct and universal, being invariant over time and present in one form or another across all peoples, then they persist in life and law as the basis of law and good human relations, as charters and declarations and as unifying principles and practices. One principle is care, and its opposite is hate, with the utter lack of care defining a state of war. Care goes hand in hand with principles of peace, reason, fairness and justice, and this is what we want the activities at City Hall to be based on. These principles are not weak, but said definitely and strongly, in clear protection of what is good, stated in plain language, honestly and in characteristic Canadian bravery. We understand justifiable anger, stated in no uncertain terms in the language of judges, as a powerful force for maintaining personal and social health by correcting injustice.

[25] We understand that for those who have neither suffered injustice nor experienced abuses and war, many of the words of justice including those in our Canadian Charter seem weak, meaningless or

without value, or are perhaps regarded as cute and irrelevant by abusers. However, they were written after war, after families were abused, tortured, slaughtered, attacked, oppressed. The voice used is one which speaks from a knowing position of pain, as a voice of fire and truth speaking loudly in no uncertain terms about what is true and right, not tepid, not mild. This is a voice used in defence of the vulnerable, the injured, or anyone who feels different or feels they do not belong. Do not say that the fierce use of language to defend our lives is in anyway a hurtful slight. It is not, and we will speak clearly using the exact language needed to describe what we see going on around us. We say this to the directors of PCH: *We are all born free and equal in dignity and rights. We are all equal under the law. We stand eye to eye in front of any other individual, just as qualified and capable, just as strong, just as equal, just as free. We are inherently worthy and valuable. All that is public belongs to the public. We employ you, you live on social assistance and we are not your slaves.* The Mayor believes, in his actions and expressed in policy, that we exist to pay him; he orders us and we must. He says, in aiming to control every detail of our lives and in deciding how we are to live, that the meaning and purpose of our lives is to serve him. We are taxpayers, that is all, and we must pay. But it is he that has revolted against the law and gone rogue.

[26] Our fundamental freedoms were defined centuries ago under conditions of exceptional violence and torture. Found to be undeniable truths of what remains in us when everything in our lives has been ripped away, killed and burned and we are taken to the edge of death. How dare this Mayor and council mock and disregard as irrelevant our *Section 4* freedoms. Furthermore, if we are to follow the *Section 1* requirements of fact, evidence, reason and proof, we have after three centuries of science much more to say on this matter. We have a complete science-based redefinition of our *Section 4* rights based on a vastly improved understanding of the body, mind and conscience. In Canadian law, for example, we say that our ethics of hard work and honesty in the search for truth are of great practical benefit to our lives, and that in this many of the foundations of justice are so universal that they must be made explicit in our Charter. We are finding that the absence of truly foundational and thus universal concepts in our Charter, although naturally implied, are being interpreted by many as their right to go ahead with poor behaviour. Here are two examples. We are concerned that *Section 32* of our Charter is being interpreted by both national and multinational corporations as their right to work above our top Canadian laws. We find a need for a *Section 1* scientific basis clarifying both the fundamental freedoms and the foundations of natural justice. In both, we would like a clarification of the principles that are universally applicable at the Constitutional level, as distinct from a lower-level breakdown into instances (e.g. *Section 16(1)* special language considerations for specific provinces that were the result of political power struggles based on extortion rather than on judicial matters of logic or reasoning in care for Canadians). Here in Peterborough, such political sociopathy is also derailing our rights to life.

[27] The word care is one example of a critical foundation of justice, which is obvious and inherent to healthy life but invisible as the glue that holds families and our country together in peace. Another key word absent in our Constitution is communication, which is not a right to a response (as that would be compelled speech), but a matter of human decency that becomes a right only when Freedom of Association has been removed and actions have been taken against our lives. Another example is personal and social risk rights, critical now to the future of our children, which are fundamental to our individual lives and our human venture based on curiosity and exploration. We have a bare-bones Charter, but need an extended version for greater clarity of use and application. For example, our short version reads *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, whereas a self-consistent title clarified by SCC rulings and *Section 1* proof of substance is *Canadian Charter of Personal and Social Rights, Freedoms and Responsibilities*. We are finding ourselves torn apart by the absence of truly universal

binding descriptions of common essential human needs that must be clarified in our Charter as cohesively unifying national goals critical to saving our children.

[28] *Section Summary*. In this context, we soundly reject the political control of language used at PCH that rejects *Section 1* descriptive reality and uses people with real vulnerabilities as human shields. Here, we consider the very real and incisive language our judges and soldiers use in active defence of our freedoms. Our soldiers fought and died in defence of our lives without a doubt using the appropriate language. They did not fight for parking meters. They did not fight to have this Mayor and council create a massive humanitarian crisis in which they order the police to move people along to their deaths. Our words here are not abusive because they are not directed at anyone. The person they refer to is City Hall or a figurehead thereof which could be anyone. We do not know who the perpetrators are, but we know they exist by the actions they have taken.

[29] The most important shield for a social predator is government itself. Sociopaths attach themselves to legitimate groups in order to appear credible. We see for example, people that have fought tooth and nail to overcome the rules of government to finally open a business, and then at the last moment the Mayor steps in for a photo opportunity to imply he was involved. In such press releases, the Mayor claims to be providing a solution but behind the scenes, often buried in bylaws, creates antithetical damaging policy. Always, the motive is money, not justice and not community. PCH does much work putting on a show and polishing its image, further creating many documents that give the appearance of justice but which are actually diversions and obstruction of justice. We wish they would simply do the work, not spend millions on campaigns of obstruction and promotion that neither address the underlying issues nor do anything real to build our lives. We reject the massive interference of PCH in all essential aspects of our lives and say we are free, justified and obligated to save our children by acting robustly on the most urgent issues threatening their lives.

[30] When the systems created by the directors of PCH differ vastly from the systems created by our Supreme Court justices to the extent of full rejection of the legal system along with the basis of democracy itself, what are we to think? We experience much injustice at PCH directly, yet on reading Charter case law we find the minds and hearts of our top Canadian judges to be very close to our own minds and hearts, exhibiting competence, clarity and cohesion. We do not find these present at PCH, as evident throughout their distorted documents, bylaws, policies, processes and actions against us refusing representation. We make this case securely knowing that the actions of the Mayor and council will not survive superior court scrutiny, just as they have not survived this initial scrutiny by local residents directly damaged by PCH policy. Would a judge look kindly on the creation of an authoritarian state within Canada working expressly to circumvent the law and undermine our democracy? No, not with such systematic force, bullying and threat using human shields to cover up illegal activities that are far beyond the scope of legitimate government and also aiming to violate *Section 15* Charter laws.

2.5 MEANS AND INTENT TO VIOLATE SECTION 15 CHARTER LAWS

[1] We begin with in paragraphs 2.5 [2] to 2.5 [8] to clarify the structure of this case thus providing exact *Section 1* certainty about the means and mechanisms by which this Mayor and council intend to violate *Section 15* Charter law at significant social scale to the extent of enslavement of a large population. They have taken clear and definitive actions purposed to tear apart healthy social structures

and polarize individuals and society in each area of essential human needs to the extent of generating extreme *Section 15* inequities violating our fundamental human rights to life. They have published land use plans and proposed social structures identical to those used in North Korea to control every essential human need and deprive citizens of any significant opportunity for personal or social self-determination, in particular those critical to survival. Vastly interfering with fundamental Charter activities of growing food, making and selling things, engaging in trade. Making all society vulnerable to the point of being a national security issue, for we cannot respond to crisis and feed ourselves, or make and sell the things we use daily. They have in collusion gutted the basis of the economy. This Mayor and council have, of their own accord, generated detailed and active plans to remove all the key elements of foundational social security essential to a healthy life, going further to attack the basis of democracy itself. They seem quite content to be the source and author of significant human rights abuses, effectively rejecting all citizen actions to secure life and prevent such abuses.

[2] This case is divided into two main components of assessment, mental health and competency. The mental health component corresponds to questions of care concerning the primary role of government in the defence and representation of citizens with respect to organizational efforts required to meet basis-of-life needs of common concern. Legally this is consideration of impact on others which in *Section 15* Charter law requires engagement of PCH with those impacted by law as a basic function of representation in democracy. At the biological level required for *Section 1* Constitutional analysis of this situation, our claim is that the capacity for moral reasoning is genetically inherent and learned as a matter of direct experience and human development in the dominant social setting of parental care. It is here that our fundamental senses of justice arise along with the language required to describe those senses. Arguments of fairness, for example, arise very early in childhood development. We argue, as a crude introduction to the topic, that our conscience arises from an approximate division of the brain into two hemispheres connected such that one part of the brain is capable of observing what the other part is doing. Roughly speaking, one part of the brain is devoted to moral reasoning (an overarching guiding awareness) and the other to cognitive reasoning (with detailed focus on tasks and objects). We see this when children split a piece of cake. One expresses moral outrage (emotional and justice-based) if the other does not slice the cake equally (rational and math-based), and here we say that our sense of fairness is biologically based on equitable access to the resources required for survival. We understand our legal system to be similarly divided into two components, moral outrage at fundamental injustice, and the logical case arguments requiring fact and tangible physical evidence presented as documents admissible in a court of law. Specifically, words like care or justice do not correspond to physical objects and so are difficult to measure. In matters of parental care, for example, what we take as evidence of lack of care is the failure to ensure the meeting of essential human needs, and we are appalled by purposeful deprivations of needs critical to life.

[3] Our critical concern with PCH is thus the deprivation of essential rights and freedoms critical to life. This is expressed as lack of integrity. The directors constantly use “soft” political language to play on emotions, quite disconnected from “hard” evidence of actual work done, the legal concern being fraud. They say one thing and do another. We are concerned about documents produced at PCH that fall entirely into this category, such as official plans devoid of connection to physical reality and without tangible markers of beneficial work done to solve our most urgent and pressing problems. We are further concerned about the lack of a valid basis of decision making throughout PCH; there is none. Everything is arbitrary, according to whatever individuals happen to think at that moment. Our alarm concerning mental health is widespread failure among the Mayor and council in meeting the *Section 1* rational-connection Oakes test. Our serious *Section 1* concern is the complete lack of connection

between the expenses and activities of PCH and the lives of those struggling to pay for it all. We express extreme *Section 15* injustice as moral outrage from our senses of injustice and further have significant *Section 1* cognitive dissonance when what we see going on at PCH makes no sense. Our Charter concerns are serious *Section 15* inequities extending to human rights abuses that relate directly to *Section 4* moral reasoning by provable rational connectivity to extreme *Section 7* citizen hardships caused by PCH policy. We understand that at national scales when the real economy based on our labour and natural resources decreases, the tendency is for those in government to escalate economically and seize more for themselves in hopes of gaining life security. Our concern here in Peterborough is that the actions of the Mayor and council have gutted our economy and our lives to such extent as to increase social strife, intensify human rights abuses, escalate lawlessness and cause economic, social and environmental collapse. We find these PCH activities against us and the government to be directed related to matters of fraud, collusion, theft and extortion, but here we address only the most serious *Section 15* abuses.

[4] In saying this, we have a considerable basis of *Section 1* science backing our paragraph 2.5 [2] claims, but have taken pains to provide here only an easily understandable introduction to the topic. Similarly, paragraph 2.5 [3] is an introduction to the legal concepts. In order that both [2] and [3] be understandable, we offer here a colloquial understanding of our *Section 3* democratic rights, that *every citizen has the right to vote in an election of the House of Commons or of a legislative assembly and to be qualified for a membership therein*. Anyone can run for office. The Mayor and council have no specific competencies. As winning an election depends very much on being known, or having funds for a marketing campaign, the selection of our representatives is inherently biased. There are no requirements for an understanding of law, knowledge of the role of government, mental health or sanity. Those who run for office can simply lie, having real intentions contrary to public needs. There is the self-serving bias, and on winning, the confirmation bias expressed as assumption of consent of the governed. Then campaign promises are broken and actions are taken on all sorts of matters about which we would never agree. What are we to say when the last PCH last tax increase stole the grocery money from struggling seniors, but was used for no legitimate purpose of government, this being an extreme violation of *Section 15* Charter law that exhibits lack of care in being a direct threat to this citizens' *Section 7* rights to life, liberty and security of the person? Here, we present both moral arguments and provable *Section 1* rational-connectivity monetary links to those involved in the abuses. We are further concerned when this lack of care for vulnerable seniors becomes systemic and appears across all of Peterborough. We find it curious, and troubling, that not one member of council been assigned the task of representing seniors. Or youth, particularly those in great distress. Specifically, in our Canadian mosaic, we are concerned that this local government has a structure not fractally representative of our larger national organizational structure designed around addressing common concerns of essential human needs. PCH seems to have purposes other than that of legitimate government, which is a major Constitutional violation as a matter of sedition.

[5] Sedition concerns violation of each part of our Constitution, and here we address widespread PCH *Section 15* violations so serious as to threaten the fundamental life security of many citizens and remove their ability to live much less pay taxes or respond healthily to crisis. Because this is a Charter case touching on matters of crisis response concerning the most vulnerable members of society, many of whom have not experienced government as a helpful force in their lives, and further deals with urgent matters of survival of this generation of Canadians, we take particular pains to point out the foundational basis of our present change of perspective to that of major *Section 15* inequities. In this context, the central topic is defined by a set of surrounding related topics, rationally connected. We

view the world and look around us from this perspective to see what matters most and what has greatest impact. Concerning *Section 15* inequities, what matters is the set of *Section 7* concerns dealing with life, life security, and the freedom to work to attain personal and social security of essential human needs from the limited resources of nature, further limited by our skills, knowledge and maximum daily human capacity to do productive work. We understand this as a realistic conversation in which the main topic connects rationally to the most important related topics and further to more distant peripheral topics. When the conversation strays too far, it ceases and there is a return to the main topic. We this understand the human brain as functioning ecologically by assessing a sum of related impacts which after processing finally generate a summary statement. Is life working, or not? What do we need to do?

[6] We are not arguing that the Mayor or any member of council or staff wakes up in the morning with a to-do list of Charter laws to violate, humans to abuse, or a clear intent to commit fraud. By analogy, we imagine few people are inspired one day to become a cartel leader but are instead gradually drawn into that world by loss of perspective and exposure to instigation by those fully embedded in the life. Some entered City Hall with intent to solve societal problems, while others entered to gain life security by attaining levels of pay under work conditions that they could not attain outside government. Once once in, they were swayed or pushed by a smaller group of individuals who entered into these positions purposely seeking money and power as biased over the duties of their position to provide fair balance with social and ecological concerns. A small gang of influencers using multiple and numerous strategies to gradually work against the primary goals and purposes of government to the effect of creating a culture out of touch with the reality of the lives of taxpayers and at odds with our Constitution. They have created a fantasy world completely out of touch with the reality of our lives or the state of the world, and being sheltered inside it imagine everything is wonderful. The only intrusion is escalating prices, which they aim to mitigate by increasing wages so as to not feel the slightest discomfort. Considering this from the point of view of human development, it is quite possible that the individuals in this group have not attained a sufficient level of cognitive development and moral reasoning to be fully aware and conscious of their own internal microcosm and have developed belief systems quite distinct from those of a reasonable person as a legal reference point.

[7] As a direct result of these considerations, our main focus is thus not on the individuals but on the policies they created. Although we must by law point out what moral outrages occur as a direct result of these policies, so that the impact of the actions of PCH may be fully understood in social context, our main concern is with the cognitive arguments of describing the problem quantitatively based on fact, evidence and reasoning and generating safe and tested reasonable alternatives (as a *Section 1* demonstrably justified test) that protect the lives of all Canadians and secure a future for our children. Therefore, the remainder of this section describes the moral reasoning cognitive function, followed by a substantial evidence basis intended to have significant foundational logistics as the basis of Charter law interpretation also laying the groundwork for the safest course of actions in response to crisis. Our understanding is that if we were to follow the principles and practices of our Constitution Act, we could deal with any crisis at any scale and with relative ease given our resources attain *Section 7* life security of all essential human needs in short order. We further understand, given the provable state of the world, that additional significant efforts would also provide this in perpetuity for our children and divert us from our current trajectory toward a human and ecological rights disaster, these be rationally and provably connected in cause and effect.

[8] In this overall context we consider most seriously the dynamic SCC Constitutional framework for healthy decision-making that secures the future for all Canadians, which we find here to be most

interesting and valuable as a leading problem-solving document. We further hold other documents in high esteem, ranging from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to the World Scientists' Warning to Humanity and to the various IPCC reports on the state of the world and what to do about it. We find these documents to have been created by the top minds on the planet working in care for us without monetary motive, to have a strong basis in physical evidence, and to contain solutions to saving our kids that are for the most part relatively easy and community-based matters of local problem solving easily attainable within our local communities. We are alarmed that this PCH leadership team strongly resists anything to do with our Charter rights to personal and community self-determination, furthermore taking forceful actions against our government and our rights to life.

[9] The inability to distinguish between needs and wants is a major problem in government. Government is seen as a place to gain life security. All of society is taxed, producing stability for those in government. Workers in government, finally have decent pay, a phone, a car, affordable food, a home, dental, eye care, vacations and retirement savings, and everything they need to do their job. And justifiably so, for how can they live and get to work without these essential components of life security? Not once considering that those outside government must also have these critical necessities to live and work, and furthermore that the work they do must pay for their equivalent worker in government. It is precisely here that the work done in government must be restricted to essential matters of support for those paying for it all as the primary role of representation. We find this Mayor and council to be quite confused. In delegating tasks such as garbage collection or street cleaning to PCH, we never relinquished our rights as employers to determine what work needs to be done. We never relinquished our monetary rights to receive service for what we paid for. We certainly did not agree to have our money taken by force and used for purposes other than what is was intended. We would never agree to have our funds used against us, with millions going into activities aimed expressly at ensuring this discussion of needs *versus* wants never takes place. For there is no end to wants and it is not the role of government to act against our essential needs to the extent of putting many in dire circumstances as a direct consequence of their actions against us.

[10] We say here that each worker in government is well aware of their essential needs in life and as required for work, and also that they must support rather than deny these essential needs to those paying for their services. If each were to act as a caring parent and invest in creating types of work for their children specifically aimed at economically meeting our common needs, then the concerns of workers in government about their life security would greatly diminish and their children would also gain life security by the work they do. The cost of living would decrease and the quality of life increase by supporting social integrity. We understand the desire to seek more by schemes to gain income without labour, but such unproductive investment is speculation acting to increase prices, decrease wages, decrease the quality of good and services, and is a type of theft making life difficult to actually impossible for the next generation whose labour must pay for it all. The key question here is where the real and substantial value is being produced; the primary basis is in the work we do using the resources of Nature, knowing these to be *Section 7* Constitutional Activities of profound importance to our lives. It is not the role of government to attack our fundamental social security net of care for one another by denying this generation of young Canadians their right to gain a foothold in life by growing food, seeking shelter securing work and creating jobs in our core economy of essential human needs. We know workers in government are also aware of their rights, for if we removed one of those rights from them, what is absolutely needed for their work, their institution would collapse. So why have the directors of PCH removed these rights from us?

[11] We have workers in government not doing the work of government, engaging in work that degrades our lives, quite happy to attack our lives for money, forcing all of society to their will, claiming that they have some right to our money and will take it by force, and colluding with those of similar ill intent to create a corporate feeding frenzy on our lives. We have bankers that do not want us to have homes of our choosing who aim to control all land, money and work, grocery store owners insisting on stopping us from growing food, and a local PCH aiming to attack all caring social structures, block communication and rip apart any form of caring social connectivity allowing connection between people and the land critical to gaining local self-sufficient self-determination. With PCH breaking so many laws to gain extreme benefit from corporate collusion to the extent of non-representation and complete loss of faith in government, for this is not government, this generation cannot even begin to gain a foothold in life, much less change course away from their doom. Much of the population has nothing to do. We are not allowed to engage in what matters most to our lives. All means of self-sustenance have been blocked and denied, resulting in a massive social inequity of rights to engagement and work. Society is polarized. We either have no say, no resources and nothing to do, or we are suddenly employed in work that consumes all our life, does not give us basic life security and has no purpose or meaning. These are the *Section 15* extremes that keep us on course to destruction.

[12] Here, we start with equality under the law, keeping in mind the different matter of equal benefit of the law which is a matter of considerable importance in taxation and concerning what types of work are being done. Does that work help or hinder our lives? Could we do better at the job than the clerk we see in front of us? Should this type of work or activity be going on at all? We cover only a fraction of the major problems at PCH, selecting only a few examples indicative of systematic *Section 15* injustices. One example suffices to indicate the general problem of an inability to overcome the self-serving bias. Someone in government does not want to pay out of pocket for dental. So they create a benefits plan. Outside of government, we have no such plan. We pay out of pocket to get dental care, and we pay for the benefits program of government. We get doubly hammered, and the result is a major proportion of the population unable to afford dental care at all, with some in dental emergency situations that directly threaten health, and they get no help because government does not consider teeth essential to health. Whereas if they could work just once month at the government rate of pay, their lives would be spectacularly improved. Workers in government think many such things to be essential to their lives and work, and so do we. When such things are as common as teeth, they fall under *Section 15* considerations wherein the role of government is to address these matters equally and specifically to not allow extremities of abuse to affect the most vulnerable members of society. Whereas the leadership team at PCH spends much of its time purposely generating such self-serving inequities, thinking they are an unlimited for-profit business and that they can do whatever they want.

[13] In Peterborough, when a resident has a legitimate complaint and can point out clearly how a bylaw is wrong and without legal basis in fact, evidence and reason, the Mayor and council reject each and every individual complaint, refusing to recognize equality under the law to the extent of removing dignity. If a police officer sees someone committing theft, so that a law is clearly being broken, are they not justified in taking action? It is the same here. A citizen sees a law being broken, and has taken legitimate action. Justice is denied at PCH by violation of individual *Section 15* rights. Streams of thousands of people continually prove the law wrong, yet it is neither changed nor struck down and the damage continues. A bylaw that was a stupid idea when passed decades ago continues to damage forever, despite the Courts having directed PCH to periodically review the damaging or beneficial effects of a law, they refuse to do so. Then we find the law growing beyond its original intent.

[14] If we consider democratic application of *Section 15* Charter law expressed by the Mayor and council acting as individuals looking into the matter and providing independent assessments of the situation and then voting, we expect that justice should be present in balance by the leadership team. We find it curious that a fair and balanced view does not emerge by this process. Democratic due process has clearly been subverted. There is a problem here with equality under the law and equal benefit of the law.

[15] In electing a team to represent us, we understand that in statistical equality this particular PCH leadership team is no more qualified or competent than any other member of society. But more than that, they have at their disposal a very large population to draw on for maintenance of justice and societal health in all manner of subject matter expertise. We find it strange, and against the structure of Canadian government and healthy democratic society as proposed by the Supreme Court of Canada in the 1982 Constitution Act, that the Mayor and council have rejected this *Section 15* requirement of statistical and individual equality by excluding the voices of those impacted by their policies.

[16] We understand that for many people the purpose of seeking a position in government is to gain life security, but this must not be done by removal of life security from those paying for the service. For though that may provide short-term gain for workers in government, it would undermine the basis of funding. The continual increases of pay by decreasing the incomes of those paying is a well-known recipe for social and economic collapse. This too is equality under the law.

[17] This is also a matter of equal pay for equal work. In many policies, bylaws and documents of PCH, we see that the work has not been done. What work has been done is minimal, or perhaps sums to one day labour to set up a cash-flow cow, and it is either incomplete or fails to meet Grade-school standards, exhibiting no knowledge of the role of government or evidence of basic math, literacy and logic skills. That the entire leadership team combined and given years to do the work cannot attain such minimal standards is beyond belief and gives evidence for intent to seek income without labour by entitlement. This is rejection by PCH of *Section 15* Charter law concerning equal pay for equal work.

[18] We say that paying taxes for services of benefit to us is a work contract. *Charter law Section 15 is quite clear, that we are to receive equal protection and benefit under the law.* And yet all of PCH policy is aimed at anomalous benefit, with a small group of people having rights and benefits they say are essential to their lives and work but which are denied to those who pay for it all. The Mayor and council have stated this in writing and we see it in action across all PCH operations, that everything public is for the sole benefit of PCH and their beneficiaries in business. Even if this intent were not stated, we could show this is the sole purpose of most policy including taxation (which has no Constitutional basis and cannot be considered legal). We know it is on directors of PCH to prove how we benefit (*Section 1*), but they refuse to perform these democratic duties of office.

[19] All of our interactions with PCH are unpaid and consume our precious time. There is incentive for PCH to create confusion and not answer questions, because much money is made by this activity. Everyone at a council meeting is earning a tremendous amount of money, and we can calculate the cost of our questions from the time allotted. We could have done far better economically by writing clear policy ourselves. Refusing to answer honestly and sufficiently to our *Section 1* questions is a clear statement from City Hall that their time is valuable but our time is not and forms their core message of disrespect and inequality. Even in writing this case, we are doing the work they should have done.

[20] In the case of unusual pay at City Hall, we have the results of competency tests. The written portion of proof is the documents. The verbal portion of proof is in presentations and statements made on public record and as press releases. And the active portion is physically demonstrated in the actions taken and quality of work done. In that, we see that most of staff are quite up to the task but the PCH leadership team is not. As we have the test results indicating their actual capacities, evident in written policy and in practice, but with low levels of actual competency. We see the Mayor and council struggle with the meaning of words, rarely attaining Grade-school standards of math, language logic and reasoning, and exhibiting a complete lack of understanding of the role of government, their responsibilities, and the structure and purpose of Canadian government. We can test this. Would a single one of them pass a high school equivalency exam? The government makes us pass many tests to prove competencies such as working at heights, safe food handling and so on, but are not themselves subject to such tests? *Section 15*, and much of law, has everything to do with reciprocity, which is a far more accurate and applicable term than equality for application in life and law.

[21] In major *Section 15* inequity, workers in government get a home but write extreme policies denying others human rights to shelter, a *Section 7* right to life. At best, those working at minimum wage remain in the permanent life insecurity of renting, always a month away from disaster, with their labour paying for the excesses of government. We say the work we do is statistically equal to the work done in government. We have created a special place called government specifically to do work of common mutual interest for our benefit. There are those who pay and those who provide services. Our well being is of critical importance, for if we cannot gain any stability of essential human needs including work and shelter, how can we pay? In our Constitution Act, it is specifically the job of workers in government to defend life security for all. It is truly insanity to gut our lives and undermine the core economy of essential human needs and the ecosystems we rely on for survival as the sole basis of our economy. Here, we say we have equal rights to life, which under Charter law requires redirecting our paid workers in government to doing work that addresses essential needs and solves urgent problems.

[22] Charter case law is clear that any law must have clear purpose and deal with urgent and pressing problems of real significance to society. In Peterborough, these are pressing and substantial problems of land, water, food, work and shelter, entering the make-and-sell economy, each of which is a component of life and life security. Zoning based on the worst ideas of two centuries ago, developed in another country for the sole purpose of controlling and crushing people, has removed these freedoms. For many, the crisis is here and now. The lack of response of PCH to those in urgent must be regarded as not mere neglect but acts of hate and criminal negligence purposely and maliciously aimed at our ruin by persons of the poorest character who simply do not care what happens to others. We have several workers at City Hall, from enforcement officers to front desk clerks and more, whom we know want to do work of meaning and purpose, work that builds our lives and community. They too hate what this Mayor and council have done to violate their *Section 4* rights.

[23] A fundamental theme of justice is consideration of impact on others. The consideration of reciprocity. The ability to care, expressed as empathy, as a fundamental job requirement of all those in government (*Charter Section 1, and confirmed by numerous other Charter Sections and Supreme Court of Canada case rulings*). The question of equality, care and reciprocity is this: could anyone in government live outside government under the rules they created? Could an average high-school graduate, starting life with little and therefore classified and labelled by those in government as poor, ever gain a stable foothold in life sufficient to secure essential human needs by the work of their own

hands? Not when a government like PCH is against them, working solely on behalf of themselves and their corporate partners. Why has everything of value in the community, which belongs to the community for their benefit, which could give us work of value and meaning, been seized on and handed over to uncaring corporations with no interest in community? We find equality essential to representation, with the lack of equality being equivalent to the lack of representation, equivalent to organized crime. This is beyond the shadow of a doubt the opposite of good governance.

[24] We understand there is big money in removal of rights. The point of PCH activities is not justice (which is the dominant role required of government) but to enrich a small group based on the labour of others. The point is also to remove freedoms and opportunity, such that the oppressed group cannot even begin to start something, gain a foothold and potentially start a competing business. *The Supreme Court is thus very clear that the intent of Section 15 is to protect, defend and support groups suffering social, economic, political or legal disadvantage in society. We say this group is now the youth of Canada, who find it impossible to gain any sort of foothold in life, and who face and grim future they are not allowed to change.*

[25] We understand most PCH policy in this context as clearly consistent with a collusive anti-competition business plan, forcing us by removal of options into the hands of corporate owners seeking to control each and every essential human need and action, forcing us to stick with the worst ideas of the past that provably drive us on a course of destruction. It is most definitely not the role of government to run the business plans of private enterprise, and most certainly not to the extent of refusing in any way shape or form to represent citizens. And yet that is precisely what is going on at PCH. The Mayor, along with a few key players, that have forced, coerced, threatened, mislead and bullied the rest of council into voting on issues they knew perfectly well were the wrong way to go. These are deeply disturbed, profoundly corrupt individuals willing to say, do or destroy anything to get money. The result is PCH policies that completely reject equality under the law along with responsibilities of care and protection of people.

[26] Now that we are in crisis, and City Hall escalates economically by mining and crushing our lives, we urgently consider this *Section 15* question of pay proportional to competency, based in testable and provable science. We understand that at any given level of skill, competency and training there are natural human limits as to how much work one person can possibly do in a day. Specifically, we recognize that in testing productivity there is a range and distribution generated that in statistical analysis closely fits a Bell curve. We can quickly test and define normal and anomalous workloads and productivity that correlate with known factors of work ethics and intent, skill and merit. At one standard deviation, 66% of the population provably has average skills and productivity – if they are actually trying to work. But some people are working hard - against us, deliberately undermining life, liberty and security of the person. Others are working, but not hard, but not on matters that really have anything to do with supporting our lives, and also getting anomalous pay considering their skills and natural human limits of productivity. Some people specialize in manipulation of the lives of others, working feebly themselves but dumping work on others and taking credit for their work. Claiming competencies they do not have. The PCH leadership team has generated many documents ranging from demonstrations of significant incompetency to evidence admissible in a court of law of deliberate deceit and fraud. The work we paid them to do, though not hard, was simply not done. Or it was done, partly, but against the law. Or it was an income-without-labour cash cow, illegally supporting entitlement, high pay by position alone completely unrelated to healthy indicators of hard work, productivity or competence. Clearly this is the intent and purpose of a parking meter, or many license

fees, to get money without having to do work, as in many cases we see no service being provided. We also know that we pay taxes for the legitimate services of government, it being fraud to pay again for services we already paid for.

[27] When someone in government who has everything they need paid for by us says \$60 000 with benefits isn't enough, and want a wage increase or point to someone else in government earning \$80 000 for similar work, is that a reasonable justification for an equality-based pay increase? Perhaps, in consideration to those paying for it all, is a decrease justified? We all suffer from baseless wars of escalation. The basis of comparison here is individuals, whereas we require a Charter basis for comparisons across society. At present, a vast army of working Canadians required to pay for all of government, by working with part-time minimum-wage no-benefits jobs in which they never gain life security yet must also supply all the needs of workers in government. As many of the so-called labour jobs actually require a significant to vast knowledge of the details of the trade, how do we compare across all of society what work is essentially equivalent? Has government risen above our ability to pay for it all? What is the basis of continual increase? Here, we understand all these matters of concern to be rationally connected and with provable money trails allowing mathematical calculation of impact and proof of equity (or the lack thereof) within acceptable ranges and limits. These being further tied to the maximum human capacity to do productive work, a human limit, with essential needs tied to the limits of Nature. To exceed those limits mean high risk of an early death for our children, which is not socially acceptable as it is preventable by living reasonably according to our *Section 1* Charter limits.

[28] In establishing a minimum wage as a standard reference point, we could assume competency in proportion to pay. Considering the high percent of the population working at minimum wage, the claim by City Hall is that this large population is sub-average, but this is a statistical impossibility. The second claim by City Hall, considering their pay and benefits (in circumstances of already having everything provided and paid for, from cars to offices to help to printers and down to every last pencil), we expect high skill and competency. However, the majority of the work done by City Hall revolves around low-end work such as garbage collection or street cleaning. Therefore, we consider the question of provable statistical equality, noting that our Charter requires that the primary role of government be about justice using well-established principles of care to solve problems and balance society. It is this role that the directors of PCH reject in their refusal to represent, instead choosing to participate in destructive practices well known to undermine all of society.

[29] If we take the top 1% of skilled people in all manner of human endeavour, specifically saying that a skilled violin maker is as gifted, talented and experienced as a machinist or accountant or master of physics, or any number of specialists each claiming to be special, we see that in fundamental cognitive abilities or any other measure of expression they are fundamentally equal. The concern with entitlement, which is seeking a level of pay by position and title alone and not by merit, is that each person is abusing the idea of equal pay for equal work by finding anyone at all anywhere in a similar position with higher pay and demanding equality with that. Removing considerations of competence and comparison to natural human limits, they simply must have exceptional pay. That this is an unjust and unfair abuse of the idea of equal pay for equal work can be proven by testing.

[30] If this statistical evidence of violation of *Section 15 Charter law* fails to convince, here is a simpler line of argument. How many people working at minimum wage, who can barely make ends meet, are needed to pay for one person in government earning four times that? Or consider this. Prior to Covid, the cost of government was about 42% of the economy and growing. With stay at home orders,

many were not working or lost work. As the percent of the population not working dropped, government spending increased. When government takes 50% of the economy, each working person must support themselves plus one equivalent person in government. Who can possibly earn enough to afford that, given the rates of pay in government? Since we are forced to pay, and have no say about anything (our rights and freedoms having been removed, not by our will or consent), is this not statistical indentured servitude? Isn't servitude without say the point of writing one-way unilateral policies of forced compliance? Isn't it characteristic of systems of slavery to have no say about anything that impacts your life and future, and to further encounter systems where all possibilities, choices and options of self-determination have been removed? Where are our pioneer rights and freedoms to carve out a life for ourselves? Why does this entire generation of Canadian kids face a grim future? Why are we tending parking meters when we have these most urgent matters of life and survival to tend to, but are blocked by government officials like those at PCH intent on maintaining these most corrupt and damaging practices of the past? What are we not free to change course and tend to that which brings us life?

[31] When a high percent of the population claims high pay suggesting high competence, far beyond the work one human can possibly do in a day, the actual situation is an intent to seek income without labour in addition to the normal pay for the expected workload. In government, this is money taken from others at low rates of pay, which is a harnessing of labour under conditions of statistical slavery directly related to removal of democratic freedoms guaranteed protection under our Charter. At PCH, this astounding imbalance of pay, power and competence is maintained by illegal actions against people, parking policy being just one of many examples.

[32] Suppose someone at City Hall earns \$60/hr, and they impose a fine, fee or tax on a large segment of the population earning \$15/hr. The number of workers required to support that government worker is $N = 60/15 = 4$, but the low-pay worker must pay this fee after living expenses, the majority of which are imposed externally (rent, electricity, water, heat, insurance, food *etcetera*). When a fee is set in proportion to what the government worker wants, but must be paid from the disposable income of a low-wage worker, if they have it, that amount can be crushing or a major impediment to moving forward. If we move to a direct comparison of the work done, we suspect the worker in government would be shocked at both the intensity of the work and the actual level of knowledge and skill required. They would literally not survive the reciprocity test, whereas the labour worker on getting that government job will be shocked by the ease of the work, the benefits of the full infrastructure and the rate of pay.

[33] Furthermore, this 60/15 pay ratio indicates 4x the productivity. We want proof of productivity proportional to pay. But when we look, we find the opposite. In this case of most policy, the work done to create the policy (at best one day) indicates very low competency, and the running expenses needed to keep this scheme going are an incredible waste of time and must be considered work done against us. That is, we are owed and seek return of illegal gains.

[34] We consider here the provable basis of this Charter law of equality and its application. If we start with a statement such as "*All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.*" from the UDHR, is this a statement of philosophy (based in belief) or a matter of provable fact? Clearly we are not equal, for some have strong aptitudes and interests in compassion, whereas a small minority of the population is not endowed with distinct properties of consciences and are specifically diagnosed

sociopaths. Do we all stand tall in full confidence of our dignity and inherent worth? Most certainly not. There is a range and distribution of these properties. So we take a moment to consider the realistic provable basis of *Section 15*.

[35] If we reconsider our practical example of five friends buying and splitting a pizza, the very definition of healthy, friendly and normal human relations, we see that they naturally use a fair and caring but distinctly inequitable splitting of costs and proportions (the size and number of pizza slices). Some want more, others less. Some have money, others have little. Inherent fairness accounts for this, so much so that as an expression of language and its practical application, the word itself is closely synonymous with justice. We can say there is a healthy inequity, but with care and concern for others and within the context of free and finite reasonable limits.

[36] We also say in our five friends model there is an intuitive understanding of the mathematical expression of fairness present in the economics and distribution of a finite resource. Exactly equal division of the cost and slices of pizza is strictly fair if all were equal. We use three languages to express these concepts, words, physically demonstrable practises, and math, a second language using symbols that are distinct from those used to represent words. With the integrity of these languages and actions expressed as honesty, we understand fairness as integral with economics as a mathematical equation describing care.

[37] The equation of friendly care is one of linear algebra. Most simply, this is the cost C divided by the number of people N to find the cost per person $c = C/N$, and this also sets the number of equal slices per person to $n = Q/N$, where Q is the quantity of pizza ordered. In practice, however, although this math is simple we also introduce variables as factors for the more complex inequal but fair division according to needs, interests, and monetary resources. We can, for example, pay less and get less, or having no money and being very hungry, get group support by paying nothing but doing the labour. Representing money by the variable m , work for payment by pizza as the variable w , and hunger or need by the variable h , a fair division may be $c = mC/N$ and $n = wQ/N + hQ/N$ and we might also make loans of these quantities across time. These equations are linear and proportional, and do not contain interest-compounding factors driving exponential growth or other expressions of improper power relations used to generate and accelerate unfair inequity. Fair play is critical here, for a friend does not seize control of a critical ingredient of pizza to use it forcefully in leverage and extortion. If we are not given a fair chance, we quit engaging and instead concern ourselves with appropriation of justice.

[38] If we say that people are different, how can they be equal in quantities of dignity and respect as universal human qualities? We can express this by linear algebra. Let M be a mother, and D be a daughter. They are clearly different, so how are they related? If we take a number of mother-daughter pairs and express some quantitative aspect of their relationship (for example, sharing food, money and chores) in an X-Y plot, if this is done in proportion to the relevant factors, then a linear equation is formed with two constants, which are not physically determinable but which are yet sensed and known as over-arching common truths. The slope of the line may be considered care, expressed on average as a constant, and the intercept, which is also a constant, may be concern. If that intercept is positive, it indicates health. If negative, it indicates harsh circumstances detrimental to the person. This is what social workers do when deciding the fitness of parents, they look for evidence of care indicating that the person is bearing their responsibilities of their position.

[39] We are specifically saying that the physically measurable factors reveal what is not measurable.

We already know that these indicators and factors of care are used to consider whether or not a parent is providing sufficient care for a child. The same factors are used to consider whether or not City Hall is providing sufficient care for the health and well-being of the citizens who pay for the expenses of City Hall. We also understand that attitudes and beliefs are expressed in actions. Hands, for example, voluntarily do nothing unless expressly directed to act. If we claim that certain actions do not express care, but instead intend and then express its opposite, we may simply be expressing our feelings which may be true. We may also claim that these actions result from a type of character that does not care, either inherently lacking empathy by nature or having developed those attitudes by nurture in specific social circumstances (e.g. the culture at City Hall).

[40] If by observation over time we know these poor attitudes at PCH are not temporary fluctuations like weather, but are persistent and deeply seated like climate, we also suspect them to be deeply embedded in a personality type, quite possibly fundamentally incapable and inherently unqualified for the role and position. Here we say we have clear measures of care required by local government as critical to meeting our basic *Section 7* needs for life, liberty and security of the person, with its components of housing security, food security, work security and so on, in the meeting of essential human needs, that is being so profoundly undermined by City Hall that we cannot live and have no future! We know with complete and utter certainty they have acted against us, purposely gutting and undermining our lives and the basis of the economy.

[41] In saying this, we have taken into account a full range of public attitudes. Some, believing government must by definition be good, think this is no issue at all, so they inherently assume that there must be a good reason, and that those charged with an offence must be guilty. For some, a certain QCH policy or fee is a mere annoyance, and the spectrum grades into those who find them utterly loathsome and reprehensible. This is usually the most vulnerable for whom the impact is devastating. So we have taken pains to find measurable factors each of which is tied to a physical reality and can be assessed as a sum of scalable impacts on legal standards such as life, liberty and security of the person.

[42] Out of all of this, the greatest crime is against the most vulnerable with the least life security, not just those who have had everything removed from them, but those who have yet to gain anything at all. An entire generation of Canadian kids from whom even the opportunity of a future is rapidly being removed from them by an uncaring older generation not acting in their defence, who urgently require a massive scale of *Section 15* life defence to prevent a serious foreseeable crisis which is not in the distance future but evidently upon us now.

[43] We understand that the average person considers only the direct economic impact on their lives, as a small amount of money each time, forgetting about scalable impacts. They say it's not much money, no big deal, and people pay much more in other places. Again, excuses are made. The fact is, thousands of people are paying continuously, creating a massive concentration of wealth for a very small population. For those with money, it's no big deal to pay a little each time. For those with little to no money, they needed that coin to have enough to buy bread, or seeds, and a fine means they cannot buy groceries, pay the entire electric bill, or make rent. The consequences are immense and can cascade. Thus we have damage to the stressed minority far out of proportion to the intended effects of the law, caused directly by the social-economic elite whose job it is to protect and defend people. Flat fees are highly damaging to some by being inherently unfair. PCH scales fee arbitrarily in accordance with what they want, whereas arbitrary application of the law is illegal. Many of these individual perceptions result from failure to overcome the self-serving bias. For those with money, it's no big deal. For those

with little to nothing, it is an outrage. It is another thing entirely to see and consider the net social impacts.

[44] When we add in these energy costs, CO₂ outputs and thermodynamically irreversible consumption of essential resources to our claims of damage, in doing so we directly refute statements by the Mayor that none of this is real or matters. *We could in fact make an extremely strong case that money is not real, that we simply do not believe in it, and on that basis not pay. Why should we pay, when the parking ticket has no basis in reality and the Mayor has no economic rights that can be legally referred to in our Charter?* Instead, we say this is unfair harnessing of our labour under conditions of force, threat and removal of choice and freedom. Furthermore, as the real value of our dollar is entirely based on our labour, surely we should be able to work for the City to repay the claimed debt - as the work equivalent of money? This is quite literally the mathematical expression of equality, relating two quantities by an equals sign. The Mayors actions are a violation of many Canadian laws, and also of *Article 4* of the UDHR, that “*no person shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms*”. Right here in Peterborough, those with nothing are being forced to work to pay for those with everything. A key feature of slavery is having no say, and that is the situation.

[45] All this is measurable and provable. We refer here to violations of *Article 1* of the UDHR specifically because the context of the UDHR is war and hate crime. The synonymous content of *Article 1* appears in our top law as the social, economic and human rights instrument of *Charter Section 15* in the gentler peacetime context of a softer social crime. Nevertheless, we say many PCH policies are the opposite of care, personally, economically and socially. We further see that were the context to be changed from that of a sleepy small town to one of deepened social strife, that the Mayor and council are primed to take worse actions than they already have. We know things can get much worse, and would rather act now with positive care in smart prevention. We understand the term *reciprocity* as a synonym to *equality under the law* implying the switching of roles and places. If we take on this expressed attitude of City Hall, then we too have no capacity to tolerate the violent, abusive and aggressive behaviours characteristic of most of City Hall policies, bylaws and intents of one-way rule and taxation without say or basis in law.

[46] Some say they do not like math, but the evidence indicates otherwise. If we value work W in dollars D per hour, such that $W = D/\text{hour}$ and money $D = \text{Work} \times \text{hours}$, people get very interested in this math. In these matters of pay expressed in dollars per hour the question of fairness and equity with respect to the ability to work to meet essential human needs is a matter of major concern as it is critical to our survival. Here we say that the senses of the body are highly attuned to the size of things, their quality and amount, to the extent that we have excellent built-in biological measures of fairness as being equitable access to the resources required for survival. We also say that although an entire region of the brain is devoted to communication by spoken, read and written language, another part of the brain is largely devoted to the mathematical senses of proportion, amount and equity. Although we do not cite references to the scientific studies supporting the social claim of rights to equity and fairness, we could. Instead, we cite *Charter Section 1, the reasonable limits clause*, which clearly supports *Sections 7 and 15* and defines our right to reason, to reasonable behaviour and reasonable application of law and which is definitive in clarifying the primary role and responsibility of government in Canada. If that is not clear enough, we can cite Canadian Supreme Court cases ruling that the objective of law is to deal with pressing and substantial issues. Reason means that the problem and its solution must be clearly defined. Here, the Mayor has defined the solution using the language of mathematics

using a dollar amount.

[47] Using the equation $\text{Dollars} = \text{Work} * \text{hours}$, we can quickly prove that the Mayor wants only money and not community service. If we have committed some offence, as he claims, when we “break” a bylaw that we cannot regard as law because it has no basis, then why can't we pay it back with community service? We could, for example, do the work of writing understandable parking policy based on the law, or do polls verifying that the bylaws generate positive social benefit in service to the community. *That City Hall uses the equation $\text{pay} = \text{dollars per hour or salary per year}$ proves their belief in this equivalence, making it our right to return the real value of any debt owed in equivalent work-hours as community service.* And surely we should be paid at the equivalent rate of a PCH worker, with benefits. If we lack money, we can use equivalent work for tax reduction. On this matter we note that because PCH has incorporated, and we are forced by taxation and regulation to belong to this association, by removal of Freedom of Association we have been automatically granted membership in this Company along with the full set of social, economic and voting rights to work freely with anyone in Peterborough and make change within Constitutional constraints on all matters of common concern and mutual benefit.

[48] We also understand perfectly well that the dividing line between levels of pay imposed by government as a minimum wage and the wages they take for themselves from our labour is the difference between them having a home and us renting in a state of permanent life insecurity, always a month away from disaster. It is abominable that they deny us shelter of our choosing. *We believe it is the role of government to defend our Section 7 Charter rights to life, liberty and security of the person for all.* We further believe, and in this case have evidence for, the gross distortion of life by an extreme minority of the population whose views are against and not for healthy, fair and equitable relations between friends and neighbours working together in caring community. Such people of poor mental health are disproportionately represented by their pathologies in positions of power in government.

[49] Concerning such personality types in politics and in positions of power over others in government, when it comes to obeying them or obeying the law, every individual must always defer to obeying Canada's top laws. Taking the time to ensure that they have a firm basis in care, fact, reason and evidence to support their actions (which is normally the case), and also taking some time to read our Constitution and a few relevant CSS cases to make their thoughts compatible with the clear minds of justice. Doing this here, we have found that the principles of justice and their expression in our Charter are quite natural and intuitive to our own internal senses of justice. The only trick then, is to understand a variety of perspectives, which is largely gained in healthy conversation. It is specifically this healthy conversation we lack in Peterborough, having been blocked at City Hall and denied in the media.

2.6 CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT, A SECTION 12 HATE CRIME

[1] *Section 12 Case Structure.* This entire case is structured around the impact of this generation of adults on the younger generation. There is significant evidence, globally and at the local scale of our lives, of significant degradation to our planet and local ecosystems, the threat being that our continued course of actions will force this generation into dire circumstances. We understand that most adults as caring parents understand exactly the problems and frustrations of life, and yet are locked into courses of action imposed externally on their lives as laws and expenses impacting their work, household

budget and freedoms to act. Here we argued that a certain personality type seeking *money* and *power* has removed our essential freedoms to secure life by violating *Charter Sections 1, 4, 7 and 15*. We generated a finite list of personality characteristics based on our experience with City Hall, and mapped these onto the dimensions of personality seeking a fit based on defined criteria. We then viewed life from the perspective of a person who imagines themselves as a ruler, as different from the view of a legally defined *reasonable person*, understanding this in an interaction with City Hall that results in reasonable or needed actions being blocked, with simple tasks that should be free or low-cost being changed *unreasonably* into PCH-controlled tasks of unusual complexity and expense. We then ran a series of SCC tests of law and democratic freedoms, each with finite easily determined criteria, to verify if our own actions were reasonable, justified and needed as essential to life security without damage to others, and comparing these to our experience of the behaviour of the person of City Hall. If in these tests we verified our hypothesis of a personality type dominating City Hall obsessed with money and power over all other considerations, then we also had to map out what was a profound disinterest of that personality type and thus neglected. This required understanding of the intent, purpose and responsibilities of legitimate government was, furthermore determining categories of relevant evidence as the case structure for our claims. Naturally there is some overlap due to common features in these multiple tests with multiple rankings, most specifically revolving around essential human needs. To remove biases and gain perspective, we used a set of well-known verifiable social models as points of comparison. As a result of all these rankings and risk assessments in various areas of common concern, taking care to support a healthy multicultural diversity, we arrived at a set of conclusions corresponding to legal categories of proof ranging from “most likely preponderance of the evidence” to “certainty beyond the shadow of a doubt”. We did not specifically aim at a prosecutorial point of view, but found certain actions of PCH to be so evidently wrong as to be placed in that category. As we cannot imagine the directors of PCH have that point of view, our main emphasis was on fact and evidence with a variety of perspectives determined by multivariate analysis, these being the three main parts of this case broken into sections describing their web of activities.

[2] Here, we consider *Section 12* concerns that this generation of Peterborough kids are already under punishing conditions purposely created by the directors of PCH and will further be punished to insane extremes for crimes they did not commit. We assess the specific contributions of PCH to increase the likelihood of an early death of our children at a large social scale. We assess the removal of essential citizen rights and freedoms by PCH to create life-threatening circumstances already present but predicted to worsen and become irreversible once the damaging action is taken by the directors. We considered what activities of City Hall are damaging, which if continued will soon become extremely outrageous to any sense of human decency so as to shock the conscience. We find we already have excellent models of what not to do, as well as fact-based predictors of disastrous outcome proven beyond the shadow of a doubt, and a list of easy community actions needed now to save our kids.

[3] Our *Section 12* concern is this: are the directors of PCH socially and economically forcing us to disaster, and also vehemently preventing our free actions to save ourselves? *We determine this by looking at the interests of PCH in justice versus suspected primary interests in money and power. The latter being expressed as a desire for complete economic and social control purposed to prevent any of the personal and social Charter Rights and Freedoms of Peterborough residents from being realized.* Is the intent of the person of PCH complete control of all essential human needs and actions of residents for monetary benefit, and are these coupled to actions of social control for the purpose of exerting power to drive society to appalling *Section 12* circumstances? Are their actions easily encapsulated and described by two primary personality intents of *money* and *power* regardless of legality or social,

economic and ecologic impact on others? Or are their actions consistent with intents of social concern for the meeting of essential human needs using Charter directives? We begin with *Section 12* considerations of legality (corresponding to *money* by budgetary cash flow directions and plans, as deduced by cognitive reasoning and evidence), and end with social *Section 12* impacts (corresponding to *power* aimed at social control and engineering, as deduced by moral reasoning and citizen experience), with additional social, economic and ecological impacts put in section 2.7.

[4] *Section 12* of our Constitution states that *everyone has the right not to be subjected to any cruel and unusual treatment or punishment*. It comes directly from the war-crimes *Article 5* of the UDHR stating that *no one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment*. *Section 12* prohibits treatment or punishment that is grossly disproportionate in the circumstances, so outraging our sense of common decency that Canadians would find it “abhorrent or intolerable” (R. v. Smith, [1987] 1 S.C.R. 1045 at 1072; R. v. Morrisey, 2000 SCC 39 at paragraph 26). All children understand the removal of right and freedoms as a punishment, but *grossly disproportionate* refers to extreme abuses causing much damage or threatening life itself. Here, the damage is assessed with respect to practical application of our *Section 7* rights because extreme punishment is often aimed at inflicting severe pain and suffering by removal of essential human needs. We are obligated by care to prohibit grossly disproportionate limitations of the right to life, liberty and security of the person (Canada Attorney General v. Bedford, 2013 SCC 72 at paragraphs 120-122). In this context, we understand the poor conditions of slavery, and the tactics and strategies of war including building encampments to harness labour and effect deprivations of life, as key social reference points we should not create in Canada. These being against our laws aimed at peaceful social care and protection of critical rights and freedoms. On *Section 12* issues of degradation of life, the international instruments binding on Canada include *Articles 7, 8 and 10* of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, *Articles 1, 2 and 16* of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and *Article 37* of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

[5] For *Section 12* to be engaged, the impugned measure must be a “treatment or punishment” by a Canadian state actor (Canadian Foundation for Children, Youth and the Law v. Canada Attorney General, 2004 SCC 4 at paragraph 47). In *Section 12* context, treatment refers to measures taken far beyond normal and acceptable levels of punishment (R. v. Rodgers, [2006] 1 S.C.R. 554 at paragraph 63). Here, treatment is defined as a process or manner of behaving towards or dealing with a person or thing (e.g. Chiarelli v. Canada Minister of Employment & Immigration, [1992] 1 S.C.R. 711 at paragraph 29). Concerning the behaviours of the directors of PCH and how they treat citizens, the Supreme Court has ruled that there must be some active State process in operation, involving an exercise of State control over the individual, in order for the State action in question, whether it be positive action, inaction or prohibition, to constitute ‘treatment’ under *Section 12* (Rodriguez v. British Columbia (Attorney General), supra, at 610). We understand punishment imposed as a penalty for an offence to include imprisonment (R. v. Nur, [2015] 1 S.C.R. 773), fines (R. v. Pham (2002), 167 C.C.C. (3d) 570 (Ont. C.A.) and various forms of detention and lockdown (Ogiamien v Ontario Community Safety and Correctional Services, 2017 ONCA 667 at paragraph 7). Therefore we are concerned with the policies, fees, fines bylaws, papers, plans and actions taken by the person of PCH as poor treatments creating conditions of punishment with social, economic and land use controls being so encompassing and against us as to create a social and economic prison aiming to control as much as possible all essential human needs and actions, pushing us hard to destruction by forceful removal of freedoms. Further attacking ecologies critical to our survival, aiming for their permanent ruin into irreversible states equivalent to a generational death sentence for our children.

[6] For a State action to be considered cruel and unusual, the treatment or punishment must be so excessive as to outrage standards of decency and be abhorrent or intolerable to society. This threshold is not met by treatment or punishment that is merely excessive or disproportionate (*R. v. Ferguson*, [2008] 1 S.C.R. 96, at paragraph 14, *R. v. Lloyd*, [2016] 1 S.C.R. 130 at paragraph 24, *R. v. Boutilier*, [2017] 2 S.C.R. 936, at paragraph 52). The phrase “cruel and unusual” is a statement of a compendious norm meant to be flexible, context-specific and linked to reasonable or objective community standards, and we aimed to be comprehensive in describing our standards here. *Section 12* further deals with extreme or irreversible treatments or punishments, with tests of gross disproportionality requiring that a number of factors be carefully examined and weighed against each other including the gravity of the offence, the personal characteristics of the offender and the circumstances of the offence. In this analysis, we can also consider to a significant degree the personal characteristics of a “representative offender” having the general characteristics of individuals who appear with staggering regularity in political and other positions allowing abuse of power over others.

[7] We are also concerned with damaging PCH State treatments of us in actions occurring for an extended period and of uncertain duration (with no defined end date) that are cruel and unusual in the creation of impossible circumstances for citizens. In our current social, economic and ecological crisis rationally connected to the policies of this Mayor and council, citizens are denied any meaningful opportunities to challenge the continued deleterious conditions (*e.g. Brown v. Canada Public Safety*, 2018 ONCA 14 at paras. 40-48). Even if we get a response from PCH, it is trivial and the review is not properly conducted (*Steele v. Mountain Institution*, [1990] 2 S.C.R. 1385), particularly on matters concerning reasonably foreseeable circumstances of great present and future threat to life, liberty and security of the person. We continually see that the actions of PCH are not those of legitimate state interest, with imposed regulations, fines, fees and taxes having continuous deleterious effects on average citizens unable to afford life. We find these combined effects of PCH policy to be not merely damaging treatments of us but punishments because the directors have structured Peterborough as an encampment specifically designed to remove critical rights essential to our lives for the purpose of forcing us into the hands of their income-extremist beneficiaries in business. We believe this personality type views citizens either dimly or as a threat. We find PCH policy not aimed at our self-determinative freedoms, but aimed at leveraging essential human needs using extortion to harness our lives and labour and effect extreme life-threatening economic inequities. These *Section 12* extremes comes into play when citizens in dire circumstances of serious poverty lack food and are denied access to land to grow it. When they lack work and are denied all opportunities for self-sustenance in our core economy of essential human needs. When they are in precarious housing situations struggling with externally imposed expenses on all essential human needs far beyond capacities to pay for it all by work. When they lack shelter and are denied any form of shelter and purposely driven off the land by policies of this Mayor and council. We consider these extreme attacks on life, liberty and security of the person to be grossly disproportionate punishments, with many people never having experienced government as a positive force in their lives. We have seen these policies at play in countries politically purposed against freedom that are socially and economically structured commit significant human rights abuses.

[8] We are alarmed to see PCH policies and land use plans specifically designed as State actions against self-provision of shelter or growing food created by directors determined to remove all ameliorative provisions allowing self-determinative access to critical resources required for survival. We are concerned by the actions of PCH directors who work to undermine society by acting against access to

land, water and life-sustaining work in our core economy of essential human needs, who destroy land critical to this for fast profit. On these matters, a key societal point of comparison is North Korea, which has plans and actions near-identical to those created by the directors of PCH purposed to interfere vastly with the lives of citizens to the extent of considerable impoverishment and the creation of unsurvivable living conditions. We find the Mayor and council have no interest at all in representing us using the principles of fundamental justice as part of the balancing process needed to maintain healthy society and aid citizens in urgent *Section 7* distress and long-term despair concerning their grim future and the low odds of long-term survival. It is cruel and unusual punishment for this generation of Peterborough kids, who already find it impossible to gain a foothold in life, to know that an early death awaits them, one that is preventable. To know what forces against them damage their lives, and to know based on evidence beyond the shadow of a doubt that they will not likely survive.

[9] The key issue here in Peterborough City Hall is slavery. The Mayor and council have invented of their own free will and against all best advice and Ministry directives, a land use map in which they plan to destroy land most critical to our survival, specifically designed to remove our critical rights to life and any freedom positive change by self-determination. Their purpose of PCH policy is extortion of essential human needs using denial of food and shelter to force us into compliance with their goals, one of which is harnessing our to effect extreme *Section 15* financial, social and ecological inequities. This Mayor and council have invented many sanctions, fines, fees and threats of unlimited State recourse against our lives if any citizen or City worker dares to exert their Charter Rights and Freedoms following Supreme Court of Canada directives and processes. We submit into evidence the PCH Consolidated Fees and Charges Bylaw 16-147, a long list of prohibited activities working directly against our securing of essential human needs. We find consistent work done to stop communication and social activities aimed at ameliorating our difficult to distressful life conditions. We submit the PCH budget which indicates the primary purpose and activity of City Hall to be the real estate sales arm of bankers. We have no say at all about anything significant to our lives, the primary purpose of PCH being complete control us and to funnel everything of value in our lives and community to corporations. PCH acting as the sales arm of bankers removes our Freedom of Association from these debt-sellers who do essentially no work to set up a mortgage (this now being merely a computer program) but insist on hundreds to thousands per month for that trivial work based on the fraud of issuing notes without real backing. The budget and activities of PCH show that no real or effective community involvement is allowed, the result being complete State control in which the directors of PCH have created an inescapable system of statistical indentured servitude for essential human needs including housing. At the root of the issue, the Mayor and council completely and utterly reject the very idea of equality under the law, claiming some imagined right to unilateral rule over the lives of 84 000 Peterborough residents in fine detail. These are not legitimate activities of government, and we see no higher government directives at all that direct this Mayor and council to these purposes. We can only conclude that these are the free actions of individuals working explicitly against us, against the law and against our government. To the directors of PCH, we say their claimed ignorance of the law is no excuse (*Criminal Code Section 19*).

[10] Concerning being held accountable for the individual actions of the directors of PCH outside the realm of legitimate government, we reject their claim that these are State actions. They tell us to get a lawyer at our own expense on matters of public concern, which they know consumes much time and is economically prohibitive for individuals. Understanding this as a strategy to deny recourse, and using their logic used in fair reciprocity, we say these are individual actions of scheming directors for which they cannot use public funds for personal defence. It was never the purpose of Incorporation to protect

public servants in activities involving no risk of a venture (as needed in private business), as their incomes are guaranteed by taxation. We are charging the person of the City of Peterborough as created by its directors. Laying these charges, will they suddenly demand the fair due process they denied us? Here we are concerned entirely with matters of public interest, noting that taxes are collected expressly to defend matters of public interest. We do not wish to make this case, but we must, and we do not wish to consume public funds, vastly preferring that this Mayor and council had simply followed the SCC plan for healthy democratic engagement using our Constitutional processes, adjusting their policies as needed for public service and representation. We also see that all lines of recourse developed at PCH are intended to keep public matters private. Concerning getting this *Section 12* component of our case heard in a court of competent jurisdiction, the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal considers only a narrow range of individual *Section 15* cases rather than their legally required full Charter mandate, and therefore we consider this *Section 12* matter to fall under that full range of Constitutional debate and discussion in both the public and governmental realms. This being a local example of global concerns fully within the universal domain of parental care and a matter of national disgrace.

[11] The specific actions taken by this Mayor and council concerning the removal and suppression of citizen rights essential to life have created a hostile punishing environment for Peterborough youth directly threatening their lives and survival. Our kids have no future here. We understand these as acts of war against humanity, by promoting struggle and strife using ideas and policies that directly attack our fundamental *Section 7* rights to life, liberty and security of the person. We say that legitimate activities of government do not include fraud, threat, collusion and extortion, and neither do they include rejection of law and replacement of our Canadian democracy with the full working mechanisms of an authoritarian state intent on oppression. For decades now, we have been living under conditions of economic and social lock-down in Peterborough, our lives completely controlled with all opportunities to make and sell things systematically blocked and hindered by a small handful of people intent on owning everything for extreme anomalous benefit. In each case, they want money but do not want to work for a living, their goal being to harness our labour or make us pay, in both cases to such extreme inequity as to ensure no change in our poor condition. The Mayor and council are the key figures involved in and responsible for maintaining this local web of organized crime. They are so violently opposed to all equitable social purposes of government they have written policies aimed at disruption of stable society, social enslavement and overthrowing our democratic form of government. With respect to local citizens, they have created policies indicating intent to create homelessness and then commit manslaughter, further purposed to commit genocide. There is no place left for this generation of Peterborough kids. Just as in North Korea, this Mayor and council have claimed all public land as their own, controlling our lives and land uses to vastly interfere with our ability to grow food, seek shelter in forms of our own desire and making as suitable to us and preferred, and crippling our capacities to make and sell things essential to trade allowing us the income and capacity to live freely. This outright and blatant attack on our lives is also a direct attack on the rights and rulings of the Supreme Court as the final and ultimate justice in our land.

[12] We live in a social and economic prison in Peterborough, controlled completely by the Mayor and council and their beneficiaries in business. Our every action to secure a life for ourselves is hindered and attacked. Our children can rarely secure a future here, and as they leave our families are ripped apart. Others fall into circumstances so crippling they cannot leave, having no resources to. Others find their options to work so extremely limited by expenses imposed on them for transportation, communication and job search tools that it soon becomes impossible to find any options at all. We do not speak here only of the desperately poor, but of the typical high school graduate who encounters

systems created by the Mayor and council aimed to deny social connection to others with similar desires to start a small business, particularly in types of work requiring a team of two or more. We find these practices systemically imposed throughout all local government to the effect of entirely crushing the start-up basis of our economy with not hopes for economic regeneration. In this, we continually find trails to PCH with the Mayor and council at the core as the key persons responsible. Instead of being concerned with their primary Charter duties (which we see in our Constitution as clearly focused on justice by maintaining a healthy social order respectful of all the rights and needs of citizens), we find this Mayor and council instead to be fully devoted to running a real estate business in which they are major beneficiaries. Our land is their product, and they offer us as an “eager” source of labour for factories and corporations. They create advertising flyers and pamphlets saying how wonderful life is here, whereas we wonder where this wonderful place is. We know that tourists and retirees coming here will be appalled by the lack of things to do and by the disgusting state of our lives, shorelines and decayed downtown which have been devastated by the economic mining practices of PCH.

[13] Concerning the extension of these anti-social activities into *Section 12* concerns, it is shocking and appalling for our children to know that their planet is dying, that their lives are at risk and that they face a grim to unsurvivable future. To know that nothing substantial is being done to protect them. Surely it is the primary responsibility of adults to defend the lives and future of their children. To protect their well-being not only as vulnerable citizens but with respect to the sanctity of life. What greater personal, national and global cause is there than to protect and defend life itself? Isn't the protection of families, homes and land the primary reason why Canada or any other nation declares defensive war, with peaceful citizens becoming soldiers willing to lay down their lives in defence of others? Surely it is the responsibility of an older generation to cease and desist destructive activities that now directly threaten the lives of their own children, and to powerfully support activities that defend and protect life. Instead of care, we have outrageous activities that accelerate acts of destruction against the lives of our children, many of which are fully promoted and supported by worst actors within our local government. When we discover the reasons for this degradation of life in Peterborough, we are outraged. The land most critical to our survival being irreversibly destroyed, this generation of Peterborough youth are being punished for crimes they did not commit.

[14] In PCH policy after policy, much of which was invented decades to centuries ago, we find ourselves locked into the worst ideas of the long-dead. Policies created one afternoon decades ago in a vote that barely passed, with effects that were later found to cause much damage, and which now have no legal basis in passable reason (*failing all Section 1 tests and not being legitimate purposes of government*), and yet this Mayor and council refuse all discussion (see paragraph 2.6 [7] above). We know the work needed to save us is community-based and not that hard, requiring strong efforts now to mitigate prevent disaster and mitigate the creation of high-risk dire circumstances we are not likely to survive (*cf.* World Scientists' Warning to Humanity). That our farms, forests and fisheries are dangerously worn thin, with entire Canadian ecosystems collapsing, and with the effects of a hot polluted atmosphere already upon us, is now proven at the highest legal level of *beyond the shadow of a doubt*. Our IPCC reports being legitimately based on mountains of firm and solid evidence, fully backed by every living Nobel laureate with complete scientific-governmental agreement between the top minds on our planet. We further know that the work required to save us is not that hard, but requires strong effort now. Such plans to save our kids are completely consistent with our top Canadian Ministry and Supreme Court directives to take safe and caring fact-based actions on all matters of personal, social and national security. But here in Peterborough, when we try to obey our top laws by doing the work needed to create a safe and sound social, economic and ecologic basis for our lives, we find

ourselves attacked by this Mayor and council who threaten us with all manner of ill intent. *In bylaws and fees, they inflict on us all manner of things we would never have inflicted on ourselves, much less our children, and we find their actions against our lives and future are fundamentally against our learning process of correcting mistakes and solving problems.* In this, the Mayor and council cannot distinguish between the meaning of the words open and closed, and their effects as dynamic *versus* static. They intend to lock us into the worst practices of the past, proven to damage, and they deny us all reasonable, proven and safe practices known to enhance life and secure good relations between people and the ecosystems that sustain our lives as the sole basis of our economy.

[15] We see much evidence of work done against us throughout PCH documents and in the budget. We compare what percent of our taxes go to corporations, what percent to legitimate services, and find millions misdirected to no good purpose. Whereas the amount going to societal justice as the primary Constitutional purpose of government and to Charter directives of community self-direction or ecological imperatives is zero. There is no community self-directed social benefit. There is no representation of youth, seniors, or community-based job creation. Everything about life in the Peterborough region is controlled, purposed entirely at extreme monetary gain, and based entirely on the whim of the Mayor and council. Who act with no basis in law and write policies exhibiting actual contempt for our courts, laws and Charter rights to direct our own lives. Instead, this Mayor and council engage in acts of social force taking us in directions already known to have results that shock the conscience of humanity. Purposely aligning themselves with corporations having no State interest, aiming to create economic monopolies that are collusive, anti-competitive, controlling of human needs and using tactics of cornering, bullying and trapping to completely remove our self-determination. Whereas the valid good-government goals of PCH could be easily attained economically by engaged democratic involvement using the significant base of community expertise available in our population *under* legal constitutional SCC processes. It is an act of war by PCH to completely destroy our local capacity to grow food, especially considering escalating prices and the climate-caused drought-based collapse of ecosystems in places that produce much of our food (*e.g.* California). Whereas here we could feed ourselves and the world. Destroying land critical to our lives is a death sentence.

[16] What this Mayor and council fail to realize is that when they lack specific competencies, our community is here to help, not hinder. In this case, concerning the primary judicial role of government in representing people by a balance of considerations, we can assist with matters of judicial competence. When this Mayor and council lack aptitudes of social care and consideration, we have a large body of expertise in these matters, some in the community and some already assigned this government work of maintaining social health. When this Mayor and council lack clarity and become *vague, arbitrary, in over-breadth or without rational connection or clear intent and purpose to overcome pressing issues*, we are here to help. When they fail in these core competencies, the problem is that citizens are put in conflict with the law. In all cases, we must obey our higher laws, lest we be charged with more serious offences such as aiding and abetting, or contributing to factors leading to the deaths of our children. We are legally and morally obliged across our entire Charter and by the intent of all law and legitimate government to not pay into systems designed for our destruction. And even if our rights were not recognized by government, we find such rights to be obvious and evident, inherent to our being and essential activities of life.

[17] Concerning PCH activities, we consider all manner of fair reciprocity. Nevertheless, our primary test is this: would any caring parent ever do this to their children? Why, when we obey the law and make proposals or try to do things completely meeting all good criteria of *Sections 1, 4, 7 and 15* of our

Charter, taking care to not intrude on all other rights of our friends and neighbours, does PCH reject our initiatives? Why do we constantly find, in shelter and housing for example, that the basis of our rejection is only inconsistency with the plans of banks and business with which PCH has itself aligned? We do not say this *vaguely*, but with much evidence proven by monetary and paper trails with rational connection directly tied to the intents and actions of the directors of City Hall. We cannot pay into activities of fraud that degrade our currency and lives by forced speculation that are acts of theft and harnessing of labour, further driving our children on course to destruction.

[18] We are in a major species extinction event. Major Canadian ecosystems have collapsed. We are setting dates for when we can no longer catch fish in the oceans. We are extremely alarmed that these attacks on our lives and the basis of life are not only massively damaging but irreversible. And this Mayor and council have slated land most critical to our lives and survival for destruction. All who oppose him or act to defend citizens are threatened or fired. There is no law in PCH. He says everything is wonderful. His *vague* official plan for our lives is not a plan at all, allowing *arbitrary* action without *reason*. It is extremely illegal and a direct violation of our lives and Canada's top laws, *specifically as it was our Charter right as employers of PCH to write this document as a post-election summary expressing our concerns and directing them in our official plan as to the work they are required to do*. The PCH plan, written by consultants knowing nothing about our community or structure of Canadian governance, contains no reference to physical reality or the role and purpose of government. There is no plan to address any urgent issue of life security we face, and this is instead a purely political document with pretty pictures and graphics designed to sound nice with no real substance. We call this political posturing fraud, an abdication of duty, and a failure to respond to the very real crisis we are in. It is proof of a mind not connected to reality, evidence of insanity and a profound lack of care.

[19] This Mayor and council prevent us from doing anything needed to save ourselves, denying shelter, the right to grow food, the right to good government, and the right to work for self-sustenance. They say we cannot touch the land, that it belongs to them, and if we cannot pay we must leave. Concerning these vile actions against us, we could easily and to the same effect read the 1791 Declaration of the Rights of Man from the French revolution concerning their attitude of rulership. Our concerns here are not merely *argumentative*, for we see in this document significant clarity on certain relevant matters greater than that found in our Constitution. In contrast to times past, and concerning the present and proposed conditions of life in Peterborough, many Peterborough residents look with envy on the guaranteed food and shelter, exercise, educational and social programs offered by our Canadian prisons. Which leave much time to relax, meditate and attain significant personal development in regards to a better future. The cost spent per federal prisoner being very high and far out of proportion to the expenditures of PCH ensuring a similar standard of social care (which is zero), the directors further act to prevent us from attaining such basic standards ourselves.

[20] Many also envy the historical conditions of benevolent slavery offered by Thomas Jefferson in which they had free roam of a wooded mountainside and creek, with cabins, community, chickens and cows with fields to tend providing all manner of nutritious crops and vegetables. They received spending money from businesses run and invitations without beatings (avoiding *Section 12 gross disproportionality*) to be involved in quite a number of great projects requiring a broad number of inherent skills including the building of Monticello, which we would recognize today as a fine tiny home. Whereas in Peterborough, we get to do nothing. Thomas Jefferson was much like this Mayor and council in wild, reckless and stupid spending on all manner of fine things and vacationing that do not

bring life security and are denied the working population, thus driving the entire venture to ruin and bankruptcy. All the while espousing the Rights of Man as an interesting philosophy. If this Mayor and council lack financial competencies not grounded in physical reality, also driving us to ruin, then we have the Constitutional right of self-determination based on Charter considerations to exert our expertise. We won that right in 1982.

[21] We understand this Mayor and council benefit immensely from certain social and economic rights denied to citizens, and further that they wish to benefit from rights far beyond the scope of legitimate purposes of government, to run a wide variety of businesses. Thus turning PCH into an anything-goes unlimited profit enterprise without limit, but one which we are forced to pay into. Here in Peterborough, if residents want to meet for social purposes, our requests concerning facilities are denied unless we pay first, and the content of our meetings and identity of speakers screened for approval and deep pockets according to the interests of the Mayor, the council and the Department of Economic Development. All staff are ordered to complete silence on what PCH does, has or offers. All public postings are removed or not allowed, even for the friendliest activities. This intent of in-crowd totalitarian control extends throughout all local government. We do indeed long for common places to meet, work and talk freely afforded under benevolent slavery.

[22] We have an entire generation of youth in Peterborough trapped between low wages and high house prices, who find not way to create work, requiring a place to work a sales outlet and people to work with. Who have no place to convene socially to address these inadequacies. Who are actively denied such places and healthy social structures of care aiming to solve problems by the Mayor. We are concerned here with the requirement of burden of proof of *Section 12* harm done against Peterborough youth, as in general it is on the person harmed to make the case. We have created a place for the special work of government, and paid for it all providing land, buildings, tools and everything they need, and yet there is no place in society for an entire generation of youth. Although their role is well-defined by certain extremist beneficiaries in the older generation, to be harnessed labour with freedoms to pursue alternatives denied. They start life with little on graduating and have no place to go. The bankers have declared most land private and have speculated prices beyond reach, claiming some unknown right to both our money and land to gain income without labour, and this City Hall claims public land as off-limits for their benefit, such that we have no say and nothing is left. We understand this as a trap aimed to leverage land against human needs, but to no good end, designed for totalitarian control and purposed to rip apart healthy social structures of care across the generations.

[23] Concerning these *Section 12* injustices in dynamic living-tree ecological relations with *Sections 7* and *15* Charter law, it is not fair to have the burden of proof placed on the person making the claim of removed rights with effect of damage (Law v. Canada 1999, 1 S.C.R. 497 at paragraphs 80 and 83). Concerning the removed rights to life of children and young Canadians, it must not be on them to prove the odds are stacked against them by the actions and negligence of an older generation to such extent that the risk to them is high and the odds of their survival low. Surely this work was done by the IPCC and the World Scientists on their behalf. Whereas it would take years to decades for a child to understand the operations of government or the complexity of the financial mechanisms by which the rich harness the lives and labour of others to generate massive incomes without labour. Years to overcome the massive obstacles placed in their path by a local government that refuses to recognize our inherent work, economic and social rights, or the fact that our lives and economy depend completely and utterly on the provisions of Nature. What is this generation supposed to do with a mountain of lower-level law that has become so complex it cannot be understood, with it's application arbitrary and

only available to the rich affording an army of lawyers? The vast majority of people depend completely and utterly on government as a union of the people, and they pay taxes explicitly for the purpose of defence of our lives. Here we say that the over-arching parental purpose of defence of life and the life of our children is the primary purpose and obligation of leaders in government working with all members of society to positive benefit.

[24] It being unreasonable to expect this generation of young Canadians to provide the full case of harm done against them, with the appropriate social, historical, legal, economic and ecological data and context required to prove their rights have been removed by generational discrimination, we as caring Peterborough parents make this case on their behalf. We say our kids face such tremendous disadvantage that they require special protection with urgent *Section 15* affirmative actions needed at large scale to save their lives. Although we have made some effort on their behalf here, we say the burden of proof is on this Mayor and council to explain their actions of non-representation and work done against our lives and the basis of life. In considering the SCC plan of democratic involvement with responsibilities of social integrity across all of government, we say it is the inherent job and role government to act as caring parents in defence and protection of families. We make this entire case on behalf of our children. We would never do to them what this local government has done to us.

[25] As evidence of this inherent parental role of government to protect all matters of life, liberty and security of the person, we submit the ministerial and functional structure of government itself as evidence of its requirements and duty to meet common essential human needs by education, transportation, farming, communication and so on. We further say that the full set of working rights the government grants to itself as essential to its functioning are also our rights. Workers in government cannot lord themselves over us, for they are our employees legally obliged to defend our lives using the practices and principles of our union contract, the Canadian Constitution Act. Are their lives separate from those working to pay for it all, that they rise high by crushing others and making life impossible? We have an army of Canadians struggling to pay for it all, but with no say, which is a condition of forced servitude not freedom. An entire generation of young Canadians must now bear the consequences of this, starting life with nothing but born into falsely-created debt in a degraded world from which they might not ever hope to recover. Trapped between low wages and high house prices, the entire country designed around the desire for income without labour, the fantasy of infinite exponential growth wherein few benefit. That's not care. That's hate. To know they face a degraded world, and to see escalating degradation instead of defence of their lives when there are know reasonable solutions not being implemented, and to suffer the consequences of something they did not do, cannot be considered anything but cruel and unusual punishment.

[26] We say the parentally-protective case for urgent action at large scale to protect this generation has been made in all manner of detail and evidence by the top minds on the planet, yet we can safely say that absolutely nothing substantial is being done about our most urgent problems. Furthermore, the state of local government control of people, and their refusal to solve real problems, and their refusal to work with citizens on solving problems, and their refusal to allow us to solve major and obvious problems, gives us no faith in their political leadership at all, but rather concerns of criminality. Nevertheless, we do believe in democracy, and in the rule of law, and in the principles of truth, honesty and fundamental justice, and in the hearts and minds and intent of our judges whose lives are dedicated to matters of fairness, peace and justice, much like ours. We say that on this matter of protecting the lives of this generation of Canadian kids, that the burden of proof is on this Mayor and council to explain their actions. Since they refuse to do so, we make this case. This being a pressing and

substantial objective with a clear and defined mission for our lives and country.

[27] The purpose of our having a Charter is to free everyone to make good decisions under the law but above the whim and will of scoundrels, bullies and the mentally ill, using the *Section 1* logistics as our main sanity clause. Since we cannot apply to PCH for justice, we must make our case public to get any hope at all recourse. By the time this local government responds, and they show no intention of doing so, many more will be hungry and homeless, without work or permanently mired in debt. Another year or more will have passed, beyond the climate tipping point from which we may never recover. No, we need fundamental justice by decisive conversation at the local scale of our lives. We need to act directly using our rights and freedoms, using documents like this to clearly state our case and reasons for action. That is the purpose of having rights and freedoms we can act on.

[28] When the life, liberty and security of our person is attacked from all directions, it is difficult to know where to begin. We have the sweeping actions of government to perpetually increase itself while flat-lining the wages of taxpayers, thus growing a vast army of part-time minimum-wage no-benefit workers that they force to pay for it all. Millions of Canadians now with no options and no life security and in falsely-created permanent lifetime debt for essential human needs. We have an older generation fully expects this younger generation to pay for it all, somehow also recovering from the debt and damages done to farms, forests, fisheries and our atmosphere. In this context of grossly disproportionate violation of generational *Section 15* Charter rights that also threatens their *Section 7* rights to life by removal of critical freedoms, their profound lack of care must be considered cruel and unusual punishment.

[29] Right here in Peterborough, this Mayor and council are fully dedicated to representing themselves, bankers and big business, with no intent at all to defend individuals or protect those starting life with nothing. Even in prisons, we do not remove food and shelter, but this Mayor and council do. To remove essential rights to shelter, and to grow food, and to have self-determined work in our core economy of essential human needs, is not an act of care. Our pioneers had a better chance at life than does this generation of Canadians kids. This Mayor and council, along with those of similar mind in corporations with no interest in what happens to people, are busy creating policies that are clearly biased and against people, with no concern at all for the future of our kids. We know exactly the personality types that do this, and here we say the directors of PCH are the instigators, having rebelled against the laws justly protecting us. They refuse to listen. They block all recourse. They continually act against us. They deny all community involvement. They are directly involved in stopping communication, in disrupting community connection. Only money matters. Money and the exertion of power. Only they have the right to decide. But we are all born equal in dignity. Equal in rights and freedoms. Equal in our rights to life. And we say to this Mayor and council, *“if we the citizens of Peterborough are not to be compelled by removal of all forms of recourse to extreme measures of protest against City Hall, our equal rights to life, liberty and security of the person must be respected. This crime wave at City Hall cannot continue. This is our home. Our children must have the right to life here. This Mayor and council must obey the laws of Canada”*.

[30] We understand the many forces which can drive a region or country from hard circumstances into dire matters of survival in which *Section 12* violations become uncontrolled and rampant. Here, we are concerned with the realistic basis of Canadian Social Security, and the manner in which individuals sequentially fall into dire circumstances summing to a significant population. In attempting to address this here we seek prevention of foreseeable circumstances. Currently the pillars of Canadian Social

Security are purely economic, whereas we know a caring society is held together by all manner of non-economic or sub-economic activities. We help each other. We have life security from the work we do, for ourselves and others, all of which is based on the longevity of materials and “running expenses” that include growing food. Clearly, a realistic and provable Charter basis for all our programs of work, social care and social security must be directly based on labour, on how we choose to spend our time, and not entirely on the monetary equivalent which is subject to all forms of manipulation that degrade by trickery and theft the real value of our currency. This is a Constitutional discussion concerning the real and healthy basis of fair and sustainable life in Canada, one in which government has significant equal say with regards to being under Charter law, but no right to interfere with. We find this is specifically the area of life this Mayor and council neglects, there being no money in it for them, or attacks in order to force us into the hands of businesses controlling essential human needs. We find this to be a purposeful attack on the basis of our personal and national life security, and a known force destabilizing countries.

[31] Whereas we know for a fact that if parents were to invest directly in this generation of young Canadians in the best-ideas creation of caring green and low-carbon work that also helps our lives, for example, food security, our lives would improve significantly over systems of social security based only money alone that force us into the hands of the most unscrupulous actors. We reject these actors, and vastly prefer following legal Constitutional directives. But who in government defends our lives using the principles and practices of our Canadian Constitution Act, which they are legally, morally and economically obliged to do? How can we have integrity of society when those impacted by law have no say and those writing law do not follow our top laws or even understand the basis of law? Instead of care and protection for our kids, this local government – a small gang of directors - is more concerned with continued guaranteed cash from activities known to undermine our lives which are not the basis of any real or substantial life security.

[31] We know for a fact that many people are against both the rule of the law and equality under the law, as they seek anomalous benefit while denying others the rights they enjoy and benefit from. Many seek income without labour, aiming to profit immensely from the labour of others. Assessing the dimensions of personality, approximately 1% of the population are extreme narcissists grading into sociopaths who actively deny the rights of others and psychopaths lacking conscience who take pleasure in inflicting harm on others. And we have a Canadian government so intent on polishing its good image that we live in a country with no hate laws at all. We have *hate speech, which is the outspoken promotion of inflicting harm on a specific group or destroying it*, but no recognition that the primary drivers of war using tactics of war are sociopaths seeking leadership roles in banking, business and government where they use tactics of war against everyone. So we say definitively here that hate crimes exist and that those committing the crimes are directly involved in driving destructive practices that will destroy the lives of this generation of Canadian youth. The main political tactic in Canada is quiet removal of rights, smiling and saying everything is wonderful and will only get better. When we know the reality of our lives, this is propaganda generating massive distrust in politicians and government. We see this process of fundamental fraud highly active at PCH.

[32] Why are workers in this local government not doing the job we are paying them to do? Why are they not enthusiastically taking part in the greatest mission in the history of the world, a drive to save this generation of Canadian kids from disaster? Why are workers in government not using the fair, just, sane and inclusive SCC plan for our country? Why are they not free to do the job they were elected, hired, trained and paid to do? Because their lives too have been attacked by a tiny minority of

sociopaths working within government abusing their positions and claiming powers over others they do not have. When we have a world consensus on the problems we face along with clear solutions, the vast majority of which are healthy and community-based, why are we not free to do this critical work needed to save our lives? Here in Peterborough City Hall, we have an older generation stuck in their ways that refuses to do it! *We therefore say it is the fundamental right of each new generation to shrug off the worst practices of the past, to use the best ideas we know to move forward, and to boldly solve problems their parents thought impossible.*

[33] We know that failure to act on our most obvious and urgent problems, particularly when there are known and reasonable solutions, is without a doubt criminal negligence. But we can also predict with great certainty that much of the world population cannot now be saved from the most dire circumstances of mass migration, civil unrest, war and starvation that will further act to destroy the ecosystems we depend on. We can cite many documents, but the World Scientists' Warning to Humanity is a good start as a clear and easy read that also provides solutions. To know that fate awaits our children, and to inflict that fate on them by negligence is not only a crime against humanity but cruel and unusual punishment. We are a creative species with many solutions, but we must be free to act on our best ideas known and proven to take us on the safest route to a secure future. We have many solutions!

[34] As legal guardians, parents understand the removal of rights and freedoms, choice and options as a useful tool to teach children healthy behaviours. Punishment by removal of freedoms, by fines and imprisonment, is also key to administration of legal justice. In this context, we naturally understand the proper use of authority for corrections to poor behaviour, with much of law being based on fairness and reasonable behaviour and actions. We also understand that good relations between adults are based on overarching and universal considerations of reasonable respect and equality, with most disputes being solved by reference to fact, evidence, reason and proof. This being the basis of law, we are free to live as long as we operate under the law by acting as reasonable persons. The concern here is that the Mayor and council of the City of Peterborough have removed essential rights and freedoms critical to life, thereby crippling our lives for monetary gain by rejecting the foundational legal principle of equal benefit under the law.

[35] We know from a critical reading of our Constitution that rights are not a list. Rights are an active inclusive living ecosystem used in daily life as directly connected to the living ecosystems that support our lives. We knew this in the year 1600 as well, but now we have internet access to a wealth of backing science. We can quickly understand our *Section 7* rights to life as a set of factors required for a functioning life based on work done using the resources of Nature to meet essential human needs. Water, food, clothing, shelter, access to land and tools, childcare and education, work, transportation and communication, healthcare. Concerning the overarching universal principles of good human relations, selecting one principle such as honesty as a trait of good character brings with it many related principles of justice, trust, care and concern. The Mayor and council do not simply violate *Section 12* by their attitudes, beliefs and actions, most of which are written directly into bylaws that illegally violate our top laws, but they violate many other related laws and rights at the same time. We understand these sets of practices as explicit attacks on the basis of our lives, the sum of which is a hate crime, our serious *Section 12* concern.

[36] We say that access to land near water is most critical to our survival. We say that planting seeds in soil to grow plants to eat is an obvious and inherent right to life that includes natural and provable

rights to personal and social health provably founded on natural and inherent seed, soil and environmental health. We have significant evidence for this which is open to reasonable debate and admissible in a court of law. We further say that a healthy social order promoting peace by the meeting of essential human needs is a universal unifying principle of the highest personal, social and national importance, critical to personal and national security. We say these are painfully obvious matters of common sense that any reasonable person would agree with based on direct life experience, fact, proof and evidence. And further that these are legitimate purposes of government required for democratic representation and defence of our lives using the principles of justice. We understand that certain land in Peterborough most critical to our survival is inherently protected from demeaning interests at the Constitutional level of life as Charter land.

[37] Concerning safe routes to a fair and sustainable future protecting the lives of our children, we say that the growing of vegetables is a highly peaceful and healthy personal and social activity associated with exceedingly low rates of crime unless taken over by special interests aimed at wealth extraction by controlling the land, live and labour of others. We also say that this critical part of our economy is essential to personal, social and ecological health and its viability depends on the most important land near water. It is an essential function of government to protect such land critical to our survival, protecting our lives by protecting our core economy of essential human needs. And yet the Mayor has proposed the most destructive zoning possible, taking us on a course of reckless endangerment that threatens our lives now and decidedly ruins any chance for the survival of our children. This is a serious violation of public trust, completely aimed at enrichment of two specific groups, City Hall and bankers, by forcing the entire population into immediate and foreseeable dire circumstances. We submit as evidence of this antagonistic activity against us the PCH land use plan.

[38] Instead of obeying the law and being honest, the Mayor and council have turned to fraud, extortion and collusion in explicit actions against people by rejecting the principle of equal benefit under the law. In speculative land use, which is a means of driving up prices to generate income without labour, the primary beneficiaries are City Hall and bankers, by increased taxes and interest respectively. Only rarely can an individual landowner profit, because they must live somewhere and enter an escalated market. Bankers are primarily interested in making all land private such that each critical component of a persons' life is fully exposed to an escalating open market. The only thing left is public land, which the Mayor says is not for public benefit. Anyone who cannot afford to pay these two groups is left with no options, no place to go and is hunted down and denied both shelter and recourse. The hungry have no place to go to plant food. These are abusive denials of fundamental human rights by collusion with full rejection of community solutions. It is our understanding that it is not the role of government to run the business plans of private enterprise, or to engage in market speculation, but to represent and defend people using the principles and practices of our Canadian Constitution Act.

[39] *Our sense of fairness as a basis of justice arises so early in human development that it can be defined by the biological imperatives of life as equitable access to the resources required for survival.* How is it fair that those starting life with nothing, which is the case of your typical high school graduate, be forced to pay those with everything while finding it impossible to meet their own essential human needs by the work of their own hands? Is this not a situation of statistical indentured servitude, when one has no say about anything that impacts their life and future, and essential freedoms critical to life have been removed along with removal of freedom of association, the result being forced into the hands of the very groups working against life, liberty and security of the person? We reject the totalitarian use of land a mere commodity used as a force of extortion against essential human needs,

and instead point to our permanent Charter uses of supporting *Section 7* rights to life by a healthy balance of interests in a full set required for the ongoing sustenance of all species in our ecosystems. Whereas in equating money to land instead of its real basis in our labour, PCH denies us Freedom of Association from certain forces destroying the real value of our lives and our currency. If we are to be forced to use a common currency, then its abuses must be denied with its healthy uses defended by mutual benefit Constitutional justifications. We find this to be a foundational SCC issue requiring urgent clarity concerning the future and survival of this generation of Canadian children.

[40] We say this on finding PCH is running a real estate business, which is not a legitimate purpose of government. It is now an investment company, run by financial directors. The result of PCH policy is complete control of land and money, the creation of an economic prison in which self-determination and Freedom of Association has been completely removed. We cannot escape these scoundrels. There is literally no place for this generation to go to start anything, which is a deep anti-competition policy, and we know that the minds those who created this system of complete control have no interest at all in care for others.

[41] All means of discussion and recourse have been denied, and the Mayor is actively removing all places of public benefit, rest, refuge or shelter, because it does not bring him money! We say this is extreme hate, loathing and contempt for us, for our children, and for all of humanity. These are indeed acts of war against humanity, completely coupled to destruction of the ecosystems that sustain our lives as the sole basis of the economy. This is the direct result of an insane mind willing to destroy anything and everything for personal gain, a criminal mind also intent on lying, cheating, stealing and breaking all manner of laws. This is organized crime, fraud and collusion, a hatred of humanity and our children. No caring parent would ever do this.

[42] All valuations by PCH are entirely based on what they want, not on any indicators of real value. This being coupled to land use policy which forces us into the hands of bankers is collusion. It occurs when the directors of PCH make deals with exclusionary bankers and developers specifically designed for the removal of rights and freedoms. In that planning, critical rights are removed without compensation, this being a planned and purposeful disruption of the integrity of society expressed as package of practical rights and circumstances needed in order to have a functional life. We know this as the components of a household budget with essential requirements including a home and work. If we lose a component, for example transportation or communication, our options decrease substantially. If costs increase so that we cannot afford food, life is very difficult when the option to grow food has been removed. If we do not earn enough to afford rent or the attendant expenses imposed on us, the most cruel aspect of the PCH business plan is the complete and utter removal of options and places to go. We know they are running the business plan of bankers and are complicit in it be receiving benefit from taxes based on house valuations. This is great incentive for massive human rights abuses, which happen daily at PCH at a significant social scale to threaten life, liberty and security of the person, our concern also being that this is not a legal form of taxation. It is not the role of government to play the market and engage in speculation for profit. The measure in the Constitution Act is life, liberty and security of the person, with work done to meet essential human needs. Government must not crush people with its expenses, as its primary job is ensuring the well-being of everyone. We could easily, fairly and justly fix government incomes in proportion to Bell-curve minimum and typical wages for similar work done, in order to maintain fair democratic representation of rights to essential human needs including shelter and food. We make that case here as the public employers of our civil servants, citing *Section 7* as a principle responsibility requiring a balance sum of factors for mutual well-being

by attendance to critical issues of ongoing life security assessed legally by living tree doctrine.

[43] We have physical evidence. We can simply stand downtown and see who benefits. Banks, insurance companies, City Hall and perhaps a few chain stores selling degraded food and poor products from China to the effect of extreme global pollution. Whereas must live, work and consume locally. We have skills and talents, and can easily make most of what we buy, but are given no chance by controlling interests who are also driving our destruction. The key here is a combination of work, food and shelter, but the Mayor says we have no right to shelter. But we say our pioneers had the right to build any kind of shelter they wanted or needed, as critical to survival and gaining a foothold in life. It was their right to work freely and fairly with others for mutual benefit and success. *It was their right to bear that risk, not to have such risk imposed on them as to threaten their survival, and we see that enshrined in our Section 7 right and freedom of personal security.* Concerning being forced into the hands of insurance companies by government, we require SCC clarity on this issue by defining a clear baseline of normal daily activity rights particularly with respect to injuries covered by healthcare. These also being used in *Section 7* clarity to define what risks must not be imposed on this generation in direct connection to the meeting of human needs using the resources of Nature. We are instead finding that due to the action of the directors of PCH, their intent of complete control makes us not free, but indentured servants trapped forever in falsely created lifetime debt for essential human needs including housing. There is no care concerning our lives and fate, and that is a hate crime extending quite unreasonably well into *Section 12* territory.

[44] We might have been only 99.9% sure in this general assessment of *Section 12* violations, were it not for seeing the massive humanitarian crisis in Peterborough, in which the Mayor and council are actively involved in the denial of water, shelter, food, work, clothing, heat, a place to sleep, having identified a specific group they say must not exist, giving them no place to go and pushing people on their last legs along into conditions with low odds of survival. We find this part of a larger plan to give people no place to go, to remove all places of social benefit, rest and refuge, to allow no one escape from their socially, economically and ecologically destructive housing model of extreme consumption, profit and debt that works against all human and Charter principles of dignity, respect and freedom. PCH further does not allow anyone to escape these circumstances, and they deny any and all reasonable and fully developed solutions aimed to save lives. Are we at war? Is this a country in famine? The conditions here are far worse than to be found in any prison, which at least affords heat, a safe place to sleep, meals, social, fitness and education programs. What we need here are UN-style emergency relief efforts for those seeking refuge from this despicable Mayor and council, who control land use and could easily solve the problem, but desire not to do so and block all efforts at ameliorating these appalling conditions. In the Criminal Code of Canada, *Section 318(c)*, this suits the definitions (CCC 318(2 and 4) of advocating genocide against an identifiable group. We know further the fate they have laid out for our children, or anyone else who simply can't work hard enough to pay the income extremists that have seized control of our lives, our work and every essential human need and resource required for survival; at this scale, the CCC *Section 46* violation is treason. We further call this aggravated negligent manslaughter, for those who have not survived, and for those that have, this is a CCC *Sections 219* (1 and 2) and *221* violation of the most serious category, perhaps better called culpable homicide.

2.7 SOCIAL, ECOLOGICAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF SYSTEMATIC ABUSE

[1] Peterborough is a social, economic and ecologic disaster zone wherein we have lost the capacity to grow food to support ourselves or respond to crisis, and cannot produce the vast majority of the things we need in daily life. Here we describe at the foundational level of analysis required by our Charter our fundamental human freedoms to work within the limits of Nature and with our human capacity to work. We define these as the basis of law, the basis of valuation of the Canadian dollar, and our rights to life, seeking to mitigate the worst practices of abuse with the most severely damaging social, ecologic and economic impacts. The Mayor and council of the City of Peterborough claim the right to rule without reason. In seeking totalitarian rule, they reject reasonable limits, equality under the law, fair discussion and judicial due process. They issue edicts without basis in law exhibiting extreme bias against us and the basis of life. They work against our Supreme Court and against our democratic form of government designed for protection and care of people. When we go to City Hall with our concerns based on fact, evidence and reason as the basis of law, thus proving their bylaws to be illegal, we find ourselves fully rebuffed with many systems in place to deny fundamental justice. Furthermore, our reasonable actions fully founded in law are rejected by the directors of PCH and they then act with threat and force against us when we try to gain even the slightest basic foothold of life security. Aiming to profit by destroying the foundations of life, this Mayor and council not only constantly attack the democratic basis of law but have gone on to unreasonably issue detailed plans purposed to completely deny the rights to life of this generation of Peterborough youth.

[2] This being a Charter case critical to the survival of our children, and critical to immediate crisis response, we take pains here to provide the most solid foundation in provable reason possible. In listing essential human needs and the work required to meet those needs from the finite living resources of Nature, we generate a fairly lengthy description of the foundational requirements of life. That list might include education, childcare, healthcare, finance and so on, with each broken into further detail, but all understandable over time as the components of a household budget and its attendant spectrum of human activities. We found we could select a triplet of components as most important entry points to understanding the basis of our lives, from which the other components of life could be easily deduced and proven to be inherently related. If that basis set of viable life is food, housing and work, for example, it naturally implies a place to live, land to grow food, work required to live, and the integral necessity of water and plants as essential to life.

[3] Although we can create laws and social structures aimed at meeting our common needs in a variety of ways, under no circumstances should we create social structures aimed at the denial of fundamental human freedoms to do work directly to attain food and shelter. If we separate these geographically, legally and by exclusive ownership with effects of systematically removing societal integrity by complete removal of alternative and also healthy systems, then only those with significant resources can attain basic life security. The only reason we gained such a standard of life this past century is by burning gas to do work, and yet now our knowledge is sufficiently advanced that we can quite reasonably meet human needs by living, working and producing what we need locally. We stand at the cusp of going green and electric, for example, and could easily grow food locally.

[4] We effect no change to our Charter in re-organizing its existing principles for purposes of clarity. Our rights to life, for example, are supreme and could be considered equivalent to Freedoms in the title of our Charter, further noting that many consider God as equivalent to life or a sense of justice. We also consider that within the provable physical realm, the meaning of the word law is closely integrated with the bearing of responsibilities, these being care for one another by the work we do to meet essential human needs. Legally, under our *Section 1* evidence and proof requirements, the *Section 2* list of

fundamental human freedoms is true but incomplete, as a more accurate set of fundamental human freedoms corresponds more closely to our modern understanding of body, mind and spirit. Eating food, for example, is highly personal constitutional choice critical to health as a right to life, and it ties directly to a place to live in which the right to work or grow food must not be denied or interfered with so profoundly that one cannot live. If we choose the triplet Food-Work-Housing and replace the word Housing with the word Shelter, then we find a shift in meaning to a rawer reality that is more broadly encompassing in its implications for Freedoms under a broader range of circumstances with closer practical ties to real needs and closer legal-moral ties to foundational human rights. These are questions of how we freely choose to live. Some want to live lightly on the Earth, but find themselves denied by City Hall.

[5] Here, we maintain the requirement of place as a definition of home wherein use of the word ‘food’ indicates a broad range of related activities consistent with the ecosystem services of Nature in a yearly cycle of life. We have always known this, but advances in scientific understanding have advanced so much that we can live lightly on the land quite well with smart use of our best ideas in low-energy mechanics, integrated high-nutrition ecologically-positive farming, and use of solar-battery-motor systems allowing significant reduction of fossil fuel use. We further have computer systems allowing easy access to how-to information and recorded assessment of local sustainability. We have the knowledge to save this generation of Canadian kids, but this Mayor and council refuses to allow us to save ourselves, denying our self-determination and insisting on using the most antiquated damaging systems already proven to drive our ruin.

[6] We find in our use of the words Food-Work-Shelter, as one of several means of Freedom of Expression tying our sensory systems to motivational responses, that these are mental linguistic concepts with the same use and purpose as the mathematical geometric axioms of point, line and plane from which much else emerges. The idea of point, for example, is used to physically distinguish objects as unique and separate and therefore countable using integers. The separation of points defines a connection and a length, and a regular change of position defines countable time thus defining all the basis of physics and measurement which if done well closely corresponds to physical reality. Similarly, in the realm of life, Food-Work-Shelter are defined as dynamic linked activities, with both intellectual and physical work defined as the product of force times distance. These are fundamental activities of life, not unique to our species and independent of our political systems and ideas of law and language, characterized by three dynamic living interactions Food <--> Work, Food <--> Shelter and Work <--> Shelter, each dependent on the other. In this, several emergent properties arise, one of which is plants as food with their requirements of place, water, light and soil integrated with a profound underlying web of life, and trade of work and essential nutrients between and within species. We have care for infants, children, seniors and division of labour as human necessities of trade indicated by the exchange symbol <--> as being natural and necessary as the conditions of life defining our Laws, Freedoms and *Sections 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 15, 16, 24 – 32, 52* and preamble Rights, many of which are equivalent to fundamental human rights. Those without the means of significant transportation, or who might not want to travel so much and who also want to live, produce and consume locally thus optimizing resources and not killing the planet, have the inherent right to reasonably limit their *Section 6* mobility rights.

[7] We find here in Peterborough certain people aiming to profit immensely by profound interference in our fundamental Food-Work-Shelter dynamic trade relationships with the Earth, going so far as to remove these essential rights equivalent to life even though it is well known that removal of just one component makes our life unviable. Some have no interest in this work in our core economy of

essential human needs and seek to feed off the foundational trade relationships, while others already have their essential needs of food and shelter met and have decided their “work” is to harness the labour of others, or to have unlimited ownership taken to such extent as to deny all possibilities of life for others. Our concern here is that no place has been left for youth wherein they can gain a foothold in life in this foundational core economy of Food-Work-Shelter, that their entire lives will be harnessed to destructive ends, that they are denied access to the resources required for survival, and that such resources have been stupidly destroyed to such extent as to guarantee high risk of an early death under preventable but dire to horrific circumstances. We say that actions against our core survival triplet of Food-Work-Shelter are against the law, equivalent to death threats, attacks on democracy and acts of sedition against goals of national security purposed to promote social unrest.

[8] From this particular route of logic, one of several arriving at the same conclusion, we broadly define crime at the foundational basis as the unfair removal of fundamental justice with denial of reasonable recourse, equating law with the taking on of responsibilities and defining fairness as equitable access to the resources required for survival. Those that do not want to work wish to harness the labour of others, denying responsibility and rejecting reality as the basis of law and care as the basis of decision making. All this is highly active at PCH, with the intent to fracture society and destroy all of life by denial of law and rights. Reason is fully rejected in favour of money and power for those who already have everything. We define crime as that which threatens and degrades life. Instead of a ground-up basis of understanding firmly grounded in reality, we have a vastly different process at PCH, the top-down enforcement of imposed ideologies at great odds with the law and life. We could make the basis set of analysis Seeds-Soil-Energy, or Education-Finance-Mining, or Law-Freedom-Biology, and by confirmation with accurate descriptions of reality arrive at a reasonable ecological diversity of ways to live as Cultural Diversity Rights consistent with our sustainable democratic freedoms. This can be done if our Charter contains time-invariant principles practically focused around unification in the permanent meeting of essential human needs. We can do this. We know how. Only a few people do not want it, rejecting both reason and equality under the law.

[9] The Mayor and council work full time shaping PCH to their will, primarily focused on money and power, with some activities being legitimate and others not. Our concerns bear remarkable similarity to the list of offences in the American Declaration of Independence committed by the King of England, another well-known power-hungry sociopathic income extremist willing to do anything for money. This is not a coincidence. We submit into evidence the British North America Act, which was designed by and for bankers and rich business owners working with politicians for the sole purpose of control, exploitation and plunder. It is a war act, and was used to kill and take everything from First Nations landowners. Its vile origins were the Enclosures Acts of England, aiming to completely removed any form of mutual benefit from the population by completely controlling every aspect of their lives for wealth extraction. Its origins were slavery, which when finally banned resulted in the collusion of existing business interests to maintain complete ownership and control of essential human needs by controlling all details of the lives of others. Children can die on the streets for all they cared, and that is the situation in Peterborough today. Any one seeking shelter or refuge from these limited all-encompassing systems will be hunted down and removed, with all recourse denied. All of this “law” was simply imported into Canada for the same purpose and remains in place in the Constitution Act. Politicians simply ignore anything to do with rights and freedoms, or the basis of law, or even the law itself, imagining they are the law. This was clear when after decades of battle, even the smallest set of rights and freedoms was enshrined in our Constitution as a Charter. Politicians opposed this, even though the vast majority of Canadians wanted it, and they rushed to extortion, refusing to sign unless

they got even more power for themselves.

[10] Collusion to control people, land and money was completely present in 1982, and obviously remains present today. Specifically, the operations and bylaws of PCH have not been changed for compliance with the anti-tyranny democratic standards of the Canadian Charter. In fact this Mayor and council even reject the Canadian justice system, founded on *Section 1* of our Constitution. It's business as usual, with fraud and corruption continuing as usual, despite a real economic collapse of our core economy due to Covid and despite massive and overwhelming evidence for the destruction caused by these policies to our lives and planet. We will die if we continue this route, but the Mayor and council refuse to change anything, rejecting and breaking multiple laws because they benefit. To the same effect, the basis of our lives is continually undermined and our economy crushed.

[11] Concerning natural social and economic rights present in caring inclusive community, such rights in Canada can only be had by incorporation. People in corporations have the right to work freely with others for mutual benefit to tremendous advantage by free and common access to use of land and buildings, cars and trucks, money and tools, sharing time, resources and talents. In a company, you are not charged to use the printer. Workers in government have this right. Families have this right. But these rights were explicitly removed from English villages for a clear purpose and intent, to completely control and harness the lives of others. Our children in Canada, lacking such rights are being used for that purpose. Their lives are under direct threat, and we have no say concerning their lives and future. denied, only accessible under the Corporations Act. The Mayor and council enjoy and use these economic and social rights as essential to their benefit, but in denying these rights to others enslave the entire population. Refusing to change course even as it provably drives us all to ruin. This is a personality type that enjoys denying rights to others, and they simply don't care. This is hate, and we know this because no caring parent would ever do this to their children.

[12] Some people will say and do anything for money, regardless of consequence to others. Fraud is the intent to trick and deceive for monetary gain. The Mayor and Council say the word public means private. They work in collusion with bankers and other fraudsters intent on money laundering and harnessing the labour of others to say that public means private. The mutual goal of this collusion is complete control of people, money and land for extreme benefit for the few who do not want to work but instead seek major income without labour, perpetuating many schemes to undermine the *Section 7* life security of others to the extent of driving ruin while claiming no responsibility. We know this because there is only one degree of separation between those benefiting and our work or bank accounts, whereas the lack of direct connection gives seven degrees of separation with no obvious monetary or regulatory links. For example, the Mayor directly forces us into the hands of insurance companies who refuse to follow the rules of insurance with the intent of taking everything from us while providing no substantial service in return.

[12] The Mayor has no intent whatsoever to responsibly link incomes at PCH to provable work done for mutual benefit that visibly improves our lives. Instead, we decline as they rise. The Mayor furthermore does much work against us, purposely degrading the basis of the economy and our lives as he funnels everything of value into the hands of unlimited profit corporations, forcing us to pay for that while completely crushing and denying any caring community based solutions. This unilateral mechanism of baseless wealth extraction and infinite exponential growth is well known to undermine the economy, crush lives and drive total economic ruin and collapse. It happens when the average person working as hard as they can cannot pay the expenses of the already rich who refuse to back

down, growing by mining the economy and driving the collapse of many individual lives. Whereas the basis of law is consideration of impact on others. Whereas the Canadian dollar belongs to the Canadian people and by law must be used for our mutual benefit.

[13] The Mayor makes ludicrous claims of ownership, stating in bylaws and actions that public land belongs to City Hall for their benefit alone. In this, we find our questions screened to ensure our events meet some undefined requirement of PCH and that we bring sufficient funds to PCH. The directors of PCH would most certainly not allow a conference, for example on the future of the Peterborough region, unless they completely controlled its content and approved the speakers. Neither do they allow public postings on public bulletin boards, and they further want us to pay for meeting rooms that we already own and paid for. The entire community is on social and economic lockdown, and has been for years leading into decades, as a direct result of PCH policies that are against our Constitution.

[14] We see clear monetary motive for fraud and seizure of power, and the Bylaws of Peterborough show the means. We can also prove intent beyond the shadow of a doubt, thusly. Two separate families deciding to split a plot of land find it most economical to make a single access road. They use this road to run a single power line, and can also decide to plow it or do mutual garbage runs. To do so cuts costs in half. To have a contractor do the work on their behalf does not release their rights to self-determination, and in no way is this practical social expense for mutual benefit a never-ending escalating for-profit business to be controlled by one person. If the property has a pond or river, they can also decide mutual access along with provisions for the critical preservation of nature. These are the natural features of community self-determination on matters directly impacting their lives, for work must be done to pay for it. But here in Peterborough, all self-determination has been removed, we have no say, and everything is done not to minimize cost but to maximize it, removing benefit from the community, hand it over to private enterprise, or continually escalate the cost of services far beyond what people can possibly support. That is, when a sociopath gets involved, everything is about them, others have no say, and every good principle is turned around. One ends up with ludicrous claims of ownership along with violation of law, disrespect for people and any form of say or self-determination. This fraud manifests as decision-making processes based on monetary considerations alone with no concern for equal benefit under the law or critical matters of comparative work, social or environmental concerns. This is a personality type that simply does not care, willing to say and do anything for money. Here we say that democracy does not consist merely of electing the next authoritarian ruler, but in foundations of communicative debate in which those impacted by the law and paying the bills are on equal footing with those writing the law and escalating the budget. We say workers in government are our employees, and we have the bill we paid to prove that. We are equal under the law and have significant freedoms to enforce that. We further say that we take great pains to obey the law, and it is the Mayor and council that have rejected the law along with our system of democratic governance, an act of deception, betrayal of public trust and treason. They have personalities of contempt and hate, inflicted on us in defiance of law and the rights of our children to life. What they have done is cruel and unjust, with the removal of critical freedoms and rights being an act of punishment and hatred toward humanity.

[15] Concerning the Mayor and council, who wrote the policy but are using human shields and other strategies to protect themselves from answering questions, why are we forced to pay for every cash cow idea that crosses their minds? Actions and expenditures that undermine and do not build life, liberty and security of the person across society. Unable to control themselves around money, instead of fixing things by root cause analysis, by magical thinking they turn up the dial, increasing taxes and fees

to get more. Let's get real: that tax increase literally stole the grocery money from a struggling senior. What right do the Mayor and council have to give themselves continual raises for degrading our lives and damaging our downtown? Unable to see past themselves to the lives they impact, not one considers fair reciprocity. Instead, scheme is added to scheme, and not one asks if this is the role of government. Problems are viewed not something to be solved, but as a new fine, fee or tax to be perpetuated into infinity. A quick analysis of how this is done reveals the strategies used across the board at structure of City Hall, along with the tactics and actual working mechanisms including the means of control, silencing and removal of recourse.

[16] The claim by City Hall, that everything is fine and look at the good we do, is in sharp contrast to our actual experience of City Hall as a bunch of heavy handed thugs. A hornets nest that you had best avoid lest you get stung. City Hall is the actual source of much of the trouble we experience in life. Reasonable things we want or need to do are made insanely complex and expensive.

[17] We mention these as broad examples of the anti-social behaviour of PCH directors. Consider the active removal of rest areas. Tired truckers and weary drivers need a break. Feet on the ground. Rest and refuge from the constant economic assault on our lives. Eyes closed a moment, for without that, life becomes harsh and driving becomes highly dangerous. *The active removal of rest areas in Peterborough by the Mayor and council is a direct threat to life and security of the person, our Section 7 rights.* City Hall greatly increases the risk to our lives in doing this. We know this is tied to land use policies aimed directly at removal of options. The removal of picnic tables, public bulletin boards, and access to drinking water.

[18] In general, the replacement of all that is public with private businesses with no interest at all in what generates public well being. In specific, the removal of any place where kids can sell lemonade to begin to learn commerce and trade. The emplacement of paid parking systems in parks we already paid for. The claim to own Nature and make it a for-profit commodity, owned exclusively by the small group at City Hall. City Hall uses many tactics to make enjoyment of life and the necessity of refuge in Nature unaffordable and impossible for those without money. Why? So government can have a new fleet of cars to enforce the meters! In towns like Port Perry, where they simply stopped doing this, what problems have arisen? None. Any problem that has is so minor as to be easily dealt with by talking to the individual.

[19] Instead of justice, we see predatory behaviours. A normal person assumes everything is normal. An unhealthy person assumes everyone else is a monster that needs to be controlled. A normal person assumes reason and good intent. If things look normal on the surface, they probably are. A deceptive person thus makes sure to smile, dress well, pose for the camera and make everything seem normal on surface. Although social and economic predators are quite calculating, their actual actions cannot withstand the light of scrutiny. What the Mayor says is the opposite of what he does; we see neither honesty nor integrity, with much evidence in PCH documents for criminal activity consistent with a person with exceedingly poor mental health, an inability to care or make rational decisions based in reality, and a strong desire to break the law, harm others, and act irresponsibly.

[20] This Mayor and council have designed devastating public policies causing much social, economic and ecologic damage creating much ill will and distrust in government. Those who have suffered personal abuse recognize immediately the characteristics of abusers active within PCH. We did not agree to this. We do not approve. You do not have our consent. You never will. We say this is not

government, this is not law and this is not our Canadian system of justice. This is a few specific individuals morally and mentally unfit for the position who abuse others and purposely break the law.

PART 3 – CRIMINAL CODE VIOLATIONS

3.1 MEANS, MOTIVE AND OPPORTUNITY WITH MONEY TRAILS

[1] We have major concerns that the processes of decision-making within City Hall lack a legal basis and prioritize monetary incentives over a healthy justice-based balance of social and ecological factors considering impacts on our lives as required by our Constitution Act. Much of the Peterborough population has over many years experienced in each aspect of PCH operations problems and unusual expenses tied to unreasonable practices for which they are denied explanation. Expressed colloquially, we have evidence that this Mayor and council will say and do anything to get more public, provincial and federal money, attacking us and other parts of government, including beneficial community organizations. We see vast sums going into PCH with no significant evidence of proportional community benefit, having run many legal Charter tests indicating illegitimate use of funds by PCH with minimal intent to follow Charter purposes of mutual benefit. The Mayor and council are running illegal unlimited-profit business operations, using legitimate government services as a cover. After much consideration of the evidence, we generated the 3.1 [2] summary statement.

[2] Persons of the poorest character are attracted to large pools of money. Without colour of right, they make a false claim of ownership and authority, moving specifically to deny those paying into that public pool of funds their monetary rights to receive substantial service for what they paid for. Those claiming control of our money immediately begin awarding themselves no end of benefit, continually voting raises for themselves focused on all manner of wants over need, and further begin to design fees, fines, laws, rules and regulations aimed at complete removal of recourse coupled to the use of force and threat for non-compliance, grading into fraud and extortion. As entitlement sets in by the confirmation bias, reason as the basis of law becomes disregarded along with consideration of impact on others. Systems are created to reject all external oversight with goals of total authoritarian control purposed to deny justice and remove critical rights and all autonomous freedoms of citizens. PCH has created such systems of complete control, within which all means, motives and mechanisms are present to the effect of complete denial of fundamental justice. All reasonable alternatives are denied in favour of worst-practices systems tied to a willingness to destroying anyone and everything to get money. We have strong evidence that the PCH leadership team have created, of their own free will, land use plans structuring Peterborough socially and economically as an internment camp, determined to deny our fundamental freedoms and rights to life. Claiming rights they do not have, violating *Section 31* of our Constitution Act, this Mayor and council have, by seditious anti-democracy intention, illegally extended PCH operations into areas far beyond that of legitimate government and well into the territory of multiple and major Criminal Code violations.

[3] From the community viewpoint, Peterborough residents are alarmed by paying fees for services we already paid taxes for. Paying again for the use of buildings and meeting spaces we already paid for. Paying again for the use of land we already own outright in the public realm. These double-dipping practices constituting fraud and the false claim of ownership being theft, both being criminal code violations and against the legal obligations of City Hall to work only for the mutual benefit of citizens. It is illegal to run the business plans of private enterprise through government. Instead of obeying the

law, this Mayor and council instead try bullying, attaching promises of threat and force to each fee if we do not comply. But we cannot comply, because in doing so we act against the top laws of our country. Being open to higher charges, we must call the Mayor and council on their bluff, understanding that their bylaws have no basis in law, are bizarre and unreasonable, are against the law and by being against us and our government have no force or effect. We must consider fraud when many fees are imaginary, an arbitrary invention of a “service’ requiring no work done by PCH and coupled to removal of legal Constitutional options to do the work ourselves. We have strong evidence that they are willing to kill to get money, working consistently against our foundational legal principles of justice. When considering actual work done, we find our healthy best-practice ideas proven to meet Charter *Section 1* standards, that are needed, critical to life and *demonstrably justified*, are refused by the Mayor and council in favour of social, economical and ecological worst practices that cripple our lives, our economy and capacity to work, threaten the lives of our children.

[4] We now turn to the matter of accounting fraud. We see the PCH bylaws aimed at defining crime on their own terms to gain massive monetary benefit far beyond any reasonable purposes of equity and justice, as bearing significant evidence of worst practices. It hardly takes a trained eye to see that a single person has swept through these by creative spreadsheet accounting arbitrarily adjusting values to force the total to some desired amount. We know this because each line item ties to our considerable body of community interactions with PCH as forced fees in which we rarely find substantial reason. When we as citizens know how to do things well, we have deep experience behind our concerns of that certain extreme beneficiaries at PCH reject provable competency proportional to pay, a serious *Section 15* violation tied here to concerns of theft, fraud and the use of force. In the bylaws tied to fines and fees taken by threat of further fees and claims that the full force of government will be used against citizens if we disagree, of concern are the claims of professionalism at odds with our understanding of Generally Accepted Accounting Practices. No licensed Chartered Accountant would ever have approved this document without substantial fear of losing their license. No citizen would approve such baseless practises, and yet these bylaws were fully reviewed and approved by the Mayor and council despite containing numerous clearly fabricated line items. We have many questions here, but this Mayor and council refuse to answer to any questions at all, and instead spend much public money creating systems to effectively block and deny all lines of effective inquiry and recourse.

[5] In these monetary bylaws prioritizing fiscal expedience over justice and community involvement, many line items have no basis in law, are against Ministry directives, and clearly aimed at denial of personal shelter, work and food security within broader goals of removing social security. We see fees for services we already paid taxes for tied to many activities that are not legitimate concerns of government aimed at caring mutual benefit in areas of common concern and that further allow us the freedom to solve our own issues of critical concern to our lives under clearly defined (legal SCC) best practices. Throughout the City Bylaws are land use policies (*e.g.* parking policies designed as unilateral cash grabs) causing significant damage to all of society. We see no valid Charter basis for taxation, for example, but instead see much evidence for collusion with certain groups aiming for unlimited profit by controlling all essential human needs and denying all reasonable alternatives. Concerning the ice rink or many other public utilities, we have community experts who find the actions and economics of this Mayor and council to be inexplicable except in the context of either incompetence or fraud. In all manner of licensing, we fail to find anything other than minor excuses to cover purely economic motives. In dog licensing, for example, we find the directors have all the means, motive and opportunity to reject their legal obligations to reasonable *Section 1* descriptions of problem and solution, aiming to take in enough money on this matter alone to hire 5 people at \$46 000 per year (see

paragraph 1.3 [6]). The vast majority of these by issues require very little skill to assess and solve, being mainly grade-school tasks. We believe such tasks should actually be integral to our education system as part of civics, particularly for students with strong interest in matters that directly impact them in which they can prove under parental guidance to do a better job than the Mayor and council. We understand this as a legal-guardian parental obligation to defend the roots of living-tree democracy and ensure a healthy life and sustainable future for their kids, the lack thereof now meaning an early death for our children. By this means of using the legal SCC plan of democratic engagement, our children can exercise their *Sections 1, 2, 7 and 15* rights to defend their lives without requiring use of *Section 6* mobility rights to get away from this mentally ill Mayor and council. Our children have the right to live here; this is their home.

[6] When the simplest review of PCH policy and operations reveals not only fraud but multiple layers of fraud with intent to deceive the public, and we see so many examples of this that the problem must be intentional and systematic, then we must consider money trails and means, motive and opportunity in direct relation to subversion of justice. Legally speaking, this is the *rational connection Section 15(1)* test of equal public benefit under the law assessed across a range from most likely to provable beyond the shadow of a doubt. Expressing this colloquially using reasonable person standards, we have these questions constantly asked by streams of citizens and constantly denied. What value do we get for what we pay for? Why does it cost so much? Why do we get so little, or is any service actually provided (this being a criminal code violation of fraud)? Why is no basis for a cash-flow bylaw provided, and why do the Mayor and council refuse to answer our questions? If we ask our questions at a council meeting surrounded by a large number of highly paid individuals, and none answer sufficiently, what is the cost to us per minute? Is there a better way of doing things?

[7] This being a Charter case critically concerned with life-and-death matters of crisis-response survival, our foundational evidence-based *Section 15* question is this: is the labour done by PCH equivalent to our own labour within the normal Gaussian distribution of human capacities to work? Is the type of work done beneficial to safely securing our common *Section 7* human needs in perpetuity, or is it a type of non-essential unproductive work degrading our *Section 7* rights to life? As the directors of PCH demand money, we say that although our printed currency is a convenient tool of trade, it is subject to all manner of manipulations that decrease the real value of our lives. Since the Mayor and council accept the *Section 15* equation $Work = Money/Hour$, they must also accept $Money = WorkHours$ recognizing labour as the real basis of exchange. The Mayor claims to want money to do the work at City Hall, and we can test this truth or uncover real motive by offering work, for surely there is much to do covering a wide array of skills. In this, we understand theft as a type of minimal work done in which a person wishes to benefit significantly by taking from another person in a manner that removes benefit to the extent of obviously damaging and degrading their life. In work done against someone, the magnitude of harm done is inversely proportional to the life security of the person negatively impacted, this being a measurable finite sum of factors commonly understood as a household budget. There may also be one most significant factor that if damaged causes a persons' life to become unviable, for example shelter, which depends on that persons' circumstances. This is the fundamental question of fairness, as the Mayor and council have set fees proportional to what they want, regardless of our capacity to pay. With regards to fraud, we say the Mayor and council want to make a few people rich at our expense, and they do this by denying accountability and Charter rights to community involvement, falsely claiming ownership. Do they want money, or work done? Our *Section 15* truth test is our offer to do that work as a legal Charter Freedom using provable WorkHours equivalence. We say the directors of PCH only want money, far more than is reasonable considering the

work, and they do not want real work done for legal Constitutional mutual benefit as required for a healthy functioning democracy inclusive of all citizens regardless of circumstance. We consider this further in section 2.5, but here our concerns with fraud and theft are logically broken into two provable components of damage done, monetary biases and the unfair harnessing of labour by the removal of freedoms and uses of force for effective slavery. In this manner, the Mayor and council drive us to wretched social circumstances.

[8] The legal democratic involvement of qualified citizens is similarly broken into two components, one being free involvement fully concerned with matters of justice, and the other being work involvement for purposes of healthy social benefit providing personal and social security. Component one deals with concerns that the Mayor aims for totalitarian rule, and two deals with monetary motives within PCH detrimental to honest work being done for legitimate government services. We find the decision making process of City Hall illegal, insanely expensive and convoluted, a clear product of irrational minds of ill intent. We find practices of work avoidance to be widespread. Under Charter law, citizens and the primary points of consultation because we pay for it all and have in our community the full range of expertise required, further considering that the Mayor and council are elected with no expertise at all. When they use consultants, the cost is extremely high, and we have in evidence several reports proving that the consultant has told City Hall exactly what it wants to hear. We also find the consultants lacked the expertise required to do the work, all of which requires good knowledge of the Constitutional purposes of government. A clear example is the PCH official plan which is so *vague* as to contain no substantial content thus allowing arbitrary rule. Hiring consultants to the work required by PCH is a massive waste of money and a violation of our Charter rights to self-determination when when the impacted parties with the skill and knowledge base are present in our community. *We want to know why the directors of PCH have broken the law in this official plan by violating our rights to a Constitutional monarchy form of government wherein issues are debated pre-election and citizens write a post-election document directing these new civil servants to do this needed work meeting their legal obligations under Charter directives, with failure to do so being an act of sedition.*

[9] We believe the Mayor and council use consultants for many purposes not beneficial to the public interest, primarily avoidance of their legal duty to work on our behalf (it being easier to turn up the tax dial and get someone else to do it), avoidance of responsibility (whereas they are legally liable in having commissioned the work, directed its writing and content, and signing off on it), and intent to commit fraud (by creating false appearances of propriety). We find many PCH documents including those written by consultants indicating no understanding at all of the role and purpose of government in meeting its legal, moral and economic obligations to residents. The consultants were clearly not experts, yet were paid as such. We further see across all PCH policy and bylaws a complete lack of any reasonably justified basis, meaning that edicts are issued on whim aimed at any excuse to get money. Again, we find that children could do many of the PCH tasks better, with their work later verified or edited by parents, thus easily PCH slashing expenses and providing fundamental justice in direct relation to ensuring best practices in educational, economic, social and ecological balance. As citizens, we can easily integrate grass cutting policies with larger ecological concerns. Instead of sane and rational policy based on balanced interests, we see significant motive within PCH to reject open lawful community input for the purpose of unidirectional cash flow and unilateral exertion of power. Processes that should be clear and simple are made complex, expensive and extortive.

[10] Instead of following our legal democratic process, which would have pointed out, for example, that parking meters damage downtowns and that those with the power to write the tickets should not be

the ones who benefit (a clear conflict of interest as they were not impacted), we find PCH consistently abuses its position of judicial authority to collect money for itself with no basis in law. The money trails in this case are decisively short and leading directly to those who wrote the bylaws. In another case, we we have done a comprehensive review of PCH parking policy providing evidence of much damage to society. We find at PCH arbitrary rule wherein many of their operations are the exact opposite of good reason, money-based and against any conceivable principle of life and law. In general, everything of value to the community has been handed over to unlimited profit corporations without our approval. Doing that forces us into the hands of unscrupulous actors who view our lives as an infinite tax pool. Of particular interest, City Hall aims to gain as much as possible for themselves by denying any form of affordable shelter, though they could. Their plans to not let anyone escape the bank-run housing system from which they benefit has further created a humanitarian disaster zone with many fighting for their lives each night, and the costs to downtown businesses, our institutions and our lives are immense.

[11] The directors of City Hall falsely claim that all public land and assets belong to them for their benefit alone, the intent being clearly understood by the effect of residents having no say at all in the public use of public land for public benefit. And yet they have admitted and put into writing that the land does not belong to them, that they are on Treaty land, which was not a legal treaty as it was coerced under threats of death and starvation. That the entire PCH leadership team combined cannot distinguish between the meaning of words public and private is a matter of significant concern. They further confuse the distinct roles and purposes of government and business. Here we considered three *most likely reasonable* explanations: 1) incompetence; 2) mental illness; and 3) collusive intent to commit fraud. Our encompassing consistent social explanation is that we are significantly damaged by a sociopathic belief system in which the sociopath(s) claim ownership of what does not belong to them, this being the Criminal Code violation of theft. We understand this as a matter of unreasonable and forcefully imposed will far removed from provable reality concerning the factual state of our lives and world. This is the imposed idea that the belief system of one person with limited ideas can rule by force over many others with a healthy diversity of provably better ideas firmly based in fact and tested to be good *under* the law. A consistent economic explanation encompassing our many observations is this: *the PCH leadership team is running a real estate business on the behalf of bankers in written deals to remove the rights and freedoms of citizens, and they do this in contrast to their Sections 7 and 15 Charter duties because they receive benefit.* We pay taxes for legitimate government services, so are paying again for what we already paid for that which belongs to us? We thus question the state of mind of these directors. To large extent we need not question them directly, as the Mayor and council have already expressed their beliefs in writing, words and actions. Our social concern with respect to their activities and growing budget on matters having nothing to do with legitimate government is unreasonable behaviour as ruthless expansionists. If we simply contrast what they have done with the law, we find that their purposes are fraudulent, criminal and against our lives and Constitution.

[12] Whereas when we try to do reasonable and needed things to gain basic life security of essential human needs, even at the most rudimentary level of survival, we are attacked by this Mayor and council who violate our *Section 11* rights to be informed about the specific nature of our supposed offence, to have this matter solved within a reasonable time based on the principles of fact and fundamental justice, to be presumed innocent of wrongdoing particularly when our activity is healthy, and to have a fair and public hearing on the matter by an independent and impartial tribunal. We understand that in non-criminal matters having to do with attainment of life security of essential human needs this tribunal could consist of reasonable to expert community members, this being a particular area in which PCH vastly interferes with our lives in violation of direct orders from the SCC to not do

so. Because we have freedom under the law, it is a critical responsibility of local government to develop self-serve best-practise plans wherein all members of the community can work as individuals or with others to meet our personal to national objectives of life security. As caring parents, we are profoundly interested in doing all we can to save our children from preventable circumstances of disaster based on incontrovertible evidence that we must act now in all manner of common and urgent concern. Why the Mayor and council do not wish to participate in this greatest mission in the history of humanity is beyond our comprehension, but nevertheless understood as being in the realm of mental health issues. We want these individuals to get the help they need as appropriate to their condition, it being a separate task of caring community to make the legal person of PCH behave in a manner consistent with the law.

[13] Consider this one example of many proving PCH disrespect for taxpayers expressed as disregard for law coupled to contempt for us, an egregious matter of violating *Section 15* Charter laws aimed at fair equal benefit under the law. On public land we paid for, the Mayor and council charge us rent for parking spots while reserving free parking for “important” figures at City Hall. Though we own this land, the directors of PCH say it is private and are using it to run a business, which is not a legitimate purpose of government. We know homes are private. Streets and parking lots are definitively the most public space possible, moreso than a library with important functions of quiet shelter with rest and respite from the elements. We see further major efforts by PCH to remove all public spaces and land that does not bring them money, including rest areas needed by weary travelers. If the directors of PCH own our Canadian land, we ask them to show the deed. We have tax receipts showing we paid for the infrastructure and buildings. If they own the land, why don’t they sell it, shut down City Hall and retire with fortunes! We reject their ludicrous claim to own the land, water, air and trees. Everywhere we go, we must pay for what we already own. Where can we go to be free, to simply exist? In this context, we know that bankers have strong interests in removing everything public making all land and assets private. Between City Hall and bankers claiming everything is private, there is nothing left belonging freely to citizens, there is nowhere we can go and all avenues of recourse are removed. We say this zoning is purposeful, to freeze or starve us into compliance, and we see many PCH actions aimed to that effect. Specifically, the directors of PCH are claiming rights they do not have, with authority and powers far beyond that of legitimate government. But this is our home. We say Canada belongs to Canadians and that the PCH directors are not landowners but our employees. We reject this extent of their reach far beyond any valid purpose of government as criminal and illegal.

[14] Now we turn to a colloquial expression of these issues. The vast majority of PCH tasks have to do with low-end matters of street cleaning and garbage collection. Throughout the activities and bylaws we find many issues that children can easily engaged with to understand the problem and participate via their parents as legal guardians in democratic processes impacting their lives and future. Quite frankly, a child could do a better job than the PCH directors with all their bluster. That would start by actually doing the job, not focusing on creating layers of fraud and obstruction of justice. We say layers of fraud here because we pay taxes for legitimate government services, whereas PCH is either running a business here, which is illegal, or they are double-dipping and making us pay for services we already paid taxes for, which is illegal. Add to that their use of threat and force, which has replaced democratic due process, which is also illegal. We think they don’t answer questions because they can’t stand scrutiny, which is illegal. And they further aim to attack and control all essential human needs and actions for unfair profit to PCH and their beneficiaries in banking and business. We understand perfectly well this problem of creative collusion that is wreaking havoc on our lives.

[15] We are concerned that this Mayor and council support fraud and tax evasion. We see signs placed throughout our community claiming that vacant land is private property. PCH supports this privacy claim of land owners even when such land is in public areas requiring a healthy social scene for the economic viability of our shopping areas. We know the intent is not to use this land, but to passively speculate by leveraging human needs for profit in the hopes of gaining income without labour. We understand our bodies as private. We understand that to protect our privacy a home is not just a place to live but a critical organizational system where we are safe, warm and dry with refuge from the world wherein we can engage in many matters including sleep that are truly private. We understand a building used for business as less private but still essential to making a living. We understand vacant land as damaging to us, ecologically, socially and economically when those that want to work we cannot use it. This land is further it is being used to park or launder money by “laws” having been written to support tax evasion. Even if the “investors” are Canadian with interests in retirement life security, we can show that this unproductive land-holding works against any hope of attaining real life security. We understand that PCH benefits from supporting such damaging fraud to the effect of trashing our lives and downtown, whereas it is better to support Peterborough residents wanting to work.

[16] We say we do not have to inquire of the specific individuals to know their beliefs, though in our personal experiences that is the case, not when we see their beliefs in action and literally expressed in policy. We wish to strike down all these contemptible and illegal policies, dismantle these specific mechanisms of oppression, and free ourselves to work and shop on the land we own. But I say here that PCH has all the means, motives and opportunity to commit social crime at a significant scale, with the mechanisms being clear and the money trails being short. Concerning all these Bylaw claims PCH makes against us, we find it not unusual that we are charged with offences under circumstances that make it very difficult to prove we are not guilty. Concerning definition of the problem and its reasonable solutions under the law, the logic used by the Mayor and council is practically maddening. *In Charter Section 11d, for example, our right to presumed innocence is violated when the accused must disprove on a balance of probabilities the existence of a presumed fact. The Mayor preys on this problem, for it is not easy for anyone, at the moment of seeing a parking ticket (for example), to gather evidence proving it is not valid.* In this manner, the odds are greatly stacked against us. We ask why and we often struggle to find a reason. We must consider what we have with us at that moment to gather evidence, and we must consider the odds of winning and the value of our time taken to fight our case. These are real costs, created by significant imbalances of power and process, considered here as part of the social and economic damage of the PCH system to our lives.

[17] For each bylaw, we'd rather get to the root of the claim by PCH against us which is our *Charter Section 11a, the right to be informed without unreasonable delay of the specific offence.* We find the burden of proof to be on the party making the charge, but when we ask about the specific nature of the offence we get no answer based on fact- and justice-based fundamental reasoning. The Mayor and council who wrote this nonsense, simply present an aggressive armed array of tactics to reject all questions of fundamental justice at all points. We are alarmed that the charges are so far out of proportion to what could possibly be considered a violation that we consider these bylaw charges fees tied to disproportional levels to be crime against us and significantly damaging to our lives, community and society in its net effects. To this end, we cite the Supreme Court ruling of *R. v. Oakes*, [1986] 1 SCR 103: “*First, the measures adopted must be carefully designed to achieve the objective in question. They must not be arbitrary, unfair or based on irrational considerations. In short, they must be rationally connected to the objective. Second, the means, even if rationally connected to the objective in this first sense, should impair “as little as possible” the right or freedom in question. Third, there*

must be a proportionality between the effects of the measures which are responsible for limiting the Charter right or freedom, and the objective which has been identified as of "sufficient importance"."

[18] On this basis, we see evidence that City Hall is doing exceedingly well while the real economic base of our lives is ruined and downtown crumbles. That the Mayor says everything is wonderful appears to be a loss of touch with reality and a symptom of a mental dysfunctional trait of self-important grandiosity appearing across Peterborough. What should be humble public service buildings are now all architectural waterfront marvels with no expense spared inside or out. Paid for by tax increases that took the money we needed for paint to prevent total disrepair of our homes. Our lives, and our downtown economic base are either collapsed or on the verge of collapse as we struggle to pay for it all. Millions pouring into an economic development department, with no demonstration at all of competency. City policies have crushed our downtown and made it impossible for anyone with little money to get anything started at all. An entire generation is lost, high school grads with no chance to carve out the life they want as our pioneers did, that set of freedoms removed. This is not defence of our lives. This is not representation. Democracy does not consist of electing the next authoritarian ruler. We have laws in this country.

[19] *We make two claims. One.* We say that any one moderately educated individual can consider these issues of self-reliant self-determination and quickly make a reasonable judgment concerning what to do. One individual of clear mind can make a substantial claim that any poor bylaw must be changed for conformity with our common legal basis in reason (*Section 1*). We know that a judge can do this as well, but they would be most annoyed with wasting their time deciding on matters that the Supreme Court has already ruled on, which are already legally in the realm of community self-determination using the common-sense principles, practices and procedures of our Constitution. It is utterly ridiculous that we must go to these extreme lengths just to be heard, but the Mayor and council insisted on it. This is the matter of individual voice, and the Mayor claims that only his voice matters.

[20] *Two.* We say that two or more individuals sufficiently educated on the issue can discuss and vote on the matter. In this view, voting is not merely a matter of expressing like or dislike, but a matter of being informed. However, in the case of many people having a personal response to parking meters and the attached systems as being a violation of life and against their person, polls and public voting on the issue does indeed matter. But in this case, we do not need a poll, not when there are clear violations of basic principles of law. We can directly address the basis of law and decision making, and choose carefully and rationally and by considering all impacts both positive and negative, what is the best thing to do. It is this basis of a caring kind sensible democracy that the Mayor attacks to the effect of crushing both the economy and the dignity of our persons.

[21] We end this section with a matter of serious concern. So far we have considered the Mayor and council as having worked alone, and we have been quite generous in assuming that by inherent problems of poor cognitive ability and moral reasoning, perhaps coupled to ignorance and a personality type predisposed to consistently working to accrue personal benefit, that they perhaps felt justified in their actions. It is possible that by the self-serving and confirmation biases they created a bubble culture quite out of touch with the state of the world and the reality of our lives, particularly in having the power to ascribe themselves continual benefits so as to not feel the slightest discomfort of social and economic struggle. By power, we mean here the means, motive and opportunity complete with money trails to create a fantasy kingdom in which they may be rulers over the people creating policies that damage our lives, then imagining that we somehow brought these hard circumstances purposely on

ourselves. However, they brought an outside agent in, one fully conversant with the law and intimately aware of the meaning and ramifications of the express legal rights and obligations of our Charter as starting in *Section 7*. They have a lawyer. That lawyer must certainly have seen in action all our concerns with Criminal Code violations, and been well aware of the meaning and implications of *Section 11d concerning the rights of the accused to be presumed innocent until proven guilty according to the law in a fair and public hearing by a court an independent and impartial tribunal*. And at the risk of being disbarred with their associate law firm being put in disrepute and open to charges of conspiracy, no reputable lawyer would have counselled the directors of PCH to take a poor course of action against the law, the government and the people. In this, we can rule out ignorance on the part of the directors to the effect of strongly confirming their poor intent.

[22] We understand that no person doing good work hides it, and in this we see PCH proudly proclaiming its good works in the media. And yet when we are charged by this Mayor and council with having committed one or another public offence, they aim strongly to deny realistic *Section 1* recourse and aim to keep the matter quiet and behind closed doors by a policy of isolating and silencing individuals, being an obstruction of justice by working completely against the intent of Charter *Section 11d*. We understand this also as an act of sedition when its purpose is to cover up illegal and undemocratic activities within PCH committed by its directors, whereas it is necessary in a democracy to have open debate on all matters of pressing public concern. We further know that positive work done defends and builds our lives. In this living democratic context, we as citizens find we have a very firm basis in realistic decision making, an excellent understanding of the issues and what rights and freedoms have been attacked, violated or removed, and we can see plain and obvious means, motives and opportunity complete with money trails to those writing laws directed toward forcing unjust inequity.

3.2 FALSE CLAIMS OF OWNERSHIP: FRAUD, THEFT AND EXTORTION

[1] Fraud is an act of trickery used to accomplish theft by false claims of rights and ownership that deprives a victim of benefit by removal of their rights. The fraudster acts without colour of right using a variety of tactics of intentional deception to secure unfair and unlawful gain. Fraud is characterized as a lack of integrity between what a person says and what they do, these being distinctly different. Theft is simpler, as someone simply takes what does not belong to them. They had no right to take it, but benefited by depriving another person of both their right and benefit, causing harm. Theft is the action of taking, whereas fraud concerns deceptive speech and language. If a fraudster in a role of authority makes significant claims purposely distorting the truth and not backed by evidence, then the fraud relates to additional crimes against the duties of office. In assessing fraud, the process of judicial inquiry is rightly focused on the noteworthy human trait of honesty which has been found to be quite beneficial to good human relations and to many types of human endeavour in which the search for truth plays a primary role, thus violating *Section 1* of our Constitution. *Section 380(1)* of the Criminal Code of Canada defines fraud quite broadly, there being many types of trickery: *Every one who by deceit, falsehood or other fraudulent means (whether or not it is a false pretense within the meaning of this Act), defrauds the public or any person, whether ascertained or not, of any property, money or valuable security or any service is guilty of fraud.*

[2] Theft is defined in our *Criminal Code Section 322(1)*: *Every one commits theft who fraudulently or without colour of right takes, or converts to his use or to the use of another person anything, whether*

animate or inanimate, with intent (a) to deprive, temporarily or absolutely, the owner of it, or a person who has a special property or interest in it, of the thing or of his property or interest in it; (b) to pledge it or deposit it as security; (c) to part with it under a condition with respect to its return that the person who parts with it may be unable to perform; or (d) to deal with it in such a manner that it cannot be restored in the condition in which it was at the time it was taken or converted. Of the greatest social concern here, as it guts the capacity of individuals and people to sustain themselves in the Charter-protected core work of meeting essential human needs, is the theft of land, work and decision-making powers that belong to the community. Individuals in need and distress, along with an entire generation of young Canadians starting life with little, finds themselves controlled and entrapped by a few individuals aimed fully at harnessing their lives and future to no good end. Here we find City Hall zoning land for commercial use which is snapped up by the highest bidder who has no intent to work, but desires significant income from those who do wish to work. The economic impositions on any new startup being prohibitive or crushing, further forcing maximum debt on any new venture. The young person must pay everyone before they even have a chance to earn a dime, including workers in government who already have guaranteed no-risk life security by taxation. Scoundrels of the poorest character are thus favoured over those of good character.

[3] Here we focus on major categories of PCH fraud, as detailing of the many instances of egregious bylaws and *Section 15* violations in which money is taken without significant return of a service of similar value would be too voluminous. In crisis, we are urgently concerned with large-scale *Section 7* violations aimed at attacking people for money by removing rights to life, liberty and security of the person that define PCH as an anti-democracy criminal organization. Fraud at PCH often takes the form of a bylaw lacking a legal basis and not being a legitimate service of government, in which the directors of PCH falsely claim rights and authority they do not have thus violating many *Sections* of the Constitution and Criminal Code. We must address at least three claims made by the directors of PCH, these being of pressing and substantial concern as the greatest threats to our lives and survival: 1) their claim of ownership of public land and assets; 2) their denial of our rights to do work of balanced benefit to our community under Constitutional directives; 3) their claim to being a legitimate form of local government. The effect of denial of our rights to life is to control essential human needs by denying fair access to the critical resources required for survival, further acting to force us into the hands of unscrupulous actors also dedicated to that cause. We state these claims knowing that any person with fraudulent intent is unlikely to state their foundational claims with such stark legal clarity. In making these claims, the directors act far beyond the scope and purpose of legitimate government, the purpose being to generate extreme benefit to persons in and associated with City Hall by completely controlling the population to ill intents of economic mining and harnessing labour by force and extortion of essential human needs.

[4] In fraud, we encounter something which seems on the surface to be reasonable but which later does not survive rational fact-based analysis from another perspective. In direct experience, something might seem odd or unusual, or be further along that spectrum from odd to suspicious to clearly wrong. A citizen might have a sense of the inherent purpose of government as gained directly from the process of voting for a representative, and then encounter a behaviour of elected official seemingly at odds with this purpose. Questions naturally arise from this cognitive dissonance, prompting a truth-based inquiry into the basis of this apparent lack of integrity. This being a Charter case, we take pains to lay out the basis of this investigative process, thus making it open to fact-based legal debate. Fraud deals with linguistic deception; the deliberately complex language of law is an example. PCH bylaws claim of ownership of public land by PCH aimed at unilateral benefit, one effect being that because of PCH

contracts this public benefit is also given to private corporations. We are understandably confused by this claim of ownership because the word public no longer seems to mean public. Is this a mistake or a misunderstanding, or is this wording purposely fraudulent? Linguistically, determining this may be uncertain without further context because each word is defined by related words. The keyword 'honesty' is defined by related supporting words, and this characteristic in a person is defined by a set of related values in which there is minimal difference between what a person says or does. Conversely, a dishonest action is confirmed by related poor actions. In a mechanical analogy, we might not know the purpose of machine by considering one part alone. Our concerns of clarity thus revolve around deciphering meaning, intent and purpose. We might have suspicions about poor intent from a single event or instance, but these cannot be confirmed at a high level of confidence without finding a supportive contextual framework (the legal levels ranging from reasonably certain to beyond the shadow of a doubt). We can decipher this by comparing written bylaws to actions, behavioural indicators and budgetary confirmation of intent and effects providing unusual benefit to PCH and its associates to the detriment of citizens.

[5] In assessing intent and purpose with respect to fraud, each PCH bylaw and its related economic action was referred to well-known social states and then subject to a series of tests of democratic function and judicial due process. Writing a bylaw, including one to levy taxes, requires a series of legal tests to ensure a validity within the structure of an engaged democracy respectful of rights and freedoms. Do the actions of PCH survive Canada's democratic Rights and Freedoms test, or are they working against people and government using baseless unilateral force? Of interest here are the judicial SCC *Section 1* truth tests that may define, for example, a fine, fee or tax as being in extreme economic and social *overbreadth* or be so damaging that a PCH bylaw cannot be regarded as law under *Section 52*. It might have been good once, but is now taken too far. We can thus logically assess if the directors of PCH are fulfilling their judicial duties or engaging in illegal activities falsely claiming rights far beyond the scope of legitimate government defined in the Constitution.

[6] We are concerned to the point of alarm that the directors of PCH have monetary motives so extreme as to reject their democratic duty of office and attack the social functions of government designed to maintain a healthy society with a fair balance of interests. This being a Charter issue, it was necessary to consider the type of work being done at PCH with some being beneficial but much being detrimental, understanding labour as foundational with respect to currency which is merely a convenient tool of trade subject to all manner of deceitful manipulation. This generated a proper *Section 15* comparative work analysis with labour being inherent to the process of assessing equitable fair trade, independent of whether or not the work was paid. The concern is securities fraud when PCH issues a note as a bond saying we owe them, but in paying we find no equivalent work done or the type of work done was against societal interests. A monetary analysis was then used as a broad indicator of the type of work done ranked across a scale from negative detrimental work to positive beneficial work. In paid work, which is often based on a mountain of unpaid work, the paid amount includes multiple factors determining the ability to do the work and its quality. One could get paid, for example, and not do the required work, which may be a matter of theft or fraud depending on the claims made by the person paid. Our contextual framework was that of overall social, economic and ecological health, with a firm factual basis in *Section 1* Oakes truth tests, entirely based on the *Section 7* Charter work needed to meet essential human needs using the finite resources of Nature and its living ecosystems. Does PCH support our lives and future, or are they engaged in social, economic and ecologic mining activities causing great damage and being significantly irreversible (by local species extinction and the physics of systematic degradational thermodynamics) with outright attacks on all components of

individual and social *Section 7* rights and freedoms? The Charter concern is voting by the Mayor and council on issues in which they are barely literate, thus lacking *Section 1* authority, and yet have extreme social, economic and personal biases. Lacking the required knowledge and cognitive abilities, they were not qualified to act and yet did so due to delusional moral reasoning (a symptomatic mental health issue of ASDP) to the effect of extreme damage across all society. They then pass a “law” and say the matter is closed, whereas the animal-behavioural evidence documents this as the hunting behaviour of social predators, a gang behaviour of social attack. A willingness of a specific personality type to destroy all society and kill to get money.

[7] We found by this analysis that the primary purpose of PCH is not judicial, social, economic or ecologic defence and representation of residents, but to seize control of all land and resources, people and essential human needs, removing options and freedoms critical to life to the effect of full corporate control of land, work and money. When a right has been removed, in this case Freedom of Association from persons and groups that damage our lives, there had better be very good *Section 1* reason. The primary fraud is thus that of false representation, wherein much public money is spent by PCH on maintaining appearances of propriety and justice, falsely using public relations campaigns to make their activities seem legitimate. The fraud here includes use of public funds for personal promotion. Such campaigns of misdirection are thinly veiled, as we have much evidence of no substantial positive change in our lives as millions are drained from our local economy and community. That directors of PCH spend much time and money constructing a legal fortress instead of simply doing the work required under the law is a serious abuse of position and misdirection of funds away from the principal purposes of government. The budget and activities reveal PCH as being in private business, operating distinctly as the real estate sales arm of bankers, fully against us, our Supreme Court and our Constitutional democracy. We understand this as a criminal network of corporate collusion fully devoted to working against the government and against the rights and freedoms of individuals, families and communities. This is a gang gone rogue, driven by sociopathic-psychopathic personality types.

[8] Each suspected case of bylaw and budgetary fraud was then assessed for basis-of-law violations with respect to our Criminal Code, our Charter and its related human rights instruments, and established educational and legal mental health standards. We can thus say with high confidence that the character of the person of City Hall is dominated by the distinct presence of deeply disturbed social predators. Their mode of operation on gaining positions of power over others is to claim rights they do not have while denying the essential rights of those they prey on. Most desire access to a large pool of money (banking, insurance, taxation and retirement funds being key examples), wherein they claim rights to control and refuse to recognize that they were only allowed to use that money only under certain conditions and only for the intended purpose. Specifically, sociopaths deny the rights of the persons paying, that the money be used only for the defined purpose, here defined across our Constitution and in contract law as the requirement to work for social benefit, this being the reason we pay taxes. In the same context, we understand that WWII was caused by sociopathic income extremists claiming entire countries as their own, aiming to profit immensely from the natural resources of others. We are dealing here with a small percent of the population with mental health issues of ASPD who rush to positions of power over others and have natural inclinations toward abuse and desire for complete control of everything that goes on. The political technique of fraud is to claim authority, using the law as a weapon wherein each good principle is turned around in its intent. In mental illness terms, this is cognitive dyslexia. In that process, violating all the foundational principles of law, everything of value is seized on and taken to the extent of pushing people to extreme deprivation and death, and further denying all the efforts of the attacked person to escape their circumstances. Regardless of the “law”

written by sociopaths, nothing can change our basic sense of violation of care, respect, freedom and justice inherent to our nature and character. We hold these truths to be self-evident, but now also backed by a mountain of solid scientific evidence admissible for consideration in a court of law. We also submit into evidence the holdings of the National Library of Canada, whereas the bylaws of PCH are based only on the whim of authoritarian rulers working under an irrelevant set of rules designed centuries ago under conditions of considerable ignorance.

[9] We now have the capacity to understand the world as viewed multi-culturally from significantly different states of mind, as required to meet our *Section 27* obligations for healthy ecological balances of social, economic, linguistic and environmental diversities as factors creating respectful culture. In monetary culture, for example, we have only an unreasonable ideology as an imposed monoculture, fully rejecting evidence of damage and not allowing the existence of reasonable caring alternatives concerning how we choose to use our common currency, this being in the public domain of Charter concern as an inescapable monopoly. The same can be said of land, for the totalitarian removal of a place to exist is so fundamental to life that its removal will with high certainty drive a person into circumstances likely to cause death. Yet this is their intent. We understand the culture created at PCH by its directors to be extremely unbalanced to the extent of being a toxic force destroying our lives and working against the survival of our children. From the perspective of a citizen enjoying a park, City Hall has worked on their behalf to ensure green space and a good quality of life. From the perspective of someone in City Hall operating under the delusion that they own the land under complete arbitrary authoritarian rule, they have a full staff of gardeners tending Their grounds. All homeowners are on Their property and taxes are viewed as condo fees for services of maintenance. If a Mayor operates under the delusion that City Hall is a business, they imagine themselves to be the CEO seeking to maximize profit for City Hall, with the council as its board of directors. The task is to cut anything that is an expense or does not generate profit for the group. Everything public with any potential for profit is taken for the benefit of City Hall and handed to associated businesses such that our taxes ensure the ever-increasing profits of private business. You must pay the unlimited for-profit business Corporation of Peterborough for services rendered, with all City land, buildings, infrastructure and cash flow considered as assets on the balance sheet. You must pay to use your own downtown, with parking meters as a rental fee for using Their land. It is not unusual for those entering politics to state their aim to turn government into a business, and then we see significant evidence in the documents and operations of City Hall that this is the case. Some of our servants in government think they are running a business and call us customers.

[10] This Mayor and council claim that everything that is public belongs to them and is for their benefit. We understand this as the primary sociopathic claim that caused two world wars. We say Criminal Code *Section 322(1a)* applies, this is outright theft. *Section (b)* applies, the Mayor makes promises and issues press releases based on lies with actual policies of taking by force. *Section (c)* applies, we cannot afford the outrageous expenses of City Hall imposed on us by force and live under the rules they created that have already damaged our lives and gutted our economy. *Section (d)* applies, this illegal seizure has already caused permanent degradation of our land as a direct threat to our lives, destroying the future for our children, causing species extinction and degrading our planet. The Mayor and council are temporary, but aim to inflict permanent irreversible damage in land use plans effecting policies of genocide. We are already suffering, but if this local government continues these hate policies our children will die. The concern here is PCH interference in our Constitutional Activities supporting life and essential human needs, and overall our Charter preamble clearly delineating our authority under God and our equal rights to decision making under the law, these being critical to using

our *Section 7* rights to act freely addressing fundamental personal, social and national security issues essential to ongoing life. We have other beliefs, such as the right to live lightly on the land in caring concern for future generations. The directors of PCH are actively working against SCC directives by destroying our Charter-protected core economy of essential human needs. Denying tiny homes. Denying life-saving tents. Denying homeowner builds, or making the process exceedingly convoluted and prohibitively expensive. Denying the right to build a shelter of our choice, as needed, and instead imposing on us and against our will a life we do not want, a life that will destroy us. In zoning intended to remove work that belongs to a community of individuals, they have removed any place where we can touch the land for purposes of enjoyment and ecological strengthening, grow food, or engage in free and open trade essential for those starting life with little to stabilize their lives and develop. An entire generation is thus lost, without hope for a future, the war crime being removal of the right to development. We call this out Pioneer Right, to start life with little and build it up by the labour of our own hands (*UDHR Article 22*).

[11] Whereas in fracturing society by removal of essential rights and freedoms and isolating individuals (by war crimes violations of *UDHR Articles 4, 8 and 21*), PCH has done this in written collusive contracts with business, developers and bankers in order to receive extreme benefit. Specifically, local government must relate to us at the Constitutional level of work done to meet essential human needs, for this is the constitutional level at which we live our lives. Whereas they have systematically removed from this essential institution all systems intended to provide social care and benefit. Instead, specifically attacking the basis of our lives and the means by which we can support ourselves, they created a food, work and shelter security crisis for which they are responsible. Stated simply, we ask why our workers in government want money. One reason is to buy food. They do not grow food, we do, and yet they have taken sweeping actions to as much as possible prevent us from growing food. They have similarly gutted our capacity to make and sell things, which is not only a grass-roots attack on the individual but cripples the country in its productive capacity to the point of being an attack on national security. The equality under the law concern is this: the Mayor and council benefit enormously from free land, buildings and supplies, being on social assistance, yet by false claims of land ownership vastly interfere with the lives and rights of our children in manners ensuring they can never gain a foothold in life or escape the permanent life insecurity of indentured servitude for essential human needs (an *Article 4* violation done by full rejection of our equality under the law to make critical decisions determining our lives and future. We say they do not own the land, that the land must not be used for these evil purposes under any circumstances, and that the Treaties have no basis since they were forced under threats of death and imposed conditions of starvation. City Hall has admitted this in their land acknowledgement, and yet continues to impose the same conditions of threats to our *Section 7* rights in creating systems of designed disempowerment to the extent of having created a large-scale humanitarian crisis. One means by which they have done this is by systematic work against numerous Ministry directives, such as the Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing mandates to build urban and rural communities allowing people to participate in and build a strong basis for the local economy, which is completely and utterly dependent of the self-determinative rights and freedoms of individuals to build shelters of their own choice. This not being the purpose of government, the directors of PCH have engaged in fraud claiming rights and authorities they do not have, the purpose being theft of life-sustaining work that belongs to us, as individuals that cannot exist independent of a caring community of mutually-beneficial work and free trade. They have taken many actions ensuring that no one can escape their banker- and business-systems aim at full removal of the critical necessities of life with the purpose of creating a totalitarian state of complete removal of freedoms controlling all essential human needs and fully aimed at exerting deprivations driving us to death. In Peterborough,

the directors of City Hall have created a state aiming for the genocide of an identifiable group by systematically removing all the critical components of life, a serious *Section 12* and war crimes act of torture and cruel and unusual punishment. *Section 12* prohibits treatment or punishment that is “grossly disproportionate” in the circumstances; in other words, one that would “outrage our society's sense of decency” such that Canadians would find it “abhorrent or intolerable” (R. v. Smith, [1987] 1 S.C.R.). They have done this by continually attacking people and pushing many into these circumstances, including an entire generation of young Canadians just starting life, and refusing to ameliorate the circumstances despite there being numerous reasonable solutions, chief amongst these being use of our Constitution Act for its intended purposes. The extreme concern here is that in writing illegal and unconstitutional bylaws, they have then put the Peterborough Police in extreme conflict of law as they are directed to push extremely vulnerable individuals along to their deaths, acting against reason and conscience and against the *Section 7* and universal rights to life, freedom and life security of individuals and society. In sweeping actions aimed at getting rid of an undesirable group, that group being anyone without enough money to pay City Hall and their collusive coercive beneficiaries in banking and business, who are of no use when lacking money other than as labourers, they have committed the CCC *Section 318(c,1)* offence of advocating genocide of an identifiable group along with CCC *Sections 219 to 221* offences of criminal negligence of duty causing bodily harm and death, for we can prove it is their duty to protect life in all aspects across all their legal and moral Charter obligations, the additional related web-of-crime charges being fraud, theft, criminal collusion, sedition and treason. We are thus certain beyond the shadow of a reasonable doubt of the presence of a person operating within City Hall who enjoys taking others to the edge of life, removing possibilities of access to water, food, heat, sleep and all other forms of refuge. Who also actively prevents people from attaining these necessities themselves and who continually tears down any gains in life security. We understand these to be the behaviours of a psychopath who lack conscience but takes pleasure in torturing others and holding the power of life and death over them, refusing escape or refuge.

[12] We thus have serious questions of benefit and ownership concerning the actions of the Mayor and council in the continuation of these abominable policies set fully against the lives and futures of Canadian citizens. We understand that sociopaths believe the world revolves around them. They structure the lives of everyone under their domain with the purpose of complete control. Only their ideas matter. No one else has say, unless the sociopath assesses this as the best thing to do to maintain their position. They hate anything beyond their control, anything exhibiting care and concern by mutual benefit to others, and in this have a strong propensity to commit social crime. They make astounding claims to own everything, including that which is not theirs, using an astounding lack of logic which we view as evidence of mental insanity and conduct unbecoming the position. We have tested this perspective of the directors of City Hall many times and have much evidence substantiating this belief system of the Mayor and most of council. We have on record what they stand for and what they vote for. The beliefs of the Mayor are internal to his mind, but if we treat his mind as a black box, not knowing the thoughts and process of decision-making from input to output, we can nevertheless gain a good understanding of the point of view by what is evident in words and expressed in action. In the same manner, we cannot know the inner workings of a black hole, but we can by the absence of information and effects on surrounding suns know to a high degree of certainty how it operates.

[13] We can thus say at the highest level of confidence concerning major fraud that the Mayor and council forcefully and by removal of social rights and recourse issue securities without any basis in law. Securities, or bonds, are notes written claiming a debt. If the basis of writing that note is false, that is fraud. We understand that the issuing of false notes is a characteristic claim of a personality type that

believes the world owes them, a mental health issue that must be worked out in the private realm, not publicly. A prime example being the false issuing of tax bills that have no basis in Charter law. People enter government to gain life security, under *Section 7*, and this is the only legal and Constitutionally legitimate basis of taxation. Life security cannot be attained by destroying the life security of those who support your life. This Mayor and council, in another example of many, issue parking tickets expecting us to believe they have a valid basis. We seek, but do not find this valid basis and instead consider the issuance of such tickets as proof of the judiciary role of local government obliging it to follow the rules of law. That they have not done so, even under the orders of the SCC, means their bylaw has no *Section 52* force or effect. Finding ourselves in conflict with the law, we must obey our top courts. But when we obey the law, not agreeing with the belief systems of sociopaths, they issue threats and do much to obstruct a rational *Section 1* justice-based discussion of the basis of policy. Now that our lives are deeply in crisis, we are forced to address major securities fraud emanating from PCH wherein the Mayor and council issue tax bills claiming owed debt based entirely on speculation rather than on any legally justified Charter basis in which the work done respectfully supports the lives of citizens. It is illegal in Canada for any level of government to make money by removing rights, for their primary task is to work on our behalf to protect our lives as much as their own, particularly as we provide the tax basis. And yet the directors of PCH have devised many schemes to harness our labour and mine out the substance from our lives. We know this as a form of slavery, as many freedoms have been removed. The sociopath believes they have rights but others do not, they have say but we do not, they have freedoms but aim to remove freedoms from others. Their will is to dominate by any means necessary.

[14] *Section 1* requires that for Charter-level debate on these critical matters of ensuring the survival of our children we must seek out the fundamental basis of this PCH-directed securities fraud. We find this basis to be in major *Section 2* violations of our Freedom of Belief. It seems the directors of PCH find it hard to believe that they are employees paid under contract to perform duties democratically directed by citizens working under the law. The directors reject equality of reasonable self-determination under the law, and instead wish to impose their own narrow beliefs across all society. We have strong evidence from the budget and activities of PCH, which completely deny community involvement and are strongly anti-justice, anti-democracy, anti-freedom and anti-environmental, that the actual belief system is that of ever-increasing infinite exponential growth which rejects all diversity of alternative systems based on healthy caring *Section 1* and other Constitutional considerations. If we consider the expressed basis of organized religions, then it is safe to say colloquially based on much evidence that we are dealing here with a religious cult of radical extremist money worshippers imposing their beliefs across all society by unilateral force, threat and removal of rights to life.

[15] If we accept the claim by the directors of PCH to own all public land, and we do not, then they must bear significant responsibilities for assuring a legal basis in all they do with a balanced Charter-based set of societal, economic, ecologic and cultural interests. Camping is demonstrably justified as a great Canadian experience when done under conditions not depriving individuals of water used for it many purposes of drinking, cooking and cleaning to maintain health, or heat, or the fundamental right to life of a place to exist and live lightly on the land. In our culture and history, we point to our Pioneer Rights to take risk, build an initial shelter of our own devising, and go on to provide the necessities of life using tools, fair access to the critical resources required for survival, and to build up a life by the labour of our own hands, free from forces acting against our lives and survival. We understand that land lasts longer than a human lifespan, and that in this the Mayor and council seek permanent PCH control by incorporating. Yet we find not legal basis for incorporating, but instead have much evidence indicating that their claim to own public land is an intent to remove freedoms essential to life and

healthy society, purposed against SCC directives and aiming for maximal interference in our lives aiming to control all essential needs and actions. Since bankers aim to make all land private, the claim of ownership of public land by PCH removes all options with intent (evidenced by the effect) to work in collusion with bankers aiming to get money at any cost regardless of damage. A land use map shows that when public use of public land for public benefit is denied, the direct result is a totalitarian state acting entirely against our reasonable rights to Life, Liberty and Security of the Person. Here, the PCH Criminal Code violation is extortion of essential human needs taken to the extent of threatening life along with the basis of life (a planned act of genocide). In *CC Section 346 (1)*, every one commits extortion who, without reasonable justification or excuse and with intent to obtain anything, by threats, accusations, menaces or violence induces or attempts to induce any person, whether or not he is the person threatened, accused or menaced or to whom violence is shown, to do anything or cause anything to be done.

[16] *Concerning Illegal Incorporation*. We understand that the primary purpose of incorporation is to protect the private assets of individuals in the event of failure of risky business ventures. However, government is not a business. Products are not made and sold. The only allowed activities are the *services* of legitimate government described in our Constitution Act. The income of all workers in government is stable and secure as taxes are spread out across all of society. Quite to the contrary, the lives of workers outside government often fluctuate wildly, and often in direct causal relation to the impositions of government, as much venture risk is present in our lives. As we know this is not the role of government, we say these beliefs of the directors, forced on us by their taxes, fees and bylaws, violate our Freedom of Belief in caring inclusive democracy and its Freedom of Expression in creating caring community on a firm and sound social, economic and ecological basis. We can cite many Charter cases and Ministry directives confirming our beliefs in the law and in the role and purpose of government. *We submit into evidence the Articles of Incorporation of the City of Peterborough as indicating the unfounded beliefs of the directors that they are in business.*

[17] We say that the sole purpose of incorporation, if it is valid at all, must be only for the recognition of PCH as an artificially-created 'legal person' with the required behaviours being those of our Constitution Act (1982). The City is not a venture requiring risk of investors and protection of the personal property of those venturing forth, as fully funded safely by continuous taxation. Quite to the contrary, there must be careful fiscal accountability and jurisprudence with respect to the role of office concerning the lives and needs of citizens, specifically recognizing that by practical application of *Section 7* law, our balance sheet is also social and ecological, for all we have comes from Nature by the work we do. We hold these truths to be self-evident, but now also backed by a mountain of evidence, the facts of which form the basis of law. We accept this sole purpose only, and reject all other claims made by the Mayor and council in their Articles of Incorporation, the charge being fraud. They took these actions. No one forced them. They are responsible.

[18] We urgently ask for Supreme Court clarification on this matter of incorporation as a matter of life and death. The effect in Peterborough has been to rip apart the caring structure of society such that this generation of Peterborough youth have no place to exist except as servants of corporations. Further their lives are at high risk with all hope of recourse being removed. They are forced into the hands and plans of an older generation refusing to let go of ideas and practices that are clearly damaging. We know our Charter as a form of incorporating permanence of ongoing life by use of its overarching timeless principles. Our concern here is with Charter compliance of the Corporations Act, which it seems to us must have two parts. One, meeting the needs of business continuation when faced with the

coming and going of directors and workers. Two, meeting our Charter needs of continuance of viable land, water and life such that each new generation has hopes for a viable future. The situation we face right now is that land, water and life critical to our future is held in Peterborough at the whim of a handful of people who could (and have) do permanent damage to the viability of life depending on whatever they happen to think at the moment. This is the crucial question of home, not only for us but for all species. This Mayor and council have effectively claimed this is not our home; we have no say about anything critical to our lives and survival. We say these claims are false.

[19] *Concerning PCH incorporation, we must take this as evidence at present of fraud. The directors apparently believe they are running an unlimited profit business, but a strange one that takes money by force by threat and removal of Freedom of Association. If City Hall is a business, we ask that they produce the business registration. Concerning the claims of ownership the Mayor and council have made in Bylaws, we ask that they produce the receipts and deed. Whereas we have tax receipts proving we paid for all City assets in full. If they do indeed have ownership, they could sell all the assets and become billionaires, thus ending government and removing all public property and social benefit from our lives. The Mayor and council have taken great pains to ensure the latter. The real working policies of the Mayor and council are not written down, but can be tested for actual existence. The quiet disappearance of rest areas. The removal of all bulletin boards allowing public postings. The refusal to respond to inquiries about what the City has to offer, without paying fees first, the screening of events of clear social good that the Mayor does not approve of, the refusal of all related government offices to allow postings, the complete removal of places of refuge for those fighting for survival by seeking shelter. All have been tested. The Mayor is willing to use force to impose his ideologies. We are crippled in our capacities to make and sell things, and to grow food to feed ourselves, and to seek shelter to survive. We understand that any child who dares sell lemonade on public property will be forcibly removed. We understand the goal of this Mayor and council is to remove all the critical actionable rights to life of an entire generation of Peterborough youth. As caring parents, we cannot allow this. Specifically, as legal guardians we are obliged to take part in the democratic protection of their lives using the principles, practices and processes of our Canadian Constitution Act (1982), despite its many flaws and weaknesses, with critical rights missing or ill-defined.*

[20] We understand that many of the actual working policies of the Mayor and council are unspoken but will be revealed as violent State actions if we act independently using our Charter rights. This being a personality type of total domination in which nothing goes on without their control and say. We already know, from policy, their intent to commit manslaughter. We expect the hungry will be arrested or forcibly removed if they dare plant a carrot on public land. We know these as unstated but actual working policies directly emanating from the rage generated in the mind of a sociopath if anyone dares question or defy their will. We believe these are deep anti-competition policies emplaced by the Mayor in collusion with corporations seeking complete control. The Mayor and council have designed and approved zoning purposed to remove from residents all real and economic possibilities of creating work or meeting essential human needs. The Mayor aims to control and fracture every critical aspect of our life security. The Mayor makes no attempt whatsoever to compensate for the removal of essential rights and freedoms that would allow any form of justice or maintenance of a healthy society. As the Mayor and council completely and utterly reject all forms of citizen and community involvement, being deeply anti-social, we can only conclude that their goal is replacement of our Canadian democracy with the working mechanisms of an authoritarian state. We have much evidence of this as actively working and provably existing at City Hall. We believe that under this direction, the only end point is social, economic and ecological devastation, the creation of a state like North Korea, the

world's largest concentration camp run by a dictator.

[21] Concerning the question of callous disregard for our lives, the Mayor and council do not have consent of the governed. We did not agree to their policies and we never will. We instead say that the Mayor and Council are obliged by their position and responsibility to address all urgent issues of major concern to our lives. Their role obliges them to use caring land use policies and practises that do not deprive people of their fundamental rights to existence. We never gave up our rights to democratic self-determination and we never will. We say it is our Charter *Section 1* right to not have our lives ruled by the incompetent mentally ill.

[22] We believe that the actions taken by this Mayor and council were intended to remove our sense of security of the person, for we are under constant threat. By the removal of refuge and recourse, giving us no place to go, our sense of safety and belonging has been removed not only by these hateful PCH policies and their active content with ludicrous claims of ownership. We insist that Canada is our home and we reject these assaults on our lives. We believe in the law and in the set of principles and practises of our Charter to create a caring social culture of support for our lives by defence of our land and freedoms. We reject the culture created by the directors of our local City Hall as being unhealthy and at odds with the healthy aims and intent of our Charter. We have strong evidence that these actions taken by the Mayor and council are consistent with the actions of a person committing and covering up fraud, using intentional deception to secure unfair and unlawful gain by depriving citizens of legal rights to fundamental justice, democratic rights to engaged caring community and essential rights to life.

[23] In tax fraud, the Mayor and council have acted to produce false valuations of land and homes by rejection of realistic *Section 1* evidence of lower real values. In false land valuations, undisturbed land has essential life-sustaining values of complex and healthy integrated living ecosystems providing us and many other species a firm basis for life by provision of multitudinous services. Land in which such ecosystem services have been largely destroyed is of reduced value, because it degrades our inherent *Section 7* rights to life and security of the person. In both cases, the only way value can be extracted is by our work coupled to rights to trade that are obvious within families, between people and across cultures. In this, we understand currency as being a convenient invented tool of trade needed to establish fair comparisons of the value of our work and the products we make. We understand trade as a liberty, a necessary freedom of trade critical to making our lives work in healthy relation to others and the land from which we took the resources critical to survival. Of interest here, the City of Peterborough, along with the Mayor and council, receive tremendous social and economic benefit from the free use of land, and further they depend entirely on our social assistance in providing the buildings, systems and tools required to do their jobs. We have given them everything they need, and yet they wish to unfairly and with great damage deprive us of these essential resources required to live and do the work we need to do to support our lives as well as theirs. What we would like to see is their fundamental basis for land valuations, particularly considering that false valuations are a direct means to harness our lives and labour by removal of essential rights and freedoms. Of particular concern are false and inherently unfair elevated land prices aimed specifically at gaining income without labour as a means of harnessing our labour under conditions in which we receive no benefit but are instead degraded into conditions of forced indentured servitude for essential human needs in a state of permanent life insecurity, this being the opposite of freedom. In the false valuation of our homes, we know that the real value at the time of construction is labour and materials, after which the house is subject to the degradational laws of thermodynamics by decay in physical worth and inherent value. Whereas City Hall claims that this house has increased in value, we find no evidence for this. The value

is only the time and materials at the time of construction, increasing only with the time and materials of repairs done to maintain its condition. All of society values honest fair labour with pay proportionate to the quality of work done, and we find great satisfaction in this, yet find ourselves subject to and servants of those seeking income without labour, who do not want to work, who do work against our lives that degrades and mines out the value from our lives, and that unfairly and to great detriment to us harnesses the labour of our lives to no good end. What is evident in this are the hallmarks of slavery, the removal of rights and freedoms to the extent that we are forced to work under conditions that give us no benefit but give extreme unfair benefit to those seeking to control and plunder our lives using the most unethical and unjust practices and principles ever conceived by humanity, acting utterly and fully against our lives and all elements of our constitutional and Constitutional Rights and Freedoms. We require here a *Section 1* justification from the Mayor and council for their valuations of land and homes, whereas the only legal basis for taxation is the finite, understandable and easily measurable sum of factors determining basic *Section 7* life security reasonable constrained by *Section 15* and other *Charter* considerations, the Criminal Code charges being fraud (a CCC *Section 380(1)* violation) and extortion of essential human needs (a CCC *Section 346(1)* and human rights violation taken to the extent of intent to commit criminally negligent bodily harm and death).

[24] *Concerning a room as a reference point for valuation.* The rental of a 10' x 10' room provides the core organizational components by which one can venture out into the world to learn or make a living. In a typical rental situation, one has access to a bathroom and kitchen providing additional basis-of-health services. How valuable is that room with respect to what one can earn to pay for it? If one has first and last months rent, but lacks a job, entering into that rental agreement takes those critical funds needed for life and if one does not land a job with significant pay immediately, in two months the person is worse off and perhaps damaged in economics, options and reputation beyond recovery. This is a high-risk situation. And yet without shelter first, a stable home base, it may be impossible to find, get and keep work. If one is homeless, personal maintenance takes much time and energy, as these resources found within a home are dispersed rather than concentrated in one place. That makes it very difficult to accumulate the funds required to rent a room. This analysis gives a very good sense of the measurable value with respect to income, but is incomplete without another reference point. Of interest to the Canadian climate is a prospectors tent, waterproof with insulated floor and insulated walls. The size of a room, with space for a bed, desk, chair and stove. The key differences to a rented room in a house seems only to be the materials of construction and the low cost of construction allowing freedom from rent. When what you get is permanent life security, it is clear that those seeking to benefit from perpetual rent that puts you in permanent life insecurity are highly motivated to not allow camping, cabins, tiny homes or anything that gives you freedom and the essential rights to life. We understand this as the basis of motivation of workers at City Hall to deny any and all forms of free self-reliant self-determination. Yet we say we have the right to live lightly on the Earth, as we choose, and in Freedom.

[25] *Concerning forced labour.* In the rental of a room, a direct relation exists between the person seeking extreme income without labour and the person paying. If the house is not paid off, a significant proportion of the money you pay for rent goes to pay for the mortgage and directly into the bank account of the income extremist threatening the life, liberty and security of your person. If the house is paid off or not, a significant proportion of the money you pay for rent goes to pay for taxes on the house as well as the personal taxes of the homeowner, directly into the pockets of someone at City Hall who wrote the policy. There being only one or two degrees of separation with proven money trails rather six degrees of separation between persons who are not otherwise directly linked. Specifically, when you lack life security you did not agree to pay those with vast life security who also act further

against your life. And yet the Mayor and council have signed contracts deliberately forcing this removal of Freedom of Association, and in those contracts also removing many rights and freedoms critical to life. They further do this by removal of all options, pushing hard for an authoritarian state in which you have no freedom, say or recourse. A life is being imposed on you that you do not want, there being in a mortgage or rental agreement a component of forced labour by which your hard-earned money forcible goes to those you know are destroying your life.

[26] *Concerning false claims of risks to health and safety.* Camping is a great Canadian experience, if well equipped. Cabins are wonderful. In each, the benefits to health and life are tremendous. We have found, however, that the directors of City Hall have made major efforts to remove from their institution all manner of things to do with public care and benefit, and further have removed places to camp, park, rest areas, attacked and diminished parks and anything else providing mutual benefit, rest, refuge and respite. And have sold public land belonging to us, which was not theirs to sell. And have removed much from the public domain that which was not theirs to remove, putting what belonged to us in the hands of private for-profit corporations to our degradation and detriment. And further denied us permits to establish such low-cost places to escape their systems, denied individual builders, denied tiny homes builds, denied community. Denied us the use of existing buildings and existing lands, to provide life-saving shelter and a place to build up and grow. At the root of these denials are claims of threats to our health and safety, with standards set so high as to be impossible, and that is the point. We are kept in conditions far worse than those we wish to enter into for our survival and stability, with risks imposed on us being greater than the risks of entering into the improved situation. Furthermore, under *Section 7* of the Charter, we have the right to take risk, but not to have far greater risk imposed on us. Of great interest here in providing a basis of evidence, we are aware of two major discoveries this past decade that may be the greatest of the century. In the discovery of the fourth phase of water, an electrical energy system was found wherein infrared light provides energy for the body and is key to the immune system in driving out toxins and contaminant, vastly defending health. This is activated in natural surroundings on exposure to sunlight when we are in contact with the Earth, providing evidence that far greater health is to be found in tents, camping and cabins than in artificial man-made rooms in houses and apartment buildings. Next, medical studies of Wim Hof have revealed that purposeful exposure to the stresses found in Nature work to give direct access to the immune system and restore the basis of health. The removal of these stresses, in houses and apartments, decline health. The only possible remaining concern then, must be related to keeping clean and dry and having healthy measures in place for sanitation. Considering what we know in this field, sanitation under all circumstances is not an issue. We deny on the basis of fact and evidence these false claims of risks to safety and health which are used to deny us the rising out of circumstances we do not wish to be in. Furthermore, the burden of proof is on those who deny us, and we note that it is their job description to help and not hinder us. Instead of telling us what to do, pitch in and help, you sluggards!

3.3 CORPORATE COLLUSION AND INTENT TO COMMIT HARM

[1] When sociopaths have seized control of every essential human need, with groups acting collectively to control work, prices and wages, the result is complete removal of freedom and options. The goal is to ensure life security for themselves, but the extent to which this is taken is unlimited and totalitarian. We know, by comparison with what happened in Venezuela, that the viability of our country is under threat. Here, the goal is complete control of how we can use the land. When those whose job it is to protect and defend our lives turn instead to working against us, rejecting the law and denying justice,

life becomes very difficult indeed. Rules, fines and fees are created, not for the purpose of equal benefit under the law with special protection for the vulnerable, but as weapons formed against us. We need not know all the details to know the effects and therefore the intent. It takes very little effort to follow the money trails to see who benefits from our deprivation. In housing, the primary beneficiaries are bankers, builders and City Hall, each aiming for maximum profit and maximum indebtedness using predatory practices aimed fully at unfairly harnessing labour, denying essential rights and freedoms critical to our lives and healthy ongoing society, and removing critical resources required for survival. All this is done by complete and utter rejection of law itself, and certainly by vehement rejection of any form of equal authority and reasonable caring decision-making power under the law concerning the most fundamental aspects of our lives, how we choose to live in healthy relationships with people and the land, further knowing water as key to life. We find it unreasonable and impossible that a handful of people believe they are capable of controlling the lives of everyone in the City in fine detail, for they lack the *Section 1* knowledge needed to so in the context of bias-free application of justice. Most have neither read nor understood their job description and our contract, the Constitution Act.

[1.1] For purposes of clarification, *Section 1* reads “The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees the rights and freedoms set out in it subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society.” This requires all persons paid by tax dollars to behave reasonably and with reason. They must have a reason for what they are doing, particularly when removing the rights of others to act reasonably in doing what they need to do to live. The limits prescribed here under the law are founded in consideration of the impact of your actions on others as the basis of all relationships. Under the law means all decisions must be based on fact and evidence presentable to another person or an independent third party as free from bias as possible. Under the law means a sworn duty to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, for honesty is our universal value, the basis of trust and the basis of the justice system. Demonstrably justified means that you must rely on what is known to work throughout our history, and in particular to avoid what have been proven not to work having disastrous consequences. All of this is based on the average person being healthy, reasonable and good, having demonstrable capacities to learn, work well with others, creatively solve problems, and most importantly express themselves in fundamental trade critical to healthy family and social relations. We have limits at least because the amount of work we can do in a day is limited, as are the resources available to us, the amount of food a farm can produce, or what an ecosystem can sustain without irreversible damage. We can at present prove this statement to be true beyond the shadow of a reasonable doubt: that our lives and the economy are based entirely on the work we do using the limited provisions of Nature. Without water and healthy ecosystems, we die. These are reasonable limits, fully applicable to all *Sections* of the Charter, *Sections 7 and 15* in particular. The Supreme Court is clear, that *the purpose of affording constitutional protection against the deprivation of liberty is to safeguard the entitlement to make decisions of fundamental importance free from state interference* (R. v. Harrison 2009 2SCR 494 at [53]). And yet the directors of the City of Peterborough have aimed at maximal interference in our lives at the most profound level of crippling and destroying our capacities to live, save ourselves, secure and build our lives and create a caring survivable future in a world our children want to live in.

[2] We claim here a significant state of crime in Peterborough committed by an older generation in positions of power who attack rather than defend this younger generation. We say that of all the groups responsible, the directors of City Hall are the primary perpetrators of *Section 15* generational hate crime, exhibiting such lack of care that criminal neglect now extends to purposeful malice. Of all the groups responsible, only City Hall has the power to write laws defending our lives along with the

explicit responsibilities to maintain a social order of benefit to all. Instead, the directors of City Hall have chosen to break the law and inflict such disproportionate harm as to directly threaten the lives, essential freedoms and life security of Peterborough youth, a serious *Section 7* breach which is also an *Article 1 UDHR* war crime.

[3] When a web of crime exists, it can be hard to know where to start. A web is a network, with nodes connected by links. Each node connects to a few others. There are several factors, requiring a multivariate analysis. The underlying legal principle is consideration of impact as the basis of law. The question is, who is responsible when the effects of multiple impacts make life impossible? Here we say that an older generation, who should be protecting and defending young Canadians just starting life, is instead making life hell for them. Here, one node is City Hall. Another may be an insurance company. Another, a bank. We go to several government agencies, only to find each has been gutted in a key functionality. We are shocked to find that agencies we thought were core government are now private for profit companies. Are these systems useful and beneficial, or damaging and destructive in their net impacts on an individual? Overall, City Hall does much good work, but within it are spiders creating a web of crime. For those on the receiving end of the government stick, trapped in life, they know the source and cause of their woes. But it is something else entirely to do something about it, for webs of crime and their mechanisms are complex. One poor behaviour supports another. Whereas the symptoms are clear, as entire peoples are impoverished, have no say, lack recourse and have no hope for a future. To the extent that we live in a lawless country and our participation in democracy is meaningless.

[4] In this analysis, we can safely say that our lives are under attack from all directions making it very difficult to know what to do. We can also safely say that we live in a strange democracy where we have no say whatsoever about anything impacting our lives and future. And that this generation of young Canadians has never heard a politician speak in defence of their lives, much less do anything. That is, we can easily attain, from evidence in our own lives, the civil Charter *Section 1* requirement of preponderance of the evidence in saying that the damaged state of the world and its trajectory to a grim future is as well known as is the failure of the older generation to act to save the lives of the younger generation. If we add the IPCC reports to our evidence we attain the legal standard of evidence beyond the shadow of a doubt of a high risk of widespread human suffering from which we might not recover due to changes inciting war, disease and famine. We submit into evidence the World Scientists' Warning to Humanity which outlines not only the problems but the relatively easy community-based steps needed to change our course to a safe and secure future that defends the *Section 7* rights to life, liberty and security of the person of this generation of Canadian kids. We are most alarmed that the directors of Peterborough City Hall not only refuse to do the work needed to defend our lives, but actively prevent us from doing the work to save ourselves – specifically by controlling land use in collusion with bankers, allowing only the most damaging land use practices possible.

[5] The evidence for such sweeping claims is provided by a simple test. It's not that hard to make and sell pizza. We make pizza safely at home by economical access to ingredients, a refrigerator and oven, a few kitchen tools and a counter to work on. We rely on our senses to verify whether or not food is good to eat, we have a good sense of safe food handling which is not hard to learn, and we have the natural risk rights to both eat and share food which are inherent to life and obvious in our *Section 7* Charter right to security of the person. This is a fundamental matter of highly personal choice critical to health and well-being that also defines care in healthy social structures. It should not be terribly difficult or expensive to make and sell pizza outside the home. Yet if we try, we find ourselves blocked.

[6] A key problem here is that the sum of life expenses imposed on a recent graduate with respect to income that can be gained in available jobs does not allow even the most financially careful person to save enough to buy the required setup, even for a mobile pizza making operation. Such commerce is banned in residential neighborhoods, and there is literally no place to go for any economically feasible scalable startup. The process of getting started might take years, and then an even bigger problem remains: an entire generation is trapped between low wages and high land and building prices, in a system created by City Hall and bankers, both of whom benefit by escalating impossibly high prices. The net result of this collusion is that an older generation seeking massive wealth for themselves denies a younger generation even the slightest chance to gain a foothold in life, starting from scratch and building life security by the work of their own hands. Not only are their pioneer rights denied, but they face a degraded world run to ruin by the previous generation in which the odds of survival are rapidly becoming dangerously small.

[7] In parking policy, the directors of City Hall aim for complete control of the system of justice by defining the crime, deciding the punishment, and denying all means of recourse. When we appeal, someone at City Hall decides the case. We were charged and responded by making specific charges denying the validity of their case, but do not receive reason, repair of the provably unjust bylaw, or independent and impartial consideration of justice. The police, who are responsible the fair application of justice, sit at every council meeting in quiet collusion. What recourse remains for our matters of fundamental justice to be heard? Why is this local Mayor and council using strategies of war against citizens? We say, in agreement with *Article 21* of the UDHR, that we have the right to take part in the activities of our local government, either directly or through our freely chosen representatives. We say, in agreement with *Article 28* of the UDHR, that we have the right to a social order in which our rights and freedoms can be fully realized. Why does this Mayor and council continue to commit such massive violations of human rights against free citizens who have done nothing wrong?

[9] Instead, those that benefit from injustice have emplaced the structures, means and mechanisms of obstruction of justice, creating a social situation in which our Charter Rights and Freedoms can never be realized. We do not have representation. City Hall, in removing our Freedom of Association, is complicit in the conduct of corporations aiming to remove our legal rights to justice.

[10] Consider the example of electronic parking meter systems that aim to maximize income without labour, integrate the system of justice into a computer and deny all means of recourse. What is the basis of these tickets that the parking meter manufacturer wishes to automate in their electronic systems of control, collection of personal information and automation of justice that can be easily updated to a means of surveillance? We say the parking policies are based on an unfair cash grab, an abuse of power, merely a means to ensure unending cash flow by defining a normal activity, shopping, as a crime. In terms of the principles of fundamental justice, we say that the problem and solution has not been defined, and that unreasonable solutions were used for ill intent.

[11] *We say without doubt that when a government service is contracted to a company, that company is an agent of the government doing work that must be in the public interest and required to obey Canada's top laws. We also know that Mayor and council commissioned, the work, directed the actions and are similarly liable and responsible for the outcomes.*

[12] In earlier sections of our case, we have shown that the land use policies of this Mayor and council

are the same as the policies of bankers, to remove all land from the public domain and make it private, that even public land is claimed to be private, and we reject these claims and the policies saying instead that these are criminal acts of collusion also involving land and house price fixing as indictable offences requiring imprisonment for the perpetrators. In current context, these are actions against humanity that have not only gutted our lives and the economy but now directly and provably threaten the lives and future of our children. The Mayor himself has stated many times his contempt for our lives on this most urgent and critical matter of our survival.

[13] Even if we restrict our charges to matters of fundamental law, we say this. The vast majority of PCH policies are *arbitrary* at best, bearing no relation to any legally justifiable purpose or objective. Most are so *vague* we can rarely understand the basis of the offence we are charged with (so it has a *mens rea* component), and seems so highly antisocial as to indicate a mental disorder. Therefore, we have provided here the required clarity for legal debate. Most are so far in *overbreadth* as to constitute crime against us, whereas the means used to achieve a societal purpose must be reasonably necessary. We say there is *gross disproportionality*, in that the City actions and legislative response to some ill-defined problem, if it exists, are so extreme as to be disproportionate to any legitimate government interest.

[14] How could such actions possibly support life, liberty and security of the person, when they attack that? Is this representation and defence of people? Is this a goal of societal good, aiming for our benefit? Is this fair and justifiable act to take in a free and democratic society? No, democracy itself has been rejected and replaced by automated systems aiming at complete control of every aspect of our lives. We believe this is the intent of these corporations the Mayor has forced us to pay into without our consent. We understand very well the purpose of many PCH policies, and say that the Mayor and council could easily have predicted the foreseeable consequences of their actions. For example, the removal of recourse, justice and freedom was their intent in forcing us into association with certain corporations manufacturing automated parking meter systems that define an offence, assign guilt and require payment in one swipe! We say these corporations have weaponized machines, technology, computers and computer systems against us in acts against democracy violating several Sections of our Charter and in acts of war violating several Articles of our Universal Declaration of Human Rights to which Canada is signatory.

[15] In saying this, we could be wrong in detail. We refer to war here to show we are coarsely correct and not off track. Countries go to war because the sociopathic instigators are either completely crazy or intend to take money and resources which do not belong to them. In an act of aggression, we know the last World War was caused by banker-funded sociopaths claiming they had the right to take and own the resources of other countries by force and occupation. Canada was founded in such an act of colonial takeover. Later, in an act of defence and protection, Canadians declared war to defend us against global tyrants and bullies, aiming to protect people and families, and now we have committed to an international role of peacekeeping. In government, we become highly alarmed when we see acts to take without just cause that are specifically coupled to removal of rights and freedoms, silencing, and the lack of any language of defence and protection of our lives by our elected representatives. We have legitimate concerns on these matters right here in Peterborough.

[16] Sociopaths attach themselves to good causes as a cover for their nefarious activities. They either threaten and force others to their will, or work with other sociopaths to form a criminal gang. We say such a gang has formed within City Hall, claiming authority over others they do not have, and working

distinctly against citizens to control every essential human need, not for our benefit, but for theirs. We further say that the Mayor and key members of council have colluded with other organizations whose work is neither essential nor of particular benefit to society, adding nothing of value to goods and services and aiming at harnessing our labour to an extent that must be considered social and economic slavery. The harm done is immense, and now these groups threaten the very lives of our children. That is where we draw the line. And now we see, in their attacks on people and their willingness to push the vulnerable to the edge of death, how far they are willing to go.

[17] Organized crime, under *Criminal Code Section 467.1 (1)*, has a clear definition. A criminal organization means a group, however organized, that (a) is composed of three or more persons in or outside Canada; and (b) has as one of its main purposes or main activities the facilitation or commission of one or more serious offences that, if committed, would likely result in the direct or indirect receipt of a material benefit, including a financial benefit, by the group or by any of the persons who constitute the group. It does not include a group of persons that forms randomly for the immediate commission of a single offence.

[18] The basic services of City Hall are well known and not particularly complex types of work, and one of our concerns is that this work we could do ourselves is done in the most costly complex manner possible, removing all work and self-determination from residents for the purpose of taking everything of value from the community and handing it over to unlimited-profit corporations. We have much to say about that, however, our immediate urgent concern is with additional activities that provide no service to us whatsoever and in fact undermine and diminish our lives to such extent as to be major to serious ongoing threats to the lives, liberties and security of our person, going so far as to attack us and also remove from our children any possibility of a future here much less one they can survive. Why would the Mayor and council engage in such activities so clearly against our lives, going further to break multiple laws, rejecting the law itself while committing major Charter breaches and human rights abuses?

[19] We speak here of the complete removal of essential rights and freedoms critical to life done by those with obvious intent and motive to completely control every essential human need and action for profit for themselves, with no regard for the lives of others and completely intent on mining out and destroying our lives. Such activities are highly illegal, against any legitimate purpose of government, and well into the world of organized crime operating by fraud, theft and criminal collusion. As his employer, it is not obvious why we should continue paying a Mayor with no interest in fulfilling his legal obligations to represent us by defending and protecting our lives using sense, reason and the clear behavioural directives of our Canadian Constitution Act, and in fact working against our interest. Why has this Mayor and council rejected the law and worked to overthrow the Canadian government replacing it with the full working mechanisms of a harsh authoritarian state?

[20] We are most offended that this Mayor and council continually attacks our children, giving them no chance at life here and no future. According to the Mayor, as evidenced by the actions and operations of City Hall made explicit also in writing, the only purpose of Peterborough residents is to pay and in this great efforts have been made to ensure we have no say. The Mayor completely and utterly refuses to give reason for his actions even when asked, in complete violation of the law, common sense and decency as made clear in *Section 1* of our Charter and SCC rulings as to its application. And the Mayor is also involved in deep anti-democracy anti-competition policies of benefit to corporations with no interest in public benefit, taken to such extent as to directly threaten not only our lives but the basis of

our lives, furthermore crushing the economy so greatly as to make it impossible for working people to pay for it all. Why would the Mayor do this, going further to commit devastating human rights abuses in collusion with organizations of the same intent?

[21] We understand that the motives are those of a distinct personality type with intense hatred toward humanity, a type that cannot control themselves around people and money and who acts on their impulses to deny the rights of others while enjoying the benefit of rights denied. Such persons lack real skills and do not want to work, thus spending all their time scheming, plotting and manipulating the lives of others, those who do work and add real value to their lives and the dollar by the work they do. But here we consider the means and mechanisms by which they operate, turning essential services into cash cows for themselves and harnessing the work and lives of others to such extreme extent as to be systems aimed at statistical indentured servitude without recourse or say.

[22] This was of course the business plan of Canada, developed by bankers centuries ago in England for the explicit purpose of control of land, work and the lives of the entire population. So we have no doubt as to its existence, for the laws of control, exploitation and plunder were developed for that purpose and simply imported to North America as the basis of law and which remain in place in our Constitution despite having no real legal basis in fact, evidence and reason. One can read this older part of our Constitution, essentially unchanged from the content of the British North America act, and see directly the sense of it aimed completely at the unlimited exertion of force by those in power with the complete removal of any sense of recourse or hope. That was indeed the point, two centuries ago.

[23] Now we consider the means and mechanisms by which this is done, not on behalf of the people working to pay for it all, but on behalf of the few who benefit immensely and to such extent that they take pleasure in getting around and breaking the law and enjoy destroying lives of others. This is a specific personality type lacking the basic human capacities of reason and care, who express their personality in what they do. Specifically, we now understand this as mental illness closely linked to thought systems distinctly divorced from reality and far removed from any sense of obligation or responsibility concerning the impact of their actions on the lives of others. In Canadian law, it is the job and responsibility of social workers to maintain the healthy social structures of life in Canada by ensuring that the mentally ill do not seize control of the lives of Canadian and drive their destruction and ruin. The principle standard of mental health assessment is *Section 1* of our Charter, stating that there must be a very good reason for the actions of every worker in government, not only that we must be free to meet the essentials of our lives by the work we do, and that our work pay for the work of government, but that these government actions must be of benefit to our lives.

[24] Each law and action of government must have a pressing and substantial objective, and also be reasonably limited in its impact on our lives. To be reasonable means not only to have good reason, but to be negotiable and flexible in relation to others, sensibly caring and accommodating. Yet here in Peterborough, we have none of this. We understand perfectly well the purpose and intent of this Mayor and council have nothing to do with our well being, for there is nothing at all in City Hall that concerns citizens and everything has to do with the control of our lives and work by corporations. We do not have representation, which is the primary purpose of electing officials and having them do work for us. That is why we pay, and there is nothing in our contract that says we do not have the right to do the work ourselves if we want to or need to. We never did and never will give up our fundamental rights to self-determination, for these are also our rights to life, law and justice.

[25] Therefore we draw strong contrasts between the hearts and minds of our Supreme Court justices and the hearts and minds of our local politicians, saying the former works on our behalf while the latter does not. And we can prove this with very little effort, for this Mayor and council have taken great pains to document and declare exactly how they intend to break the law. The full extent of their criminal activities may never be known, and here we mention only a few of the most egregious nature representing the most direct and dire threats to our lives which if continued will kill our children.

[26] Here in Peterborough, a handful of people have purposely and maliciously shattered our lives into components, which each component being handed over to a corporation intent on complete and utter control of an essential human need. This Mayor and council are operating the business plans of private enterprise, which is not a legitimate purpose of government. The explicit purpose of government is to represent and defend the Canadian people in the meeting of essential human needs and against any and all threats external or internal. We elect and pay our representatives and workers in government to do this task of defending our lives and our freedoms critical to making a living, sensibly, reasonably and with care, and specifically not to attack us and undermine our lives by removing our say and self-determination. Specifically, we are the employers of workers in government, and we have not employed them to be lords and rulers over us enacting policies that undermine, ruin and gut our lives.

[27] We specifically say this Mayor and council are running anti-competition policies so deep that our children have no chance at all to gain even the slightest foothold in life, the purpose being to harness their lives and labour in all aspects for the sole benefit of those whose wealth already exceeds any *Section 1* reasonable limit with respect to the meeting of essential human needs. We further say that those who harness the lives of others do so by enjoying rights and benefits purposely denied others, to the extent of causing present and foreseeable miserable circumstances so shocking as to represent the annihilation of this entire generation of Canadian youth. We speak here as caring parents, refusing to allow this act of genocide against a distinct group, our children, and here we address the means and mechanisms by which this evil and hateful work is done and directed by the Mayor and council in Peterborough.

[28] Out of all the work that is done in society, that which is most essential occurs with respect to labour done to meet essential human needs, which must also be specifically limited so as to neither remove nor destroy the essential resources required for the lives and survival of our children. Much of this work is non-economic and unpaid, specifically done as the solid basis of paid work, by the maintenance of our lives, homes and land without which we could not do paid work. The economic portion of our lives visible as paid work relies on trade with the most convenient tool of trade being our currency. Specifically, it is this trade that generates cash flow, and we say this Mayor and council interfere most profoundly with these most essential aspects of our lives, critical to livelihood and a healthy functioning economy. At the basis of our lives, however, we have life security only by the work we do using the resources of Nature, and it is that basis which the Mayor seeks to control and attack, and not for our benefit.

[29] We have throughout history men and women who want far more than can be had by the work of their own hands, who set their intents on getting others to do all the hard work while they receive the benefits. At the household level, women who do not want to work find hardworking men, and men who do not want to work find hardworking women. On the issue of equitable distribution of work, the claim is made that some types of work are far more valuable than others, and yet the valuable work could not have been done without a solid basis in the substantial non-economic work. When essential freedoms

has been removed, such that the beneficiary enjoys rights specifically denied to others, this grades into slavery. A key feature of slavery is the removal of freedoms to the extent that the slave has no say whatsoever about any matter of life, their options of self-determination being completely removed and replaced with punishments for non-compliance.

[30] We are appalled to see these features of life present and active within Peterborough City Hall policy, but we understand the personality type that would do such things. In this manner, a small group colluding to harness the lives of others has seized control of all details of the lives of 84 000 Peterborough residents, saying we have no say at all about the course of our lives and our future. This is completely and utterly ridiculous, especially considering that the tasks of City Hall are essentially low-end matters of garbage collection and street cleaning that we could easily tend to ourselves in a smarter and more economical manner. We look across society and find no other group responsible for these actions. No one forced the Mayor and council to do this. They chose to, of their own volition, as clear expressions of their thoughts and character. We do not accuse the Mayor and council, but simply compare what they said, did and put in writing to the law and what is legally required of persons in their position.

[31] This Mayor and council have removed from our children any possibility at all of ever gaining a foothold in life or having a survivable future in Peterborough. Why is the Mayor so against children? Why would he not do everything he can to protect them and ensure their viable future? The Mayor claims ownership of the land itself, land which belongs to the public which we paid for. He says the only purpose of this land is for the benefit of City Hall, essentially claiming that public land is private. At the same time, the bankers aim to make all land private, claiming some exclusive right to control both land and money, and the net result of City Hall working hand in hand with the debt-sellers fraudulently writing false notes without backing (the illegal practice of kiting) is complete control of land leaving citizens with no options and no place to go. This is purposely done to force us into the hands of bankers. *The legal question concerning their land use plan, which aims to plow under and sell off to the highest bidder land specifically most critical to our lives and future is this: what is the pressing and substantial objective?*

[32] We believe the answer to this question is obvious, contrary to the law and purpose of government, and indicative of active collusion of PCH with bankers against our lives. City Hall clearly benefits from the speculation of bankers seeking income without labour by controlling the most critical aspects of our lives and future. However, the law says that City Hall must assess taxes in proportion to the net impact on our lives as indicated by real and substantial indicators of life, liberty and security of the person, of which the value of homes is but one indicator of several. Workers at City Hall want a home, a car, a phone, enough cash to buy healthy food, and so on, and yet they collude with businesses aiming to control and undermine that, undermining our freedoms instead of acting as caring parent directly investing in job creation for their own children in types of work that fairly support each aspect of life security. Specifically, this Mayor and council aims to destroy the land most critical to our lives which provides the basis of personal and national security by attending to the essential reality and common need of our lives, food security. A critical component of our *Section 7* right to life security, along with our inherent rights to work to attain that.

[33] Leveraging essential human needs against people is the most vile form of extortion. Consider the criminal code definition of extortion, *CC Section 346(1)*. *Every one commits extortion who, without reasonable justification or excuse and with intent to obtain anything, by threats, accusations, menaces*

or violence induces or attempts to induce any person, whether or not he is the person threatened, accused or menaced or to whom violence is shown, to do anything or cause anything to be done.

[34] The purpose of such false claims of ownership, along with the claims of critical rights denied to others, extends beyond accruing benefits denied others but well into matters of complete control and removal of freedoms essential to life. We have good evidence that that the biological basis of fairness is equitable access to the resources required for survival, and that the removal of such equitable access is a direct threat to the lives of others, an act of ultimate violence which will lead to a devastatingly inhospitable future for our children. These acts against people and against our survival are most despicable, and again we want this Mayor and council to tell us, *what is the pressing and substantial objective of your zoning bylaws?* What problem are you trying to solve, particularly in the context of the legal obligations of your job that are expressed so clearly in the law and in our Constitution Act?

[35] We say that the false valuation of house prices by PCH, with its arbitrary and baseless manipulation, constitutes deliberate and intentional price fixing. It is furthermore not the role of government to engage in market speculation to profit itself. It is not the role of government to run the business plans of private enterprise, particularly because government removes Freedom of Association by taxation. This is the of force, which is especially noxious when it is not for our benefit as that defeats the purpose of taxation in representing our interests. Instead, this is fraud and collusion, and the source of this is the Mayor and council claiming to not know the meaning of words or the role of government as distinct from business. If this is not purposeful deceit, fraud, then it is strong evidence of a Mayor and council so incompetent as to not being able to attain Grade-school standards of math, language, logic and moral reasoning. And we see this problem throughout all City Hall documents.

[36] We see the intent to remove any form of self-determination actualized in the City Plans for our lives, which are purely political documents of fraud, make to look pretty on the surface but being devoid of any substantial content concerning the very real problems residents face. This is more like a list of projects. They further reveal a complete ignorance of the role and structure of government, or any reference to the real work that must be done in fulfillment of these duties. The Mayor and council, who claim to understand the community and therefore have the knowledge to write the content of this document, did not want to do the work and instead hired outside consultants who know nothing about our community. These 'experts' furthermore showed that they know nothing of the structure of Canadian government and its obligations to citizens, and are incompetent.

[37] Furthermore, it was not the right of the Mayor to create this document laying out the course of our lives, but it was the right of citizens impacted by the plans with intimate knowledge of their lives, the land and the community. The Mayor assigned this task to a consulting firm in the belief that he could not be held responsible for its contents, but he commissioned the work and guided and approved its contents. We could have done it far better at no cost, and indeed it is our fundamental and Constitutional right of self-determination to do so, since we are the employers of all workers at City Hall. This is the active and illegal removal of self-determination, including a refusal to recognize and follow the directives of our government-citizen contract, the Canadian Constitution Act. This rejection of the law and system of Canadian government is a not only an act of sedition, but an act of treason because the Mayor intends deathly harm to citizens by forcing us onto a course with high risk of killing our children by destroying essential resources critical to our survival.

[38] In the structure of Canadian government, a Constitutional Monarchy, the King is a figurehead

representing defence of our lives by defence of our Constitution Act. The Governor General is the last line of defence of our Constitutional rights, with the power to strike down any Act not good for the Canadian people, being Unconstitutional. Attacking our lives and the lives and future of our children is equivalent to attacking the King. We understand the King as a father figure, and we know of his real and symbolic character that he would do whatever it takes in care to defend the lives of children. To attack our lives and the foundations of life itself, irreversibly rendering the land itself useless for the sustenance of life and our lives, is the most definitive act of treason possible, for it ensures the worst fate for our children, putting us on course to a grotesque act of war against humanity. But these are personality types that will say and do anything for money, even starting wars if there is profit to be had. In no way can we consider the actions and plans of this Mayor and council to be intended for Peace, Order and Good Government (the components of which are now made explicit in our Charter), as directed by the King.

[39] Our Constitution Act is clear. It is the duty and role of all educators paid by taxation to maintain educational standards across all of Canadian society. To ensure that all documents across all of government have clear meaning and purpose consistent with the principles and practices of our Canadian Charter. Any teacher reading these City Plans can assess them using the legal standards of their profession in the capacity they were hired for and give the writers an F, a failing grade because these are not plans at all. None of the content is consistent with a plan, the problems are not described and neither are the solutions. There is no content whatsoever indicating the job, role and obligations of a local level of government. This complete ignorance of law and government is utterly unacceptable. The strong indicators of incompetencies coupled to fundamental problems of mental health, along with illegal intent, provide evidence of a significantly corrupt leadership team at PCH. These are people that need to be put in court-ordered community treatment programs, not put in charge of our lives, money and future. We see throughout the City Hall leadership team significant incompetencies coupled to obvious and evident pathologies expressed as complete lack of care for the lives of others. The mentally ill must not be allowed to run our lives. This is not good government.

[40] This Mayor and council have decided to use zoning, not for the benefit of residents, but to control and fracture society for their benefit and the benefit of their partners in banking and business. Banksters, and speculators that have bought all our land not to use but to gain massive profit when we try to use it, who also are tax exempt. The point is to deny people places to work and sell, in a fundamental anti-competition strategy the removes options and freedoms and drives people into the hands of the already-rich who seek even more income without labour by harnessing the lives of citizens and our children. The purpose of this zoning is control and collusion, and the intent is not for meeting essential human needs or providing opportunity for recent graduates starting life with nothing, but to deny essential human needs and remove opportunities. The Mayor has no interest in the use of public land for public benefit. Considerations of benefit or health, or of highly detrimental social and ecological impacts, are not part of the equation. And when we consider that he represents companies only, and not people, as evident in the operations of PCH, its activities plans and budget, and we follow the short money trails to who benefits, we see motive. If this Mayor and council dare claim they cannot do anything, or point at other parts of government as the problem, we know this is not true because they are fully authorized to defend our lives under the principles and practices of the Constitution Act, a document that clarifies the intent and purpose of all laws beneath it.

[41] Again we say that when the Mayor and council push for complete corporate control of every economic aspect of our lives and every human need, the net result is removal of options and freedoms

to such extent that it becomes impossible for anyone starting life to gain a foothold. When by removal of essential freedoms and options, we are forced into the hands of corporations with no interest in mutual benefit, removing our Freedom of Association, that corporation becomes an actor of the state and obliged to follow our Constitution. Furthermore, the Mayor and council, having directed these actions, is responsible and liable as the governing body. Whereas we know this is not the purpose of government.

[42] We understand our crisis as due to as a housing model created by bankers aiming to deny any form of shelter and force people into their system of housing and debt. City Hall and the local police happily oblige, ensuring there is no place for anyone to go, and actively hunting anyone down who dares to try to survive fighting for their life in a tent. What nonsense! It is the right of the person to afford themselves any form of shelter they desire, just as it was the fundamental right of our pioneers to do what it takes to live and begin to build a life for themselves. Government does not have the right to impose a specific type of life or shelter on people, and in sharp contrast we say that a rugged life of one's choice builds strength, spirit and resilience, puts one in touch with the body and the Earth, and is indeed a great Canadian experience! We have much land here, and economical camping, cabins and tiny homes are a beautiful thing of great interest to a major segment of the Canadian population. But the Mayor and council, working closely with bankers to drive up house and land prices for mutual benefit are dead set against anyone escaping from their system of life and rights deprivation.

[43] The Mayor and council are furthermore directly involved in land speculation for their benefit. As soon as land is zoned commercial, its value and the taxation rise dramatically. Specifically, a few people claim to own our downtown. They want so much that it is impossible to get started. It's a financial trap, with the odds stacked against success. We are not allowed to make anything in residential neighborhoods, or to sell anything outside this commercial zone. It is quite impossible for the vast majority to have a home, a workplace and a place to sell. One has to have great wealth to start, and there is no place for someone starting life from scratch, which is the entire population of Canadian youth, to even begin. Trapped between low wages and high house prices, the odds are stacked against them and they must at all points pay the already-rich first before they even have a chance to get started. This is the direct effect of the combined business plans of banks and government, working with each other for profit but with complete disregard and lack of care concerning the fate and lives of their own children, this generation of Canadian youth. Specifically, they are actively creating laws, rules and circumstances no caring parent would ever inflict on their children. It is neither the role of parents nor the role of government to make life hell for kids. These are acts of war and hate, not care and responsibility.

[44] We created a place for government, with land, buildings, tools and everything needed to do very specific tasks of economically meeting our common needs. And yet this government refuses to allow even a scrap of our land to be made available to give our kids a chance to work to meet essential human needs or make and sell things. We could easily create a place for this generation in society, but acting as caring parents defending their lives and freedoms, not forcing them into the hands and anti-competition plans of the already-rich! We say that critical defence of our lives is the role and purpose of government, not criminal collusion that actively drives the destruction of our lives.

[45] The approval of restrictive zoning is a purposeful agreement between City Hall and private enterprise that puts in writing the plan to remove critical rights to life that are not compensated for elsewhere. The owners of an apartment tower, for example, remove critical possibilities of planting

food and gardens, repairing vehicles or doing projects, making things or selling them. This is the active removal of rights, a very long list of what you cannot do, without compensation elsewhere. City Hall gives us the same list, such that in each area of life we are blocked one way or another from doing reasonable activities or having Freedom of Association from those who aim to plunder our lives. This is the British system against which the Americans revolted, saying of the sociopathic income extremist the King of England and his cohorts "*He hath sent out swarms of officers to harass us and eat out our substance.*" That's City Hall, a source of criminal harassment, vastly interfering with our lives to the extent we cannot even begin to gain a foothold of basic life security of essential human needs. We have no self-determination; instead, we have a law-breaking authoritarian ruler intent on the mining out of our lives to the extent that our kids have no future.

[46] The Mayor says that public land is not public. This is fraud, a fundamental deception claiming that we do not know what words mean. But we do, and we know the purpose and intent. Those who cannot afford to pay rent will be hunted down and removed, given no place to go, no shelter. A child daring to sell lemonade on public land will be forcibly removed. A youth daring to sell something they made will be removed. And if they dare try to make and sell pizza, there will be no end of charges and trouble. The Mayor cannot imagine a solution to this. Completely forgetting that land and buildings were given to him for free, to do a specific job. He did not pay for the land, and we paid for the building. So we can easily imagine a solution for this generation of Canadian youth starting life with nothing and facing the greatest challenge ever to face humanity: how to possibly survive in this dangerously degraded world, one that was irreversibly damaged by the worst land use ideas of this Mayor and council refusing to obey the law, solve real issues and care for people.

[47] The Mayor and council collude with speculators who also lie and commit fraud, saying that public land is private, aiming for income without labour by taking money and harnessing the lives of others. Much debate occurs in our lives and in the courts concerning what is private, and what is most private is the sanctity of the body. Next is the sanctity of the home, our main refuge away from the world, a major source of protection and safety, and most critically an organizational system for the essential operations of life. We are a species that needs clothes and tools, and places to store and prepare food, and like all species we need a place to live, rest and sleep. In this spectrum, we can say that the least private place is public. In particular, our places to sell what we have made depend very much on an active social scene, with stores that both compete and complement one another for the benefit of shoppers and for mutual success. One person seizing control and refusing to cooperate with others, saying that the only purpose is unlimited personal benefit, ruins the scene for everyone. This is a serious problem in Peterborough, where speculators seeking income without labour have bought land critical to our economy and escalated prices beyond what anyone can bear. The specific claim is that these vacant stores or land is private property, but it cannot be, as it is in a public area and there is no private function present and actively used by the owner. This is a lie. The land is not used for purposes of privacy.

[48] Instead, this is public land we cannot use for any purpose whatsoever. We can say that someone has made a claim on the land, as in mining law, and must actively develop it or release their claim. We also know this land is often massively damaged ecologically, and its restoration is of great value. We also know this land has tremendous social function, but instead it damages us, removing freedoms and options for life and survival. And we know that were the land taxed fairly, it would have to be used to recover those taxes. So why does this Mayor and council support tax shelters for those who are rich enough not only to buy land but to have it sit there unused? It is most obvious that such unproductive

speculation has created an environment in which those who want to work have no place to go, whereas this government is supporting and protecting those who do not want to work. It is also known, from the United Nations Special Raconteur on Housing, that this land is being bought to park money illegally gained in other countries and for money laundering. Furthermore, even if this is not the case, the owners seek income without labour specifically by harnessing the lives, finances and labour of others seeking to use the land to work and generate income. The cost, however, is so high that the massive debt loads incurred can most likely never be paid back, and the only possibility for success is to sell degraded products of poor quality at such high prices as to be unaffordable for local residents. Only giant chains selling garbage can exist in this wretched situation, and our kids have no chance. This is not life. This is slavery and the brute use of force to harness our kids into disgusting and damaging fraud-based systems designed and run by those with no regard for life and law, fully supported by the directors of Peterborough City Hall.

[49] Surely our top priority is our children, doing all we can to protect their lives and prepare them for the most difficult world imaginable, one where all land, farms, forests and fisheries have been degraded past the limit of what they can recover to sustain us, in an atmosphere so polluted in just one century that much of life on this Earth is now actively being snuffed out. Why are we supporting those who do not want to work, and making life impossible for those that do? Only a sociopath would do this, not a caring parent. Again we ask this Mayor and council, is this what we are paying you to do? Why do your plans and actions not reflect care for people and the ecosystems that sustain our lives as the sole basis of our economy? When you say the problem is complex, all that indicates is that you lack the cognitive capacity and skills of moral reasoning to figure it out. We don't find it complex at all, and yet you block all our reasonable solutions, specifically because our solutions don't bring in enough money for you and your cohorts in banking and business, with whom you conspire. In this we can truly say we are not represented, so why should we pay for *Section 1* services not received? Further, we are owed for the negative work you have done against us aimed specifically at degrading our *Section 7* rights to life.

[50] After imagining a scenario of survival, an exercise that quickly maps out essential human needs along with the fact that all these needs come from the resources of Nature coupled to the labour of our hands, which could not be done without considerable childhood care and education, we can march through each need to define the groups interested in complete control of each need along with creating utter dependencies by removal of opportunities for self-reliant self-determination. Why does this Mayor and council give hungry people no place to go to work to grow food? Surely, with collapses of food production in California and across all southern States, we could respond rapidly with a major effort to grow food in the Peterborough region with its critical access of land adjacent to water? However, grocery store owners have no interest in our self-reliant self-sustenance, which is surely a right to life, and do they too work behind the scenes with City Hall to ensure the worst possible land uses and denial of access to land to the hungry to grow food and create jobs for themselves? Now we don't have enough trees left for furniture, and the Mayor says we cannot use the most critical land on the planet to address our most urgent needs, that rare land next to water essential to grow food, essential for our very survival.

[51] And if we look at the overall context of life in the Peterborough region, we see that most of what we buy is not that hard to make. Surely it is the job of City Hall, as part of our critical social infrastructure, to connect people for job creation. And yet we see they refuse to do this, for sociopaths are deeply anti-social, hating anything to do with mutual benefit, social care or robust and active community involvement, further being anti-competition anti-democracy activists willing to destroy our

lives, work, and country for gain. This is our home. Canada is our home. We will not have our lives and home gutted by criminal activists pushing to a ruinous end for us and our children. In the name of God, at least read what the Pope said about ‘Care for Our Common Home’!

3.4 CRIMINAL NEGLIGENCE AND RECKLESS ENDANGERMENT

[1] We contrast the City Hall Charter care duties to represent and defend us with the actual activities within City Hall of criminal negligence and reckless endangerment, defined in *Criminal Code Sections 219(1) and (2): if in doing anything, or in omitting to do anything that is his duty to do, shows wanton or reckless disregard for the lives or safety of others*. In families, care means at least the meeting of essential human needs and the provision of healthy conditions for the lives of children, their growth and personal development. Between adults equal under the law, that means defending our freedom to provide for ourselves meeting all human needs by the labour of our own hands, not to scheme to make sure we cannot do that. Concerning these elected government representatives, and anyone paid by tax dollars to provide essential services, duty means as required by law. Specifically we elect and pay those in government to represent us, creating a healthy social order of benefit to all. Instead, we are attacked by this Mayor and council, and we see they have worked hard to remove from City Hall and across the land anything to do with public access to public resources providing a fundamental basis in personal and social life security. This can only result from a personality type suffering from ASPD.

[2] Here in Peterborough, we have elected representatives devoted to denial of these fundamental realities, actively destroying a very specific type of land most critical to our survival, giving us no say about the matter, and actively colluding with banks and corporations to benefit a handful of people. They have no interest in the basis of life security, and active interests in destroying life security. Clearly aiming to remove all options in all areas of essential human needs to force us into the hands of their already-rich colleagues who benefit vastly from the destruction of our lives. In housing, for example, they completely and utterly deny our rights to shelter by the means of removing all places to go or live that are not controlled by income extremists. The intent is to force us into the hands of those intent on controlling and destroying our lives to benefit themselves using decision making processes based entirely on monetary gain with no basis in physical reality, impact on others or the devastating consequences of their actions which destroy the lives of others and the ecosystems our lives depend on as the sole basis of our economy. These are social predators intent on trapping and cornering people by the removal of freedoms and options critical to life.

[3] The specific personality type focused on removal of rights from others is sociopathic, a well-defined mental illness requiring treatment. We know this personality type seeks positions of power over others, aiming to benefit themselves by control, manipulation, deceit and force. Such persons have little regard for the lives of others and no regard for law. Their behaviours and actions, including avoidance of responsibility and work, contrast very strongly from persons with minds of justice based firmly in physical reality and with personality traits of conscientiousness and care focused on competency gained by hard work. We speak here of the majority of hardworking and inherently honest Canadians, whose minds and hearts of care and justice align most closely with the senses of values and ethics exhibited by our Supreme Court justices.

[4] Considering our children just starting life, reckless endangerment is intentional disregard for the

foreseeable consequences of actions that impede their lives and destroy their future. Is there anyone that does not know the state of the world? If there is one that does not, they are unfit for any position wherein they have any significant impact over the lives of others. We say it is a trivial exercise to map out essential human needs by imagining a scenario of survival, to prove that everything we have comes from Nature but requires work to use, and to firmly base all decisions on this firm *Sections 1, 7 and 15* physical reality. We know for example, that seeds grow in soil, that food grows in soil, and that eating is a highly personal matter of choice critical to our health and constitution definitive of life. In our Constitution, universal respect for life, liberty and security of the person is our Prime Directive, and our lives are destroyed if we do not strive for this. Food security is a critical component of personal and national security, without which countries erupt into protest and war, followed by famine and disease. We have proven by fact and scientific chains of evidence that fundamental food, seed and soil rights are a critical part of a healthy environment that sustains not only our lives but life on this planet. Yet the Mayor and council push us toward death by denying this most critical part of life in zoning policies aimed at fracturing our lives and ripping apart society creating a structure of life in which we lack access to the critical resources required for life. When we ask why they do this, we quickly find the reason along with substantial evidence for it in the bylaws, budget and activities of City Hall, and in systematically working through what other reasons there might be, these are in the category of most unlikely and lacking substantial evidence; in this systematic manner, we thus arrive at a “beyond the shadow of a reasonable doubt” degree of certainty. We are further aware that pathological liars consistently say the opposite of what is true, and that narcissists have only the capacity to see things in terms of what benefits themselves. We need only reverse what they say to discover the truth consistent with fact, evidence and reason admissible in a court of law (*meaning contextualized by an inherent sense of justice*). Their damaging views, however, must not be forced on all of society. They must not engage in activities that are a threat to the foundations of life of all citizens, and yet they have to the extent of giving those starting life with little no place to go to survive, to grow food, or to engage in life-saving free trade on public land they have a right to be on. Only the sickest minds in society would remove from others to a totalitarian extent this life-sustaining constitutional basis of Charter-protected work; no sane person or caring parent ever would. This foundational denial of the rights of a person to begin to gain a foothold in life in the key areas of life security including the chance to make and sell things when starting life from scratch is planned and deliberate and has crushed my life along with the lives of many others. I can say beyond the shadow of a reasonable doubt this is not the purpose of government, for I voted for representatives to defend and not attack my life. I lay these basis-of-life charges of violation of CCC *Section 219* against the City of Peterborough and its directors for creating degrading social conditions that one cannot escape and rise above despite all best efforts to do so, these also being entrapment and extortion of essential human needs directed toward genocide and purposeful acts against our Constitutional purposes of government.

[5] I have been thrust against my will into life-threatening circumstances created by the directors of Peterborough City Hall that have made my odds of survival low and caused bodily harm, these being well defined as the sum of essential human needs determining life security made explicit in practical applications of *Section 7* of our Charter. Our Supreme Court justices say that the purpose of affording constitutional protection against the deprivation of liberty is to safeguard the entitlement to make decisions of fundamental decisions free from state interference, and I agree. I say that having a place to exist and live, at least with Canada as my home is a bulwark of protection of the individual against the State which affords and individual a measure of privacy and peace against the overwhelming powers of the State. Whereas in Peterborough, we find in written contracts and control of land by zoning that the Mayor and council have colluded with construction companies and banks to remove all reasonable

options of housing, against Charter purposes and further are running the business plans of private corporations through government which removes fundamental rights to Freedom of Association. Here, the burden of proof is on those who have removed the right to provide a sound basis for having done so, particularly when their actions threaten life, liberty and security of the person also remove many other freedoms to the extent of creating a slave State of indentured servitude for essential human needs. They have taken specific actions to deny all forms of shelter that are Ministry Mandates needed across the spectrum from survival to exerting our pioneer rights to take risk and build up a life for ourselves by the labour of our own hands. All this requires a place to exist, the removal of which cannot be distinguished from a right to life. This they have done to me, and I am most irked. Here in Peterborough, I have encountered systematic attacks on every aspect of my life and life security to such an extent as can only have been planned, and I have further identified, including by systematic process of elimination, the group being responsible for this as being the directors of Peterborough City Hall. Here, the charges I lay against this group are violations of CCC *Section 221, every one who by criminal negligence causes bodily harm to another person is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding ten years.* The outright attacks on my *Section 7* rights to life, liberty and security of the person being a direct result of their policies and actions, and the actions they have directed others to take that are a direct threat to me, whereas they have sworn duties with clear responsibilities to defend the full spectrum of my Constitutional rights and freedoms. I have detailed these damaging impacts on my life security in my Plaintiff Statement, and further note they have aimed to put me in a group against whom they direct much hate and taken actions against fitting the CCC *Section 318(c)* definition of advocating genocide. I have found myself thrust into a large-scale humanitarian crisis created by the negligence of duty of the PCH directors which they could ameliorate but refuse to do so, a crisis that further aims to draw in an entire generation of young Canadians already trapped into falsely created impossible circumstances. Concerning those who the Mayor and council have already systematically pushed to their deaths, the accurate description of their crime is aggravated negligent manslaughter, a violation of CCC *Section 220, every person who by criminal negligence causes death to another person is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for life.* I cannot lay these charges, since by skill and wit I have survived their wicked intent, but in placing me in a group they aim to destroy I do lay the CCC *Section 318(c) charge of advocating and promoting the genocide of an identifiable group, the homeless.* I reject this label, for Canada is my home, I am proud, strong and true, I have done nothing wrong, committed no crime, and this is land I have a right to be on. For I have not seen such horrific circumstances of social oppression except in the most corrupt and despotic States. This cannot be allowed to happen in Canada, the additional CCC *Section 46* charges of plans and actions taken to kill the Children of the King being Treason, for I know the King would not want this. I speak here with the full Charter authority of God, also with the authority of God above and independent of the Charter, and also by equality under the law complete with Freedom of Belief and Expression, saying God bless the King and his Head of State representative, the Governor General of Canada, who also would not want this. Neither is it the will of parents to have this done to their children, simply because they can't earn enough to pay the income extremists who are attacking their lives.

[6] In zoning aimed specifically at removing options and removing Freedom of Association from income extremists seeking to control essential human needs critical to our lives, and in saying the public has no say at all about anything concerning their lives and future, this manipulative and fundamentally deceptive Mayor and council effectively say Peterborough is not our home. We are not allowed to touch anything, especially not on the most critical matters of our life in areas in which action not taken will provable produce grim to dire circumstance for our children. In shelter, in these

deep anti-competition policies effected through collusion between a tiny minority of the sickest minds on the planet, we have massive human rights abuses in Peterborough that directly threaten the lives of residents with direct attacks on our children by both the active removal of rights and aggressive actions against them. In food, as the world plunges into crisis and food prices escalate, this Mayor attacks our core economy of essential human needs by denying the hungry any place to go to grow food. Whereas we need a robust societal effort across all society to address the now-major issues of meeting essential human needs. These actions of the Mayor and council, by refusing to represent and defend people based on the law and the principles and practices of our Constitution Act, are not acts of care but acts of hate consistent with their thoughts, ideas and personality types.

[7] We speak here of representation, and of legal obligations, duties and responsibilities of our public employees with respect to their employers. We see plain and evident disproportionate harm done here in Peterborough to the lives and future of our children, a reckless disregard not only for them but driven by an undermining of their fundamental rights to life which require the active protection of disadvantaged groups just starting life from scratch and now facing a high-risk future with essentially hopeless odds of gaining a foothold in life much less surviving. We see that all law is based on proportionality, with a powerful system of justice based on assessment of risk and the degree of harm done, and also that this Mayor and council force upon us the highest-risk scenario based entirely on speculation. Pure speculation, that we will continue paying into systems designed for our destruction, that are distinctly against life in all its aspects, against the active use and expression of our freedoms, and against life security itself.

[8] Concerning life security, we understand this as the work we do using the resources of Nature to meet our essential human needs. We rely on materials that last, and also on consumable and running expenses one of which is planting, growing and selling food. Few crops grow inland, and water is critical to life and the growing of fruit and vegetable crops. Access to land and tools is critical to avoiding massive disasters and appalling human rights abuses, and this Mayor and council aim to do just that, publishing a plan for the destruction of land most critical to our survival, working not on our behalf but on the behalf of bankers. These land use practices are an act of war against us. We understand the critical social role of local governments as organizational structures which must be aimed at defence of our lives, just as we understand our Section 7 right to life security as inherently containing our personal right to take risk, not to have risk imposed on us in matters of fundamental human needs that we must urgently tend to for our lives and survival.

[9] We know, for example, that there is a low-risk path based on physical reality and not on the fantasy of speculation as a means of theft that harnesses the lives and work of others, and that growing food free from the massive interference the state is a highly safe route to go for both personal and national security. And yet this Mayor and council have produced a plan for our destruction with a system in which we have no say about these most fundamental matters of life. In their attacks and abuse we know City Hall as a place to best be avoided, a hornets nest of nonsense aimed specifically at crippling our lives by mechanisms and means of control and plunder. Is this system created by the Mayor and council honest, or does it produce legal democratic involvement or good will? The Mayor and council are sufficiently smart to not overtly issue statements of hatred (a criminal code Section 319 violation), but behind the scenes make deal and write policies going well into the territory of promoting hatred against and identifiable group, this generation of young Canadians, despite being well aware of the situation our kids face.

[10] No caring parent would ever continue in this direction of degradation of farms, forests and fisheries which have already collapsed ecosystems essential to our lives, but would take actions in all these areas in prevention of disaster. We know these as caring community-based actions that this Mayor and council actively despise and take great measures to prevent. We see their plans for our future, and take as evidence of hateful destructive intent their land use and zoning plans specifically designed in the most ruinous way to the detriment of our lives and future. No caring parent would even do this, and then refuse those threatened with death the opportunity to take simple, caring and fundamental actions to save their own lives.

[11] If this Mayor and council dare claim ignorance of the realities of our lives, the situation we face, and the law, saying they did not know or are not responsible for their major multiple violations of Canada's top law, for multiple human rights abuses, and for many violations of Criminal Code, we point to Section 19, that ignorance of the law is no excuse. In contrast to this Mayor and council, who reject decision-making based on fact and evidence, care for others and a balance of considerations, we rely on the application of CC Section 19 within Section 1 reasonable limits. We say we cannot obey law we cannot understand (that lacks a description of the problem and its solution), that is clearly not written by a reasonable person exhibiting care and concern for the well-being and safety of others, and that law too complex to be understood is arbitrary in its application. This is the specific problem: the Mayor has issued edicts expressing his own will without any basis in life or law or the express responsibilities of the role.

[12] We also say that if we must obey the law and are put in conflict with the law by this mayor and council, that we prefer to follow our top laws written by minds of great clarity and care, consistent with our own senses of reason and respect for others with regards to the careful meeting of essential human needs by the work we do. We understand the basis of the profound interference of this Mayor and council on the essential matters of our lives as motivated by considerations of monetary excess alone driven by a tiny minority of the population that the Mayor prefers to benefit alone despite the obvious destruction and mining out of our lives. We say that the idea of ignorance of the law being no excuse is limited to reasonable behaviours in particular those concerning good human relations and regards for the sustenance of life by the work we do to meet essential human needs.

[13] We understand good governance as the paid assistance of our lives in those essential endeavours for our cost-savings mutual benefit. If this were not the case, then we have an oppressive government intent on abuse of our lives with no interest in our mutual well-being. At the very least, this is a personality disorder of extreme narcissism making this Mayor and council unable to overcome the self-serving bias as needed for the role, coupled to serious questions of competence and work ethics, but we say these concerns extend further into matters of malice directly tied to issues of mental health and such serious personality disorders as the make them unfit for any role whatsoever in which they have power over the lives of others. We share in common and as a unifying force all essential human needs and are most alarmed when government becomes a force against the meeting of essential needs and aims to harness our labour in manners of slavery saying we must pay without say to our own detriment driving further the wide-scale ruin of our lives. This Mayor and council have issued plans for the death of our children which we cannot abide by. The government says there is no hate crime in Canada, so as to look good, but we say there is. But as it stands, we must instead cite criminal negligence and place it in the context of both international human rights instruments and the Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act.

[14] Of pressing and substantial concern here is the active removal of any land those with nothing have a right to be on. We say this is directly due to the creation of artificial circumstances specifically designed to remove all such reasonable options and freedoms, a plan designed by bankers in England centuries ago for the express purpose of denial of essential rights for control, plunder and wealth extraction by the already-rich. The Americans reject that cruel British system of persecution and oppression centuries ago and we rejected it in 1982. But this Mayor and aim to illegally continue it because it gives them unlimited control and power over the lives of all residents and completely removes any form of our personal and social self-determination. That is their personality type, and they work only on behalf of the already-rich corporate owners, removing our Freedom of Association and forcing us to pay those whose intent is control and destruction of our lives for motives of profit alone. In that way, there is no free market, and the Mayor and council by ensuring that local residents have no chance to even begin anything are ensuring the complete removal of competition on behalf of those aiming to control money, food, housing and so on. These are inhumane actions and human rights abuses against this generation of young Canadians who by definition start life with nothing, armed with hope, spirit, strength and intelligence backed by the love and life experience of their parents and teachers, and now with direct access to the vast body of knowledge directly available on the internet.

[15] It is a most cruel and unusual punishment for this generation to know their fate, to know of the many things they can do to save themselves, and to be specifically denied the right and freedom to effect the changes needed, as directed by the top minds on the planet, to save their lives! How is this done? In every community, and particularly this one, by the refusal of an older generation including this Mayor and council to obey the law and act reasonably in care to save the lives of their own children. This Mayor and council say we do not have the right to self-determination, specifically claiming in bylaws that Peterborough is not our home, that this downtown does not belong to us, and that we have no right whatsoever to even touch the land. Whereas we say that not only is Canada our home, but that the Canadian dollar belongs to us and must be used for our mutual benefit, and not for the underhanded, illegal and forceful destruction of our lives by fundamental deceptions of fraud and theft.

[16] If we ask, what is the intent of these bylaws and plans, we can see clearly the intent is not protection of our lives but acts of permanent destruction aimed at gutting our core economy of essential needs by gutting the critical land and ecosystems that sustain our lives. We further know, internally, that workers within government to protect our lives by smart and caring land use decisions are consistently trodden over whenever a deal is made between politicians and big business. The law is completely and utterly rejected, while we are viewed simply as taxpayers or customers, not as human beings on equal footing with equal benefit and protection under the law. We draw the line when our elected leaders show no regard for life and law, threaten our lives and very existence with their actions, and break multiple categories of criminal code, denying recourse and working hard with business interests to ensure our silence on major issues of critical importance. This is highly illegal.

3.5 OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE RELATED TO FRAUD AND SEDITION

[1] In the Criminal code of Canada, *CC Section 139(2)*, this every one who wilfully attempts in any manner to obstruct, pervert or defeat the course of justice in a judicial proceeding. PCH is a judicial body; it can write and enforce law. Obstruction of justice happens when we ask for the basis of a ticket or bylaw, but we find none, are refused an answer, or are lied to. Here, we are concerned with

obstruction of fundamental justice with regards to the Constitutional *Section 1* obligations on the directors of PCH to provide a justifiable reason for their actions to citizens. What is the basis of dog licensing, for example, and what service is provided? We know that in failing to comply, we will be charged with an offence. We also know we cannot comply with a law we do not understand, except by force taken against us, and it helps tremendously to have a *Section 1* explanation of both the problem and the solution proposed by PCH. We wish to be informed, preferably in advance, of the specific nature of the offence in order to not be charged and to not charge PCH with violation of our *Sections 11a* and *11d* rights. To know the nature of the charge and to be assumed innocent, respectively.

[2] We further wish to avoid the cost to us and to the courts in seeking a *Section 24* remedy on such matters as should have been solved at the level of fundamental justice by healthy and robust communication based on fact, evidence and reason as admissible in a court of law. Without that, the cost to society is great and the cause of justice defeated at the grass-roots level. Without that, many citizens in Peterborough choose to obey Canada's top laws over the edicts of the Mayor and council and their demands for money without just cause. It perverts the course of justice to win an individual case, thus proving the law or bylaw wrong or wrongfully applied, and to have the process of justice defeated continually by a policy of individual isolationism with proceedings conducted in secrecy, and because of this that vast majority of resident naturally and instinctively apply *Section 52* sanctions against PCH policy, justly refusing to recognize the validity of the Mayors' claims that we owe PCH for this injustice done against us.

[3] Since we won the right in 1982 to live freely under the law with direct access to the principles, practices, processes and procedures of the law, so that we might better understand and obey it, we find this lack of procedural fairness and actual obstruction of fundamental justice at this local level to be not only appalling but deeply offensive to our persons and democracy.

[4] On this matter [1-3], we are most concerned by the character of any person who rejects our reasonable requests for information on matters that directly, and often negatively, impact our lives. Who makes threats to avoid evidence being given. Who engages in corrupt and dishonest means to give evidence. Who fabricates a story. Who falsely accuses another person, points in a deceitful manner to another department, or cites other laws or bylaws that are irrelevant or misleading. Who promises unmitigated actions of the State against us when we know this is not the nature of the justice system. Who not only abstains from providing evidence but fiercely objects to that even though it is the duty of their office to do so, *in purposeful violation of the "demonstrably justified" test of Section 1 of our Charter*.

[5] As PCH writes laws it is a judicial body required to follow Charter processes. When we ask a question at City Hall, particularly after being accused by them, we are indeed in a judicial proceeding. If their laws lack a rational basis or have no basis at all, then there is no law we can understand or follow. When the directors refuse to answer, we have two options. One is to have an independent judicial decision maker, which in this case is any elected representative who can make a sound case with a firm basis in decision-making. Another is self-representation using the legal decision-making process of our Constitution. Using fact, evidence and reason, contentious parties can find solution under the law. In most cases, the standard of justification required by law is low and easy to attain by any reasonable person. This level is preponderance of the evidence, considering what is most reasonable or most likely. In some cases, one has to dig deeper.

[6] A simple example is needed. Two carpenters argue about how to frame a door. The engineering logic based on the properties of wood along with the properties of the structure being built is reasonable and testable. A decision can be made by access to information or derivation from first principles based on fact, reason and evidence, which is debatable and testable, rarely requiring input from a third person. Working under the law is working under fact, evidence and reason. We expect with regards to City Hall that this process be present throughout their operations and that it also applies to this specific example of building such that the vast majority of activities are pre-approved with clear access to information, these being already broken down into well-known low-level stepwise trade tasks. Each not particularly difficult, though arduous. Each with a firm basis in reason.

[7] We have seen across the board at PCH there are strong monetary incentives to defeat all lines of inquiry, debate and recourse, and concerning motive, means and actions taken to that effect we have addressed fundamental aspects in finer detail in Sections 2.1 to 2.4 and 3.2. Here, we examine briefly the close relation between fraud and obstruction of justice, but at a higher, more encompassing level of consideration, that of emplacement of layered systems with multiple tactics and strategies aimed at obstruction of justice.

[8] We find bylaws consistently tied to monetary benefit to PCH with no significant basis in legitimate governmental purposes of justice and improvement of societal conditions. Each of which is tied to threats of force used against us for non-compliance. Each of which is tied to fees for asking questions, with no promise that the response will be sufficient or justifiable.

[9] We find much effort has been made to ensure silence and crush debate and communication across the board and on all fronts especially on matters of most urgent concern critical to our lives. Even our friendly pre-Covid events requiring access to community resources we paid for and own are pre-screened for content and to ensure we have significant funds available to City Hall.

[10] Instead of simply doing the work required of them, the directors of PCH are spending millions in campaigns to maintain their image, millions to block, deny and obstruct real and effective justice based on Constitutional processes while creating appearances of care and honest due process. Instead of obeying the law, they aim to write it and define it for themselves on their terms. We reject their Code of Conduct, except those parts consistent with our Constitution, as an attempt to subvert justice, give appearances of justice and deny independent oversight of due process.

[11] A full description of the laws broken by the directors could fill a book. Yet we can describe their obstruction of justice quite simply. The directors create rules they say we must live by. A room full of people is presented with a problem. Not one wrote down the problem or the solution. They voted and say the matter is closed. No basis for their decision is given. Those impacted have no say. If we want to know the reason for their decision, the directors say that is secret. The directors have written a bylaw saying that if we want to know, no information will be given out unless we pay. Next, we must guess the content of the secret meeting and then apply under the Freedom of Information Act. We are not guaranteed a truthful or adequate response, but that decision is also final and if we dare question it then another fee applies. We say the whole purpose of this is to conceal incompetency, conceal fraud, obstruct justice, defeat public scrutiny and public discussion of public matters, act against the law, act against us and act against the Supreme Court, for many of the PCH bylaws act directly against the rulings of the Supreme Court. This Mayor and council are working against the purpose of Freedom of Information, and instead want to turn their paid public work into a commodity, which is a purpose of

business not a purpose of democratic government. We also take this insanely expensive and convoluted thought process as evidence of mental illness, for it defeats the purpose of law. We paid for them to do the work. Show the work. But they aim to defeat all public say; by secrecy, those impacted have no say. We don't know what we are dealing with, and yet must obey and pay? Obey what, we ask. What is the urgent and pressing concern that required a law? What is the cause, requiring this direction of funds?

[12] Concerning access to information about the content of closed meetings that nevertheless impact our lives, we understand the need for privacy to formulate, test and try ideas prior to making them public. We too wish our Constitution was clear on this most urgent issue of privacy affecting us all, particularly with regards to *Article 12* of the UDHR with respect to the unprecedented scale and use of computer internet communications. But we find it completely and utterly ridiculous to have to know in advance the content of a close meeting in order to request information, an impossible situation especially as PCH requires us to understand the meaning, purpose and intent of the Municipalities Act. This is obstruction of justice, created by a mentally ill person lacking presentable logic. What is the basis of dog licenses? Top Secret! What is the logic: if we don't know, we can't say anything?

[13] The directors claim that we will receive justice on our issues by going to a lawyer that they hired as an Integrity Commissioner, but only on a limited range of issues within a Code of Conduct they wrote. Who does this lawyer represent? How much will it cost us as taxpayers? Will this be a timely process effecting significant change as required by our crisis, or will it effectively violate our *Sections 11a* and *11b* rights to speedy due process? Is that lawyer even qualified to tackle the issues we raise, especially noting that our Charter process requires direct resolution between us and our legal elected representatives on these most obvious and easily solved issues requiring only the lowest standards of reason? We also find that PCH has defined the scope to be so narrow as to be useless and further demanded secrecy to as to deny broader *Section 52* recourse. All of this is denial of justice aimed at maintaining appearances of justice, a matter of fraud.

[14] We say this is subversion of justice by rejection of democratic due process, aiming to make private matters that are public, also acting to create costly complexity of clear benefit to both PCH and their hired contractors. We say this is done consistently and persistently as a policy and emplaced system aimed fully at denying public interaction and recourse on all matters affecting them, and to direct all public funds to unlimited profit corporations. We say these corporations, and this Integrity Commissioner have incentive to not work on our behalf as required of an agent of the Government, though recognizing that may not be the case, such that we will not receive fundamental justice by equal benefit of the law. We say this is fraud and intent to obstruct justice committed by the directors of PCH aiming to use the law as a weapon against us. Whereas any reasonable person would simply have done the work required of them in the first place, honestly and effectively, or taken the advice of a citizen who knew how to do it better. We speak here of the fundamental duty of democratic representation.

[15] We find it very unlikely that the entire council has persistently voted against the principles of fundamental justice and due process to take such specific and widespread actions against both the law and the basis of law, to consistently benefit themselves and deny justice and democratic engagement to citizens. This can only have happened by subverting justice and systematically denying all the principles and practices of democracy. If we have considered all possibilities from multiple perspectives over significant time, addressing this reason or that and seeking firm basis in fact and evidence in accordance with the law, then what remains is a conclusion we do not want to consider, that a gang has formed intent on replacing our local government with the working mechanisms of an

authoritarian state. Should this continue, we know the destination to be totalitarian rulership with its known consequences of massive interference with trade and all essential aspects of human life, which are already apparent in PCH relations with citizens, causing distress and dire circumstances with removal of all hope for a fair and sustainable future.

[16] We find it inconceivable that an entire team has voted against all the principles of justice at strong odds with the physical reality of our lives and our understanding of the state of the world. And has acted strongly against us in all manner of reasonable and intuitive community-based actions known to put us on a safe course and divert our lives away from a course of disaster. An entire team, not acting on our behalf in manners more consistent with collusion and organized crime than social benefit. Claiming social benefit in the press, but at odds with the actual working policy in which we later never see significant evidence of improvements or actual solutions to our very real to most urgent and pressing problems.

[17] On this matter of outright lying, expressed legally as fraud, we find the claims of the Mayor in the press and in public statements to be ludicrous matters of political fraud and actual evidence of insanity, being so completely out of touch with reality as to not represent us. Is that a crime, concerning the state of our lives and future? Yes, it is.

[18] The Mayor consistently claims that we have no problems, that everything is wonderful and only going to get better. With many related statements supportive to that effect. We have already addressed issues of bias extending far into matters of incompetence, inability to represent and actual mental illness allowing certain people to create and live in a fantasy world. However, if the Mayor and council have been presented with evidence-based arguments to the contrary and are capable of acting as reasonable persons under the law, that is false representation. Specifically, it is the forced imposition of a belief system or ideology at odds with provable reality that threatens our lives and removes from us by force of law critical freedoms essential to our survival. One of those beliefs is the fantasy of infinite exponential used as an argument to grow the budget of PCH despite reduced services and acts against us that severely impact and damage our lives and prevent us from saving ourselves from present dire circumstances (in some cases) and affecting much of the population already by driving the collapse of our lives, which is also an urgent *Sections 1, 2, 7 and 15* issue of national security.

[19] We are fighting for our lives, but who is the Mayor and council fighting for? We can answer this question by showing who they work for. We submit the budget and its attendant contracts to show beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Mayor and council work almost exclusively on behalf of banks and the owners of corporations seeking public funds for personal benefit. We can further show broad actions against our Freedom, specifically stating and proving that the beneficiaries gain far more than can be gained by the work of their own hands.

[20] This is done directly or indirectly harnessing the lives and labour of others, in promoting plans for income without labour, in refusing to recognize that the only significant value added to otherwise worthless printed notes ranging from parking tickets to issued bylaws to our currency is by our labour, and that the opposite of Freedom is the means and mechanisms of slavery in various forms.

[21] This is done by numerous *Section 15* violations, wherein we expect a reasonable range of pay, work and competencies across all of society tied to beneficial productive output, helping us rather than hindering, but certainly not with the unilateral and forceful imposition of belief systems not tied to

physical reality and with the effect of extreme inequities and major human rights violations in the areas of work, food, shelter, health care and essential human needs. Outright attacks directed and ordered by the Mayor on security of the person, aiming to control every essential human need on behalf of beneficiaries in business with such deep anti-competition policies as to not even allow shelter, the growing of food, or the meagre beginnings of any business start-up.

[22] We completely and utterly reject the imposed ideologies of radical extremists damaging our lives to such extent, especially when we know the basis of social security is not significantly monetary but is based on the how we choose to live and use our time with regards to the labour needed to care for each other and meet essential human needs using the resources of nature. The Mayors' attacks on the realistic basis of social security are tantamount to attacks on the basis of our lives and on the basis of national security. Only the sickest minds in society would perpetrate such acts against us, against our nation and against the basis of life itself. Assuming rights they do not have well beyond the legitimate domain of government and denying us our rights to save ourselves.

[23] We see and have much evidence to indicate this Mayor and council are involved in deeply deceptive practices designed to give the appearance of justice but which render meaningless any and all forms of significant constitutional democratic engagement and recourse. We say the primary and most effective reconciliation must be truthful, honest and adequate response from our local elected representatives concerning their actions, or the acceptance of valid arguments and ideas from employing citizens regarding all public relations impacting us. A clear example of this at the Constitutional level is the reading of citizens directions to act in an employer-employee contract on issues of common concern and mutual benefit in the post-election reading of the Speech From the Throne. Disregarding the terms of our contract, the Constitution Act, specifically to deny mutual benefit is the criminal act of sedition. To further take actions threatening our lives is intent to cause manslaughter, but to force us all on course to our deaths is a hate crime, an act of war against humanity, and the ultimate treason.

PART 4 – SEDITION AND TREASON

4.1 ACTS OF SEDITION AGAINST OUR CONSTITUTIONAL MONARCHY

[1] We understand that within Canada there is a small minority of people who detest being held accountable under the law, who despise all the principles of care, honesty and justice as our democratic foundations. Who are intent on undermining and destroying our democracy because it does not serve them. Who attack our lives by attacking all the principles of democracy and law made clear in our Constitution Act. Who wish the law to apply to others, not them. We understand all plans and actions taken to gut our lives, destroy the future for our children, weaken and undermine our country and render useless the Office of the Governor General as sedition and treason.

[2] Sedition concerns plans formed to undermine, destabilize and replace our government, whereas treason concerns actions taken to complete those plans. Sedition is overt conduct in speech and writing with organizational efforts purposed to reject and replace our form of government. It is expressed by systematic subversion of the law and each part of our Constitution by rejection of the foundational principles of law and democracy. Whereas treason relates to actions taken against Canadians, our laws and our Constitution, that are against peace, order and good governance and instead designed to disrupt

society, remove all recourse and lay the foundations of widespread protest by creating difficult to dire conditions of strife and hardship in the meeting of essential human needs.

[3] Seditious and treasonous acts against the government, once within our Constitution Act, are now part of Criminal Code (CC). In a chain of command, these are refusals to follow direct orders or plots and actions to overthrow leadership. In a free democracy, these are refusals to obey the law, or refusals to obey orders to obey the law. Sedition, in *CC Section 59(1-4)*, concerns plots, schemes and plans to destabilize the country, undermine and overthrow the government. Treason, in *CC Section 42* (cited fully later), concerns actions taken to that effect.

[4] *Section 59(1-4)* of the Canadian Criminal Code defines sedition. Every one who (a) speaks seditious words, (b) publishes a seditious libel, or (c) is a party to a seditious conspiracy, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding fourteen years. In 59(1), seditious words are words that express a seditious intention. In 59 (2), a seditious libel is a libel that expresses a seditious intention. In 59(3), a seditious conspiracy is an agreement between two or more persons to carry out a seditious intention. In 59 (4), without limiting the generality of the meaning of the expression *seditious intention*, every one shall be presumed to have a seditious intention who (a) teaches or advocates, or (b) publishes or circulates any writing that advocates, the use, without the authority of law, of force as a means of accomplishing a governmental change within Canada.

[5] Prior to 1982, the *Section 91* Constitutional peace, order and good government (POGG) directive was the only reference point for defining crimes including sedition and treason, with the king at the top of the chain of command. A leader maintaining the POGG directive was the legal reference point for a reasonable person of good behaviour acting with sense and care. Post 1982, we formed a Constitutional monarchy as our form of government wherein issues are debated pre-election and citizens write a post-election document directing these new civil servants to do work on our behalf as required under Charter directives, with failure to do so being an act of sedition. We want to know why the directors of PCH have broken the law by violating our rights to self-determination, refusing to do this work themselves and hiring outside consultants with no knowledge of government or the very real problems we face to direct our community by official plans. We further want to know why they manipulated the content of the pre-election debate(s) to ensure no matter of urgent importance was discussed, or to ensure no discussion at all.

[6] Throughout history, however, leaders of poor behaviour acting without sense or care were the source of such significant problems that the recognition of rule of law was a great accomplishment. All are equal under the law. Nevertheless, our pre-1982 Constitution based on the British North America Act remained entirely devoted to the top-down exertion of power for the purposes of control, exploitation and plunder, the idea being that infinite riches were to be had throughout the world. With the basis of decision-making unclear and the components of the POGG directive unspecified, the basis of law is neither defined nor open, making its writing and application arbitrary. When those impacted by the law have no say, again our hope lies entirely on leaders with reasonable behaviours acting with sense and care. The problem remained that a poor leader with self-serving authoritarian interests could completely control and determine the lives of everyone around them to unlimited extent, saying in fine detail how others are to live, creating laws and taking actions entirely against freedom and self-determination.

[7] The lack of freedom and self-determination being slavery by the complete control of every essential

human need and action, major efforts were made in Canada over many decades to determine exactly what rights and freedoms were above government and universally applicable to all. An attempt was made to specify certain components of equality under the law and make these available to all in order to gain equal freedom under the law allowing improved self-determination. In this manner, individuals and families working in communities and as a nation could have the freedom to discuss and make critical decisions concerning the shape and direction of our lives within the reasonable limits of care and concern for the effects of our actions on others.

[8] In 1982, we won this freedom under the law. We made clear what freedoms and rights of personal and social self-determination were above political whim and will by defining both the components of the POGG directive and the basis of law in our Constitution Act. We now have a clear process of decision-making, public and open to all. The law can no longer be arbitrarily written and applied. We made clear the specific role and purpose of government in a constitutional monarchy. We made clear the behavioural requirements of all workers in government to act under the law using the principles and practices of our Constitution for the benefit of all Canadians. We made clear our obligations and responsibilities to caring mutual defence of our lives by defence of our rights and freedoms.

[9] In 1982, after more than a century of science, it was found that many of the principles of justice and care on which we base our decisions of right or wrong, good or bad, could not be defined on a purely physical basis, or as a purely intellectual endeavour, but were rather intangible senses. We could not, for example, define what constitutes life or a defines our sense of life or the quality of it. Defining standards of parental care, for example, concerns more than just the mechanical meeting of essential human needs, although that is an important indicator of care *versus* abuse.

[10] It was therefore decided to leave this entire arena of senses and beliefs in the realm of self-definition and free choice such that the preamble to our Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms read *Whereas Canada is founded upon the principles that recognize the supremacy of God and the rule of law*: both of which are subject to debate. At the very least, this recognizes higher principles may be present inherent to life and above our control and personal whim, many of which have been elucidated in the spirit of truth and justice. At the very least, the scope is broadened far beyond the previous *peace, order and good government directive*. Without this recognition of intangible concerns, the sentence “We have no *faith* in this government” has no meaning, import or impact, and neither does the word *good* which is critical to defining the intent and purpose of law. This gives the context under which all law in Canada is to be understood, that we are a caring sensible nation defending rights and freedoms, respecting a broad spectrum of principles of life and law, and utterly rejecting anything to do with dictatorship or authoritarian rulers.

[11] We have in Canada certain people who prefer another type of government. Who simply despise and detest the very idea of being under the law, who vastly prefer arbitrary rule over others without reason or limit, who wish to enjoy certain rights, freedoms and benefits they deny others. Who further take from others that which does not belong to them, or aim to harness the lives and labour of others to the extent of removing rights and freedoms critical to life or even survival. Who also reject the very notion of equal benefit under the law, seeking personal benefit to the extent of enslaving others. Who say, by removing critical rights and freedoms, that the purpose and meaning your life is to serve them. Who aim to control every essential human need and action by removing free choice and any reasonable alternative. Who hate the very idea of equal benefit under the law. Who could not live under authoritarian rulership, but wish to be authoritarian rulers.

[12] When such people enter politics, lying about their true intentions, one of the first acts of sedition they commit is to reject the rule of law and claim powers beyond the authorized limits of legitimate government, thus violating *Section 31* of the Charter. Unchecked, they commit ungodly actions of contempt and disregard for the lives of others extending to shock and outrage. We say our *Section 3* democratic rights do not merely consist of electing the next authoritarian ruler. Next, this person says that our *Section 2b* rights to Freedom of Expression carry no weight in decision making even if soundly based in fact, evidence and reason admissible in a court of law and of critical importance to our lives, further and that our Freedom of Expression implies no obligation to respond. And yet that person claims authority over us, writes laws and rules directly impacting our lives and has removed from us our *Section 2d* rights to Freedom of Association. When we find no understandable basis for their actions and rules, taken unilaterally and forcefully without limits and without our say, rejecting the debatable basis of law, we see this as a violation of our *Section 1* rights to reasonable limits, an attack on multiple fronts of the principles and practices of our Constitution, an act of sedition. We further say this is an attack on our *Section 2b* beliefs in justice, honesty, truth and beneficial government, for we elect leaders to represent us and defend our lives by equal benefit under the law. These are our democratic Rights and Freedoms.

[13] *Section 1* of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees the rights and freedoms set out in it subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society. What are we to do when our local elected officials reject reason, are not reasonable, reject reasonable limits, do not work within the scope of legitimate government, reject the law and the basis of law, interfere with our lives to the extent that we are not free, take actions that demonstrably damage us, cripple our lives, destroy our future and cannot in any way be justified but are instead acts against us that outrage our conscience? This Mayor and council are claiming rights to do things far outside the scope of government.

[14] Whereas we pay taxes for legitimate services of government, this Mayor and council have elected of their own free will to run a real estate business in which they are significant beneficiaries. In this, they have colluded with bankers and business owners to attack *Section 7* rights and freedoms critical to our lives for the purpose of forcibly and against our will removing our *Section 2d* rights to Freedom of Association from these groups. As a result of this profound interference in our lives, we have no free market. We are put directly under the arbitrary rules of these corporations, having no other choice because of the complete removal of all freedoms and reasonable alternatives for land use that would otherwise exhibit care for mutual benefit of Canadians. We understand it is not within the role or scope of government to run the business plans of private enterprise, and especially not to the extent of massively violating multiple human rights, gutting *Section 7* rights to life, liberty and security of the person, depriving shelter to the extent of causing manslaughter, or snuffing out the capacity of the land to support life. We further say we have yet to see a legitimate form of taxation based on the principles of law defined in our Constitution Act. The Mayor and council have decided, of their own free will and against the law, to have an arbitrary and illegal scheme of taxation based on collusion, speculation and a desire to gamble with our lives by “playing the market”.

[15] We further say that the intent, purpose and effect of this illegal form of taxation is to completely and utterly reject our *Section 15* rights to equality before and under the law and equal protection and benefit of the law. We make this claim based on the components of our *Section 7* rights to life security with real work done to grow food, provide shelter and meet essential human needs based on the

resources of Nature and its living ecosystems. We find these inextricably linked, and detest all aims to snuff out the basis of life, deny us access to the critical resources of life or harness our labour under conditions that remove fundamental rights and essential freedoms. In this, we say that this generation of young Canadians faces such massive threat and discrimination from the older established generation as to require special *Section 15* protections to prevent conditions of dire to deathly circumstances already apparent in our atmosphere, farms, forests and fisheries as a major species extinction event.

[16] We say that this Mayor and council significantly abuse our *Section 16* language rights concerning the use of truthful, accurate and appropriately forceful language needed to address these most urgent matters of life, liberty and security of the person, particularly with regards to terms expressing legitimate and justifiable controlled outrage concerning their callous attitudes and lack of reasonable actions aimed at preventing our impending death. We especially decry their destructive actions including the active prevention of fair, kind and caring community actions needed to save our lives. This topic grades into their actions of treason, but we restrict ourselves here to outlining their comprehensive attacks on each *Section* of our Constitution that in sum define seditious intent beyond the shadow of a doubt. We further submit the plans, maps, bylaws and policies of PCH as being seditious words and plans against the purposes and intent of legitimate Constitutional government interests.

[17] We are most concerned by the close relation between the improper and misleading use of words for misdirection and subversion or obstruction of justice, fraud being closely tied to these matters of sedition. We see that PCH devotes much effort, time and money to maintaining appearances, including the appearance of justice and due process, which was written by them to the exclusion of due process defined as the basis of healthy decision-making by the Supreme Court directives for use and application of Constitutional law. We see this as a serious effort on the part of the directors of PCH to simply not allow *Section 24* enforcement of rights. Justice is denied at the grass-roots foundational level of citizen-government engagement. This is simply not allowed, especially not concerning the most critical aspects with significant impact on our lives, and then the Mayor and council (who have completely determined how we are to live) say we are apathetic.

[18] We are highly concerned to the point of alarm and distress, that this Mayor and council make considerable efforts to get around the law, in particular abusing *Section 32* of the Constitution by partnering with businesses, hiring them to do civic work specifically to get around any Charter limits and legal obligations of government. The intent and effect of this is to take everything of value to the community and hand it over to corporations directed by persons seeking unlimited profit, thus removing Freedom of Association and forcing us to pay the already-rich. Furthermore, the effect is to expose us to the arbitrary rules of their articles of incorporation, all of which are counter to legitimate government purposes aimed at mutual benefit to citizens. In this way, the most critical components of our lives are exposed, controlled and plundered to the extent that makes our participation in democracy meaningless. We further find this Mayor and council deeply involved in the corrupt anti-competition policies of private corporations with common practices aimed at disrupting social health and integrity, isolating and silencing citizens. To the extent of completely quenching any possibility of a small scalable startup in any area of core economy of essential human needs, quite stupidly stopping the progress and development of society and destroying the tax base. Much of this work done by the Mayor and council against us is aimed at obstruction of justice to deny our rights to *Sections 24* and *52* recourse.

[19] The social and economic impacts of these actions to completely control land uses for the benefit of local government, banks and business have been to completely cripple any possibility of starting a business from scratch and by the imposed expenses inflict such a deprivation of life, liberty and security of the person as to make impossible any actualization of *Section 6* mobility rights to find work, and further in many cases define residency as a *Section 6* qualification for the receipt of publicly provided social services. This is a fundamental matter of the right to shelter as a *Section 7* right to life, a question of care for those crushed economically, and a question of access to land to grow food as a *Section 7* right to life.

[20] The land use practices designed by this Mayor and council being specifically aimed at the removal of personal and social rights essential for life in an attempt to control every essential human need and action toward freedom, self-actualization and self-determination. These land use plans and actions are designed specifically to say Canada is not our home and purposed to tear apart and fragment any form of healthy integrated inclusive caring society. In denying us these critical options of self-determination, saying we have no right to touch the land unless we have private ownership, which this entire generation of young Canadians does not have, and in destroying this land critical to our survival, is to destroy the basis of life and hope for a future and commit an abominable act of genocide.

[21] On this matter, science has defined a far greater scope and range of fundamental freedoms than have our politicians. We have fundamental food, seed and soil rights as a literal part of our physical constitution that are critical to life and health. We further say that prisons afford far better care protection of essential needs and rights to food, shelter and social programs than does this Mayor and council, and we point to the rights and freedoms that pioneers had in building a life for themselves from scratch as being completely absent now. Now the odds are stacked against us, socially, economically and ecologically the point at which without a massive effort to secure the basis of life we will have little hope of survival. And yet all these actions are possible, caring and community-based. And completely opposed by this Mayor and council. We call this sedition and treason, an act of war against us, our country and our democracy.

[22] *Section 1* makes clear the basis of law as the basis of good decision making with regards to protection and defence of our universal and mutual *Section 7 rights to life, liberty and security of the person*. And our Canadian Supreme Court has laid out exactly how we are to do that, specifically saying we are free to act within reasonable limits concerning the impact of our actions on others, as long as each of us behaves like a reasonable person. In sedition, a poor leader rejects both the law and the foundations of democracy aiming to become an authoritarian ruler, despot or dictator. Specifically, the basis of decision-making is self-serving personal whim with no concern for the impact of their actions on others. Only their ideas matter.

[23] Much of law (and life) is based on considering what a reasonable person would do. In narrow definition, what a reasonable person would do depends on what they are doing, be it grass cutting or running a chainsaw. In broad definition, which is a legal requirement to broadly consider all impacts in balance, a reasonable person is a parental figure because parental care is encompassing and inherently concerned with the well being of children and others across the generations. *Here we say that a reasonable person is one whom acts with parental care, this being the main role of adults in society and most certainly the role and responsibility of any person in a position of authority*. This covers a broad range of reasonable activities and types of work done to meet our personal and social obligations to life, liberty and security of the person. These are rights and freedoms in being essential activities of

life with work done to meet essential human needs.

[24] In contrast to countries on route to becoming failed states, we are pleased to see a structure of Canadian government with Ministries aiming at good social organization to meet our common needs, complete with specific instructions from the Supreme Court stating that *the purpose of affording constitutional protection against the deprivation of liberty is to safeguard the entitlement to make decisions of fundamental importance free from state interference.*

[25] In our constitutional monarchy, the king remains a representational figure of the king father, that as a living figurehead of good virtues still retains significant moral authority. The Governor General is now Head of State in proxy for the king, with significant powers of citizen defence above political whim and will. The Governor General can block all Acts of Parliament against the mutual interests of Canadians, directly defending our lives using the principles and practices of our Constitution including its prime directive to defend life itself. The Governor General has the power to prevent insurrections by recognizing the valid win of a political party in an election. After an election, the Governor General is the voice of the people giving directions to our government employees as to the specific work they must do on our behalf. The Governor General is our last line of defence when our Constitutional rights have been violated, empowered to direct defend our lives, freedoms and rights by speaking on all matters that threaten our lives and future.

[26] Here in Peterborough, a handful of people have revolted against our Constitution, rejected the law and in an act of sedition replaced our local democratic government with the working mechanisms of an authoritarian state. Instead of representing and defending our lives using the principles and practices of our Constitution, seeking complete control by removal of critical democratic rights, freedoms and choices essential to life. Instead of working for us, engaging in illegal collusion with anti-democracy activists in banking and business aiming for a totalitarian state of ownership. Furthermore publishing plans for our destruction and writing in bylaws the means and mechanisms by which they aim to do so. Violating many Articles of human rights well known to be acts of war, violating many Sections of our Canadian Constitution Act know to be acts against our lives, and violating many Sections of our Criminal Code known to be criminal acts.

[27] Here we are concerned with sedition and treason, noting that these acts often consist of related infringements ranging from obstruction of justice to matters of criminal negligence of duty extending well into human rights abuses that can also properly be addressed as acts of war against humanity. We see in Peterborough City Hall a significant program of fraud directly related to a spectrum of behaviours of systematic and institutional abuse committed by directors whose behaviour is neither reasonable nor justified and therefore neither legal nor Charter-compliant. To the extent that we have no faith whatsoever that the directors of this local government work on our behalf.

[28] Here in Peterborough, the Mayor and council have conspired with private enterprise to work against the law and directives of our Constitution Act for the sole purpose of removing freedoms essential to life, liberty and security of the person in all areas of essential human needs and actions. These combined collusional actions are aimed at removal of choice for the purpose of sweeping societal control of each component of life security along with destruction of the basis of our lives and economy in living ecological systems. A concerted effort, for example, to suppress as much as possible opportunities for individuals or groups to grow food, is an attack on security of the person that directly

and predictable creates food security issues that are a well-known major cause of strife and hardship that contribute to a significant national security issue.

[29] The Mayor and council continually attack our multicultural rights critical to a free and caring inclusive society. By rejecting a religious government, and accepting a free diversity of religions, Canada has prevented war based on religious differences. We understand that in life and in many ecosystems, both socially and biologically based, that healthy diversity with competition is essential to survival and development, the response to changes and stresses that threaten survival. Whereas this Mayor and council not only consistently ignore our cultural rights but wish to impose their beliefs on us and across all of society, fully rejecting and suppressing all alternative belief systems. We say this is a major violation of our *Section 27* rights and freedoms requiring that this Charter shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with the multicultural heritage of Canadians. We have First-nations beliefs. We have immigrants from all countries around the world. We have placed peace and law above all, and have recognized in our Charter many critical aspects of what we all share in common, so that we may live together with respect, in care and dignity. And our top judges have stated repeatedly and consistently that respect for others and the law is the basis of our society.

[30] As an initial starting point for discussion, we can define culture as the shared patterns of behaviours and interactions, cognitive constructs, and affective understanding that are learned through a process of socialization. These shared patterns identify the members of a culture group while also distinguishing those of another group. Yet we say here that we do not want the culture created at City Hall by these directors. The staff and the workers do not want it. We want the ethics and values of our Canadian culture a defined in our Constitution Act, our Charter of Rights and Freedoms. We specifically do not want the values and beliefs of the Mayor and council to be forcefully imposed on us to the extent of significant harm to our lives.

[31] We want a culture of care and justice, fully intent on defending our lives and freedoms with a realistic basis in law. But what we get is a fully imposed ideology, completely ignoring all evidence of damage, taken to the extent of radical extremism at odds with the values of any reasonable person regardless of background or any other basis of discrimination. Which denies all other belief systems and acts against them by the pure imposition of will without logic or foundation in physical reality. The belief in infinite exponential growth expressed economically as interest on interest, as a desire for income without labour, in a confusion between material wealth (which is limited as to the extent with which it can be enjoyed and has the effect of extreme deprivation to others extending well into the characteristics of slavery) and the infinite growth available in the intellectual and spiritual realms wherein our values, ethics, beliefs and senses of justice lie. We speak here of an ideology of forced monetary growth imposed on others who not only do not receive benefit but have their lives degraded significantly. Who find there is nowhere to go to live reasonably and economically in the matters working to meet essential human needs while also having time for personal development toward work and other endeavours in which significant meaning and purpose are found. According to the Mayor, who promotes and benefits from these baseless ideologies in infinite growth, granting self-defined PCH wage increases even as services decline, we must all pay for that despite evidence of much work done against us gutting our capacity for productivity much less self-sustenance.

[32] We don't want a monetary-attack culture. Concerning Freedom of Belief, the Mayor wishes us to believe that a parking ticket is real. We say it is just a cash grab, an illegal interference with free trade critical to the healthy functioning of our lives, and if it is valid there had better be very good reason

defined by our universal Constitutional principles and procedures of justice. We can also say simply, as within our rights to community self-determination, that we simply don't want these here. We say that without due process based on the principles of fundamental justice, that this is just another worthless printed note containing false accusations and claims of unmitigated State force against us, which we know not to be true. This is fraud directly tied to many means of obstructing justice. It is the sheer imposition of will backed by promise of threat and force, which has been put in place systematically infused across all aspects of operations of PCH.

[33] We are concerned, as evidenced by a money-based culture at PCH with many means and mechanisms taking priority over matters of justice expressed as care and concern for people with regards to the realistic basis of their lives in labour tied to meeting essential human needs from the resources of nature, that undue focus has been placed on what is merely a convenient tool of trade, our currency. An otherwise worthless note that only has value by virtue of our productive labour, and that its value is greatly diminished by many means of unfairly harnessing our labour including types of unproductive speculative "investments" that add no real value but instead diminish value and degrade our lives as forms of theft. To large extent, we understand these as the impositions of the religious beliefs of money-worshippers, and we reject them as hateful and ungodly acts against us in outright rejection of our Constitutional preamble which provides the context for the interpretation of our entire Charter. *Whereas Canada is founded upon principles that recognize the supremacy of God and the rule of law.*

[34] We say further that we quite likely have a large segment of the population equating God with life, or at least with goodness, or who at least realize we have a rather undefinable source for our intangible values and ethics which are the basis of our legal system, or who recognize that they did not create a species tree from nothing but only have powers of choice to protect and propagate it, at the very least for our benefit. Or who recognize linguistically that we have invented different words in different languages that essentially describe the same thing, and that words are only given meaning in the context of other words used to describe various aspects of our lives. As far as we know, we have no basis in science or in instrumental measurements to define life, even though we have instruments as indicators of life and we know when something living has died. That is, we could just as easily say, to much outrage and resistance across all of society, this: *Whereas Canada is founded upon principles that recognize the supremacy of Life and the rule of law*, with life itself being above everything.

[35] We also have excellent physics with thermodynamic descriptions of irreversible reactions by which systems cannot be restored once degraded. We mix milk with coffee but cannot take it out again restored indiscernibly to its original condition. So we are highly concerned with any actions unreasonably degrading life beyond its capacity to sustain us or recover. We understand these in Canadian law to be reasonable limits concerning how much work we can do in a day with regards to impact on others and the ecosystems sustaining our lives as the sole basis of our economy. Physics has found sets of laws that we exist under beyond our control, and science in general has provided a firm basis for good descriptions of physical reality, to the extent that it is suitable to say *the supremacy of God, Nature and Life* in any truly fundamental constitutional document.

[36] In general, we can say that investigative searches for truth concerning the nature of our existence occur in arenas of religion, ethics and spirituality as well as in justice and science, with much overlap in these fields. In this, we have two broad categories, that which we did not make and which is beyond our control as laws governing us (e.g. gravity, biology), and that which is a human invention within our

domain of action. In this, some act in ignorance and fear, attempting to destroy all that which they do not understand, others and Nature. Just because some people do not like Nature, or insects, does not mean they have the right to ruin it, for we now understand and have much evidence for our *Section 7* rights to life as being inextricably tied in with the rights to life of many other species. Our bodies, for example, can only operate by having thousands of species driving its processes. And yet the policies of this Mayor and council, against us and Nature, have contributed significantly and needlessly to the crushing of certain special areas that are ecosystems essential to our survival. Despite there being plenty of far less sensitive lands available.

[37] We fear this Mayor and council disregard these limits along with the demonstrable justification *Section 1* test to the extent of forcing a model of life on us we do not want that also drives our ruin. When all freedoms have been removed, with significant bills imposed on us to the extent that we cannot live, we also find it impossible to live lightly as we wish upon the land with minimal impact. Whereas the Mayor and council have found many means of maximal interference with the most essential aspects of our lives, removing also recourse and any say in the matter. Even to the extent of stupidly gutting their own tax base. We mean no discriminatory insult here to the intellectually challenged, whereas we do recognize a scientific basis for tests indicating a sufficient level of moral and cognitive reasoning is required for any position of authority over others, which when attained also gives that person awareness of their own limits of intelligence and thus a certain humility and respect concerning the rights and abilities of others. Concerning the insanity of driving life to permanent ruin, and the close correlation to personalities causing and driving war, we also have tests of bias, sociopathy and psychopathy we wish to perform. Not as punishments, but as expressions of care to ensure they get the help they need. So far, they have denied our help, even in areas of demonstrated incompetence where community input would have solved problems quickly and economically.

[38] For instead of obeying the law and responding to crisis, the Mayor and council are writing seditious policies that undermine our national capacity to feed ourselves, creating a weak core economy of essential human needs with significant vulnerabilities that work directly against national security. Furthermore the Mayor and council have written land use plans that already create hardship and will predictably lead to the deaths of this generation of Peterborough kids by permanently destroying land most critical to their survival. Sedition by rejection of the law and each Section of our Constitution Act is one thing, but acting on plans to kill the children of the king is treason.

[39] We understand the claim by the Mayor and council that public land is not for public benefit as being a purposeful deception of fraud perpetrated for two simple purposes. One, to benefit grocery store owners and others aiming for complete control of food. Two, to starve people out and force them into government programs claiming to help solve the problem another part of government created. Neither are legitimate purposes of government, but this is what the Mayor and council chose to do. No one forced the directors of PCH to break the law and act against the legitimate purposes of government by disrupting, destabilizing and crippling our core economy of essential human needs, weakening our national capacity to feed ourselves and respond to the world food crisis caused only in part by climate change.

[40] Acting against the directives of the Canadian Supreme Court, this Mayor and council have created systematic policies of institutional abuse that are a profound interference in our lives as the primary cause of our food, work and housing crisis. No other group in society has the position or authority to have created these policies; the Mayor and council did. No one forced them to break the law and

engage in activities that are not legitimate activities of government; they chose to do this of their own volition. No one directed them to create fraudulent press releases purposed to present a good image in direct contrast to the actual written and working policies. No one directed them to create anti-social anti-competition policies and practices that have completely crippled our self-sustaining capabilities of local domestic production. Most of what we buy is not that hard to make, but the Mayor and council have worked hard to ensure those with little have no place to make or sell things. Those wanting to work are economically blocked by those with money who do not want to work and instead seek to gain income without labour by harnessing the lives and labour of others.

[41] Our lives are gutted, our downtown is a disaster zone. Millions are pouring in a Department of Economic Development with no obvious results, but we do major ongoing policies of aimed at isolating people and breaking up all forms of communication and social connectivity. The directors of PCH have written a plan for our lives that not only aims to perpetuate this destruction but accelerate it to kill our children. They further aim to destroy the capacity of the land to support life, and ultimate act of genocide that will provably decimate this generation of Canadian kids. These are not legitimate purposes of government; this is government against people. But it's not the workers at PCH that created this toxic work environment, for they do not have powers of authority over others. It is the directors that did this, forming a gang that subverted our democratic government from within to form a cruel authoritarian state intent on crushing our lives for money. No caring parent would ever do this to their children; we would act on our most urgent issues to secure their essential needs in perpetuity.

[42] We understand the recognition of certain rights and freedoms as speaking of our values and intentions toward participatory democracy in which our leaders are elected to represent us and defend our lives according to the principles and practices of our Constitution Act. By declaring religious freedom, for example, we allow a diversity of peacefully coexisting religions and further prevent religious wars based on the desire of some to force their religious views on others. By choosing to confederate peacefully over time, we prevented a bloody civil war.

[43] In 1982, we won freedom under the law, allowing personal, social and national self-determination, as long as our free actions taken to build our lives were reasonably restricted under the Constitution so as to not violate the rights of others to the same freedoms and rights to life. Specifically, we gained access to law that was open to all and understandable, not hidden behind the scenes with unclear rules as to its purpose, intent and effect. For law that is too complex to be understood cannot be followed and its application is arbitrary.

[44] In this, we understand that certain persons aiming to enrich themselves by claiming certain rights denied to others do so because they have little interest in equality under the law, with even less interest in mutual benefit of the law. In that, we can distinguish clearly the role, function and purpose of government *versus* businesses not aimed at social benefit. And we understand that such persons, particularly those with personality types interested in getting around the law and violating the rights of others, have great interest in anti-democratic activities and may collude with others to subvert the law and replace the principles and practices of our Constitution with their own interests and intents, thus performing acts of sedition and treason. Here, we are most alarmed by the actions of a small group aiming to replace our local Canadian government with the full working mechanisms of an authoritarian state.

[45] The primary problem at PCH is the refusal to represent citizens. The Mayor and council do not

view themselves as paid employees with citizens as their employers. In the primary act of sedition, they reject decent human relations based on equality and respect with both parties acting reasonably under the law, and imagine themselves to be rulers over us. In this action, both the law and our fundamental rights to self-determination on the most critical matters of our lives are rejected. The result is rejection of law and our democratic freedoms, expressed as actions taken to undermine our local democratic government and replace it with the full working mechanisms of an authoritarian state. This is sedition.

[46] We submit as evidence the budget and operations of PCH, which are entirely dedicated to the removal of essential freedoms critical to life for the purpose of representing business interests alone. We see strong monetary motives for this collusion that directly tie to significant abuses of our lives and freedoms to the extent of removing all self-determination and creating a direct threat to the the lives of our children. We understand this as a hate crime focused directly on our children with particular rejection of Canada's number one law, our right to reason and to reasonable behaviours, and the definition of democratic engagement. Instead we say that at PCH, the democratic process has been subverted to the extent that individuals are denied respect and dignity and participation in the democratic process is meaningless.

[47] We further submit the plans of PCH as evidence of the intent of the directors of PCH to remove community and individual self-determination to an extent that has destroyed our economy and removed the rights to life of this generation of Peterboroughyouth. We take the contrast of these plans with Section 1 Charter requirements as powerful evidence of a significant state of mental illness and criminal intent within the leadership team at PCH. We understand that a small gang of anti-democracy activists has formed within PCH with the intent of subverting democracy and rejecting our legal system. The direct tie to Charter law and human rights violations by rejecting our Constitution and taking actions directly threatening the lives of the children of the king are acts of treason.

[48] Neither the king father nor we as caring parents would ever support such sick actions against our most vulnerable citizens, actions that violate our lives, our laws and our future as a country. We understand that the significant action of hate is their refusal to discuss what is most important to our lives: the survival of our children. We have from the common sense, from World Scientists' Warning to Humanity, from Generation Restoration and many documents including various Intergovernmental Panels on Climate Change a fairly short list of community-based actions that could be completed in a relatively short time span to save our kids. But the Mayor and council reject all this outright, except on paper to look good, refusing to act and actively preventing us from acting to save our children.

[49] This is treasonous force, when we have within our community the full knowledge and complete capacity for creative problem solving, with many solutions ready and at hand to save our lives and secure our economy in perpetuity. We say, in agreement with the Supreme Court of Canada and following its processes, it is our Right and Freedom to act in urgency on these most important matters critical to our lives and future. We say that even if our rights to life were not recognized by government, they exist. This Mayor and council use such rights and freedoms as critical to the functioning of their lives, yet reject those same rights as available to us. They reject the directives of the Supreme Court and act illegally and corruptly in all manner of activities sin which they imagine some right to rule over us and actively drive our destruction. Have we revolted against the law and rejected democracy? No. They have.

[50] We therefore have taken great pains to describe the web of crime created and supported by this

Mayor and council in the commission of these acts. The critical claim by this Mayor and council is that they have the right to rule over every aspect of our lives in fine detail and we have no say. Whereas we see little regard for law and no concern for the lives of citizens. This Mayor and council have refused to respond to the most urgent needs of citizens in distress and have further taken actions against our lives. Instead of sanely, rationally and reasonably representing residents fighting for their lives in all areas of essential human needs, this Mayor and council have replaced our democracy of elected representatives with an investment company with financial directors actively against any form of individual or community benefit by democratic self-determination.

4.2 REMOVAL OF REASONABLE RECOURSE, RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

[1] The Mayor and council have put in place many policies and procedures to block fundamental justice and deny communication. At City Hall, if you raise the issue of parking meters or tickets, they make the issue seem so obvious and trivial as to be laughable. They simply will not take you seriously, as if the need for meters and ticket is obvious. If you want to know why, what is the basis, no one has an answer, or they make up an excuse on the spot, or they refer you to bylaws or documents that also do not answer what you need to know. But the main problem is a refusal to answer. You can raise your point, and they might nod in silence, but nothing is done.

[2] When City Hall does not obey the law, as is the case with parking policy and ticketing, and a constant stream of citizens continually prove the law is wrong and unjustly applied, this clogs the courts at tremendous cost. But the unjust law is never changed, because the Mayor and council have taken many actions to deny reasonable recourse.

[3] There is a system in place to turn aside each and every individual at every point of inquiry. There is a system in place to remove all possible communications or means to raise this issue, or any other, in public debate. If you appeal a parking ticket, City Hall decides that too. Many win their case, proving the bylaw is both wrong and wrongfully applied, but we can never address the basis of the bylaw. Discussion is not allowed and there is no independent assessment. In appeal, they simply cite an excuse, do whatever is most expedient to get rid of you, and repeat the rules they wrote with no legal basis in fact, evidence, logic or reason. This small group, based on nothing but their own whim, force and will, have also created their own legal system of judge and jury, but a strange one in which the laws of Canada do not apply. This is arbitrary application of law, but for economic mining, not justice.

[4] When local government is not a source of fundamental justice, and there are no principles of justice, at what level of government can we expect to receive fundamental justice? The claim is that if you want true justice, you should hire a lawyer and file charges, or gather people for a public class-action suit. Who has the time and money for that? If you devote your life to putting out one injustice, that may take ten years and in that time ten other injustices will have appeared. Another strategy and claim for injustice will be quickly invented, and again decades will be needed to undo crime quickly committed. And they always say, that if you do not like it, you can vote in an election for new leaders, but how will that change a deeply embedded corrupt set of bylaws? When we already have laws, why must we go to court to have existing rulings upheld? We have won our freedoms, must we win them again?

[5] No. We will not do that. Having a right and freedom means not having to ask for permission. These bylaws are public. They are in the public domain. And we have the right to access them and change

them directly using the legal processes defined within the Charter, for we have won the right to personal, social and nation self-determination. We are self-directed, under the law, when we have fact, evidence and reason and follow the principles and practices of the Canadian Constitution Act. But since these are pre-existing laws, which must now be considered as unconstitutional and of no force or effect, we are still obliged to make our case.

[6] The Mayor and council are, after all, ordinary elected citizens with no particular qualifications, and by *Section 15* we are just as capable and qualified to make decisions impacting our lives, moreso because we are 84 000 strong and within our Peterborough population have an immense body of knowledge and expertise fully capable of the task of self-directed self-determination by fair and legal due process. *This is our Constitutional right of community engagement, for under the Constitution Act (1982) and as evidenced by the Charter role of universal laws above the whim and will of politicians, defended via the Office of the Governor General as representative of the king in Constitutional defence of the Canadian people, these local lands and bylaws are in the public domain, paid for and owned by us.* We do not recognize these parking policies as valid, for any valid government must be directed by the will of its citizens using our best principles, practices and ideas critical to our lives as reasonably limited by the practical needs for a healthy life and survivable future.

[7] Specifically, this means that Canadian citizens, as of 1982, have the direct right to act, fairly, peacefully, sensibly and reasonably, based on fact, proof and evidence, to do the work needed to secure their lives and as legal guardians defend the lives and future of their children. But to do so, they must have a clear cause and case, and not over-extend their activities to negatively affect others. There is a legal requirement of care, though not explicitly stated in the Constitution Act but clear in many Supreme Court rulings, to act with deep concern for mutual societal benefit. In fact most Canadians do this naturally and daily, when working, shopping, driving or in any other activity. Why the Mayor and council do not act in this healthy manner toward citizens is a source of major concern and frustration.

[8] We see that their bylaws do not meet the basic requirements of fact, evidence and reason to be called laws. We instead see means, motive and opportunity with clearly stated intent to break the law. Numerous Charter laws are broken, not the least of which is our right to self-directed self-determination of our lives and country which we won in 1982. Within that are many anti-tyranny laws specifically designed as recourse for citizens from all those who aim to replace our caring Canadian democracy with systematic authoritarian rule. We won the right to decide the public use of public land for mutual benefit and to meet essential human needs while maintaining a healthy social structure and culture needed for our lives and businesses to thrive. A downtown is not a private place. Public land is paid for and owned by the public; we have the receipts for payments. Did the Mayor and council buy it for their own benefit? No. They're just temporary stewards, not lords and rulers! It is the job of government to represent people, and they are elected, hired and paid to do that. We never agreed to anything but democracy, and multiple sections of Charter law require communication rights, discussion and conversation, for all law must be debatable. The Mayor and council utterly reject this essential public equality of those impacted by the law.

[9] The law is clear that in assessing the effect and application of law, that all factors must be considered in balance. Like a tree, we are to consider all the branches and assess the health of the whole living thing. A downtown is exactly such a living thing, as are our lives, and its well-being and ours depends on a number of factors that define its social health. The major factors are quickly found. Some additional principles and points of view arise after a time of study and consideration. And all

these are brought together here in a multivariate analysis from multiple perspectives as required by the living tree doctrine of Canadian Charter law. We will not allow this Mayor and council to destroy our caring Canadian culture with their policies of hate, greed and destruction.

[10] We understand the healthy social interactions of fair trade by imagining the freedoms and access to tools and natural community of land and water as critical resources needed to create a pioneer village. So we include as a natural point of reference the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as things we really must not do lest we tear apart society and create hateful antisocial conditions of war. We also understand the state of the world and its implications to the survival of this generation, along with the struggles to make a living much less gain basic life security of essential human needs. But this Mayor and council even denies us the right to shelter as they rush to turn government into an unlimited for-profit enterprise devoid of mutual benefit for citizens! So there is a lot at stake here, and evidence-based decision making is of critical importance.

[11] When the Mayor and council remove our rights to shop without interference (free trade), against our will and against Supreme Court rulings, *Section 1* states that there must be very good reason. What is the reason? Why do we have a shopping tax? Why are we paying a fee for services we already paid taxes for? Is this a government business? If it is, then to pay is optional for all businesses are subject to open market competition. Can we replace parking meters with our own better system? *If this is government, so that bylaws aiming to take money from us without our consent remove our Section 4 Rights to Freedom of Association, then why do we also lack democratic say based on the principles of law?* If we look at the interest parties, basically stores and shoppers, we see that the role of local government is not to reject the involvement of those impacted but to write laws based on what is just and fair. Why does PCH reject these principles of life and law, rejecting the legal system and removing all possible means of reasonable recourse?

[12] When the Mayor rejects rule of law, and we lack law enforcement, must we protest in the streets to be heard? Why this war against us? We cite in this context the UDHR preamble “*Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law.*” Here we cite the closely related expression in our Canadian Charter, *Section 12*, that “*Everyone has the right not to be subjected to any cruel and unusual treatment or punishment*” specifically because we now know that oppression and two world wars were caused by a specific personality type seeking complete authoritarian rule over the lives of others to sociopathic extent. *Section 12* specifically refers to the type of person that seeks to perform such acts progressively and without limits, clearly described in the DSM-V and also in documents as old as the Magna Carter which brought into action equality under the law. The directors of PCH specifically reject equality under the law, which is the indictable federal *Section 59(1-4) Offence of Sedition* because they have acted against public order and replaced the Canadian system of justice and government with their self-conceived system of tyrannical authoritarian rule in which edicts replace laws firmly grounded in physical reality, fact and evidence with consideration of impact(s) on others.

4.3 BURDEN OF PROOF, REFUSAL TO WORK, REFUSAL TO REPRESENT

[1] Canadian law is clear. The burden of proof is on those who remove rights and freedoms. That's *Section 1* of the law, and it requires an explanation from City Hall for any and all actions taken, for our

Canadian Charter is the sole basis of all decision making. This is not optional, for our lives are impacted and the law is based on consideration of impact on others. It is also fully based on the protection of our lives and families and all that we need to live, made explicit in *Section 7, the right to life, liberty and security of the person*, which is also a fundamental world right in Article 1 of the UDHR using the same wording, the universal *right to life, liberty and security of the person*. *Charter Section 52 is also clear with respect to our free recourse, that any lower law that does not meet the basic standards to be called law must be considered invalid, of no force or effect*. Laws are based on fact, evidence and reason, and also examined using means, motives and opportunity, with an essential tool being evidence linked by money trails.

[2] We have in the structure of the Canadian government, an obligation by all workers in government to obey the law and directly defend people by using the principles and practices made clear and understandable in our Charter. This is not rocket science. This deals with simple questions of reason and fairness, applied to simple matters of food, work and shelter with a sensibility tied to essential human needs and the practical work needed to meet those needs. People pay taxes for services provided. No service, no pay, that's the contract.

[3] All persons paid by tax dollars are required to fulfill their duties of maintaining a healthy society, not just within their narrow roles but across all of society. Each Ministry is assigned duties that correspond to the realities of essential human needs and our "pioneer village" rights to healthy free trade and essential services to meet those needs. As caring parents, we understand those needs as our household budget and as care for children and seniors. This is the practical social context which must form the basis of all decision making, which is clearly based on the provisions of Nature as the sole basis of our economy. Again this is not rocket science, and though there a number of factors, we assess them all over time sufficiently to make out lives work. If not, we die. Our reasonable *Section 7* rights to life include bees and insects, for without them agriculture fails and we fail. The number of principles is small and finite, and easily grasped by most after a grade school level of education. And yet the Mayor has devoted himself by corrupt land use policies including use of land for parking to destruction of our lives by destruction of the ecosystems our lives depend on as the sole basis of our economy. Therefore, in addition to contempt for us and the law, we consider below this matter of Extreme Bias Extending to Malice as an all-out attack on our lives by the directors of PCH, possibly including certain staff members working as managers in the Department of Economic Development who insist on representing corporations not citizens.

[4] Real work done would have generated a valid policy. Details would include the amount of work done, the setup and running expenses. How much money is taken in, and the full and real cost of the parking program as it is borne throughout the various aspects and operations of City Hall. There would be further considerations of impacts on citizens and society. Having no policy to address valid concerns of justice makes a hellish job for front-line clerks who by all indications are being used as human shields due to the cowardice of the Mayor and council who refuse to answer questions to justify their actions. Bullies are cowards. They send out thugs to do their dirty work. Is there a single person on council with the moral courage to do the right thing? We see no evidence of this, and much evidence of submission to bullies who break the law and will say and do anything to get money.

[5] We have paid for work done. The work was not done. We have a contract for local representation on local issues. That contract has been fully rejected, and steps have been taken to prevent us from having any say whatsoever on matters that directly impact our lives. So why should we pay?

4.4 TREASON: PLANS TO KILL THE CHILDREN OF THE KING

[1] The Mayor and council of the City of Peterborough have written plans that will directly lead to the extreme hardship and death of our children, these being already in play. Aiming to destabilize the basis of life and the economy and deprive people of essential human needs critical to life. Aiming to stop people from growing food and responding to crisis, preventing people from building shelter and homes of their own choice, removing work that belongs to the community, and vastly interfering in the free market that would otherwise allow people to make and sell things and become self-sufficient. Working on behalf of bankers and in criminal corporate collusion against people and the Canadian government, they have crippled the local economy and crushed the lives of citizens. Aiming to control every essential human by controlling land, water and housing, our currency, work and wages, they are the source and authors of significant social and human rights abuses characteristic of the worst authoritarian states. Writing plans against the purpose of government is sedition. Acting on those plans to kill the children of the King is treason. Going further by acting on plans to permanently destroy the basis of life is the ultimate treason, by forceful, planned, intentional genocide.

[2] These plans might have remained undiscovered had not the Mayor pushed so hard during our time of crisis to commit a broad spectrum of economic and social human rights abuses against us clearly aimed at deprivation of essential human needs, actively pushing people to their deaths. We now know with complete certainty that PCH is the primary source of our housing, work and food security crisis attacking our *Section 7* rights to life, liberty and security of the person having taken actions specifically aimed at removal of essential freedoms critical to our lives and work. They have undermined the economy in several areas critical to national security and stability, and in denying all possible recourse acting as the primary-source instigators (by attacking essential human needs) inciting crime related to survival, street protest and by extreme oppression ultimately inciting violence. PCH is the only group capable of having done this, and within it only the Mayor and council could have directed these actions against our lives and government.

[3] The Mayor and council accomplish this by criminal code violations of theft, fraud and extortion, removing critical freedoms essential to life and trade. By using land use plans with claims of State ownership so extreme as to create a work camp functionally identical to that used in North Korea. By acting on those plans to deny human rights to land, food and shelter for the purpose of freezing and starving us into compliance with their forced-labour plans. Whereas we know these to be hate crimes and acts against humanity, strongly against freedom and democracy, here we are concerned with the Criminal Code violations of treason, particularly *Sections 46(2a)* and *46(2c)*, the use of force or violence for the purpose of overthrowing and replacing our Constitutional form of democratic government, taking actions fundamentally prejudicial to the defence and safety of Canada, and colluding with others having similar interests in committing these acts.

[4] *Section 46(2)* of the Canadian Criminal Code defines high treason and treason. In *46(1)*, every one commits high treason who, in Canada, (a) kills or attempts to kill Her Majesty, or does her any bodily harm tending to death or destruction, maims or wounds her, or imprisons or restrains her; (b) levies war against Canada or does any act preparatory thereto; or (c) assists an enemy at war with Canada, or any armed forces against whom Canadian Forces are engaged in hostilities, whether or not a state of war exists between Canada and the country whose forces they are.

[5] In 46(2), every one commits treason who, in Canada, (a) uses force or violence for the purpose of overthrowing the government of Canada or a province; (b) without lawful authority, communicates or makes available to an agent of a state other than Canada, military or scientific information or any sketch, plan, model, article, note or document of a military or scientific character that he knows or ought to know may be used by that state for a purpose prejudicial to the safety or defence of Canada; (c) conspires with any person to commit high treason or to do anything mentioned in paragraph (a); (d) forms an intention to do anything that is high treason or that is mentioned in paragraph (a) and manifests that intention by an overt act; or (e) conspires with any person to do anything mentioned in paragraph (b) or forms an intention to do anything mentioned in paragraph (b) and manifests that intention by an overt act.

[6] We mention 46(1) to provide context, concerned that *Section 46(1)* has not been updated to reflect our current Constitution. The Governor General is now Head of State whose primary function is to defend the lives of Canadians using the principles, practices and procedures of our Constitution Act, our last line of defence and charged after each election giving public direction to politicians as to the work we require them to do. This being the Speech from the Throne. In this, the Governor General is a parental figure acting in defence of children legally empowered to prevent any actions against us. Acts to stop or inhibit this function are treason. Acts to destabilize this country aiming to kill our children at the public scale of genocide are high treason, as any caring parent is inextricably linked to the fate of their child by the critical features and functions of life itself. Acts to cripple the powers and functionality of the OSGG are inextricably equivalent to acts destabilizing the basis of our lives and the country. This impacts this case directly because this is the only institution of recourse primarily empowered to defend us against acts of poor government, and it has been crippled in its capacity to do so.

[8] The Mayor and council operate by fraud, theft, extortion and removal of essential human rights to life. They lay claim to rights and liberties they do not have, far beyond the extent of any legitimate purpose of government, working in close contractual collusion with others of the same intent. Their main mode of operation is the claim of complete State ownership of land and people, aiming to control all aspects of our lives by controlling land, water, work, food, shelter, trade and communication. Aiming to defeat by any means necessary all matters of free choice critical to the healthy functioning of our lives. Aiming to utterly destroy our democratic freedoms and replace those with the working mechanisms of an authoritarian state. Rejecting the law and pushing to create totalitarian state of dictators abusive of all human rights, including the right to life. In Peterborough, actively interfering with trade, creating poverty and denying rights to shelter, land and food. Completely gutting the basis of our economy by removing any capacity for local production and self-sustenance, destabilizing our lives by attacking and undermining the basis of national security.

[8] The extortive purpose of removal of choice and the erection of economic or legislative barriers is to herd and funnel people into the hands of corporate owners. We see this in PCH land uses intended for that purpose, and also in social services who directive is no longer social care by protection of essential human needs but to run the business plans of corporations seeking a steady supply of desperate workers willing to accept any terms and conditions. By denying shelter and access to land so the hungry can grow food, the Mayor and council intend to freeze and starve us into submission. In this manner, a handful of people impose their will across all of society.

[9] On these matters we found widespread public anger extending to outrage along with deep expressions of despair and loss of hope tied to urgent pleas for help, with workers inside government also pleading for help. We found it necessary to not name individuals in this case, knowing that certain members of council have protested, others were coerced or somehow convinced, and that one City Hall manager may also be the source of these actions against us. Nevertheless, we know without a doubt that the democratic process of decision-making based on care and concern, fact, evidence and reason has been subverted locally, with significant actions also taken against our system of fundamental justice. Here we are specifically concerned with acts of treason taken against us and the government.

[10] The main claim of the directors of PCH is that they have a right to a North Korean style of State ownership of land, specifically coupled to land use policies that remove rights and freedoms essential to our lives and the healthy functioning of society. The directors say that unless you have money and can pay, you have no right to exist. You will be denied any possibility of self-sustenance, denied the right to shelter as a right to life, and forcibly removed from the land. When key rights to self-sustenance have been denied, and these are critical rights to life, the effect is to deny fundamental rights to work in the core economy of essential human needs. The effect is removal of any firm basis in life security of essential human needs critical to gaining a foothold life or starting a business from scratch. The effect is forced labour using the means of freezing and starving us into compliance. Here we say their claim to ownership of the land is fraud an outright attack on the key components of home, our right to a place to exist. We say it is theft, taking that which does not belong to them. We say it is the most despicable act of extortion applied to essential human needs, removing critical freedoms and rights to life for the purpose of seizing on our lives for forced labour. The *Section 2* issue here is Freedom of Association from groups damaging our lives and driving our ruin, expressed as our right to asylum from economic persecution, which PCH removes by forcing us into association with these groups.

[11] We speak here of our children, who by definition start life with little, who simply by being born find themselves in a world not of their making, who simply by graduating find the odds stacked against them, who have little hope here in Peterborough of even beginning to gain a foothold in life by the work of their own hands, who are denied the chance to even start. Who are currently trapped, forced to pay an older generation for ruining their lives, and denied all recourse even though what needs to be done to save their lives is simple.

[12] Some say hate does not exist at this scale in Canada. That slavery does not exist at this scale in Canada. The use of force to harness the lives of others, to effect damage visible in struggle with basic human needs of work, food and shelter. Yet we find no provable basis in these claims that people are fundamentally different here in comparison to other countries. The vast majority are good. But we have a few scoundrels to deal with. Personalities whose primary purpose is to exert power over others by any means, making others pay and do all the hard work. Devoting their lives not to good relationships but to creating systems expressing their extractive monetary-mining interests regardless of damage to others. Activities that do not help us, do nothing for us, and in fact degrade our lives to the extent of making it miserable, without hope or prospect for a future. If anyone doubts this, read the pre-1982 Constitution Act, or look to the actions of this Peterborough Mayor and council.

[13] We further say that the use of the word Freedom in our Charter is a legal test consistent with *Article 4* of the UHDR, that *No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms*. Why then do we find ourselves trapped in inescapable permanent

life time debt for essential human needs including housing, with all other critical forms of shelter denied, in a condition of statistical indentured servitude, our land and money controlled by those seeking infinite income without labour? Why do this Mayor and council issue edicts without basis in law, write plans to control us, damaging our lives at the most fundamental levels, deny us any democratic say in the matter, and threaten us with all sorts of promises of force if we do not pay? The purpose of our lives is not servitude to their every whim and idea, done by proxy to their masters, and their role is to work on our behalf for our mutual benefit, not to remove essential freedoms critical to life. *We say we are not only free by law to not pay into systems designed to damage our lives but for the sake of our children obliged to not pay. It is this Mayor and council that have revolted, acting against us and the law, acting in treason to replace our democratic government with a cruel authoritarian state.*

[14] We say that Freedom with regards to essential human needs critical to life, liberty and security of the person, must always include access to work in our core economy of essential human needs with fundamental rights to trade being the basis of our mutual social security. Freedom means defining on your own terms what sort of shelter you desire, as a need, interest or challenge, and to not have a form of shelter forced on you, particularly not when the person imposing their idea or ideology also benefits. We further say that *security of the person* inherently expresses a personal right to take risk, but to not have unusual risks imposed on a person. We say the entire human venture is a risk, but one of creative problem solution and curiosity-based exploration. To not have risks imposed on us is to take well-known routes of safety, one of which is the inherent right to plant and eat food. To have this right removed from us is a direct threat to our lives. Whereas to focus on activities such as growing tomatoes is associated with much satisfaction and extraordinarily low crime rates. We say the consideration of risk is inherent to life and the main driving force behind decision making and the structure and function of law, to the extent of it being a Constitutional principle for consideration, with a good baseline in defining normal acceptable daily risks necessary to the functioning of our lives.

[15] We say we have inherent food, seed and soil rights that are constitutional to our person that define an integrated set of rights to life that are indistinguishable from our rights to environmental health. We submit into evidence a seed and a pot of moist soil, not conceived or made by us, consistent with our preamble Charter rights and as evidence of our rights to life under natural law. We also have much scientific evidence backing our claims to this specific chain of evidence for this profoundly constitutional basis of our lives. We call this the Tomato Test, for from these actions of care arise many of the fundamental principles of life and free democratic society, planting, harvesting, storage, sales, land care and so on critical to our lives. We know these activities are essential to global security. Here, we find work as the significant Charter basis for continuous life security, not merely currency as a convenient tool of trade which is subject to no end of manipulation as forms of theft. We understand productive work as that which builds life security, and unproductive work as that which degrades life security. We decry unproductive investments as degradations of life and liberty aimed entirely at income without labour, whereas real labour increases value. All of which the Mayor denies in policy, aiming to harness our labour to no good end and in direct threat to our lives, and aiming especially to destroy land most critical to our survival.

[16] We say that life security is based on work done to meet essential human needs by access to and use of the resources of nature. We say the basis of social security across the generations must be a permanently protected pool of work for youth in our core economy of essential human needs, focused on supporting families and seniors in care for the ecosystems that sustain our lives. We find this focus

on working with and understanding Nature to be a noble effort, and needed, with sufficient complexity as to be deeply satisfying to mind, body and spirit in the cause of personal and human development.

[17] We find no legal basis for the model of taxation invented by this Mayor and council based not on fact and reason but on the arbitrary valuation of land purposed to deny the inherent value of land and our lives. Whereas we require a *Sections 1, 7 and 15* legal basis for taxation that fully respects all our Constitutional rights with minimal impairment of our freedoms. According to the Mayor and council, as expressed in their land use plans, policies, bylaws, maps and written and verbal statements, the sole purpose of land and people is cash flow compliance with their plans. We question those plans as being collusive, self-serving and destructive to our lives and life itself. We find a strong basis in our Charter that this form of taxation is illegal, having no basis in life and law and being against the Constitutional purposes of our country. We further find strong evidence of collusion with groups also at cross purposes with our lives and country, a *CC Section 46(2c)* offence, taking acts against a healthy public order which are also known to be UDHR war crimes and thus in violation of the War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity Act along with the Competition Act and many other Acts, further being against many of our good Ministry Mandates.

[18] We say the purpose of these illegal taxation and land use models developed and used by the directors of PCH is to fracture society, expose our every human need to corporations who also seek to control the land, people and labour, remove essential human rights and freedoms critical to life, and commit treason by attacking and undermining the basis of personal and national social security.

[19] What these groups share in common is a strong interest in income without labour, degrading value while harnessing the lives and work of others to add value. By many deceptive means and force taking that which does not belong to them, seeking to control the lives and work of others by controlling labour and all essential human needs. Escalating prices without basis to such extent as to cause despair, then using the taken funds to effect buy-out. This being coupled to a willingness to go to totalitarian extremes with no limit of taking and no respect for the lives and rights of others. Committing human rights abuses to the extent of removing rights to life. People being pesky annoyances and the law being something to ignore or get around. And yet we are somehow valuable as sources of money and labour, such that some harnessing our lives rise far higher than they could have by the work of their own hands, while we struggle against all odds to afford food and shelter.

[20] The urgent and pressing concern here is the lack of Freedom of Association effected by removal of critical freedoms allowing us to build our lives up from scratch by the labour of our own hands. We reject such profound interference in our lives by the directors of PCH as being far beyond any legitimate role of government. And as evidence we submit their land use plans, specifically purposed to disrupt society, control essential human needs and remove freedoms critical to the healthy functioning of our lives. They also plan to destroy land critical to our survival in a despicable act aimed at genocide.

[21] We have no interest in removing the responsibilities and obligations required by these leadership roles in local government, but we do take pains to point out that these PCH plans, bylaws, maps, policies and various documents and media of communication are in the public domain wherein we also maintain significant Constitutional responsibilities as civic employers to ensure they are Charter-compliant and designed for public benefit as directed by the Supreme Court of Canada.

[22] Concerning housing, the sound Constitutional basis is considering Canada as the home of all Canadians. All species require a place to exist. Insects have a home in and on our Earth. Access to land, water and food is critical to survival. Animals must have a place to rest and sleep, for safety and privacy. We know the home to be a bulwark of protection which affords the individual a measure of privacy and peace against many forms of intrusion including those of the State which can be overwhelming when taxes and laws turn from protection to aggression. When those in government do well, while we can barely live. We are alarmed by the actions of this Mayor and council who by bylaws, intent and discriminatory land use plans are embedding systematic imbalances against those in need of the highest legal protections, the most economically vulnerable, and this generation of Peterborough youth who find no hope for a life here.

[23] At issue is the State actors state of mind, which is such that we have no confidence in PCH as a source of justice, from which systematic patterns of abuse are institutionalized and put into practice. Which are foundationally prejudicial to our lives and survival. Which have intruded into all matters of our lives to the extent of such disproportionate harm that we must consider their plans and laws against us to venture into *CC Section 319(1)* incitements of hatred, further venturing into violations of the Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act. Though we respond fiercely, we are not the cause and we are not the source. There is only one group in our area capable of having done this, and in that group only the directors are responsible. We protest only with firm basis in reason, for a clear cause, and for an urgent, pressing and substantial issue, acting in alarm as caring parents naturally protective of our children.

[24] Because of this, we say that many land uses must have beneficial human care protecting both our lives and the ecosystems on which our lives are based, and further that these are fundamentally Constitutional activities which can be directed by our top minds under Charter CSS direction, but beyond the reach of bankers and politicians or businesses seeking maximum profit by worst practices. For many of our best practices are subeconomic, but in sum these provide a substantial basis for life security. We fully reject the Mayor's policies of land use aimed at sterilization of land and Nature critical to our lives and survival.

[25] We have presented significant evidence that this Mayor and council must lack the required skills of cognitive development and moral reasoning required for any position of responsibility over others, for instead of acting in care they have directed us on a deadly course. They have rejected the law and revolted against our democratic form of government to the extent of threatening our lives. We as citizens have been reasonable and obey the law, but in obeying the Mayor find ourselves in conflict with our top laws and at odds with reason. We wonder why the behaviours and actions of this Mayor and council are so far removed from the behaviours and actions required by law as to constitute the effective formation of a criminal organization rejecting our government with numerous violations of criminal code coupled to significant disregard for the lives and rights of others. Being particularly callous with regards to the provably grim future faced by our children in an extinction event already wreaking havoc in our lives.

[26] We know this is not merely a matter of ignorance, or apathy, or a lack of reasonable and known solutions, or even negligence extending to criminal negligence (as we have informed the Mayor and council many times about our most urgent issues, to no effect) and into active intent to commit manslaughter, but into inciting violence and actively attacking the basis of national security and stability. Having already addressed their human rights abuses as acts of war and Charter violations,

their attendant criminal code violations, and various Constitutional matters of sedition, we are further alarmed by compelling evidence for acts of treason.

[27] At the root of the problem we sought amongst the dimensions of personality the reasons with such a strong contrast of behaviours of our local politicians compared to persons with minds of justice and care exhibiting significant competencies and skills of logic and moral reasoning, our Supreme Court justices. Noting in particular that we must obey the directions of our justices and refuse to obey the directives of our local politicians which are against the law.

[28] At issue here are fundamental matters of equality, respect and reason that constitute the basis of law and healthy human relations, these also being expressed clearly and concisely as the foundations of democracy. We understand these easily as good human relations between reasonable persons that are particularly important during discussion of matters of the work needed to meet essential human needs, or the abuses thereof.

[29] It is our opinion, based on the *Section 1* requirement of providing fact, evidence and reason as a firm basis for decision-making, which is the specific responsibility of government, not us, that we emphasize the biological basis of certain terms of virtue that might otherwise be regarded as standardless matters of moral refinement. The courts have already taken great pains to elucidate our values of honesty, the lack thereof being matters of theft, deception and fraud. And here we have taken pains to describe the biological basis of fairness as equitable access to the resources required for survival, further emphasizing by the five friends model of sharing pizza the basis of reasonable and caring inequity within limits.

[30] Specifically, honesty is one virtue that when emphasized calls into play numerous related virtues. At the root of language and moral reasoning is a set of related supporting words that provide meaning and context to our lives and actions. Conversely, the lack of honesty is described in many ways throughout the criminal code to provide the context of punishments for poor behaviour. Such poor behaviours are further described in the context of understanding and treating mental illness, in our understanding of decent human behaviours, in the manuals of psychiatrists and social workers, and in many human rights instruments. All of which are firmly based in our understanding of the physical world and our relation to it, which are now accepted as evidence admissible in a court of law.

[31] *Here, we affirm the Section 1 Charter basis of reason, being reasonable, and acting within fact- and evidence-based reasonable limits with regards to our limited human capacities and the limited resources of ecosystems to meet essential human needs.* The drive for reason is inherent to our biology, intimately linked to our cognitive and creative problem solving capacities. Curiosity-based learning arises early in childhood development at the stages of recognition of parents and objects when language is being developed as one of several means of sensing and communication. We learn and understand how the world operates by direct experience and by asking why. The literature on this, describing what we know as inherent and obvious caring human relations, is extensive and now includes roots in molecular recognition based on the physics of electromagnetic force, energy and distance. We cite this specifically as the primary source of fact and evidence admissible in a court of law and acceptable as the basis of reasonable decision making regarding our lives and the limited resources of Nature.

[32] Reason is so fundamental to our existence, that if anyone is asked why, they immediately respond, even to the extent of inventing a reasonable response without any basis in fact or reality. So we see

healthy communication as fundamental to the functioning of our lives and democracy, and the rejection of free and open communication as either hostile or suspicious. This is so deeply rooted in our biology, that we see any person refusing to respond to a reasonable question as having a deeply anti-social behaviour that directly ignites our friend-or-foe survival instincts.

[33] The refusal to respond to reasonable inquiry is a distinctly abnormal human behaviour of hostility, an act of fundamental disrespect intended to degrade integrity of the person. When the person obligated to provide a reason for their actions refuses to respond to a person directly impacted by their actions, this is a fundamental human rights offence and an abuse of greatest concern when the subject matter is that meeting essential human needs critical to life security. Our responses to such an overt act of intimidation is to keep away and seek other means of recourse, or to become curious and consider the motives behind such unusual anti-social behaviour. Why would someone refuse to answer simple questions concerning the basis of policy, particularly on essential matters critical to our lives? Why this act of hostile unfriendly aggression that declares the Mayor and council as a foe against the people? Here, the denial of fundamental justice at the grass-roots level is a declared intent of refusal of democratic engagement, a denial of the basis of law by violation of basic human rights that is also an act of sedition.

[34] One concern expressed here is that the fundamental human rights, freedoms and responsibilities, when considered on a biological basis of scientific proof and evidence, are far broader and more inclusive than the set of fundamental freedoms defined in our Constitution Act by politicians lacking the expertise to make such decisions. We have parts of our Constitution that are unconstitutional, having no firm Section 1 basis in fact, evidence and reason. The pressing and urgent concern here, however, concerning our most urgent matters of meeting essential human needs in crisis, is the active denial of the directors of PCH of their primary roles of representation with responsibilities for social well-being under the clear and concise directives of the Canadian Constitution Act, which they dismiss and disregard entirely as the basis of justice and decision-making.

[35] We cite here many violations of our lives and Constitution with the refusal to represent and deal with matters of fundamental justice being sedition and the threats to the lives of the children of the king being treason. In a constitutional monarchy, the king is a representational father figure and also a real person, and all matters of the Constitution being above the baseless whim and will of politicians elected with no particular skills of qualifications. We are all equal under the law as long as we follow these directives, and here we take to task those who think themselves to be rulers over us and not paid employees contracted to provide social services following the directives of our legal contract, the Constitution Act. Instead of obeying the law, a small group of anti-democracy activists have seized control of City Hall to replace it with the full working mechanisms of an authoritarian state in which they claim to have full power to control and direct the lives of 84 000 residents in fine detail, making us pay without say even when their actions break the law! That puts us in conflict with the law, and we are obliged to obey the directives of our Supreme court and not pay for acts committed against us, especially in the areas of essential human needs where government must not interfere.

[36] We agree with our top judges that the purpose of affording constitutional protection against the deprivation of critical liberties is to safeguard our entitlement to make decisions of fundamental importance free from state interference. Nothing is more important to us than the components of life security, our universal and *Section 7* rights, including at the very least housing and the work we do to attain basic food security. And yet we find PCH to be the primary regional cause of our food, shelter

and work crisis, constantly interfering in the most fundamental aspects of our lives on behalf of banks and big business in organized collusive actions driving our destruction. This is not democracy. This is rejection of democracy, sedition. It is not we citizens that have revolted, it is a small group at City Hall, the Mayor and most of council. We would never commit these acts against our children.

[37] We understand the primary purpose and legitimate activity of government to defend and represent us by agreeably and economically addressing issues of common concern and mutual benefit. We understand these as services we pay for. And we applaud the honest workers of City Hall providing these services at times under difficult circumstances. And we are pleased to see our values and ethics and beliefs in hard work and justice alive and well within our Supreme Court of Canada.

[38] We also understand the clear and distinct role played by business in the making and selling of goods, with open free trade being critical to our lives and paying for the services of government. Specifically, we understand that by paying taxes for services of mutual value to our lives we greatly reduce our personal expenses by removal of *Freedom of Association*. The removal of choice, by considered agreement. Which is vastly distinct from an open market business, in which we have choice. But this Mayor and council do not understand this distinct difference between the role and purpose of government and that of business. And have turned City Hall into an unlimited for-profit business, but a strange one which removes choice and Freedom of Association and replaces these with brute force mechanisms aimed at complete control of every essential human need with full exposure to an escalating open market run by persons with no concern at all for impact on others. It is most clearly not the role of government to hand us over to the most unscrupulous actors in society.

[39] We refer here to a web of crime because we can quickly identify by following money trails a handful of people in government and business aiming to control everything for their benefit. Who are actively driving the destruction of our lives and land, and who will stop at nothing to get what they want. We can name these people in Peterborough. They view the law as something to get around, and they loathe and detest community involvement and the foundations of democracy with its emphasis on freedom and fact-based decision making. This is a small group of anti-democracy activists working hard in banking, business and government to subvert the law and undermine democracy and any prospect of our mutual success or sane self-determination.

[40] We also refer to a web of crime because a principle such as honesty calls into play an entire active ecosystem of related supporting principles. These act as positive feedback loops strengthening good acts to build caring community. Whereas deceptive dishonest acts create multiple damaging negative impacts resulting in multiple laws being broken and infringed simultaneously along with multiple Charter law and human rights abuses. We further see a biological basis in thought systems and a structure of the brain consisting of stored ideas with a network of connectivity. We are most alarmed by thought systems distinctly disconnected from a firm basis in reality and quite unconcerned with basis-of-law considerations of impact on others.

[41] In particular, we see within City Hall certain directors acting with no intent of mutual benefit, which is explicitly against any legitimate purpose of government. We call this a fundamental act of sedition, further grading into treason when the PCH plan for our lives do not include us and furthermore are the equivalent of death threats against our children. We see these as personality types particularly unsuited for positions requiring care for others, unable to overcome their self-serving bias and act sanely and reasonably as a caring parent. This is a personality type lacking basic competencies

that has specifically sought positions of power over others where they can avoid hard work and responsibility by pure political manipulation. This is neither representation nor defence of our lives, this is fraud.

[42] A key component of treason is incitement of violence. We find the original act of violence occurs within PCH, with the directors purposely going after essential human needs for profit and not to our benefit, purposely claiming powers for themselves while removing our essential rights and freedoms that effectively disempower us and make the attainment of basic life security essentially impossible to attain. They further remove all forms of possible recourse, deny and obfuscate all forms of justice. When many have had everything stripped away economically, with all possibilities of basis sustenance unreasonably denied, we have serious *Section 15* concerns as we see such tremendous displays of wealth and power at PCH. We wonder how the tax base can be maintained when citizens with little have been denied through unfair and discriminatory zoning any place to make and sell things. When those starting life from scratch with nothing, simply by virtue of graduating cannot even begin to gain a basic foothold in life and cannot possibly work hard enough to escape the expenses imposed on them by those who already have everything. Who are not free to do the work needed to save themselves, but are trapped in the systems created by an older generation causing unlimited destruction of farms, forests, fisheries and even our atmosphere.

[43] How does this work in PCH? By policies designed to create impoverishment. Removing from us any possibility of basic social security by direct work in our core economy of essential human needs. By removing say and recourse. By imposing on us their ideas and ideologies of how they think we should live. By removing benefit and undermining anything to do with social integrity and care. By land use plans giving us no place to go, no opportunity to start anything, no say in our community, attacking the very notion of democratic self-determination. Committing outrageous acts of denying shelter and places to grow food. Putting up signs and writing bylaws to that effect as fundamental acts against humanity highly ranked as despicable acts of human rights violations, followed by actions of forced removal that can only be considered as intent to commit manslaughter.

[44] We know that if you take any person, or any animal, and deprive them of the necessities of life, remove all recourse to as to back them into a corner, and then continually prod and cajole in all areas of life, that the result is a defensive act of a fight for survival that to an outsider may appear aggressive and violent. Here, in Peterborough, we point not to those whose rights and lives have been violated to the extent that life has become impossible, but to the original source of aggression and incitement at City Hall working against our rights, our lives, our laws and our government. *Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights, and lack of respect for the inherent dignity of the person, has resulted in these atrocious acts against life, liberty and security of the person. Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by rule of law.*

[45] And yet by virtue of a profound respect for our soldiers who fought and died defending our families and freedoms. and by immense respect for our Canadian history in which we deliberately chose pen over sword. And in again choosing peaceful discourse over protest, we have undertaken this immense work of not only pointing out what is wrong but by having at hand many solutions that if acted on now can prevent disaster, put us on a safe course and protect the lives of our children.

4.5 PETERBOROUGH CITY HALL BYLAWS ALLOWING STATE OPPRESSION

[1] The specific concern with the directors of PCH is that they have violated *Sections 46(2a) and 46(2c)*, the use of force and violence for the purpose of overthrowing and replacing our Constitutional form of democratic government, taking actions fundamentally prejudicial to the defence and safety of Canada, and colluding with others having similar interests in committing these acts. They have produced plans they acted on with force against our foundational capacity to sustain ourselves, manufacturing and selling things at the personal basis of the economy to the extent of gutting the *Section 7* rights of many individuals, creating widespread worry and discontent about the foundations of life security, and in doing so have taken fundamental actions against national security. We now have an entire generation experiencing extreme prejudice against their capacity to gain a foothold in life or use their talents to address significant problems that must be overcome if they are to have a viable future. The Mayor and council have now launched campaigns of violence against many people they deem undesirable, creating deplorable conditions of mass suffering which they propagate and refuse to alleviate, but if these people have committed a crime, ought they not be in prison where they receive vastly greater treatment with respect to essential human needs? These are the hallmarks of a corrupt oppressive state wherein authoritarian rule has replaced democratic government.

[2] We submit their unconstitutional bylaws as evidence of vast *overbreadth* and *overreach* extending into tyranny (*cf.* also *Charter Section 31*). *Section 1* of the Canadian Constitution Act (1982) defines what democracy is to distinguish it sharply from its opposite, an authoritarian state in which citizens have no say about anything concerning their lives and future, extending past even benevolent slavery. The distinguishing feature is being given a reason the State has interfered with the Constitutional activities of their daily lives, as opposed to being forced to follow baseless edicts issued on the whim and bias of an official. There must also be a basis in the foundational principles of justice, which under law requires a basis of consideration in the understanding of facts and evidence, meaning a firm grip in the physical reality of our lives coupled to a sworn oath and duty of office to tell the truth. Here we are concerned with reason and reasonable limits. Each law (or bylaw) aims to solve a problem. There must be a reason for it. An effect is intended. Did the law do what it was intended to do, and what were the unintended side effects? Simply stated, the average person can describe what they are doing and why. Authoritarian types say do it because I tell you to, and they refuse to provide reason. On the receiving end, how can we obey a law we cannot understand, if we do not know its intent and reason, or its basis? The PCH bylaws consist only of baseless orders, and we are left to guess as to their reason.

[3] Herein lies the problem. The average person assumes a good reason, and they instantly invent one. Or on asking the reason, the person they asked simply invents a reason. This occurs at a low level of resolution, such that normal people find it normal if it is presented in that way. For example, when we look at a chair we do not look far beyond its evident function as that consumes significant mental resources. At higher resolution, we find what we like best about chairs, and at the highest resolution we make a chair and in doing so find a great wealth of features with a great depth of knowledge. The problem is how to make a chair, and the solution requires significant grasp of the details. Which takes work. When a bylaw is written without the founding work having been done, it seems reasonable on the surface but without reasonable limits it can be abused in many ways. In parking policy, for example, we must guess as to the exact nature of the problem, limit how the solution can be abused, and then under *Section 1* Charter law go one step further to effect democracy and avoid tyranny. We must address the problem of what happens when an authoritarian type or worse, a psychopath gets their hands on this law or bylaw and uses it in the worst ways against people and then lies about their intent,

further pushing the law to its totalitarian extent to the effect of much damage at large scale. This is the problem of reasonable limits, these being absent in all PCH bylaws for the purpose of wielding unlimited State power, which is the intent of its authors and also the effect on citizens and all of society.

[4] In the context of treason as the use of force against citizens to the effect of oppression causing threat to their *Section 7* rights, done by rejection of the *Section 1* duties of local lawmakers intent on creating an authoritarian state, parking bylaws are land use bylaws that have been used without limit to systematically make sure that even weary travellers have no place to go to rest or catch some sleep for safety. Public areas of rest, respite and refuge have been actively removed, as has almost everything to do with free public use of public land that we own for our benefit. This has been coupled in Peterborough with the active removal of all land that people have the right to be on, not only just to enjoy as they see fit within the reasonable limits of health and healthy relationships, but in active concerted long-term efforts to ensure that no one escapes their systems and in particular their bank-run housing system from which they receive great benefit to the point of being factually considered as not government by a private unlimited profit business. The effect of this being totalitarian, with systems put in place to continually hunt down people and move them along, giving them no other place to go, all those places having been actively removed. This purpose is far removed from any possible initial reason for parking bylaws, and it is what is going on, but the average person glancing at a bylaw could not guess this intent or effect at a superficial level of analysis, and neither could they guess it was written by a person of shallow affect. Further, when the bylaw is used against them, even though they sense something is wrong, in assuming that the person who wrote the bylaw is good, the conclusion is that something else must have gone very wrong to have the law used against them in such a manner.

[5] In the mind of someone in the narcissist-sociopath-psychopath spectrum, the problem is defined very differently. Some view people as the problem, people as the threat that must be controlled. To them, the problems are how do I control people, how do I stop the problem of free parking, how do I direct benefit to myself, and how do I get rid of undesirable people or anyone that stands in my way. Only my ideas matter, I have the right to rule, and no I do not need to explain myself. There is neither reason nor reasonable limits, and they will go to any extent to impose ideas far beyond the intent and purpose of the law, far beyond any legitimate purpose of government, and well into human rights abuses and criminal code violations. And yet they, and the bylaws, look quite reasonable on the surface, and they smile and claim nothing is wrong. Someone else must have done this. Here, we say the directors of PCH have done this. They are the only ones responsible, and no one else could have done this. We further know they would not state their real intentions and actual motivations, yet we can discern these from the effects on us and the actual actions they have taken, bearing witness and testimony as to what they have done.

[6] What is clear in the bylaws, budget and activities of City Hall is that there is a complete absence of recognition of the very real problems in our lives and no plan to solve them, let us solve them. What they speak of is simply management of pre-existing system invented for the purposes of oppression, harnessing labour and wealth extraction invented hundreds of years ago and imported here unchanged to the same effect. The activities and bylaws of PCH are fully Charter non-compliant, to the effect of great damage and threat to our lives and future. The Mayor and council are actively engaged in the worst economic, social and ecologic practices well proven to drive people and entire countries to ruin. This is the plan they have for our children, which has already devastated their lives and given them no hope for a future. Yet the directors of City Hall steadfastly refuse all our sane caring parental efforts to set us on a safe course wherein our *Section 7* rights to life, liberty and security of the person can be

realized, even when we present plans meeting all Constitutional requirements of equality under the law and are further Charter activities critical to our lives that PCH must not interfere in without having a strong and compelling reason and case for having done so; the burden of proof being on them, we experience vast interference to the point of PCH being a major threat to our lives, we have yet to hear their reason or present their case. In their attacks on the most vulnerable citizens whose crime was not having enough money to pay for those that do not want to work toward the protection of our *Section 7* rights, and in fact work against them, these are the highest charges of Treason.

[7] When the Mayor and council are already acting toward genocide of an identifiable group, denying the essentials of life and preventing self-determination of those in dire circumstances to attain those essentials, we know this as the plan they have prepared for us. If they had a better plan, surely it would be present and active within City Hall, yet we see it is not. We can only conclude, when these bylaws affect everyone, that they apply to everyone as the active plan these directors have for us. And now we know how far they are willing to go in their plans to stop us from growing food, building shelter of our own choice as needed, having a place to live, and engaging in the free and open market with fundamental rights to sell things we have made without interference on land we own. We now know their full intent is to not allow a single person even the tiniest home or cabin, lest they be free and not tied into labour to pay for the rich excesses of those who impose their extreme expenses on everyone else and work actively to grade the lives and life security of everyone they can connect themselves to. Further denying the very right to even start to gain a foothold in life, in any area of basic life security. All of which are particularly critical to our children, naturally starting life from scratch with little, and having no place to even begin, their core life security in all critical areas being attacked and gutted by this ruthless Mayor and council insisting on authoritarian rule in sociopathic disregard for the lives and rights of others to even exist. This is not freedom, this is not government, this is tyranny and overthrow of the government by a small number of bad actors aiming not only at sedition but treason in the commission of these heinous acts against our very survival.

PART 5 – CASE SUMMARY AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE

5.1 CASE SUMMARY CLOSING ARGUMENTS

[1] I am fighting for my life. In each critical area of life, from food to work to shelter, I find myself blocked and stymied, unable to improve my circumstances despite my best efforts. In this, I insist that the work I do is of greatest importance not only to myself but in considering major benefits to humanity. To do this work requires significant time in social circumstances allowing me to live lightly on the Earth. I like to work. I like to grow food, work in construction, make and build things, sell things, buy things, earn and spend smartly. I find such trade and the foundations of which it rests essential not just to my life but to all life. And yet in all these areas, I find the directors of Peterborough City Hall to be fully against me. On investigation I found numerous and vast areas of life in which they wrote and acted on policies against the very basis of my existence, actively creating conditions in which my odds of survival were exceedingly low. And yet I say I stand equal to them in rights, freedoms and dignity, just as authorized as they in making critical decisions of care essential to my life. They say I do not have such rights, and further say they have the right to hold the power of life and death over me. I disagree, and in fighting for survival and a future find myself having to appeal for justice to the courts, as my knowledge and understanding in this area is outside my main area of expertise. In writing out what I feel to be the basis for my case, I may be wrong. However, to be right

in all aspects of this case would require devotion of one's life to the task, whereas I am devoted to development of a new type of medical scanner and to the creation of jobs and programs aimed entirely at mitigating social, economic and ecological disaster, preventing mass unrest and crisis.

5.2 SOCIAL CONTEXT SUMMARY

[1] When mentally ill people with poor cognitive abilities enter politics with the self-serving intent to rule over the lives of others, in complete disregard for their duties of care and the well-established public decision-making processes required of them by our Constitution, our lives are quickly run to ruin. Decisions are made with no firm basis in law or the physical reality of our lives, and a fantasy bubble is created in which logic, discourse and concepts of care, meaning and purpose find no valid place. Decisions are made that are quite literally insane, and systems are emplaced to ensure the caring sane majority who instinctively obey Canada's top laws aimed at a caring inclusive culture have no say in anything that critically impacts their lives. The smart use of money is a budgeting skill few have, and the result is wild stupid spending on all manner of things having nothing to do with building *Section 7* life security for all. Sociopaths believe all persons must serve them, all must pay and obey without say. By force, we are driven to ruin. Sociopaths attack social security, aiming to structure all society for their benefit according to their ideas. Here, in Peterborough, the Mayor and council attack the core components of our lives, food, shelter and work, working against our common social objectives of personal and national security and focused on denial of essential needs and rights to life. Vastly interfering with trade, they created destructive land use control plans identical to those used in North Korea for purposes of social and economic oppression effectively directed toward genocide.

[2] Here in Peterborough we have a ridiculous situation. The directors of PCH work against us, damaging our lives and ruining our future, and yet claim we owe them. Whereas we have a sound basis of decision-making, this Mayor and council have none at all. Their ideas and plans have caused our food, housing and work crisis. Vastly interfering with our lives, causing major damage and destruction to our economy and ecology, they simply refuse to obey our Canadian Charter directives. They say we cannot make the changes critical to our lives and needed to save our kids. Now millions are pouring in to essentially useless government organizations, each gutted in a key capacity required to function. The direct result is that we go from one to another and find no solution to our most pressing problems. And we know exactly why, but according to the Mayor and council we are not allowed to address and solve even the most obvious problems using the principles and practices of our Canadian Constitution Act as directed by the Supreme Court. Whereas the SCC has ruled we must be free to make these critical decisions of major and serious impact on our lives, the Mayor and council entirely reject the SCC.

[3] The PCH official plan for our lives is no plan at all. It contains no substantial content. It is not based in fact, evidence or reality. It is so *vague* as to be meaningless. It is purely a political and managerial document made to look pretty and sound good, and it is entirely illegal as it does not recognize our most urgent and pressing issues and prevents us from acting to such extent as to make our participation in democracy meaningless. Yet we are forced to pay for this work done against us. As caring parents, knowing the problems our kids face, we would never have made a plan for their lives like this. The PCH Plan is no plan at all, and is illegal in completely and utterly rejecting our Constitution and all its principles of law based on reality aimed at our involvement and say in meaningful and significant authorized community self-determination. As their Plan lacks a substantial basis and lays out a groundwork for arbitrary action, we cannot regard it as a valid document. The Mayor and council want the right to rule without reason. We understand this as a personality type that wants to write rules for

other to obey but that does not want to be subject to such rules. The intent is to violate our Charter preamble defining rule of law, made clear in *Section 15* as equality under the law. In council meetings and in the press, the Mayor and council make clear their belief in being *above* citizens and *above* the law, continually rejecting all who oppose their rule. We understand this delusional behaviour as being diagnostic of ASPD, requiring assessment and court-ordered community treatment under the Ontario Mental Health Act.

[4] Whereas we have well-developed free and open source tools of social internet communications with well-developed structures for sane and rational caring community engagement and involvement on any issue of choice, large or small. But we have a stone-age Mayor and council interested only in top-down totalitarian rule aimed at complete control of every aspect of our lives. All of that is highly illegal, and considering the situation, an act of sedition and treason that has attacked and uprooted many *Sections* of our Charter, has caused much damage to our lives, and now directly threatens the lives of our children. The Mayor and council, in aiming to control food, shelter and work, claim rights they do not have, denying our essential rights and freedoms, by removing critical options of Freedom with the intent to create Slavery, have left no place in society for this generation and have further doomed them to destruction. By destructive practises and denial of known, safe and reasonable options to save this generation, the Mayor and council impose shockingly intolerable risks on us, whereas it is our *Section 7* right and freedom to mitigate such risks (Canada Attorney General v. Bedford, 2013 SCC 72).

[5] Here, by living tree doctrine we aimed for reasonable balance of factors, assessing the situation by multivariate analysis of intent and impact. Our City Hall is sick and we know why. Our core values of justice must prevail for the greater good of society. Their land use bylaws are purposely designed to rip apart society, vastly interfere with our lives and inflict maximal damage. They achieve no good societal purpose, are not necessary and aim to excessively control and drain our lives by forceful removal of essential rights and freedoms. *We see a sick and abusive culture at PCH creating bylaws and policies that are consistently in over-breadth, lacking any rational connection between the problem and reasonable solutions and exhibiting no care for the social and economic health of Peterborough residents.* We see policies that are clearly purposed for fraud with illegal collection of funds used to break additional laws. We submit these as evidence of the state of mind of the directors aiming to create a culture completely at odds with the Canadian culture of sane and rational care required by our Charter principles.

[6] We are most alarmed by the lack of procedural fairness at this local level, and highly discouraged by the lack of law enforcement for clear and evident crime at PCH. We as residents should not have to go to such lengths to achieve justice on issues that can be quickly resolved in little time using basic principles of law and grade-school skills of critical thinking, social care, math, logic and language skills, and we thus make our case for incompetency and unfitness for the role of certain directors of PCH. We can no longer tolerate the level of force, hate and crime coming from City Hall.

[7] A tiny minority of the population with characteristic traits of sociopathy and mental illness have significantly damaged our City Hall, falsely claiming that they and only they have the rights to shape our lives and determine our future. Such persons with criminal tendencies and mental disorders require treatment and are fundamentally unqualified to be in positions explicitly requiring responsible care and concern for impact on others. We cannot have City Hall itself adopt these poor characteristics, not when the legal and moral requirement is to have the specific behavioural characteristics, principles and practices described in our Constitution Act. Local bylaws must be compatible with our Constitution, for

when they are not, they put us in conflict with the law. Although it is the intent of this personality type to replace good democratic government with the working mechanisms of an authoritarian state, here we do not pursue these matters of sedition and treason but desire the active presence of fair and respectful due process within City Hall.

[8] I am pleased to say that local residents have an excellent understanding of life and law in Canada, and have justifiably resisted paying into corrupt systems designed against us. Peterborough residents understand that in the post-1982 structure of Canadian government, all public documents belong in the public domain and are open to debate and best-ideas amendment by all members of society whose legal responsibility it is to maintain the health of our democracy, our lives and our country.

[9] We have a contract for work done by City Hall on our behalf, with the terms and conditions being implicit in the practical nature of the work done at the local level and also laid out specifically in our union contract, the Canadian Charter. No work done, no pay. Work done against us causing damage, a balance owing. We pay for representation. No representation, no pay. Laws written against us, against the law and democracy, of no force or effect. Our obligations are to care and peacefully defend Canada, our lives and our children using free and justifiable, peaceful and safe citizen actions with profound regard for *Section 1* of our Constitution. We believe in equality under the law, with accountability for those that break the law.

[10] I have determined that many City Hall documents do not meet our basic standards of education, our basic standards of mental health, or our basic standards of economic accountability. Instead, the intent of the directors of City Hall is against a caring economics concerned for the well being of all Canadians, and their work rarely shows a Grade-school understanding of the structure of life and law in Canada. In this sense, I find a profound faith in the skill and ability of young Canadians with natural tendencies and instincts to good government. I also have great faith in the law and the working structure of our Canadian government with Ministries that reflect essential human needs and activities. I understand that maintaining the health and well being of our lives and country can only be done by free and open democratic debate that includes those impacted by a law. Whereas the Mayor and council have taken great pains to replace our healthy democracy with the illegal working mechanisms characteristic of despotic authoritarian states. We must deal with these mental health issues in government, for the mentally ill have no right to direct and control our lives.

[11] In the context of a social, economic and ecological crisis in our lives precipitated only in part by Covid, and by considering a mountain of evidence of a present world crisis (IPCC data), we are quite concerned to the point of alarm that the lives of this generation of young Canadians is at a serious level of risk. We cannot continue these worst practises of the past. We have major concerns locally and at a global scale of direct impacts to the lives and future of our children, direct threats to their rights to life, liberty and security of the person, not in the future but here already. As caring parents we are legal guardians of their lives, relying on law for sane and caring defence. But we will also fight for their lives with ours if necessary, remembering that it was by the blood of our soldiers that we won these freedoms and rights to life back from the tyranny of sick sociopaths willing to destroy everything by the means and methods of war. We understand the local use of force and bullying exerted on us by the directors of PCH in this context.

[12] Are we oppressed by these policies of City Hall? Yes. The Mayor has imposed his religious belief in money on everyone, an imposed ideology of infinite wealth extraction at no cost to our lives. I find

no significant evidence for this ideology. It is actually a degradation of our lives and a forced harnessing of our labour to poor ends.

[13] We are concerned that the Mayor has threatened the jobs of City Hall workers, with actual personal, social and economic punishments to anyone in departments insisting on representing people by fairly obeying Canada's laws. Where is fundamental justice, wherein those who obey the law are protected under the umbrella of Charter law? When the bylaws themselves are clearly wrong, clearly damaging, and with no basis in law, *why is it that law enforcement officials, who know the law and the basis of justice as a job requirement, are silently complicit and do not enforce Canada's top laws?* Do they too fear the consequences of defending citizens by obeying Canada's top laws?

[14] At broader scale, we are most alarmed by the practises of City Hall that have made our lives utterly impossible and given our kids no hope for a home here much less starting a business. By land use policies designed by bankers aimed at controlling and destroying our lives and taking everything we have. Supported and promoted by City Hall, who benefit from these crimes against humanity.

[15] We are most alarmed by the removal of public space, rest areas, actions to criminalize camping, the handover of everything that is valuable and public to private corporations controlled by income extremists with no regard at all for law who have escalated everything to make life impossible. Speculators, seeking income without labour, who in escalating their demands have gutted our downtown and made it impossible for those with little to start anything. City Hall does this, by denying the public use of public land for public benefit and to meet essential human needs, which is theft. Part of that system of hate is parking policy, which we address significantly in another class-action case. We call this hate and an act of war against humanity when multiple *Articles* of the UDHR are violated by City Hall and bylaws are written that no caring parent would ever inflict on their children.

[16] The City produces glossy flyers, in sharp contrast to the realities of our lives. This city is a social, economical and ecological disaster zone. We are not allowed to do anything to change that. We are most alarmed by the destruction of property critical to our survival caused by City Hall land use policy.

[17] In Peterborough, we can see who benefits. The collusion with bankers to escalate land and home prices such that City Hall benefits greatly from the ruin of our lives. The refusal of City Hall to address the issue and declare there is such a thing as reasonable risk in routine daily activities. Citing insurance policy to stop reasonable activities, further forcing us into their hands, making us pay when no substantial service is provided, our money no going to the purpose for which it was intended. PCH, working as the real estate sales arm of bankers.

[18] What does well here? Not citizens. Look at our downtown. Banking, real estate, insurance and government, each with lavish buildings, no expense spared. The money taken from struggling seniors. The last tax increase took the cans of paint needed to repair our homes. All of this is direct result of the laws written in England centuries ago by and for business owners and bankers. The US rejected those principles and practices of tyranny, saying about the income extremist causing it all "He has sent out swarms of officers to harass us and eat out our substance". That's the system the Mayor is running, he is after every dime we have, he does not care, he believes he is ruler over serfs and thinks the laws of England still apply!

[19] We rejected those laws in 1982. Almost four decades have passed and these petty stupid small-

town Mayors refuse to update their bylaws to meet the requirements of modern government dealing with modern issues of care for people and the ecosystems that sustain our lives as the sole basis of our economy. This generation of Canadian kids, trapped between low wages and high house prices by the Mayor working in collusion with bankers to artificially fix house prices, with price fixing being an indictable offence. We know who benefits from this cruel system, for we see it directly in our downtowns. Our kids don't stand a chance. The Mayor completely and utterly denies the reality of our lives and the state of the world; he makes this case and we agree. He has money, taken directly from those in dire struggle to make ends meet, and because he has our money thinks everything is fine. These are sick, sick people, breaking the law, and completely delusional. They do not represent us.

[20] Hence this suit and its charges including fraud, abuse of position and extortion. Numerous City of Peterborough Bylaws must be either struck down or severely modified immediately as illegal and unconstitutional, corrupt and with no clear basis in law. We reject the directors that reject due process and rule of law, rejecting reciprocity and rejecting reasonable limits. We reject fines and fees that are arbitrary and punish us by presuming guilt (a *Section 11d* violation). Whereas we say the real source of offence is the directors of City Hall, removing rights and taking by force for purposes of fraud with damage to our lives and economy. Concerning illegal taxation, we see many incentives to act improperly against us.

[21] If you are right, PCH directors, present your case in accordance with Canada's top laws. Stand and deliver! Present your case on the basis of law, fact, reason and evidence. Because as it stands, all I see is means, motive and opportunity. I have followed the money trail, and it leads to nothing good. It leads to those of a hateful mind, who will say and do anything to get money, who devise the sickest means of doing so, who are in fact against the lives of others and willing to destroy every to get it. How can I not consider these PCH policies, which have no good cause we can stand behind, as anything other than a hate crime against humanity? This is not what I want and this is not what we need. I will not pay any extortionist who leverages my essential human needs against me, for I am Canadian.

[22] On these matters of theft, fraud, organized crime, collusion, undue use of force, disproportionate harm and the replacement of our Canadian democracy with the brutal working mechanisms of an authoritarian state, the courts will decide the fate of these PCH director, their sentencing and the return of illegal gains. Concerning the abuse of public trust, the destruction of land critical to our health, well-being and survival, we must now exert our rights and freedoms to act under CSS direction with particular attention to providing a firm basis for applying *Sections 1, 2, 7, 15, 23, 24, 25, 27, 31* and 52 of our Charter to save the lives of this generation of Canadian kids.

[23] Concerning their sentencing, I say that if punishment is proportional to the severity of the crime, the order of punishment from moderate to severe is this: 1) mental health assessment with court-ordered community treatment; 2) benevolent slavery under the conditions of life applied by Thomas Jefferson; 3) to be stripped of all resources and social connectivity and put in the condition of a Peterborough high school graduate living under the removal of options imposed by PCH; 4) to be made to do part-time no-benefits three-jobs work in the service industry appropriate to their level of skill, with imposed expenses never allowing attainment of basic life security of essential human needs; 5) to be sent to prison, where all human needs are provided and there is much time and freedom to learn and grow, though in this we are concerned with the high cost; 6) to live in Peterborough, be denied shelter any place to go and be hunted down if you dare try to survive, to be hungry and denied all opportunity to grow food, to have no income and denied all social connect or places to work with others to make

and sell things; 7) to be born into federal debt, young but old enough to know you face high odds of an early death under miserable circumstance further knowing that those in positions of power are causing and accelerating this and actively creating conditions leading to genocide.

[24] I say make your case, you temporary directors of City Hall. Stand and deliver, as required by law. I stand against you. You have abdicated your responsibility, and chose crime instead of relying on the principles of justice. You have rejected the law and worked to overthrow and replace our democratic form of government with an authoritarian state. You are outside the umbrella of protection of law and can be charged, sent to prison. I am not the one who has committed crime, but I have had crime committed against me. My life is now under direct threat due to your selfish gross negligence, demanding more even as our economy collapses, actively driving our ruin by not tending to what matters most, what is required by law. I will not pay for the ruin of my life, and I fully reject you bylaws working against me, saying it is my *Section 52 Right and Freedom to Act to Save my Life and to not pay into systems designed for my destruction*. As of 1982, I do not need permission to defend my life using this law, but instead by direct access to the law and the basis of law make my case. I stand against you and say, no, this will not happen on my watch.

[24] I say make your case, you temporary directors of City Hall. Stand and deliver, as required by law. Tell us why we should not immediately reject all your policies, replace you all with people that actually care, demand return of your illegal gains, cancel all contracts made illegally, and exert our democratic rights to be free from your tyranny? For we see here that our Canadian Charter has many anti-tyranny practices that we have the right and freedom to use, without permission when we have just cause and reason. Now we desire to perform widespread acts of social obedience to Canada's top laws aimed at peace, order and social care, addressing all essential human needs for the sake of saving our children from what is now the definite certainty of a grim future, a crisis which you have created and failed to respond to. Now we have stated our case. What's yours? Stand and deliver, explain your actions, and tell us why you should not be sent to prison.

[25] In sharp contrast to what these directors have done, we say needs and necessities must always be placed firmly ahead of wants and desires, and reality over fantasy, otherwise there is violation of fundamental rights to life, liberty and security of the person (*our Prime Directive, Section 7*). Our judges packaged these concepts clearly and simply in one expression, *reasonable rights within limits firmly based in the reality of fact and evidence*. There is more than one way to express this idea, but this is how it was expressed. Our pioneer history of practical and rugged work, our history of choosing vigorous debate and peaceful negotiation over time by pen over sword, while we watched a bloody civil war erupt to our south, was all packed in one sentence declaring the context within which all our rights and freedoms were to be considered. By Freedom of Religion, we prevent war in Canada based on religion. We rejected slavery, and actively work to suppress conflict and hate based on many forms of active discrimination. We won our Freedom Under Law in 1982 by the reformation work of Pierre Elliot Trudeau, which gave us access to the basis of law to directly defend our lives justly and prevent unreasonable and baseless authoritarian rule over our lives. Now we have many anti-tyranny principles and practices in our Canadian Charter that we are free to use and have the right to use in direct defence of our lives. And here we exert those Rights and Freedoms in action against the most foul anti-people anti-law anti-democracy anti-life practices we find emanating from the mentally ill leadership team at Peterborough City Hall. We say *that our rights and freedoms in the full context of our Charter are subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society*.

[26] I argue here, in [1.2] 6 and [1.3] 33 that PCH is a judicial body required to respond to citizen questions by providing a valid *Section 1* basis-of-law reason that proves benefit to our lives and effects a fact-based balance of considerations, with particular focus on not removing reasonable options and essential freedoms (this document, section [1.1] paragraph 24). If the Mayor and council lack the knowledge and skills required to do this work, then our primary social responsibility under our Canadian Charter is to act in our legally-recognized qualified Constitutional roles to provide such reason with a firm basis in law. To do otherwise is to reject our responsibilities to a fair and healthy society that defends the lives of our children by caring respect for rule of law.

5.3 CONSTITUTIONAL CITIZEN CRISIS RESPONSE

[1] We understand our Canadian Constitution Act as containing within in all the wisdom and work ethics of our pioneers, all the dynamic strategies and lessons learned from war by our soldiers who laid down their lives defending their families and our essential rights and freedoms. And now we have the greatest cause and purpose in world history, doing the kind and caring community-based actions needed to save the lives of our children. We do not propose a top-down heavy-handed strategy, but one of sound and realistic community care that frees individuals to follow their interests, find passion, purpose and meaning in their lives, and set their own course of healthy self-determination respectful of the rights to life of others. Restoring our local capacity to feed ourselves, to create new green jobs for our kids, to make and sell things locally, at a family and community scale. To create work that cares for people, our lives and the basis of life in our local ecosystems, the land itself. Protecting seniors, and building our lives, not draining it and driving a disastrous future for our kids.

[2] We must be careful and wise in what we choose to do, concerned for impact on others, on our friends and family in community. Many are in emergency situations, mired in debt, struggling to afford food, with no substantial or meaningful work that brings purpose to their lives. PCH has proposed a plan to do nothing about our most urgent issues, a plan to attack food and housing, to harness our labour to no good end, to gut and destroy every bit of land that we need to sustain our lives. We must immediately form an acting Mayor and council, to make a plan to save our lives, divert disaster, save our kids and spare them a wretched future. All based on the practical reality of our lives directly and provably tied to our living local ecosystems. To write bylaws consistent with our top laws, aiming to that help and not hinder us by vastly interfering with the most critical elements of our lives.

[3] Here, we say we are obliged to act sensibly and reasonably with particular care for the impact of our actions on the lives of our children. We find imagining a scenario of survival to be a valuable legal reference point for reality-based decision making meeting our *Section 1* Charter requirements. Thus making the case for sane decision making with regards to Charter-protected work done to meet our essential human needs from the resources of Nature. As each new generation starts life from scratch, we understand their Pioneer Rights to work as individuals or with others as essential to stabilizing their lives with regards to our Charter-protected core economy of essential human needs. Because that's what caring parents do. They protect the lives of their children, stabilizing their future with Charter work.

[4] This rich *Section 7* field of interest and endeavour is now the greatest challenge in human history. We now have access to the full body of knowledge concerning the state of the world. We have an excellent understanding of human nature, what to look for and what not to do. We have the Canadian

Supreme Court plan, created by our top minds of care, justice, wisdom and intelligence, who have laid out a fantastically diverse structure filled with options for a country of diverse cultures and interests. All held together by what unites and unifies us, our common needs for food, shelter, work and healthy relations to each other and the ecosystems that support our lives as the sole basis of our economy. It does not say that directly, but instead contains the highest-level principles and practices required for healthy and sound decision-making based on fact, reason, care and evidence.

[5] Furthermore, our top minds with hearts of justice and care have gathered across the planet, millions strong, and without monetary motive for themselves have unified and united around this just cause of saving the lives of our children. They too have created a plan of peace and directing us to clear actions we can take locally and in community, that we can use freely and by choice to not only secure but improve our lives. An economic direction that uses the best ideas and tools to move forward to a new economy of permanent stability. One that takes us away from a course of destruction and crippling inequity. One that we need no wait to use, but can act on immediately using the rights and freedoms to act without hindrance or impediment under the directives of our Charter.

[6] In contrast to many countries, we have both the personal and social right to self-sufficient self-directed self-determination. We do not live in an authoritarian state, and woe be to those that aim to create one. For we are a nation respecting equality under the law and equal benefit of the law filled with a people of brains and brawn, might and muscle, moral strength and courage. We have hearts of justice, empowered by the rights and freedoms of our Charter to defend the lives of our children, fairly and honestly without damaging our friends and neighbours. A Charter that benefits all.

[7] We live in a world vastly different from that of our last national crisis, World War II. We now have amazing new tools of productivity and communication. We have major new medical and scientific breakthroughs, rich and untapped in potential. Solar. Lithium batteries. And the capacity to understand and connect it all. Which the youth of Canada have already done. They know what is going on. And they have solutions. That we as caring parents can invest in, guide and support. But this cannot be done without a firm basis in meeting essential human needs. We hold these truths to be self-evident. That by eating plants grown in soil as the basis of life is constitutional to our bodies and gives us inherent and obvious food, seed, soil and ecological rights to health. Everyone should be able to plant food if they so desire, and to understand those rich ecologies and hidden worlds that form the basis of sustainable life. Let's be clear. Unsustainability means death. And food security is the basis of national security. We have pressing and urgent needs to meet, protect and care for our basis-of-life *Section 7* responsibilities to each other and the planet. That alone is a rich field of endeavour, critical to our health.

[8] We have in these leading world documents and our Charter, legal and valid, sane and rational common-sense plans of health and restoration exhibiting a profound level of care for our lives, our future and the most vulnerable members of society, seniors and children. It is easy to put together an integrated sustainable community plan exhibiting social care and concern integrated across the generations, directly tied to the work we do and our freedom to do it with realistic care for the basis of life. And to do so without violating other lives, culture and ways to live, for only in this rich diversity of ideas and efforts can we attain a healthy stability of points of view, our multi-cultural rights.

[9] The whole point of having rights and freedoms is that we do not have to ask permission. All we have to do is work under the law, with a good reason for what we are doing and why. We have good reason, and our cause is just. It is this Mayor and council that do not have good reason, whose cause is

not just, who have not obeyed the law, who have acted outside the scope of government, who have formed a gang that has rebelled and acted to overthrow our local government and replace our working democracy with the full working mechanisms of an authoritarian state. We did not do this. They did. They chose of their own free will to reject the principles and practices of our Canadian Constitution Act and rebel against the government, taking actions that are illegal and unlawful and completely against us. We would not go to such great lengths to say so, were it not for the urgent need to act to defend the lives of our children.

[10] We are not protesting. We are not making demands. For we do not merely have the right to Freedom of Speech, but to Freedom of Expression which takes us from the realm of ideas into the realm of action. We are free to work with each other in care and respect doing the practical work this local government is required to do but is not doing. It's our Charter right and freedom to follow the directives of our Canadian Constitution Act, for if we do not obey the intent of our top laws we are at odds with the law and lost. Our Constitution obliges us to not pay into systems designed for our destruction, for that would defeat our national purpose and drive us to becoming a failed state. For the sake of our children, we cannot fail. And our top Canadian judges have directed us to how to act justly, fairly and reasonably, and with kindness, within this cause. For we are nothing if we are not caring Canadians, standing as an emblem to the world on all matters of peace and justice. We will obey our judges, not the crooked directors of PCH, lest we commit the greatest crime of all, failing our children.

[11] By the living tree doctrine of law, every single Canadian is an important leaf in our Canadian cultural mosaic, valued and inherently worthy of dignity and respect, and with unique interests, skills and perspectives critical to our human venture. And we are unified and united in our common essential human needs, held together by our care. Unified in the greatest mission in the history of humanity, to save our children, to spare them from what we know is coming. They are already in it.

[12] In 1982, the Supreme Court of Canada changed the structure of Canadian government from a brutal top-down system of control designed centuries ago in England for the purpose of unlimited exploitation and plunder to one based on care for people by defence of the freedoms needed to live in a fair, just and democratic society. Prior to 1982, there was nothing but a top-down system. We changed that in 1982 to a horizontal system wherein people could stand eye to eye in respect and equality, under unifying universal principles of care and justice. By access to the law, free to direct and determine the course of their lives as long as they stayed within the bounds of behaviour make explicit in the practices and principles of the Charter and at the foundations of justice, with care and not harm.

[13] The main purpose of the hierarchical structure of government, it was ruled, would be organization of effort and coordination of people and resources in response to needs. Government was to be ruled by reason and law, with careful consideration of impact on others. The defence of our lives and country was to occur by use of this law in practice and principle by all citizens. We got rid of a pyramid scheme and replaced it with horizontally equality, in which the intellect and creative capacities of every single individual could be used to solve problems from small to major import. Those ideas could be used, after a process of consideration from multiple perspectives, within government, thus allowing democratic engagement and various means of self-directed self-determination at all scales. In our lives, in our communities, in our country. It is thought to be a robust structure, fully capable of responding to anything and dealing with any crisis, for it contains our history of crisis response, the wisdom of our elders, and now full access to a world database of knowledge including how-to videos.

[14] In this context, health is the capacity of individuals and communities to respond to crisis. We are in crisis. The Mayor and council have not responded. City Hall is not healthy. What can we do, when we know what our lives are like, when we understand the state of the world and the dangers we face? Our kids are already trapped between low wages and high house prices, facing an infinite lifetime of debt along with the global threats of a planet that is dying. The Mayor hides his head in the sand and says this reality does not exist, that there are no problems. We do not believe this. This is abdication of responsibility. We know the state of our lives and the state of the world.

[15] In 1982, we agreed in our Charter to government-citizen relations of equality and respect. If the Mayor and council reject this, we can make this an employer-employee relationship for services we pay for, insisting on strict definition of the role of public servant.

[16] As Canadians, we have vowed to protect life. Our lives. The lives of our children. Farms, food and the ecosystems that support life. We have vowed to protect the freedoms, free choice, the options and alternatives and anything necessary to ensure the health of our families and communities. With tax pools used smartly under our direction put toward securing our lives and future, not spent stupidly on things that do not and never will bring life security.

[17] The Mayor and council have no plan for economic recovery. No green-jobs creation strategy. Where in this is the plan for food security? What specific actions are listed for care of seniors, or work for youth? The percent of community decision-making allowed is zero. Downtown is plundered, our lives are highly vulnerable rather than protected, and they continue their course of plunder, their course of acting against us. Fortunately, the policies of City Hall are public, we have a case and a cause, and by the legal structure of life in Canada we have the right to make what is wrong right. By our Charter, with our lives backed by the Supreme Court, we have the freedom to take action in all areas of our lives. We can change the bylaws, for they are public and open, they belong to us, and we have the Constitutional authority to write bylaws consistent with Charter law and focused on beneficial societal purposes.

[18] *Section 15* of our Charter recognizes the fundamental equality between those within government and those without. Specific talents differ, but in statistical equality, those within government are just as capable and qualified as those without. Furthermore, since the number of elected representatives in government is small compared to the population, there is a large pool of talent generating testable best-practices ideas to draw from to solve problems and make Canada exceptional among nations. This we will do. The Canadian Constitution Act (1982) is designed explicitly for an engaged democracy to work together in caring community. We completely and utterly rejected the idea that one person can possibly know enough to make decisions directing the lives of tens of thousands of others in fine detail. We rejected this idea, but accepted direct and caring community engagement under clear and simple Constitutional principles and practices of self-determination backed by fact, proof and evidence as the basis of law.

[19] We understand this CSS plan as the only way we can respond in a coordinated manner to this major national crisis using the free and open involvement of all citizens. Considering the criminal tendencies and incompetence of this Mayor and council, and their lack of response to our urgent crisis needs, we must find an acting Mayor and council for this important task of crisis response to write policies that are good for us, good for our future. The public can vote in the next election for what team is best. But before that, we will write the policies, the best policies for healthy society, and use them

immediately by equality under the law, directing our paid public employees as to the work they must do as this is the requirement under our contract, the Canadian Constitution Act (1982).

[20] Our Charter is clear, it is our contract. If the Mayor has changed City Hall into an unlimited for-profit business, characterized by double-dipping, making us pay fees for services we already paid taxes for, making us pay to shop, or pay for the use land and buildings we already own, then such things are on the open market and we do not have to pay.

[21] If the Mayor and council say that we must pay, thus removing Freedom of Association, then all their actions, decisions and bylaws must be consistent with our contract, the Charter. We have a contract, and these are public matters. Public land belongs to the public, as do the buildings, and these are paid public servants that must follow the directions of their employers, we citizens, using their organizational structure to tackle and solve our most pressing problems. If they break the law, we are put in a bind and legally obliged to not pay. Their bylaws are of no force or effect (*Section 52*).

[22] So we are not protesting. We are not petitioning or asking. We are not saying to the Mayor and council, please, please stop abusing us. The law is clear. We say this to the Mayor and council. You do not have our consent. You do not have our support. You do not represent us. You took the work that belongs to us, to the community, but did not do it. You aimed for totalitarian control of all our essential human needs, despite these being out of the bounds of your authority, for these are Constitutional activities critical to our lives and within our domain of decision-making. You have acted illegally, we have not. It is on you to ask, to provide reason, proof and evidence. It is on you to justify your actions and state your case, to stand before us or a judge, your choice. As it stands many bylaws are illegal and we must obey the law and not pay. The law is above you, and we will use the principles of law as the basis of all decision making, particularly on these matters of violations of fundamental freedoms and interference in what is essential to life. Life, liberty and security of the person is in our domain, and the purpose of government is to help, not hinder, block and interfere with what we need to do to secure the future for our children. We have the Charter right to act freely in all these matters.

[23] In the legal structure of life in Canada, local social workers are legally obliged to ensuring a healthy social structure throughout government. Teachers are legally obliged to check all City documents for spelling, fact, consistency and completion of assignment. In our lives and downtown, we have the legal right to determine policies that create and maintain the dynamics of social and economic health. Public land belongs to the public. Cities belong to citizens. Canada belongs to Canadians. This is our home, and our set of social rights to healthy surroundings is defined in our Charter as the set of principles and practices that form our culture. We are multi-cultural. We cannot be ruled by one narrow unbalanced view imposed as a monopoly. Our laws are clear, concise and beautifully understandable. We are Canadians, proud, strong and free.

[24] In our lives, we find the deepest joy in a forest, on a beach, with our children, with our parents and partners, with our hands in soil planting a tree, flower or carrot. We know this system the directors of PCH created is not life. There is a deep resentment every time we are forced to pay, because we know this is not freedom. This is not choice. You will never normalize this. We will never find what you have done normal.

[25] To the directors of PCH, we know for a fact that the goal of prison is to remove all freedoms and control every aspect of life in the finest most petty detail. To remove dignity and make people do things

they would never agree to do. Complete control, down to every last dime at parking meters. With no say, no discussion, no justice. We get the message and we will never agree, for unlike you, we have vowed to uphold Canada's top laws, laws of justice, laws that are right and true, laws that protect and defend life, liberty and security of the person. We will not pay.

[26] We never agreed to the control of our lives and destiny by robots. Robots in City Hall, who, when we ask why, simply repeat, because its a bylaw, because it's a bylaw. We never agreed to automated computer control systems that replace our system of justice with embedded codes defining crime simply as something you do not like with no basis in fact, evidence, reason or justice. We have just cause, and the law is on our side. We will never agree to computer control of our lives.

[27] At present we are paying, not only into the previous system of corruption, which has no basis in law, but our money is going directly to the corporations building these disgusting systems, directly tied to corrupt financial systems and surveillance, all to no good end. Systems that attack life, that do no good whatsoever to our lives. We will never agree. We will not pay.

[28] We will never agree to any system that attacks our rights to enjoy life. That say we must pay to enjoy shopping, or a walk along the water front, or a beach or a forest. These are not the freedoms of life we fought for, they are despicable acts that degrade our lives and we will not pay. We are legally obliged by Canada's top laws, by multiple sections of our charter, and by our fundamental instincts for what is good, to not replace democracy with baseless authoritarian rule institutionalizing a prison system where we have no say and every fundamental freedom to enjoy life has been removed by those seeking control of our lives down to every last dime. We reject this prisoner mentality, for we are not the ones who are doing something wrong. You are. We will not pay.

[29] And so we are not demanding justice. We are not phasing anything in. We are not fighting to win back rights we already won. We are obeying Canada's top laws, here and now, considering all factors, making our case, doing the work you at PCH did not do, having refused to the work you were elected, hired and paid to do.

[30] Five hundred years ago, in the case of Martin Luther *versus* the Catholic church controlling everything, we won Freedom of Religion granting us direct access to the principles and practices of the Bible. Forty years ago, in the case of Pierre Trudeau *versus* the British Empire, we won Freedom of Law in Canada, granting all Canadians direct access to the principles and practices of law. Allowing us freedom from tyranny and giving us independent personal, social and national self-determination, in our lives, our communities and in our country. We are caring parents all, and we are the most powerful force in Canada, acting here and in response to crisis, in caring defence of the lives and future of our children.

[31] We can and will respond to seniors in isolation and distress, with no money and no one showing up to help. We can and will act as caring parents to invest in the lives of our children, creating a permanent pool of new green jobs in our Charter-protected core economy of essential human needs, YouthWorks. We will connect our youth with seniors, in SeniorsCare to grow Food & Flower Gardens, and restore lost ecologies. To paint and repair and build, under the direction and guidance of our elders with their vast pool of lived experience. To those that say everything is about money, it's not. We have the fundamental human right and instinct to help, for this along with the land itself is the basis of Social Security. We will create and use an Hours Bank as a new non-government pillar of Canadian Social

Security at the Constitutional level at which we live our lives. Help someone in need. Bank your hours. Receive help later in life. This is what we must do.

[32] This generation deserves a fighting chance at life. Just as we created a place in society for government, so must we create a place for each new generation just starting life. As caring parents, we are the most powerful force in the world, and we will protect and defend the lives of our children at all stages of life, growth and development. We will defend their Pioneer Rights to gain a foothold in their life, building a life of their own choice by the labour of their own hands, helped by friends and family in caring connected community devoted to diversity and defence of Canadian Rights and Freedoms. As caring parents, we will help them get established in life, setting them up with starter homes and new businesses of their own devising. For that is what caring parents do. It is the fundamental right of each new generation to shrug off the worst practices of the past, to use our best ideas to move forward, and to boldly solve problems their parents thought impossible.

DOCUMENTS CITED FOR EVIDENCE AND WITNESS CONTACT LIST

Online Access:

The Canadian Constitution Act (1982).

The Supreme Court of Canada case rulings on application of Constitutional law.

The Federal and Provincial Ministry Descriptions of Intent and Purpose, Mandates and active Mandate Letters of our Prime Minister Justin Trudeau.

The British North America Act.

The Acts of Parliament.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The World Scientists' Warning to Humanity.

The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.

The United Nations Convention Against Corruption.

The 2015 Pope Francis Vatican Encyclical 'Care for Our Common Home'.

The Holy Bible containing Old and New Testaments.

The holdings of the National Library of Canada, including Michi Saaggiig Nishnaabeg This is Our Territory (2018) by Doug Williams and Leanne Betasamosake Simpson ISBN 97819278866090.

The Articles of Incorporation of the City of Peterborough.

The Budget and Operations including the full set of Bylaws and Written Documents of the Corporation of the City of Peterborough, not excluding zoning descriptions, land use maps, contracts with private Corporations, website, press releases, plans and all relevant content across all frontiers of City-Public records, actions and engagement.

The Agenda and Minutes of the Monday, December 5, 2022 Peterborough City Hall council meeting, available in print and digital records including video.

One photo of me and my tent with dated copy of .

The records of Safe Beds Canadian Mental Health Association social services workers documenting the state of my mental, physical and spiritual health, my circumstances and work I did to alleviate those circumstances, including SPDAT assessment.

The intake records of Ontario Works (case worker Amanda Myles) and YMCA Peterborough.

The Peterborough Examiner (2022) articles of Wednesday October 26 "Leal ready to get to work",

November 25 "City dismantles tent encampment", Wednesday November 30 "Leal vows he won't

forget those in need", Friday December 2 "Tiny homes urged for Park Street" and Saturday December

3 “Parnell says ‘no’ to tiny homes proposal.

I have an acknowledgement of receipt dated November 30, 2022 from the City of Peterborough of the following letter sent to the Mayor and council giving prior notification of my intent to act concerning their role in the homelessness crisis:

Wednesday, November 30, 2022

To the Mayor of the Corporation of the City of Peterborough Jeff Leal,
And Council members Kevin Duguay and Lesley Parnell Ward 1, Matt Crowley and Don Vassiliadis Ward 2, Alex Bierk and Joy Lachica Ward 3, Gary Baldwin and Keith Riel Ward 4, Andrew Beamer and Dave Haacke Ward 5.

Greetings,

Many people and groups have identified the directors of Peterborough City Hall as the source and cause of our work, food and housing security crisis. You are the only group responsible for critical land use decisions of zoning. You are the only group continually blocking reasonable recourse and solutions by individuals and groups aiming to defend their Section 7 rights to life, liberty and security of the person using Section 1 reasoning based on fact and evidence in the required context of care and justice which defines equal rights to decision-making under the law. In these matters, you are required to use Section 15 and other Sections of the Canadian Constitution Act (1982), whereas any actions beyond the scope of legitimate government are not only illegal and unauthorized, but venturing well into human rights abuses, violation of the War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity Act, and with multiple and major ongoing violations of the Criminal Code of Canada along with various Acts.

After a detailed two-year detailed investigation of your policies and operations, we can prove beyond the shadow of a reasonable doubt that you are the persons responsible for maintaining social integrity in your role of representation and defence of our lives using the principles and practices of the Canadian Constitution Act, which is our contract and your job description. We have here in Peterborough a major humanitarian crisis in which people are thrust into appalling conditions that threaten their lives, conditions causing bodily harm, conditions they would never choose, conditions that they are fighting to get out of, conditions far worse than found in any Canadian prison. Conditions requiring UN-style emergency humanitarian relief efforts, and serious immediate actions needed to save lives. Past Councils have refused to do anything, though they were obliged and empowered to do so by the scope of their authorities and the duties of their position.

You are newly elected and have inherited many unconstitutional and illegal bylaws and policies written purposely and intentionally against the higher laws by which you are bound, against the justice system and the foundational principles of care and justice, and against the Canadian people whom you are obliged to defend and represent. We know perfectly well you can write laws for good, based on care and consideration of the lives of those you impact. Based on your duties to defend the core components of Section 7 life security critical to our lives, all you have to do is ask “would any caring parent do this to their children?”. But instead we find you taking actions that have gutted the basis of the economy, threatened peoples lives, created a massive scale of human rights abuses and have put an entire generation on course to unmitigated disaster against their will.

You must accept the Supreme Court of Canada rulings that public land must be used for public benefit, which under Section 7 of the Charter obliges uses to protect life, liberty and security of the person. You must accept reasonable solutions that we bring forward that meet all the requirements of equality under

the law. You must allow a variety of solutions defending our multicultural rights to diversity of housing options and lifestyles. The Supreme Court has ruled, and we agree, that the purpose of recognizing equal rights and freedoms under the law is to allow individuals and families to make fundamental decisions concerning their lives and how they choose to live free from profound State interference. Whereas you have interfered with our lives profoundly, doing what no caring parent would ever do. When we have good reason for doing what we need to do, and we have respected the basis of law, consideration of the impact of our actions on others, and have further assessed on a balance of probabilities backed by a full basis of fact, evidence and reason admissible in a court of law, considering both the beneficial and deleterious effects of our actions, having further done root cause analysis as required by Supreme Court directives, you must accept this and further act to strike down any and all damaging and unconstitutional bylaws.

If you do not do this obey Canada's top laws, the immediate effect is to put us in conflict with the law such that we cannot act without breaking one law or another. We know this is entrapment, and in that case we must choose to obey Canada's top laws lest we be charged with the higher crime of aiding and abetting. For example, the Peterborough Police are now forced to choose between obeying you or taking unconstitutional actions that threaten a person's life. When you write bylaws against life, liberty and security of the person, and have no Section 1 basis or reason within the context of justice, our only option is under Section 52 of the Charter to recognize your bylaws as being without basis and having no force or effect.

Councils past have refused to obey the law, but here we give you a chance to.

We can prove beyond the shadow of a reasonable doubt that the bylaws and policies you have written are the direct cause of our humanitarian crisis, since you have colluded with bankers and falsely claimed ownership of public land, further rejecting the use of public land for public benefit. You have rejected our Section 1 basis of equal decision making power under the law, forgetting that you live on social assistance. Your policies have caused bodily harm and death, and further created an oppressive totalitarian state in which our critical freedoms and rights to life have been removed by the removal of options and choice. We further understand from the effects of your policies your intent. You aim to give us no place to go, remove the freedoms of a free people and are saying in effect that Canada is not our home. Whereas we know it is, and we have a right to be here.

You did not pay for the land you use and neither did you pay for the buildings. In this, you gain tremendous immense social and economic benefit for yourselves, which you deny us. We gave you everything you needed, on the agreement that you work for us and for our benefit. We would never pay taxes otherwise, and are further obliged under the law to not pay for actions against us that also damage all of society. We understand perfectly well that under the "demonstrably reasonable" Section 1 test of our Constitution, we are free to use what we know works from our history, what has been proven and tested to work already, in healthy response to crisis.

Historically, and certainly prior to 1982, the leadership team of City Hall has rejected equality under the law, believing themselves to be rulers over society and issuing edicts with no basis in law, under the expectation that we all must obey your every whim and desire to control all of society and our lives down to the finest detail. Further preventing us from even taking actions that would save our own lives. We have, for example, the Pioneer Right to devise shelter of our own choice, one that mitigates risk to life, and we further have the right to not have risks imposed on us (Canada (Attorney General) v. Bed-

ford, 2013 SCC 72).

Whereas you have used bylaws and policies aimed fully at creating an illegal authoritarian state within the boundaries of Canada fully intended to give people no place to go, issuing threats, using force and denying their fundamental rights to life. By refusing to do anything, and by denying the attempts of others to save lives, and by systematically denying recourse, we are left with no other choice but to lay charges under the Criminal Code of Canada which will result in your arrest and detention.

When you refuse to obey Canada's top laws, and further work systematically against the law, the charges are Sedition (CCC Sections 59 to 61). When you take actions that threaten the lives and future of many people, setting a trajectory that you know will lead to hardship, dire circumstances and the early death of an entire new generation of Canadian children, systematically working against the Children of the King and undermining the very basis of life security, the charges are Treason (CCC Sections 46 to 48), for you have betrayed the Canadian people in the creation of circumstances and driving forces that will reasonably and predictably lead to eventual hardship and death.

Here, we seek immediate life saving actions concerning the fundamental rights of Canadians to seek and build shelter of their own devising on Canadian land that they own, effecting their Constitutional right to make decisions of critical importance to their own lives. We are Canadians, and this is our home.

We do not wish to commit the war crime of causing damage to your reputation and life, as Articled in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as something we must not do. But neither do we want City Hall to be at war with us, committing far worse crimes. However, the law applies to all, and we have experienced an all-out assault on our lives pushing us consistently into conditions highly likely to cause our deaths, as well as bodily harm. We can prove it is your duty and responsibility, not to attack, but to defend our lives as our elected representatives. Do your job, or at least let us save ourselves using our Constitutional freedoms and rights of equality under the law.

If you refuse to respond immediately using reasonable actions needed to prevent death in this ongoing humanitarian crisis which you created by your illegal bylaws, or if you prevent us from saving by exerting our right to equality under the law, which grants us equal decision-making power, the Criminal Code of Canada charges that will be laid shortly against you are consistent with your provable actions and negligence of duty are:

Criminal Negligent Manslaughter and Attempted Negligent Manslaughter.

To be filed under:

Criminal negligence CCC Sections 219 to 221.

•**219 (1)** Every one is criminally negligent who

•**(a)** in doing anything, or

•**(b)** in omitting to do anything that it is his duty to do,

shows wanton or reckless disregard for the lives or safety of other persons.

•**Definition of *duty***

(2) For the purposes of this section, ***duty*** means a duty imposed by law.

Causing death by criminal negligence

220 Every person who by criminal negligence causes death to another person is guilty of an indictable offence and liable

- (a) where a firearm is used in the commission of the offence, to imprisonment for life and to a minimum punishment of imprisonment for a term of four years; and
- (b) in any other case, to imprisonment for life.

Causing bodily harm by criminal negligence

221 Every person who by criminal negligence causes bodily harm to another person is guilty of

- (a) an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term of not more than 10 years; or
- (b) an offence punishable on summary conviction.

Please note that this on the civil side this is a class-action lawsuit involving hundreds of litigants willing to testify, supported by primary workers throughout the Social Services who have been directed in their Mandate Letters of the Office of the Prime Minister as to their duties and obligations to defend the self-determination of Citizens, as defined in the part of the Canadian Constitution Act (1982) known as the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. On the criminal code side, this is the generation of hundreds to upwards to a thousand cases with attorney or self-representation.

I am the lead litigant, working under the directives of the Supreme Court of Canada to ameliorate the appalling conditions of this humanitarian crisis within Peterborough. In the performance of my duties, I have kept the policy team of the Office of the Prime Minister informed, and as needed individual Ministry leaders. I am further working closely with the directives of the UN on justice and sustainable development goals, in particular with the United Nations Convention Against Corruption.

I expect immediate prioritization and action on this issue of direct threats against life, liberty and security of the person. This is not a matter of voting. Voting based on whim, personal preference and bias is not allowed in Canada. This is a matter of reasoned decision making under the law, using the Section 1 decision making processes based on fact, evidence and provision of reason in the context of care and justice, as is your sworn duty under the law. Since we know is not the purpose of government to act against people, and certainly not to drive them to their deaths, our class action and personal lawsuits should not be against the Corporation of the City of Peterborough, but against the individual directors who chose as individuals to act against the top laws of our country and further to enter into significant criminal code violations and human rights abuses. However, you are a newly elected team, to protect the innocent the charges will initially be against the person of the Corporation of the City of Peterborough.

We need UN-style wood-floor insulated wall locking humanitarian relief tents, low-cost and easy to build and move, or small cabins, and a place to put them. We know there is no shortage of places to do this, just as there is no shortage of civil society offers to save our most vulnerable citizens by providing well established and proven systems of care. May we remind you of Charter Section 12: no one must be subject to conditions of torture or cruel and unusual punishment. In this, the bylaws and policies you have created are far beyond the scope of legitimate government, far into the territory of human rights abuses, acts of war against citizens, and with multiple and major violations of criminal code and actions against Ministry mandates and various Acts of Parliament. You are new, you inherited this, but it is not just on you to fix it, for we are equal under law and you are free to ask citizens to help. That is also

your duty, under the law, to accept full democratic engagement in the unified meeting of our common essential human needs.

Best regards,
Dr. David Teertstra
HoursBank.ca
TrentonNews.ca
Company of Canadians
en369@ncf.ca
613 243 5798
in Peterborough

Witness list for verification of circumstances:
For case intake information, contact:
Kristine Williams, Case Manager, Employment Services
YMCA of Central East Ontario
123 Aylmer Street South, Peterborough, ON, K9J 3H8
kristine.williams@ceo.ymca.ca
(705) 772 9386

For Ontario Works case intake information, contact:
Amanda Myles, Case Manager,
City of Peterborough Social Services
178 Charlotte Street, Peterborough, Ontario, K9J 8S1
Amyles@perterborough.ca
(705) 748 8830 extension 3653

Various Safe Beds staff members at the Canadian Mental Health Association can testify as to the state of my mental, physical and spiritual health, my work done to seek help and connect with all relevant agencies, provide full records of that along with completed SPDAT forms, and further testify that they recognized City Hall as the main institution preventing reasonable solutions, and also that they felt their work and jobs at risk if they directly provided reasonable solutions such as tents or bikes for those whose lives were at great risk due to homelessness and having no place to go. This is a secure program, so I only got to know the staff on a first-name basis.

CMHA Safe Beds (705) 745-6484
healthrecords@cmhahkpr.ca

I could also call on volunteers and staff members of One Roof to testify I am a regular there in need of food and resources to get me through the night; however, I consider the general circumstances of the homeless to be either well known or easily verified.

One Roof Community Centre
99 Brock St. Peterborough, ON K9H 2P2
705-874-1812
info@oneroofptbo.ca

I could also call on about 200 homeless people, some of whom know me to varying degree, to bear witness of identical treatment by the City, and I attach some signatures of individuals willing to testify that the actions of the City against them were those of attempted negligent manslaughter. Are these witnesses really needed, when what I say can be easily verified in newspapers, by asking the homeless, or by asking professionals in the social services?

If needed, I could ask my dear friend with whom I initially stayed on first arriving in Peterborough, to describe the circumstances under which her tenancy was threatened, but quite frankly she has suffered enough from this, particularly from her ruthless landlady, and I feel those details add no additional relevancy to the claims I am making against the directors or City Hall, whose bylaws and actions concerning allowed land use both caused and continue to cause these serious problems of foundational life security.

Photo of David Teertstra in a tent with dated newspaper:

