

A Personal Declaration of Opposition to the Abuse of Our Charter of Rights and Freedoms by the State

Written by the Honourable Brian Peckford

“I believe there are more instances of the abridgement of the freedom of the people by gradual encroachments of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpation.” - James Madison

I am compelled to write this because I feel I have an obligation as I am the last living First Minister who helped craft the Constitution Act 1982 and The Charter of Rights and Freedoms that forms part of it.

Secondly, I am doing it because I must speak on behalf of those deceased First Ministers, the majority of whom would advance the views that I am advocating now.

And thirdly, I am doing it on behalf of many Canadians who feel they have no voice; those who have loved ones who have died or been injured as a result of the vaccines; and those who have loved ones who have died or been injured as a result of the undemocratic lockdowns and other measures that have been more harmful than protective.

Who would have thought it would come to this?

In the Christmas season of 2021, governments across Canada made orders to diminish our democracy by limiting our rights and freedoms guaranteed under The Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and engage as little as possible the 14 Parliaments of this nation.

It has been, for all intents and purposes, an assault in two ways: one political and legal, and the other scientific.

A. Legal and Constitutional Issues

“The Judge must sometimes depart the confines of his legal system and channel into it fundamental values not yet found in it.” — Judge Aharon Barak, one time President of the Supreme Court of Israel.

Governments have forged ahead with infringements on our freedoms like it was just another day in the park. The blatant ignorance and casual approach to this is breathtaking. The arbitrary implementation of these measures is the greatest assault on

individual freedom in the forty years that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms has been in effect.

A. Let it be recorded that The Charter of Right and Freedoms is the Supreme Law of Canada, so says Section 52 of the Constitution Act of 1982. All laws in Canada involving Governments are subject to conforming with this Charter.

B. Let it be recorded that the first words of the Charter are: **“Whereas Canada is founded upon principles that recognize the supremacy of God and the rule of law:”**

Note that a colon punctuation comes at the end — that is to say that everything that follows is in this context.

C. Present Government COVID-19 measures violate the Charter, especially Section 2, 6, 7, and 15.

D. Section 2 describes the freedoms individuals have relating to conscience, religion, expression and the press. Additionally, other freedoms described are the freedoms of assembly and association. Today, across the nation, individuals are prevented from association and assembly.

E. Section 6 talks of Mobility Rights; the right to travel anywhere in Canada and leave Canada. Additionally, it describes the right **“to pursue the gaining of a livelihood in any province.”** As we speak people are losing their jobs, thousands of them across the country, it being alleged that their health status is inconsistent with Government edicts.

F. Section 7 describes a person’s rights to **“Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.”** Right now, our lives and liberties are being violated and the coercion we face is in rampant violation of our **“security of the person.”**

G. To top it off is Section 15 — **“Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.”**

Presently I, and many thousands, do not enjoy equality before the law, because we are prevented from going certain places that others can go.

Governments believe that they are immune from the consequences of violating these protected rights and freedoms.

I contend they are not!

Section 1 of the Charter says:

“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 section does not apply to the present circumstance. When this was being written it was in the context of a serious threat to the state, a war, insurrection, a clear and present danger. A virus whose recovery rate is above 99% and fatality rate is 0.08% surely doesn't qualify as a threat to the state.¹

Consider that the country took 114 years before it had a written charter of rights and freedoms. The United States of America had one in 1791. And it was clear to everyone in 1981 when the Charter was being negotiated that a further opening of the Constitution was unlikely for many decades, generations away, if not more. It's already been 40 years. Hence, what we were doing then was very, very important. And long lasting.

We were not negotiating fundamental freedoms and rights to be in the Constitution to see them easily taken away, especially by highly questionable science at best, and downright wrongdoing by many of the stakeholders at worst. And even then, four tests would have to be met to override those freedoms and rights.

In their narrowly focused responses, governments have ignored the Emergency Planning agencies on which they all have been spending millions of dollars over many years in preparation for just such a crisis. Lt. Col. David Redman, former Emergency Director with the Alberta Government and an outspoken critic of the present approach, succinctly describes sound emergency management:

“The foundation for government-led response to emergencies in Canada is the system of emergency management (EM). EM agencies work routinely with other orders of government, internal government Ministries, jurisdictional private sector entities, and non-government organizations (NGOs). These routine inter-relationships are required to ensure timely, efficient, and effective action in times of emergency. These EM agencies have established, practiced, and exercised process and operating systems necessary for complete action for the resolution of emergencies.

During the COVID-19 Pandemic in Canada, it is apparent that the emergency management (EM) system has been sidelined. The Medical Officers of Health (MOHs) have been placed in charge both federally and in the provinces/territories (P/T). All other partners required in the response to this pandemic, described above, have been

¹ *Covid Statistics Canada*. (2021, December 29). Justice Centre for Constitutional Freedoms. <https://www.jccf.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Covid-Statistics-canada-dec-29-2021.png>

ignored. This has resulted in a deadly and massively damaging response. It has caused unnecessary death in our seniors and massive collateral damage to mental health, societal health, education/development of our children, to our citizens with other severe illnesses, to our national economy, our civil rights, and to our trust in our democracy.

The Canadian deadly response to the COVID-19 Pandemic must never be repeated. The people responsible need to be held accountable. Lessons learned from this pandemic must show that criminal negligence by our elected leaders and MOHs can and will be held to account.”²

The public needs to understand we are going about this all wrong.

We knew better and chose to ignore all lessons learned from all previous pandemics and to ignore the pre-existing plans that were written from these lessons learned.

As an old army friend constantly says about what we are doing...

“WE ARE LOST, BUT MAKING GOOD TIME.”

And now, a new study has just been produced by the Canadian Covid Care Alliance detailing the many flaws in Pfizer’s first six months of trials entitled “More Harm Than Good”, showing that the Pfizer shots cause more problems than they prevent.³

You see, if these rights and freedoms can be taken away in this circumstance where the science is irrefutably against what is being done; where more effective alternatives are medically available; where alternate approaches like emergency measures are available; and where deaths and injuries from the so-called ‘vaccines’ are more than from all other vaccines combined in the last 30 years; then the Charter becomes diluted, people’s rights and freedoms sacrificed on the altar of fear and convenience. That means future serious circumstances will be easier to justify violating our rights and freedoms using this present falsity as a precedent to bypass the Charter all over again.

The permanence we thought we achieved for individual freedoms and rights in the Constitution becomes a fleeting concept floating hither and yon in the shifting winds of political expediency, fear and faulty science and faulty approaches - not the bedrock of a secure democracy as we had thought.

That’s why this is all so wrong.

²Frontier Centre for Public Policy July 19,2021 Canada’s Deadly Response to COVID-19. David Redman
<https://fcpp.org/2021/07/19/canadas-deadly-response-to-covid-19/>

³³Government Relations Committee. (2021). *The Pfizer Inoculations for COVID-19: More Harm than Good*. Canadian Covid Care Alliance.
<https://www.canadiancovidcarealliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/The-COVID-19-Inoculations-More-Harm-Than-Good-REV-Dec-16-2021.pdf>

H. For argument's sake, let's assume that Section 1 applies to the present circumstance. There are four tests to be met:

- Demonstrably justify
- By law
- Reasonable limits
- Consistent with a free and democratic society

Has any government in Canada met these tests?

Demonstrable justification? Nowhere to be seen! One would think that such harsh measures - denying personal liberties, eliminating people's jobs - would require a cost benefit analysis, a report, or a study. None exists.

Reasonable limits. There are no reasonable limits but arbitrary edits to the rules, reissued over and over again, most often with no parliamentary oversight.

By law — one would think that this would require a new law, requiring the Parliament to be intimately involved. When people's rights and freedoms are being taken away, is this not a matter for the peoples' representatives? If not, what is? In the Case of Section 33, the so-called "notwithstanding clause", in order for governments to override Sections 2, 7, and 15 the Parliament must be opened and a new law proposed and passed before any change can occur. And then with a time limit.

In a free and democratic society. This validates the previous point. How can a Government be consistent with the concept of a free and democratic society without the Parliament being intimately involved? If in fact it was such a big issue as the governments pronounce daily, then let the people speak through their elected representatives.

Furthermore, many governments are using existing laws that were in place long before this present circumstance existed. A new law is needed for a new circumstance, not hiding behind existing laws for other circumstances.

And so even if Section 1 applied - which I contend it does not - the Governments have failed these tests and therefore their actions are unconstitutional.

The Courts so far have failed us and abused the Charter.

I. Sins of Omission and Sins of Commission

Perhaps nowhere is the fatal flaw (error in law) of the various court judgements concerning the Charter of Rights and Freedoms more blatant than in the omission of consideration of the first words of the Charter itself:

“Whereas Canada is founded upon principles that recognize the supremacy of God and the rule of law:”

Note the grammatical use of the colon. Everything comes after this!

All considerations of the Charter must be “in the context of”, “under the umbrella of” these important concepts.

One does not have the luxury to pick and choose what parts of the Charter are to apply in a given case. The totality of the Charter must be considered, applied in any rendering of judgement concerning the Charter.

Nowhere in the judgements I have read considering the Charter in this circumstance has consideration been given to this important part of the Charter, its introduction, that is obviously designed to guide the rest of the Charter and its interpretation.

What does “supremacy of God” mean?

Is it a stretch to consider unalienable rights?

Does it not mean justice and fairness, at the very least?

One is reminded of the US Declaration of Independence, A document very much a part of the jurisprudence of North America.

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.”⁴

What does “rule of law” mean?

Does it mean following the law as written, applying consistency to justice?

Robert H. Bork writing in his book *Coercing Virtue* states:

“One of the indispensable institutions of Western civilization is the rule of law. That rule is central to democratic government, a vigorous economy, and individual liberty. A functioning rule of law requires that law be understood to have force and moral of its own, a force and weight independent of the political and cultural struggles of the moment.”⁵

⁴ Jefferson, T. (1776, July 4). *Declaration of Independence: A Transcription*. National Archives; The U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript>

⁵ Bork, R. H. (2003). *Coercing Virtue : The Worldwide Rule of Judges*. Aei Press.

I submit that all the judgements rendered, that involve interpretation of the Charter, must involve consideration of all the relevant parts of the Charter. Failure to do so renders these judgements incomplete and hence invalid.

In the present context, the recent judgements interpreting the Charter are invalid because they err in omitting consideration of the first words and concepts of that very charter - concepts that are supposed to guide the subsequent interpretations of the court.

The ruling by Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench of Manitoba, for example, makes this statement in his conclusions:

“There is no constitutional or any legal basis for invalidating the impugned provisions of the PHOs as argued by the applicants. Section 67 of the PHA represents neither an unconstitutional nor an undemocratic delegation of power.”⁶

This omits any consideration of the context in which this decision should have been made, that is *the other relevant parts of the Charter*.

A judge does not have the authority, I contend, to arbitrarily decide what parts of the Charter to consider in deciding a case based on the Charter. If so, it makes a mockery out of the concept of Justice. The Charter's words mean something, all of them, and must be interpreted in the light of all the evidence submitted.

Additionally, the Judge omits any reference to the substantial scientific information submitted by the litigants.

Finally, sacred individual freedoms and rights that took 114 years to form part of the Constitution are not to be swept away by ignoring the concepts that were to guide the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and form its context: the supremacy of God and the rule of law.

Similarly, other relevant cases bearing on the present circumstance recently heard in the Supreme Court of BC - *Beaudoin v British Columbia, 2021*⁷ and *Klassen v British Columbia (Attorney General), 2021*⁸ - fail to include in their consideration of the Charter the first concepts introduced that are supposed to guide in the deliberation of the Charter.

Tangentially, in the referenced Manitoba case, the Judge did not carry out his obligation and rule using all relevant law based on the evidence, instead bowing to an unelected bureaucrat stating that he as a judge was not an expert in health matters - as

⁶ *Gateway Bible Baptist Church et al. v. Manitoba et al.*, 2021 MBQB 218.

https://web.archive.org/web/20211029145825/http://www.manitobacourts.mb.ca/site/assets/files/1042/gateway_bible_baptist_church_et_al_v_manitoba_et_al_2021_mbqb_218.pdf

⁷ *Beaudoin v. British Columbia*, 2021 BCSC 248. <https://archive.ph/BnweT>

⁸ *Klassen v. British Columbia (Attorney General)*, 2021 BCSC 2254. <https://archive.ph/IvT21>

if in all his other judgements he has made involved him being an expert on all the various subjects that came before him. Are we to deduce that this is how judges decide cases these days? Not on the law interpreted through the evidence presented, but on the views of one set of experts. This is an abdication of duty.

Let me describe some of my views concerning *Beaudoin v British Columbia*.

While the judge recognizes the importance of the Charter in point 56 in his ruling (although without specifically referencing the concepts of the supremacy of God and the rule of law as is his mandate) he goes on to essentially ignore it in the manner in which he deals with the violations of the Charter later in his judgement.

Nowhere in this judgement is there evidence that the Province “demonstrably justified” the multiple actions to restrict the freedoms and rights of the people. Often one finds an over emphasis on the phrase “reasonable limits” and less emphasis on “demonstrably justify.” In any plain reading of Section 1, it is about demonstrably justifying, by law, within reasonable limits consistent with the values of a free and democratic society. None of these tests have been clearly established in the Judge’s ruling.

By October, the Government and/or the Judge knew or ought to have known that many of the statements of the previous year by the Ministry of Health proved to be incorrect. The incidence of receipt and transmission of the virus by the vaccinated being one dramatic example. In other words, the very premise for the vaccine, namely, to prevent contracting the virus, proved blatantly wrong. And data from around the world was readily available about the incidence of cases rising after lockdowns were introduced. This is not rocket science and was available in both government and independent publications, of which there are many.

The framework of the Charter is contained in the opening sentence of the Charter. But this is not mentioned anywhere in the Judge’s decision and renders incomplete a full assessment of the application of the Charter.

The Government and/or the judge knew or ought to have known that its/his slavish reliance on the now well-known faulty science of the Provincial Department of Health (Section 118) was a big problem.

The Government of British Columbia and/or the Judge knew or ought to have known of the significant health problems caused by the Government’s measures, including delayed surgeries causing injury and death. Many know at least someone damaged by these measures or who died.

We are talking about *life and death*, and it behooves the Government and/or the judge to ensure they have the most relevant information. A full year previous, the Great Barrington Declaration was issued. Results from the Governments of Israel and the UK

were readily available, real data showing the Provincial Government's narrative to be flawed. And data from the US and Europe Government Agencies showing deaths and injuries from the COVID-19 vaccines to be more than all the deaths and injuries from all vaccines for the past 30 years combined.

And in the Judge's own backyard, at Simon Fraser University in Burnaby, British Columbia, Dr. Douglas Allen published a paper in April 2021 a full six months before his decision entitled "Covid Lockdown: Cost Benefits: A Critical Assessment of the Literature" in which it was revealed that most of the data relied upon by Governments like the Government of British Columbia was unreliable and much of it false. 80 studies were examined.

Surely this information should have been considered sufficient for a pause in what was being implemented.

The other aspect of this sad tale is that the Government of British Columbia has an obligation to bring all the latest scientific information to the Judge's attention - as the Judge and the Government keep saying - in the public interest. The Premier and Minister of Health take an oath to conduct their affairs with integrity.

The Courts of Canada have a solemn obligation to interpret the Charter of Rights and Freedoms as written, especially those concepts that undergird its very existence: The Supremacy of God and the rule of law. "**Constitutions,**" as Bork said, "**speak for permanent values.**"

B. Justifiable Science

"The task of understanding the trajectory of a virus through a population falls within the purview of a few specific scientific fields. Lockdowns, in contrast, impact all aspects of our society. So, what we have here is not a singular, specific problem, to be tackled by a small group of 'experts' with domain-specific knowledge and skills. Instead, we face a vast web of interrelated problems, demanding many different areas of theoretical and practical expertise."⁹

- Professor Mathew Ratcliffe, Department of Philosophy, York University, writing on the website Collateral Global.

It has been known for many months that the restrictions that have been placed on our rights and freedoms do not work. The Great Barrington Declaration of October 4, 2020 should have alerted governments that their approach was wrong.¹⁰ This declaration was instigated by three world-class medical scientists: Dr. Martin Kulldorff, Professor at

⁹ Ratcliffe, M. (2021, October 1). *ESSAY: How Lockdowns Eclipse the Harms They Cause*. Collateral Global. <https://collateralglobal.org/article/how-lockdowns-eclipse-the-harms-they-cause/>

¹⁰ Kulldorff, M., Gupta, S., & Bhattacharya, J. (2020, October 4). *Great Barrington Declaration and Petition*. Great Barrington Declaration. <https://gbdeclaration.org/>

Harvard University; Dr. Sunetra Gupta, Professor at Oxford University; and Dr. Jay Bhattacharya, Professor at Stanford University. The declaration reads, in part:

“The most compassionate approach that balances the risks and benefits of reaching herd immunity, is to allow those who are at minimal risk of death to live their lives normally to build up immunity to the virus through natural infection, while better protecting those who are at highest risk. We call this Focused Protection.”

This declaration has been signed by over 45,000 medical practitioners and over 15,000 medical and public health scientists.

Additionally, numerous studies have shown the folly of wearing masks; yet our governments continue to invade our bodily autonomy with useless mask mandates. Swiss Policy Research has detailed 39 studies and has concluded that “so far, most studies found little to no evidence for the effectiveness of face masks in the general population, neither as personal protective equipment nor as a source control.”¹¹

To cite just one of these studies:

“A Danish randomized controlled trial with 6000 participants, published in the *Annals of Internal Medicine* found no statistically significant effect of high-quality medical face masks against SARS-CoV-2 infection in a community setting.”¹²

Then there are the PCR tests - a flawed procedure not even designed for the diagnostic purposes for which they are being used today. Even the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) is phasing out their use in the context of COVID-19. Furthermore, the fact that we in Canada are performing our PCR tests at cycle threshold (Ct) values of at least 30, and in some provinces over 40, means we are generating in the range of at least 95% false positives.

The following study is instructive:

“The research group of French professor Didier Raoult has recently shown that at a cycle threshold (Ct) of 25, about 70% of samples remained positive in cell culture (i.e. were infectious); at a Ct of 30, 20% of samples remained positive; at a Ct of 35, 3% of samples remained positive; and at a Ct above 35, no sample remained positive (infectious) in cell culture.”

¹¹ Swiss Policy Research. (2021, December). *Are Face Masks Effective? The Evidence*. Swiss Policy Research. <https://swprs.org/face-masks-evidence/>

¹² Bundgaard, H., Bundgaard, J. S., Raaschou-Pedersen, D. E. T., von Buchwald, C., Todsén, T., Norsk, J. B., Pries-Heje, M. M., Vissing, C. R., Nielsen, P. B., Winsløw, U. C., Fogh, K., Hasselbalch, R., Kristensen, J. H., Ringgaard, A., Porsborg Andersen, M., Goecke, N. B., Trebbien, R., Skovgaard, K., Benfield, T., & Ullum, H. (2020). *Effectiveness of Adding a Mask Recommendation to Other Public Health Measures to Prevent SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Danish Mask Wearers*. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. <https://doi.org/10.7326/m20-6817>

“This means that if a person gets a ‘positive’ PCR test result at a cycle threshold of 35 or higher (as applied in most US labs and many European labs), the chance that the person is infectious is less than 3%. The chance that the person received a “false-positive” result is 97% or higher.”^{13, 14}

On November 30, 2021, Dr. Paul Elias Alexander (former Professor at McMaster University, former advisor to the US Government and the World Health Organization) wrote the following for the Brownstone Institute:

“What follows is the current totality of the body of evidence (available comparative studies and high-level pieces of evidence, reporting, and discussion) on COVID-19 lockdowns, masks, school closures, and mask mandates. There is no conclusive evidence supporting claims that any of these restrictive measures worked to reduce viral transmission or deaths.

Lockdowns were ineffective, school closures were ineffective, mask mandates were ineffective, and masks themselves were and are ineffective and harmful.”¹⁵

Dr. Douglas Allen of Simon Fraser University in British Columbia has done a study showing the cure is worse than the disease. His abstract states:

“An examination of over 80 COVID-19 studies reveals that many relied on assumptions that were false, and which tended to overestimate the benefits and underestimate the costs of lockdown. As a result, most of the early cost/benefit studies arrived at conclusions that were refuted later by data, and which rendered their cost/benefit findings incorrect.”¹⁶

Where are the governments and our courts on all this independent science? It’s not like the information is being hidden. One click of the mouse, and the breadth of scientific debate is available to all!

Sadly, it is being deliberately ignored.

And it is this faulty science that forms the basis of these unconstitutional measures and some faulty court decisions early on.

Governments and courts deny what has happened in Florida, Sweden, and Uttar Pradesh, India. This latter state of over 200 million people has been able to reduce the

¹³ Jaafar, R., Aherfi, S., Wurtz, N., Grimaldier, C., Hoang, V. T., Colson, P., Raoult, D., & La Scola, B. (2021). *Corrigendum to: Correlation Between 3790 Quantitative Polymerase Chain Reaction–Positives Samples and Positive Cell Cultures, Including 1941 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Isolates*. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 73(9), 1745–1745. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab531>

¹⁴ *The Trouble With PCR Tests*. (2020, October 4). Swiss Policy Research. <https://archive.ph/XqoKn>

¹⁵ Alexander, P. E. (2021, November 30). *More Than 400 Studies on the Failure of Compulsory Covid Interventions*. Brownstone Institute. <https://archive.ph/WdAok>

¹⁶ Allen, D. W. (2021). *Covid Lockdown Cost/Benefits: A Critical Assessment of the Literature*. Simon Fraser University. <https://www.sfu.ca/~allen/LockdownReport.pdf>

impact of COVID-19 through early treatment and have fewer deaths and so-called cases than other states that implemented harsher lockdowns. Their rate of vaccination was significantly less than 15% in early July, 2021, when their huge peak of COVID-19 cases in May and June was almost completely reversed..

Most tragically, governments have denied and ignored the medical repercussions of lockdowns — the delayed surgeries, the delayed and cancelled specialist appointments, the increased rates of anxiety, depression and suicides.

Furthermore, they have deliberately downplayed the value of Vitamin D, Zinc, Vitamin C and Quercetin in reducing hospitalization and the severity of the disease and the value of repurposed drugs used early such as Hydroxychloroquine and Ivermectin. Dr. Peter McCullough, a world-renowned researcher in the field has persuasively shown that institutionalized early treatment could reduce hospitalizations by up to 85%. Even the value of exercise and reduction of obesity was completely ignored in public messaging.

Prevention of illness - once the hallmark of Public Health Policy - is absent from the discussion. Why is this?

Appendix/Sequel

The Four Horsemen of the Modern Era

If the above is not enough, we have the Four Horsemen of the Modern Era circling over us like massive dragons ready to pounce on any deviation in behaviour by the people to the Government edicts.

Consider the power of the media. They formed their oxymoronically-named 'Trusted News Initiative' that essentially blocks all news that is negative to their narrative that all is well, and that the lockdown destruction is not real, and the hundreds of thousands of deaths from the vaccines are untrue. They attack alternate views by playing the "conspiracy theory" card, which has up to now, succeeded in keeping the masses in check. Meanwhile, in Canada, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation alone takes in around \$1.2 billion from the Federal Government. This is just one of the media outlets that is supposed to expose conflicts of interest in high places – and has now fallen on its own sword.

Our governments have become too big and undemocratic. The Parliaments of this nation should be meeting regularly and overseeing what is happening. The people are shut out and a small coterie of people in a hyper focused discipline are running the show, completely ignoring the Emergency Measures that are in place ready to give the weighted balance of the many disciplines needed to properly manage the situation. The Prime Minister is acting like a President or Monarch; the power has shifted from Parliament to The Prime Minister's office, bypassing even the Cabinet. There are over

1400 people working directly for the PM in the Privy Council Office and the Prime Minister's Office, consuming an annual budget of \$150 million. Yet, there are over 7000 other executives working for the Government. For a full examination of this dire situation let me recommend *Democracy in Canada - The Disintegration of Our Institutions* by Donald A. Savoie.

Big Pharma has its tentacles everywhere - from the local hospital purchasing agent to the Cabinet Room. The intermingling of people on government regulatory agencies and Big Pharma is a prime example of the rot that has set in. These are the people who will not stand behind their product yet reap billions of dollars from the masses with its use; an experimental product whose long-term effects are completely unknown. Pfizer has had to settle out of court for billions of dollars as a result of charges brought against it; \$175 million because of experiments on Nigerian Children, \$2.3 billion to settle false claims that the company gave to governments, and \$300 million regarding Chantix. And now, the recent study by the Canadian Covid Care Alliance that exposes Pfizer's unethical behaviour in the conduct of its clinical trials on the COVID-19 vaccine.¹⁷ Don't think that Pfizer's efforts are being driven by any real humanitarian concern. The mark up in the retail price of each produced inoculation is at least 16-times the production cost for over 90% of the vaccines sold.¹⁸¹⁷

Big Tech is perhaps the most dangerous, hiding behind their portals to commit all manner of wrongdoing and doublespeak. Their friendly ties with China, excusing many of the horrific abuses there, to gain their twenty pieces of silver and market access is well known. Acting as judge and jury to gain access to their websites smacks of corruption to which governments seem powerless to act, given that many politicians receive substantial sums of money (fronted through false so-called non-profits and other nefarious entities) from these tech behemoths.

This is now the nature of our Western society, corrupted from within and without by these horsemen.

Hon A. Brian Peckford P.C.
Parksville. British Columbia, Canada

¹⁷ The claim was that the inoculations were safe and showed 95% efficacy 7 days after the 2nd dose. But that 95% was actually Relative Risk Reduction. Absolute Risk Reduction was only 0.84%.

1817

<https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/vaccine-monopolies-make-cost-vaccinating-world-against-covid-least-5-times-more>