



Letter Of Introduction

Letter To The RCMP Commissioner

Letter To The Govenor General

Letter To The OPP Commissioner

Letter To The Lieutenant Govenor

Letter To Local MPP

Premier Admits to Breach of Trust

During the Ontario Provincial Election, June 2014, I watched the debate between the opposing political Parties. As it stands we have had the same government in power for over 10 years and there has been scandal after scandal. Nothing has stuck and I find this very concerning.

During the debates, the Leader of the Liberal Party, Kathleen Wynne, admitted, on live television, that there had been a "breach of trust" by her government. This was in regards to over a billion tax-payers dollars being use to cancel/relocate the two gas powered electricity generating plants. This was merely so the sitting Party could garner 2 more seats, during the previous election.

What was said will shock most, but what I find incredibly shocking is that Kathleen Wynne has openly admitted that there has been a "breach of trust," by government, and yet there still hasn't been any charges laid. The charges, in my opinion, should be at least laid, based on her statements, if not "fraud", conspiracy, etc. There is no immunity, outside of the House. What the Kathleen Wynne stated during the debate was:

Approx. 2:02 minutes –

...I want to address – I want to address the issue particularly of the relocation of the gas plants. The decisions around the relocation of the gas plants that were made were wrong. ... And there was public money that was wasted in those decisions and that shouldn't have happened.

And in the process the public good was sacrificed to partisan interests.

... But I know – I know that people are still angry you have a right to be angry because – because – there was – there was a breach of trust between the government and the people of the province. – END 3:09¹

There isn't anyway anyone could not understand that this is an admission of a criminal act, by the Kathleen Wynne and the continuing government.

I have waited, like many Ontarians, for charges to be laid. Nothing has happened. This, like all of the other scandals, has taken too long. So why hasn't anyone been charged?

They have the Kathleen Wynne admitting to "breach of trust" and in that admission, she is fully aware of her statement, as there would have been discussions about what exactly "breach of trust" means. Kathleen Wynne has not revealed anyone, to our knowledge, so who should be charged. In my opinion, it should be:

- the executive of the Liberal Party, (they would all be informed)
- the entire Liberal Caucus (meaning all Liberal MPPs at that time),
- all Deputy Ministers,
- and all party advisors.

This is the only way to ensure those who were involved are properly charged. And this may be why so many sitting MPPs jumped ship before the 2014 election.

People have lost faith in the police and justice system. The investigation should be over; the admission has been stated. If the OPP are concerned that there may be political ramifications by pursuing charges, they should turn the investigation over to the R.C.M.P. Or the Lieutenant Governor should instruct the authorities to press the charges, as this has placed the Crown, the government and the entire justice system in disrepute. Ontarians have had enough of this pious arrogant disregard for the rule of law.

¹ <http://www.cbc.ca/elections/ontariovotes2014/features/view/ontario-provincial-leaders-debate>

The above leads to why the enclosed has been mailed to you. Many people in Ontario have already sent the accompanying letters to the Lieutenant Governor, the OPP Commissioner, the R.C.M.P. Commissioner, the Governor General and their sitting MPP.

And as for how all of this came about. When I heard Kathleen Wynne make the statement about the government committing "breach of trust" I waited for the press to report that she, and members of government, had been charged. After about 6-7 months of nothing happening, I contacted a lawyer to find out how much it would cost to have her, and those involved, charged. This lawyer gave me some very good advice and expressed that no matter how much money I had, and even if the charges were laid, the charges would be dismissed by the Attorney General's Office. We then had a discussion as to how we could accomplish the removal of this criminal element from government. We came up with sending letters to those who do have the authority to do this. We also knew that it would take literally thousands of letters. That is why I am sending this package to you.

If you agree with the contents of these letters, please fill in the blanks and mail them. If you know of other people who you feel would agree with them, please make copies so that the others may also mail them. The more people who do this, the better chance we have, to make those who committed this crime, removed from governing our province and perhaps get people who deserve to be elected, elected.

I am completely non-partisan. I wouldn't care which political party was involved, as it doesn't matter to me. When someone violates the law; violates the people who put trust in them; and violates the very core of what this Nation stands for, I would still be doing the exact same thing. If it were you or me, who had committed these acts and had admitted to it, we would have been charged and arrested by now. Kathleen Wynne and those others involved are only people like us, particularly during an election because anyone can run for office, doesn't matter who they are if they meet the requirements. She should have removed herself after she made the statement, because she had admitted to a criminal act, so shame on her. And one final note, with her being the Premier and knowing there had been a breach of trust, considering she had sworn an oath to uphold the law, should she not have reported it, herself, to the R.C.M.P. and had those involved charged? So again, if you agree, and it is entirely up to you, with the enclosed letters, please fill in the blanks and mail them.

Name: _____

Address: _____

• _____

• _____

Postal Code: _____

Commissioner Bob Paulson
RCMP National Headquarters
Headquarters Building
73 Leikin Drive
Ottawa ON K1A 0R2

Date: _____

Re: Premier Admits to Breach of Trust

Commissioner Paulson:

We, the people of Ontario, demand that the R.C.M.P. immediately charge Premier Kathleen Wynne, and all those involved, for the very least Breach of Trust and Conspiracy, etc. During the Ontario Provincial Election Debate, last June, the Premier of Ontario, Kathleen Wynne, admitted to Breach of Trust. The proof is supplied.

The Premier of Ontario, Kathleen Wynne, admitted, on live television, that there had been a "breach of trust" by her government. This was in regards to over a billion tax-payers dollars being use to cancel/relocate the two gas-powered generating plants, merely so the Liberal Party could garner 2 more seats, during the previous election. What she had said was:

Approx. 2:02 minutes –

...I want to address – I want to address the issue particularly of the relocation of the gas plants. The decisions around the relocation of the gas plants that were made were wrong. ... And there was public money that was wasted in those decisions and that shouldn't have happened. **And in the process the public good was sacrificed to partisan interests. ... But I know – I know that people are still angry you have a right to be angry because – because – there was – there was a breach of trust between the government and the people of the province.**² – END 3:09

Upon review of the R.C.M.P. Act³ and other documents⁴, it would seem that the R.C.M.P. have paramount jurisdiction throughout Canada, including Ontario.

² <http://www.cbc.ca/elections/ontariovotes2014/features/view/ontario-provincial-leaders-debate>

³ 11.1 (1) Every officer is a peace officer in every part of Canada and has all the powers, authority, protection and privileges that a peace officer has by law until the officer ceases to be an officer.

18. It is the duty of members who are peace officers, subject to the orders of the Commissioner,

(a) to perform all duties that are assigned to peace officers in relation to the preservation of the peace, the prevention of crime and of offences against the laws of Canada and the laws in force in any province in which they may be employed, and the apprehension of criminals and offenders and others who may be lawfully taken into custody;

(b) to execute all warrants, and perform all duties and services in relation thereto, that may, under this Act or the laws of Canada or the laws in force in any province, be lawfully executed and performed by peace officers;

(c) to perform all duties that may be lawfully performed by peace officers in relation to the escort and conveyance of convicts and other persons in custody to or from any courts, places of punishment or confinement, asylums or other places; and (d) to perform such other duties and functions as are prescribed by the Governor in Council or the Commissioner. R.S., c. R-9, s. 18. R.C.M.P. Act.

⁴ "[31]...The fact that the federal Parliament enjoys exclusive jurisdiction over the "administration and management" of the federal police means that provincial legislation cannot, despite concurrent jurisdiction over criminal law enforcement in the province, derogate from federal authority to *appoint* and *empower* persons to enforce federal legislation. Put simply, concurrent jurisdiction over criminal law enforcement does not authorize encroachment on the other level of legislative competence in

As expressed in Extra-Jurisdictional Authority of Provincially Appointed Officers in Canada, a Discussion Paper, prepared for The Uniform Law Conference of Canada by Johnathan H. Bilton, Osgoode Hall Law School and Philip C. Stenning, Associate Professor, Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto, 2001:

"[26] Interestingly, an effect of this exclusive provincial jurisdiction to "appoint, control and discipline municipal and provincial police officers" is to inform the meaning of "peace officer" in section 2 of the *Criminal Code*⁵ and, potentially, to place limits on the effective enforcement of the criminal law.

The Supreme Court of Canada in *Nolan* unanimously recognized this relationship between appointment and empowerment to enforce the criminal law:

"[I]t is important to remember that the definition of "peace officer" in s. 2 of the *Criminal Code* is not designed to create a police force. It simply provides that certain persons who derive their authority from other sources will be treated as "peace officers" as well, enabling them to enforce the *Criminal Code* within the scope of their pre-existing authority, and to benefit from certain protections granted only to "peace officers"⁶.

Based on the R.C.M.P. Act, and the Criminal Code of Canada it is the obligation of the R.C.M.P. to perform the duties, as described in the R.C.M.P. Act, under section 18⁷ being that it is the duty of members who are peace officers, subject to the orders of the Commissioner.

The admission has been clearly stated. The OPP may have a conflict of interest, based on their requirements to report to the provincial legislature and that they are "creatures of the province." Considering there has been a public admission of guilt, by the Premier, we, the people of Ontario, demand that the R.C.M.P. immediately charge Kathleen Wynne, and all those involved, for the very least Breach of Trust and Conspiracy. This is your duty for the protection of the people and the honour of the R.C.M.P. and the Crown.

Respectfully,

Signature: _____
Print Name: _____

relation to the appointment of persons satisfying the definition of "peace officer". Indeed, to allow provincial Legislatures to extend the reach of legislation into the appointment and empowerment of federal policing agents in the field of criminal law would in effect be to allow it to legislate in an area of exclusive federal jurisdiction under section 91 of the *Constitution Act, 1867*." EXTRA-JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY OF PROVINCIALY APPOINTED POLICE OFFICERS IN CANADA A DISCUSSION PAPER, prepared under contract for The Uniform Law Conference of Canada by Johnathan H. Bilton (Law student, Osgoode Hall Law School, York University, Ontario) & Philip C. Stenning (Associate Professor, Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto) June 2001, p. 19-20

⁵ Section 2 of the *Criminal Code* reads, in part: "peace officer" includes ... (c) a police officer, police constable, bailiff, constable, or other person employed for the preservation and maintenance of the public peace or for the service or execution of civil process".

⁶ *Nolan*, *supra* note 21 at 295 (per Dickson C.J. writing for the Court). See also comment by His Lordship referring to but not explicating the division of powers difficulties associated with interpreting s. 2 of the *Criminal Code* as conferring plenary "peace officer" authority to all persons enumerated in that section (*ibid.* at 296):

"[T]o treat s. 2 of the *Criminal Code* as a broad grant of authority to thousands of persons to act as "peace officers" in any circumstances could well prompt a constitutional challenge. In the context of division of powers, legislation should be interpreted, when possible, so that it is not *ultra vires*. ... I would therefore conclude that the definition of "peace officer" in s. 2 of the *Criminal Code* serves only to grant additional powers to enforce the criminal law to persons who must otherwise operate within the limits of their statutory or common law sources of authority" [emphasis added]. EXTRA-JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY OF PROVINCIALY APPOINTED POLICE OFFICERS IN CANADA A DISCUSSION PAPER, prepared under contract for The Uniform Law Conference of Canada by Johnathan H. Bilton (Law student, Osgoode Hall Law School, York University, Ontario) & Philip C. Stenning (Associate Professor, Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto) June 2001, p. 15.

⁷ 18. (a) to perform all duties that are assigned to peace officers in relation to the preservation of the peace, the prevention of crime and of offences against the laws of Canada and the laws in force in any province in which they may be employed, and the apprehension of criminals and offenders and others who may be lawfully taken into custody

Name: _____
Address: _____

Postal Code: _____

Commissioner J.V.N. (Vince) Hawkes
Ontario Provincial Police
General Headquarters
Lincoln M. Alexander Building
777 Memorial Avenue
Orillia, ON L3V 7V3

Date: _____

Re: Premier Admits to Breach of Trust

Commissioner Hawkes:

During the Ontario Provincial Election Debate, last June, there was a debate between the opposing political parties. I am completely non-partisan but we have had, in the past 10 years or so, scandal after scandal. No one has been charged and I find this very concerning.

The Premier of Ontario, Kathleen Wynne, admitted, on live television, that there had been a "breach of trust" by her government. This was in regards to over a billion tax-payers dollars being use to cancel/relocate the two gas-powered generating plants. This was merely so the Liberal Party could garner 2 more seats, during the previous election.

The charges, in my opinion, should be at least Criminal Breach of Trust, and/or Breach of Trust by Public Officer,⁸ based on the Premier's statements, if not "fraud", etc. There is no immunity, outside of the House. What she had said was:

Approx. 2:02 minutes –

...I want to address – I want to address the issue particularly of the relocation of the gas plants. The decisions around the relocation of the gas plants that were made were wrong. ... And there was public money that was wasted in those decisions and that shouldn't have happened.

And in the process the public good was sacrificed to partisan interests.

... But I know – I know that people are still angry you have a right to be angry because – because – there was – there was a breach of trust between the government and the people of the province.⁹ – END 3:09

⁸ 122. Every official who, in connection with the duties of his office, commits fraud or a breach of trust is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, whether or not the fraud or breach of trust would be an offence if it were committed in relation to a private person. R.S., c. C-34, s. 111.

³³⁶. Every one who, being a trustee of anything for the use or benefit, whether in whole or in part, of another person, or for a public or charitable purpose, converts, with intent to defraud and in contravention of his trust, that thing or any part of it to a use that is not authorized by the trust is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding fourteen years. R.S., c. C-34, s. 296.

⁹ <http://www.cbc.ca/elections/ontariovotes2014/features/view/ontario-provincial-leaders-debate>

There isn't anyone who could misunderstand that this is an admission of a criminal act, by the Premier, on behalf of herself and government. I have waited, like all Ontarians, for charges to be laid. So why hasn't anyone been charged?

The Premier admitted to "breach of trust" and in that admission, she is fully aware of her statement, as this would be part of her duties as Premier. The Premier has not revealed anyone, to our knowledge, so if she knows and is not revealing who is guilty, could this also be construed as "aiding and abetting"¹⁰? As for who should be charged? In my opinion, it should be:

- the executive of the Liberal Party, (they would all be informed)
- the entire Liberal Caucus (meaning all Liberal MPPs at that time),
- all Deputy Ministers,
- and all party advisors.

This is the only way to ensure those who were involved are properly investigated and charged.

People have lost faith in the police and justice system. The investigation should be over; the admission has been stated. It would seem the OPP may have political concerns which may explain why there has not been charges laid, this investigation should now be turned over to the R.C.M.P. and charges laid, considering there has been a public admission of guilt. Ontarians have had enough of this abusive disregard for the rule of law.

Respectfully,

Signature: _____
Print Name: _____

¹⁰ **21.** (1) Every one is a party to an offence who

(a) actually commits it;

(b) does or omits to do anything for the purpose of aiding any person to commit it; or

(c) abets any person in committing it.

(2) Where two or more persons form an intention in common to carry out an unlawful purpose and to assist each other therein and any one of them, in carrying out the common purpose, commits an offence, each of them who knew or ought to have known that the commission of the offence would be a probable consequence of carrying out the common purpose is a party to that offence. R.S., c. C-34, s. 21.

22. (1) Where a person counsels another person to be a party to an offence and that other person is afterwards a party to that offence, the person who counselled is a party to that offence, notwithstanding that the offence was committed in a way different from that which was counselled.

(2) Every one who counsels another person to be a party to an offence is a party to every offence that the other commits in consequence of the counselling that the person who counselled knew or ought to have known was likely to be committed in consequence of the counselling.

(3) For the purposes of this Act, "counsel" includes procure, solicit or incite. R.S., 1985, c. C-46, s. 22; R.S., 1985, c. 27 (1st Supp.), s. 7.

23. (1) An accessory after the fact to an offence is one who, knowing that a person has been a party to the offence, receives, comforts or assists that person for the purpose of enabling that person to escape.

(2) [Repealed, 2000, c. 12, s. 92] R.S., 1985, c. C-46, s. 23; 2000, c. 12, s. 92.

Fraudulent concealment

341. Every one who, for a fraudulent purpose, takes, obtains, removes or conceals anything is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years. R.S., c. C-34, s. 301.

Name: _____
Address: _____

Postal Code: _____

His Excellency the Right Honourable David Johnston
Governor General of Canada
Rideau Hall
1 Sussex Drive
Ottawa Ontario
K1A 0A1

Date: _____

Re: Breach of Trust by the Ontario provincial government

Your Excellency the Right Honourable David Johnston
Governor General of Canada:

I, being a Canadian resident, situate within the geographical boundaries of Ontario, do plea, ask, beseech Your Excellency to instruct Premier Kathleen Wynne to present to the Commissioner of the R.C.M.P. the names of those who were involved in, what is commonly known as, the gas-plant cancellation and/or relocation electricity generation scandal, and to have those involved charged under the Criminal Code of Canada. The RCMP may, under the circumstances, have those involved immediately charged for, at least, Criminal Breach of Trust, Breach of Trust by a public officer, based on the statement of Premier Kathleen Wynne.

This plea is founded on the admission of the Premier, on June 3, 2014, during the Ontario Provincial Election Debate, where she stated:

Approx. 2:02 minutes – Premier Kathleen Wynne states:

"I want to address the issue particularly of the relocation of the gas plants. The decisions around the relocation of the gas plants that were made were wrong...And there was public money that was wasted in those decisions and that shouldn't have happened.
And in the process the public good was sacrificed to partisan interests.
... But I know – I know that people are still angry you have a right to be angry because – because – there was – there was a breach of trust between the government and the people of the province..."¹¹

I understand that it is the obligation of the Governor General to stand back, except in extreme circumstances, and one of those circumstances involves upholding the law and for the protection of the people¹². Not only is there historical confirmation of this, it was also expressed in "The Governor General and Lieutenant Governors: Canada's Misunderstood Viceroys", by - David S. Donovan, Ontario Legislature Internship Programme (OLIP), Paper presented at the 2009 Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association."

"But in truth, there is a long-standing legal foundation in Canada which endows our vice-regals with wide-ranging and significant political powers. The legal groundwork of which appears throughout

¹¹ <http://www.cbc.ca/elections/ontariovotes2014/features/view/ontario-provincial-leaders-debate>

¹² The duties of a Governor may be summed up in three heads:...he must refrain from personal interference with the ministers in their direction of local affairs except to uphold the law or protect the people; and he must consent to all acts of government except in extreme cases. Government in Canada D. S. O'Sullivan 1879-1887, Page 38.

*The British North America Act, 1867, The Letters Patent, 1947¹³, The Constitution Act, 1982, as well as Commonwealth law and tradition which encompasses the Royal prerogatives. Nevertheless, despite this legal foundation, misconceptions remain in both the public mind and the Canadian body politic, including conventions. Yet, then again, throughout Canada, instances exist in which these political powers have been invoked, upon the discretion of the vice-regal, which seem to snub convention; suggesting that they remain in full legal effect."*¹⁴

Based on these circumstances, I realize how the office of the Governor General is to function, and as expressed in the 2009 paper:

"Essentially, should circumstances arise, these eleven so-called 'ceremonial' vice-regals have the power to dismiss their premier or prime minister, call for an election, offer the government to an opposition party or coalition and even veto legislation."

The Office of the Provincial Attorney General has been, and continues to be, tainted based on its involvement with many scandals and its dereliction of duty to protect the honour of the Crown, therefore there is no constructive or legal application in sending letters to the Office of the Provincial Attorney General.

Your Chief of Staff could forward these letters to the Federal Attorney General, asking for assistance, or he/she could forward these letters to the RCMP asking for assistance, on behalf of your Office. The reason for the involvement of the RCMP is that, it would seem, the OPP may have a conflict of interest with the requirement to report to the provincial legislature and that they are "creatures of the province."

Based on the statement, by Kathleen Wynne, it shows that the Premier knows there was at least a breach of trust by government, and therefore she knows who was involved and how they were involved. This has placed the Crown, the government and the entire justice system in disrepute. This is why, Your Excellency, I again do plea, ask, beseech You to instruct Premier Kathleen Wynne to present to the Commissioner of the R.C.M.P. the names of those who were involved in, what is commonly known as, the gas-plant cancellation and/or relocation electricity generation plant scandal, and to have those involved charged under the Criminal Code of Canada.

Respectfully,

Signature: _____

Print Name: _____

¹³ X. And We hereby declare Our Pleasure to be that Our Governor General for the time being shall, with all due solemnity, cause Our Commission under Our Great Seal of Canada, appointing Our Governor General for the time being, to be read and published in the presence of Our Chief Justice, or other Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, and of members of Our Privy Council for Canada, and that Our Governor General shall take the Oath of Allegiance in the form following:-"I, do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to His Majesty King George the Sixth, His Heirs and successors, according to law. So Help me God"; and likewise he shall take the usual Oath for the due execution of the Office of Our Governor General and Commander-in-Chief in and over Canada, and for the due impartial administration of justice; which Oaths Our Chief Justice, or, in his absence, or in the event of his being otherwise incapacitated, any Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada shall, and he is hereby required to, tender and administer unto him. Letters Patent Constituting the Office of Governor General of Canada.

¹⁴ The Governor General and Lieutenant Governors: Canada's Misunderstood Viceroy, by - David S. Donovan, 2008-2009 Intern, Ontario Legislature Internship Programme (OLIP), Paper presented at the 2009 Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Ottawa, Ontario, Wednesday, May 27th, 2009.

Name: _____
Address: _____

Postal Code: _____

Office of the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario
Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario M7A 1A1

Date: _____

Re: Breach of Trust by the sitting government and Failure of Lieutenant Governor's Chief of Staff

The Hon. Elizabeth Dowdeswell, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

I, being a resident, situate within the geographical boundaries of Ontario, do plea, ask, beseech Your Honour to instruct Premier Kathleen Wynne to present to you the names of those who were involved in, what is commonly known as, the gas-plant cancellation and/or relocation electricity generation scandal. Upon receipt of that information to forward said information to the RCMP to have those involved charged under the Criminal Code of Canada. The RCMP may, under the circumstances, have those involved immediately charged for, at least some of, the following: Criminal Breach of Trust, Breach of Trust by a public officer, Fraud, Conspiracy, Public servant refusing to deliver property, False pretence or false statement, Attempts accessories, Conspiracy in restraint of trade, etc.

This plea is based on the admission of the Premier, on June 3, 2014, during the Ontario Provincial Election Debate, where she stated:

Approx. 2:02 minutes – Premier Kathleen Wynne states:

"I want to address the issue particularly of the relocation of the gas plants. The decisions around the relocation of the gas plants that were made were wrong...And there was public money that was wasted in those decisions and that shouldn't have happened.
And in the process the public good was sacrificed to partisan interests.
... But I know – I know that people are still angry you have a right to be angry because – because – there was – there was a breach of trust between the government and the people of the province..."

I understand that it is the obligation of the Governor General, and the Lieutenant Governor, to stand back except in extreme circumstances, and one of those circumstances involves upholding the law and for the protection of the people¹⁵. Not only is there historical confirmation of this, it was also expressed in "The Governor General and Lieutenant Governors: Canada's Misunderstood Viceroys", by - David S. Donovan, Ontario Legislature Internship Programme (OLIP), Paper presented at the 2009 Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association."

"But in truth, there is a long-standing legal foundation in Canada which endows our vice-regals with wide-ranging and significant political powers. The legal groundwork of which appears throughout *The British North America Act, 1867, The Letters Patent, 1947, The Constitution Act, 1982*, as well as Commonwealth law and tradition which encompasses the Royal prerogatives. Nevertheless, despite this legal foundation, misconceptions remain in both the public mind and the Canadian

¹⁵ The duties of a Governor may be summed up in three heads: he must always act through advisers approved of by parliament; he must refrain from personal interference with the ministers in their direction of local affairs except to uphold the law or protect the people; and he must consent to all acts of government except in extreme cases. Government in Canada D. S. O'Sullivan 1879-1887, Page 38.

body politic, including conventions. Yet, then again, throughout Canada, instances exist in which these political powers have been invoked, upon the discretion of the vice-regal, which seem to snub convention; suggesting that they remain in full legal effect."¹⁶

As Frank Mackinnon stated, in the same paper:

"The Office of the Governor General and the Lieutenant Governor are Constitutional fire extinguishers with a potent mixture of powers for use in great emergencies. Like real extinguishers, they appear in bright colours and are strategically located. But everyone hopes their emergency powers will never be used; the fact that they are not used does not render them useless; and it is generally understood there are severe penalties for tampering with them."

Based on these circumstances, I realize how the office of the Lieutenant Governor is to function, and as expressed in the 2009 paper:

"Essentially, should circumstances arise, these eleven so-called 'ceremonial' vice-regals have the power to dismiss their premier or prime minister, call for an election, offer the government to an opposition party or coalition and even veto legislation."

The information, regarding the government's breach of trust, has been presented to your Honour, through your Chief of Staff, and yet your office continues to forward letters to the Attorney General's office, which was involved in the Breach of Trust.

The Office of the Attorney General has been, and continues to be tainted based on its involvement with many scandals and its dereliction of duty to protect the honour of the Crown, therefore there is not constructive or legal application in sending letters to the Office of the Provincial Attorney General. And with Your Chief of Staff having, previously, sent these letters to the Attorney General's Office and there still hasn't been charges laid, it shows that the Attorney General's Office continues to be tainted. Your Chief of Staff could, of course, forward these letters to the Federal Attorney General, asking for assistance, or he could forward these letters to the RCMP asking for assistance, one behalf of your Office. The reason for the involvement of the RCMP is that, it would seem, the OPP may have a conflict of interest with the requirement to report to the provincial legislature and that they are "creatures of the province."

Based on the statement, by Kathleen Wynne, it shows that the Premier knows there was at least a breach of trust by government, and therefore she knows who was involved and how they were involved. This has placed the Crown, the government and the entire justice system in disrepute. Ontarians have had enough of this pious arrogant disregard for the rule of law and their constitutional rights. This is why, Your Honour, I again do plea, ask, beseech Your Honour to instruct Premier Kathleen Wynne to present to you the names of those who were involved in, what is commonly known as, the gas-plant cancellation and/or relocation electricity generation plant scandal and forward that information to the RCMP to have those involved charged under the Criminal Code of Canada, or at the very least remove the offenders from any and all administrative duties, including disallowing them the privilege of attending in the Legislature.

Respectfully,

Signature: _____

Print Name: _____

¹⁶ The Governor General and Lieutenant Governors: Canada's Misunderstood Viceroys", by - David S. Donovan, 2008-2009 Intern, Ontario Legislature Internship Programme (OLIP), Paper presented at the 2009 Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Ottawa, Ontario, Wednesday, May 27th, 2009.

Name: _____

Address: _____

Postal Code: _____

MPP _____

Address: _____

Postal Code: _____

Date: _____

Re: Breach of Trust by the Ontario provincial government

MPP _____:

During the Ontario Provincial Election Debate, June, 2014, there was debate between the opposing political parties. The Liberal Candidate and Leader of the Liberal Party, Kathleen Wynne, admitted, on live television, that there had been a "breach of trust"¹⁷ by her government. This was in regards to over a billion tax-payers dollars being use to cancel/relocate the two gas-powered generating plants, merely so the Liberal Party could garner 2 more seats, during the previous election.

The charges, in my opinion, should be laid, arrests made, etc., based on Kathleen Wynne's statements, as an ordinary citizen at the time of admission, and that if it were any other people/person they would have been charged and arrested long before now. We have had, in the past 10 years or so, scandal after scandal. No one has been charged and I find this very concerning.

No one could misunderstand that there was an admission of a criminal act, by Kathleen Wynne, an unelected citizen, on behalf of herself and the government. So why hasn't anyone been charged? And why haven't you walked out in protest that charges have not been laid?

As your constituent, it is your duty to represent me in Queen's Park, so as your constituent, I want you to walk out in protest and not resume sitting until those in government who committed this crime are charged and removed from office. This is your duty to those who elected you to your seat. Criminal acts will only continue if you do not and this is the only way to ensure those who were involved are properly investigated and charged.

Upon review of the R.C.M.P. Act¹⁸ and other documents¹⁹, it would seem that the R.C.M.P. have paramount jurisdiction throughout Canada, including Ontario. Based on what is expressed in Extra-

¹⁷ Approx. 2:02 minutes –

...I want to address – I want to address the issue particularly of the relocation of the gas plants. The decisions around the relocation of the gas plants that were made were wrong. ... And there was public money that was wasted in those decisions and that shouldn't have happened. **And in the process the public good was sacrificed to partisan interests. ... But I know – I know that people are still angry you have a right to be angry because – because – there was – there was a breach of trust between the government and the people of the province.**¹⁷ – END 3:09.

<http://www.cbc.ca/elections/ontariovotes2014/features/view/ontario-provincial-leaders-debate>

¹⁸ **11.1** (1) Every officer is a peace officer in every part of Canada and has all the powers, authority, protection and privileges that a peace officer has by law until the officer ceases to be an officer.

18. It is the duty of members who are peace officers, subject to the orders of the Commissioner,

(a) to perform all duties that are assigned to peace officers in relation to the preservation of the peace, the prevention of crime and of offences against the laws of Canada and the laws in force in any province in which they may be employed, and the apprehension of criminals and offenders and others who may be lawfully taken into custody;

(b) to execute all warrants, and perform all duties and services in relation thereto, that may, under this Act or the laws of Canada or the laws in force in any province, be lawfully executed and performed by peace officers;

(c) to perform all duties that may be lawfully performed by peace officers in relation to the escort and conveyance of convicts and other persons in custody to or from any courts, places of punishment or confinement, asylums or other places; and (d) to perform such other duties and functions as are prescribed by the Governor in Council or the Commissioner. R.S., c. R-9, s. 18. R.C.M.P. Act.

Jurisdictional Authority of Provincially Appointed Officers in Canada, a Discussion Paper, prepared for The Uniform Law Conference of Canada by Johnathan H. Bilton, Osgoode Hall Law School and Philip C. Stenning, Associate Professor, Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto, 2001:

"[26] Interestingly, an effect of this exclusive provincial jurisdiction to "appoint, control and discipline municipal and provincial police officers" is to inform the meaning of "peace officer" in section 2 of the *Criminal Code*²⁰ and, potentially, to place limits on the effective enforcement of the criminal law."²¹

The OPP may have a conflict of interest and therefore it should be the R.C.M.P. which should be contacted to investigate and lay charges. In the R.C.M.P. Act, and the Criminal Code of Canada, to perform the duties as described in the R.C.M.P. Act, under section 18²², it is the duty of members who are peace officers, subject to the orders of the Commissioner to follow up and perform their duties upholding the Criminal Code of Canada. It is also your duty to respect and uphold the Criminal Code of Canada.

The investigation should be over; the admission has been stated. The OPP may have a conflict of interest, based on their requirements to report to the provincial legislature and that they are "creatures of the province." This investigation should be under the R.C.M.P. and charges laid, considering there has been a public admission of guilt, by Kathleen Wynne.

Ontarians have had enough of this abusive disregard for the rule of law and ask, again, as your constituent, that you demand the R.C.M.P. lay charges against those in government who have committed the admitted crime of breach of trust, etc.; walk out in protest and not resume sitting until those in government who committed this crime are charged and removed from office.

Respectfully,

Signature: _____
Print Name: _____

¹⁹ "[31]...The fact that the federal Parliament enjoys exclusive jurisdiction over the "administration and management" of the federal police means that provincial legislation cannot, despite concurrent jurisdiction over criminal law enforcement in the province, derogate from federal authority to *appoint* and *empower* persons to enforce federal legislation. Put simply, concurrent jurisdiction over criminal law enforcement does not authorize encroachment on the other level of legislative competence in relation to the appointment of persons satisfying the definition of "peace officer". Indeed, to allow provincial Legislatures to extend the reach of legislation into the appointment and empowerment of federal policing agents in the field of criminal law would in effect be to allow it to legislate in an area of exclusive federal jurisdiction under section 91 of the *Constitution Act, 1867*." EXTRA-JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY OF PROVINCIALY APPOINTED POLICE OFFICERS IN CANADA A DISCUSSION PAPER, prepared under contract for The Uniform Law Conference of Canada by Johnathan H. Bilton (Law student, Osgoode Hall Law School, York University, Ontario) & Philip C. Stenning (Associate Professor, Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto) June 2001, p. 19-20

²⁰ Section 2 of the *Criminal Code* reads, in part: "peace officer" includes ... (c) a police officer, police constable, bailiff, constable, or other person employed for the preservation and maintenance of the public peace or for the service or execution of civil process".

²¹ *Nolan, supra* note 21 at 295 (per Dickson C.J. writing for the Court). See also comment by His Lordship referring to but not explicating the division of powers difficulties associated with interpreting s. 2 of the *Criminal Code* as conferring plenary "peace officer" authority to all persons enumerated in that section (*ibid.* at 296): "[T]o treat s. 2 of the *Criminal Code* as a broad grant of authority to thousands of persons to act as "peace officers" in any circumstances could well prompt a constitutional challenge. In the context of division of powers, legislation should be interpreted, when possible, so that it is not *ultra vires*. ... I would therefore conclude that the definition of "peace officer" in s. 2 of the *Criminal Code* serves only to grant additional powers to enforce the criminal law to persons who must otherwise operate within the limits of their statutory or common law sources of authority" [emphasis added]. EXTRA-JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY OF PROVINCIALY APPOINTED POLICE OFFICERS IN CANADA A DISCUSSION PAPER, prepared under contract for The Uniform Law Conference of Canada by Johnathan H. Bilton (Law student, Osgoode Hall Law School, York University, Ontario) & Philip C. Stenning (Associate Professor, Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto) June 2001, p. 15.

²² 18. (a) to perform all duties that are assigned to peace officers in relation to the preservation of the peace, the prevention of crime and of offences against the laws of Canada and the laws in force in any province in which they may be employed, and the apprehension of criminals and offenders and others who may be lawfully taken into custody