

Trevor Holsworth  
Box 406  
New Denver BC V0G 1S0  
[fundamentaljustice@gmail.com](mailto:fundamentaljustice@gmail.com)  
[www.fundamentaljustice.com](http://www.fundamentaljustice.com)

Premier of British Columbia,  
David Eby  
P.O. Box 9041 Stn Provincial Government, Victoria, BC V8W 9E1  
[premier@gov.bc.ca](mailto:premier@gov.bc.ca)

November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2022

Dear Sir/Madam,

On March 3rd, 2020 I properly served the Deputy AG of Canada with a Charter complaint, following the enforcement procedure of the Charter.

Section 24(1) of the Charter:

“Anyone whose rights or freedoms, as guaranteed by this Charter, have been infringed or denied may apply to a court of competent jurisdiction to obtain such remedy as the court considers appropriate and just in the circumstances.”

Since Parliament offers the only method for the removal of a judge I wrote:

“The only Court of competent jurisdiction to judge the judges who judge the judges is Parliament. I have currently lost most of my legal rights except obviously my right to life but I am in fear of losing that. I am hereby applying to Parliament for the protection of my charter of rights. Obviously, urgency is of prime importance.”

The complaint was in response to a ruling by the Canadian Judicial Council which is the governing council for Federal Judges. In 2007 I had complained about the conduct of Judge Shaw who, when I presented the transcript to the Court, had called the Plaintiff to the stand and solicited perjury to protect her lawyer, committing fraud. I also complained that the Judge had permitted a lawyer to not comply with a court order. The actual written response from the CJC was “the admissibility and weighing of evidence is a matter that falls within the ambit of judicial discretion. Chief Justice Pigeon is of the view that Justice Shaw exercised his judicial discretion when he preferred certain evidence over others. Judicial discretion is not conduct. The failure of a party to abide by an order is not either a matter of judicial conduct.”

The concern of Canadians is that it appears that this is a claim of absolute power by the Federal Judiciary. What better evidence can any Canadian provide than the transcript. A Judge that cannot determine the priority of evidence when presented with the transcript cannot be trusted with our rights, our finances, our lives, and our children. The Charter of Rights is an empty promise, our right to Appeal is arbitrary, and the foundation of

Democracy is destroyed. Judge Shaw's fitness as a Judge was debated in Parliament in response to his ruling in R v Sharpe when he declared the law on child pornography to be unconstitutional. You will be relieved to know that he retired in 2008, 6 months after my complaint and the CJC claimed that ended the matter. However, I was very concerned about the conduct of Justice Pigeon in the exercise of his discretion to dismiss the complaint given the obvious implications to equality before the law, judicial corruption, fairness and impartiality. The CJC called my complaint regarding Justice Pigeon an abuse of process and refused to respond.

The test for Judicial conduct as stated by the Canadian Judicial Council:

“Is the conduct alleged so manifestly and profoundly destructive of the concept of impartiality, integrity and independence of the judicial role, that public confidence would be sufficiently undermined to render the judge incapable of executing the judicial office?”

”Judicial independence exists for the benefit of the judged, not the judges. It is therefore to be assessed from the perspective of the reasonable observer and in light of the public interests it is meant to serve.”

Since the time of the signing of the Magna Carta, and before, the withholding of tax has precedent as the most valid and effective method of protesting abuses of power by Government over their citizens. The Canada Revenue Agency took me to Court alleging failure to comply. I made my allegations public and ultimately requested a Writ of Mandamus on the Federal Minister of Justice to comply with his duty to protect the public and ensure that the administration of government is in accordance with the law, which it is not as the AG/MOJ has refused to respond to the enforcement procedure of our governing document, our Constitution, the Charter. At the BC Provincial Court they admitted the evidence into Court and ignored it so I appealed to the Supreme Court and Justice refused to rule at all on the request for a Writ of Mandamus, to compel a Minister to do his duty, which is a democratic failure in accountability and a failure to act judicially. At the BC Court of Appeal requesting a right to appeal I was denied. In the eyes of the judiciary that ended the matter, Res Judicata.

The Minister of Justice ultimately responded after I complained to the PM's office but attempted to mislead Canadians as to his duties, claiming that he had no legal right to intervene in the processes of the CJC. I received no further response and ultimately the PM's office admitting the Public Safety concern forwarded the matter to Marco Mendicino who has never responded.

On the Ministry of Justice website they state:

“The Minister is not bound by the CJC's recommendation; the option to seek a judge's removal by Parliament exists whether or not the CJC recommends that the judge be removed....If the question of removal is to be put before Parliament, it is the Minister who does so. It is open to the Minister to put the question to Parliament or to decline to do so. Like all acts of an Attorney General, the Minister's discretion in that regard is constrained by the constitutional obligation to act in good faith, objectively, independently and with a view to safeguarding the public interest.”

I submitted a complaint regarding corruption by a federally elected member of Parliament to the RCMP National Division whose mandate is to safeguard and investigate significant

threats to Canada's political, economic, and social integrity. In response the RCMP told me to stop sending them evidence, that they would not investigate and would destroy evidence. I suggested that the RCMP should no longer be arresting members of the public as they are failing in their application of the rule of law and the justice system is not complying with fundamental justice.

I did submit this evidence to the Emergencies Act Inquiry but it was not entered into evidence. I have submitted some of the evidence to the appropriate Federal Parliamentary committee's including the Justice and Human Rights Committee as they are currently debating proposed amendments to the Judges Act and it is posted as evidence on their website. That proposed Act of Parliament provides Canadians with exactly zero rights in the conduct of judicial complaints and provides Judges with zero accountability and zero transparency in the process. It is an absolute failure in our elected representatives to ensure the protection of the public, whom they serve.

The effect of this concentration of power in the PM's office, Federal Cabinet and Federal Judges the Provincial Governments face the real prospect of a coup, which began back in 1982 with the "Kitchen Accord" on the "Night of the Long Knives". The Provincial Premiers have a constitutional duty inspired in the doctrine of the separation of powers to act to control abuses of power by the Federal Government.

The Charter is a meaningless document if there is no method to enforce the enforcement clause. The Minister Of Justice cannot claim that the administration of Government is in accordance with the law because they are not responding to the enforcement procedure, an obstruction of justice. The Minister of Justice's absence of a public legal opinion cannot be said to be in "good faith" and in the "protection of the public". Combined with the claim to be able to plant perjured evidence at trial to defeat the transcript, is a claim of absolute power. The refusal to allow the legitimate review of that discretion is undemocratic and the claim of dictators and police states.

The Court system is the pinnacle of the Public Service and this failing of the Courts affects the integrity of the entire Public Service, Provincial and Federal.

Parliamentary Supremacy overrules the Tyranny of Justice. Ministerial Responsibility in a Parliamentary Democracy represents the power of the people. The People of Canada have the ultimate power in a Democracy. Please help to protect Canadians from abuses of power by the Executive and Judiciary of the Federal Government.

Trevor Holsworth  
[www.fundamentaljustice.com](http://www.fundamentaljustice.com)