

FROM:
 Edward A.Greenhalgh
 1603—75 York St.,
 Kitchener, ON. N2G 1T5
 Ph.519-579-8320
 Email,

info@cancerfraudbadbiotech.com

PUBLIC DOMAIN

Title: Request to Re-Open Fraud Case
 Based Upon Precedent That The Gomery
 Inquiry Is Exposing Corrupt Government
 Practices that Covered Up Criminal Acts
 Over Many Years. RCMP-PCC
 Corruption Exposed Cover-up.

To: RCMP Commissioner,
 Giuliano Zaccardelli,
 RCMP Headquarters,
 1200 Vanier Parkway,
 Ottawa, ON. , K1A 0r2
 Ph. 613-993-0303

28 April 2005

The Question is whether the RCMP enforces the
 Law EQUALLY for ALL Canadians , or selectively
 And covers up for the wealthy elite and corrupt?

The Question is whether the Charter of Rights and
 Freedoms have any REAL value in Canadian Society
 Will the RCMP respect and enforce the
 Federal Law, and Regulations? Charter,

*** PUBLIC DOMAIN***

Dear RCMP Commissioner, G. Zarccardelli:

You are directly sent this very serious letter requesting fraud and other intent to deceive charges be laid against the Administration of the University of Waterloo, specifically naming former Pres./CEO Douglas Wright and former Dean of Science/Biology Chair, Dr. J .E. Thompson, because you represent the head of authority and accountability at the RCMP. You represent responsibility to Canadian citizens and the Constitution, and the public good /safety. The deterrent property of the law protects the public. Several serious issues will be raised based upon these themes, especially the Constitution and the result is meant to benefit a better society. I can not understate how serious this letter is and must emphasize that due to the corruption I have encountered with government(which is the same as being exposed now publicly), and that it will be made public domain on the website, www.cancerfraudbadbiotech.com so the public may help too with issues of

public concern. The Gomery Commission is proving that public exposure is the only way to deal with corruption, and so justifies my now asking you to RE-OPEN the FRAUD/CORRUPTION INVESTIGATION and charge the University of Waterloo. The Basis and Foundation will be provided forthwith.

Enclosed are copies of emails to: 1) P.M. Paul Martin, 2) Justice Min. I. Cotler, and 3) Comm. Shirley Heafey & RCMP-PCC, specifically the material titled: "INTENT TO DECEIVE: The Holocaust Denial and the University of Waterloo's False Assurances. The Failings of procedural etiquette in order to avoid finding wrongdoing." The evidence clearly shows that a REAL criminal investigation never occurred but rather the evidence alleges that a politically inspired cover up occurred. Therefore, you must re-open the investigation to deal with these most serious allegations. Please note the email requests for a public inquiry.

MOST BASIC QUESTION

As A police officer you have only one question; "What federal laws or Acts of Parliament were violated and by whom?"

FACT: Answer the question (with out the political interference) from the evidence, and then your job requires you to turn it over to the Crown. Then the Crown, not the RCMP, may be judged by the public whether or not they are corrupt.

ANS. The Administration of the University of Waterloo, specifically, CEO Douglas Wright and Dr.J.E.Thompson acted with the INTENT TO DECEIVE and violated a federal Act of Parliament requiring research to be truthful and of value to the taxpayer be produced (not for personal agendas) under the Min. of Health so to commit fraud for personal gain. They, in premeditation, gave deliberate false signed assurances for scholarship money under a joint federal US-Canada scholarship agreement in order to achieve a scholarship otherwise unobtainable if the truth were told for J.C.M. Riley and to continue overall funding for outdated research while blocking research of value to understanding cancer. They did this for the personal benefit of the Riley family not the taxpayers of Canada and the US. They deliberately lied for personal gain INTENDING TO DECEIVE the LETTER and SPIRIT of the law, Acts of Parliament and the International (NIH-Min. Health) agreements. This was not an accident, mistake nor of any benefit to the taxes payers. It was solely for the benefit of private interests.

To prove the above all the RCMP had to do was to INTERVIEW and ASK CEO Douglas Wright and Dr. J.E.Thompson a very few simple questions: their own answers would prove the fraud. The RCMP-PCC email proves this never occurred. So, for the benefit of the public a sample investigative interview is presented.

1. Was J.C.M. Riley a proper biology Ph.D? Candidate with a full biology background?

Ans. No. He was a C- physics BSc. So special circumstances were fabricated for him. Are these circumstances fabricated for the children of ordinary taxpayers or was this special because he had special family connections? Special ability?

Ans. He had no special ability and no, ordinary students would not receive this special consideration, only someone with his family connections.

2. Did E.A.Greenhalgh's research prove the Riley Ph.D. to be wrong? If he was wrong would he get the NIH scholarship?

Ans. Yes, he was wrong, and had the Greenhalgh work not been suppressed he would not even have graduated?

3. Did the University of Waterloo ask of a student, Greenhalgh extraordinary efforts to prove his theories.

Ans. Oh, yes, quite unfair too. He provided theories we could have checked on paper if we wanted to, but we didn't. We asked him to get one outside competent authority, and he amazingly brought the man, who developed the theory from a leading cancer institute, and he even provided a simple scientific test that was quite easy to use (add an anti-oxidant) to Riley's work and it would fail. We didn't care, it was the time of the Tainted Blood Scandal and we expected to be allowed to lie like they did at the Blood Testing Center.

4. Wasn't Dr. J.E.Thompson's own research based on the faulty Riley research?
Wasn't Thompson on the Riley committee?

Ans. Oh, yes, that's why we chose Thompson, so Riley would get a free ride. Who knew the whole biology department was wrong. Just like McLeod vs. Banting. We wanted the funding for the department to continue so scientific answers weren't important, simply keeping the money coming was. You see Wright wanted UW to gain international prestige, so you can't have a Riley exposed as your standard of Excellence can you?

5. So both CEO Wright and Dr. Thompson were aware of their actions and had motives when they signed deliberately false assurances for J.C.M.Riley?

Ans. Oh, yes, we had the political connections to do whatever we pleased.

So, you see, Commissioner Zarccardelli from the role-play of the questions your investigator should have asked why charges should have been laid.

NOW RE-OPEN THE INVESTIGATION AND ASK THE QUESTIONS FOR REAL!!!! Public exposure is essential to this case.

Before continuing, there are important precedents to be established.

1. Skakel vs. Oberlander

Mr. Skakel (sic) is the "Kennedy cousin" who murdered a neighbour girl when he was approximately 17 years old back in the 70s. Many years later he was tried and convicted as an adult. Point, he committed one stupid act as teenager for which he was held accountable even though he was rich. Please note, he attended no classes on murder nor swore any oaths in order to commit his one tragic mistake.

Mr. Oberlander is a very rich connected man in Kitchener Waterloo. As a 17 year old he was a member of a Nazi SS death squad, though he claims only as an interpreter. The point is that to be in the SS you were chosen by competing, wanting to be in, attended classes and swore oaths to exterminate undesirable people. The SS smashed babies heads in with rifle butts for fun. And being in the SS you received extra benefits. Mr. Oberlander lied to get into Canada. He has benefited from all his acts and never held accountable.

Please, Canadian MPs have helped him fight deportation, but have done nothing to help a Canadian citizen with research of benefit to cancer. Mr. Oberlander is wealthy elite, like Douglas Wright, while I am not. Is that what the RCMP supports. Douglas Wright said in a newspaper, the "elite should rule." Do you RCMP Commissioner

agree? Is he above the law? Please note, I have asked P.M. Paul Martin for a public inquiry.

2.The Constitution and the Public Good

- A. Under the constitution any citizen with ability has a right to an education and employment. The University of Waterloo has denied this to me; and the children of other taxpayers. They have said they will fix scholarships and positions so only the ones they choose will receive benefits paid for by taxpayers. This is a motive for the RCMP's first investigation to fail, to prevent this being exposed to the public. Riley is the tip of an iceberg: positions at universities and government and scholarships are rigged as to be patently dishonest so chosen elite children receive these at the request of their sponsor. The taxpayers are cheated. The ordinary citizen has no rights under the Constitution. Wright proclaimed the elite shall rule. This is how they are guaranteed the best positions; by cheating. An inquiry would help expose this.
- B. How Criminal Acts Condoned by the University of Waterloo Adversely affect Safety. Already cited, lying by Dr. Thompson was equivalent to the lying by the health officials of the Tainted Blood. Point, scientists who lie are a danger to Canada. Another example, the Mad Cow disaster. Who told who cannibalizing cows was safe? This will only be proven unacceptable if you lay the charges; otherwise you are not protecting the public. You may be protecting the rich elite from liability, but you are not serving the taxpayers and other citizens under the Constitution.

Please note, based on the corruption at UW, I predicted a Walkerton water disaster years before it happened (you have the evidence). Recently, we have seen flu kits sent out with 1957 killer flu, and it was only a fluke a disaster did not happen. This too has been predicted by me based on the incompetence and low scientific standards shown by the University of Waterloo and J.C.M.Riley (standard of excellence, not). This is why my website has the title Bad Biotech. Please note, I have discussed on my website the dangers of emerging diseases possibly hastened by GM manipulation and cited the need for research. The government is too busy covering up for corrupt friends whom they have given millions of dollars, than to help me do this research. Commissioner, if a new disease occurs and kills your family, how will you feel that this research was blocked to cover up for incompetence and corruption? Protect society, re-open the investigation, make them prove that there are high standards protecting your family and society.

Please note that the Chancellor Lazaridis and founder of RIM has developed a Conference Center to discuss human rights abuse in the third world. He is as bad as any leader in the third world because he may well be part of my human rights abuse. A public inquiry should examine what role he has played in the cover up and Charter abuses. RIM money may well have influenced the RCMP. Everyone in the world who owns a blackberry should text message Dr.Lazaridis and ask him what his role was in blocking cancer research? It is only fair, don't you think because; RIM is now publicly promoting its Perimeter Center for advances in technology!! Do you know who made incredible advances in tech in the past? The Nazis!!! They were absolutely

incredible and, yet they had no compassion for human rights. Good point for public discussion because on my website I discuss the misuse of Embryonic Stem Cell research questioning how women in the third world may be paid to have abortions on demand to supply research etc., needs. This would be a dreadful misuse of human rights. Do you know who has bad human rights records in the third world and Indonesia? Canadian business people. Please recall CEO Douglas Wright's motto was to have millionaires in the halls, not ethical science!!!

In all fairness, on my website I request the Canadian government to test the scientists who are setting the stem cell guidelines to answer the troublesome UW question publicly. To answer the question, is research described in official government documents in derogatory terms, excellent, yes or no? I have no takers! I directly asked P.M. Martin to also ask Drs. Low and Plummer, but he and they did not reply. In fairness let us ask the public to ask the brilliant scientists at the RIM Perimeter to answer this question and compare their answers to the public. It is only fair.

THE CHARTER

Commissioner Zaccardelli, by covering up the fraud my Charter Rights have been violated (political influence caused my lawyers to commit an unethical act, already presented in evidence so don't talk about a civil case. The civil case would have exposed the fraud, so it had to be interfered with). Do you support the Charter, that the law is good for the little guy and the BIG Elitist equally without prejudice? Support means action, not lip service: lay the fraud charges.

More importantly for society, the greater harm is the black listing. Criminals like Wright succeed when their corruption succeeds and (like the Nazis) they have power through manipulating political power to inflict fear. Black listing steals a person's income, pension and is a form of terrorism. Present day example causing harm to society: Mad Cow Disaster. We now know vets who wanted to report cases of Mad Cow were threatened with job and pension loss: that is bad government and bad biotech which threatens peoples health. So if the RCMP really does work to protect the health and safety of society you must lay the charges so this brand of terrorism can be stopped.

Additional harm UW corruption does to Charter Rights is cheating the ordinary taxpayers' children out of positions that are funded by tax dollars. The Riley case is the tip of an iceberg; in fact the present Pres. Of UW Mr. Johnson was involved in such a case in Quebec before coming to Ontario. A public inquiry may also open this matter again, which appears to have been "heavy handed" manipulated. Example to test the quality of students in Ontario universities is to review the "Godsoe" letter on my website, and you will see a student, an undergrad is given a scholarship to study breast cancer for her entire university career: a guaranteed job. Is this person a "Riley"? Lets find out by publicly checking their personal standards and ethics and see if they can tell the truth. Ask this person, is research described in official government documents in derogatory terms, EXCELLENT? Yes, or no? And compare it to any the public cares to make. Point, researchers if they are to benefit society must be free to tell the truth no matter what. It may mean the difference between life and death. And the public can find out if the competition was open and fair, not prefabricated.

Special Case: I keep saying research of value to cancer was suppressed; Cell Death Signal gene as explained to Min. of Health circa 1987, “wouldn’t honest cancer researchers want to know?” Dr. Tak Mak heads the Cancer group in Toronto, and he may even have his daughters working for him. Are they superior researchers or just people cashing in on cronyism and the misuse of cancer donations? Lets check. An honest researcher should be able to answer this question, “Is research documented in derogatory terms by the Min. of Health EXCELLENT? Yes or no? Simple question, will they publicly answer?”

Special Case: Motive for Politicians to Influence the RCMP

Circa the Riley investigation an American student graduated from Yale with scholarships etc., and he was stupid enough to state publicly he fabricated his marks to get into Yale, and Yale wasn’t so tough. Yale used the threat of criminal prosecution as leverage against him. Can you imagine the lawsuit this person could have launched against Yale if the Riley scholarship was made public at the time? A very good motive to block the RCMP investigation.

The Paul Bernardo Precedent

Paul Bernardo tortured, raped and murdered two young women, and some have argued Bernardo could have been caught earlier except a grandfather who was a prominent KW judge shielded him. The allegation is had he not had this special IMMUNITY from the law the murders would never had occurred. Like the Riley special circumstances, a demonstration of the harm that results when laws and their deterrent values are disrespected by those in power. Please note, Bernardo has received hundreds of dollars for his Charter Rights and appeal funding, but the government of Canada fight s me when I discuss funding to help fight emerging diseases and cancer etc. Think about it!

WHO SHIELDED THE UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO/WHO BLOCKED CANCER RESEARCH

1. Brian Mulroney, see the Jeff Foster reply, “PM Mulroney is aware “, and PM Mulroney was personal friend of Douglas Wright and made him his educational advisor. So although Mulroney may be aware of new cancer ideas patronage for friend’s kids is more important than saving lives.
2. fmr Premier Bill Davis who controls many scholarships and is a friend to many elite families has a library named after him at UW and was a friend of Wright’s.
3. And Bob Rae, fmr Ont. Premier, is a family friend of Bill Davis.
4. John Rae, brother of Bob, heads the large wealthy Power Corp with many legal connections and was advisor to
5. Fmr P.M. Jean Chretien who did many favours for UW
6. Cabinet Min. Boudrieau received a UW degree while sitting in Parliament
7. Lib. M.P. Andrew Telegdi did many favours for UW
8. Lib. M.P. John English was a UW prof and now works for RIM/UW
9. Trevor Eyton was a UW Senator appointed Canadian Senator by B.Mulroney and heads the powerful Brascan group with many legal connections
10. Rosemary Brown a NDP member with Bob Rae and a Commissioner with the Ontario Human Rights Commission, who, if the fraud charges are laid could be

charged as an accessory after the fact and obstruction of justice with the other commissioners (the Yale special case cover up).

11. John Manley, fmr liberal cabinet minister is a UW grad. He should publicly answer the special question.

And there are more, but a full public inquiry will separate the corrupt criminals from the bystanders. You do get the point though, Commissioner Zaccardelli, in light of the Sponsorship Scandal there is a very REAL basis to cite cover up and political interference and to re-open the investigation. The integrity and commitment to the public of the RCMP is now being questioned. Please be fully aware on the basis of the Gomery inquiry and exposure of corruption, this letter will be made public domain, it is in the public's best interest to do so.

In conclusion, I have demonstrated many areas of public benefit from this case going forward. I can not conceive of any GOOD ones for it not to. As a police officer you have only one question to answer; is there evidence that Wright and Thompson had INTENT TO DECEIVE when they signed assurances for J.C.M.Riley? Did they have motive to lie? Was there reasonable evidence to prove the research was invalid and unworthy? Will the public benefit? What are YOU going to do, sir? I have cited the law, the Charter, and the public safety, plus benefits to ordinary taxpayers. In all fairness, as a police officer all you have to do is turn the evidence over to the Crown that is your duty to the Constitution and the taxpayers. If the Crown and the Courts are corrupt, then let the public judge them, you do your duty to the public and the RCMP. And what we are learning from the Gomery inquiry, the more corruption is exposed in the public, and then it can be dealt with effectively. What are you going to do, Sir?

Thank you,

Very truly,

Edward A.Greenhalgh



Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Gendarmerie royale du Canada

Security Classification/Designation
Classification/désignation sécuritaire

"O" Division Criminal Operations
130 Dufferin Ave.,
London, Ontario,
N6A 5R2

Mr. Edward A. Greenhalgh
1603 - 75 York St.
Kitchener, Ontario
N2G 1T5

*Received
22 June 2005
EAG*

Your File - Votre référence

Our File - Notre référence
2005224327

Date

June 15th, 2005

Dear Mr. Greenhalgh

I have been asked to review and respond to your correspondence addressed to the Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police dated April 28th, 2005. In your letter you expressed your views, which are general in nature, about various public officials in different levels of government and administration and how some have responded to concerns you have brought to their attention.

The broad concerns which you are seeking a response to are more a matter of public debate as opposed to specific criminal conduct which would be the responsibility of the Police to investigate. I am confident that you can appreciate that, it would not be appropriate for the RCMP, as Canada's National Police Force, to provide comment in response to individual citizens and their beliefs on issues which are matters of public debate. In that regard, I would encourage you to seek out an appropriate forum in which to solicit feedback on the views you hold.

In the event that you have specific information regarding criminal conduct I would encourage you to contact the appropriate Police force of jurisdiction in your area with those concerns.

I hope this clarifies the Royal Canadian Mounted Police's position in this matter.

J.R.A. Gauthier, Cpl.
"O" Division
Criminal Operations

Canada

RCMP GRC 2823 (2002-11) WPT

Page 1 of 1