

Bursting Bubbles

3. The Name Game
4. DOB - Do you really know it?
5. MustSubmitApplication
Registration
6. Marry the Government - or not
7. Statutes & Society
8. Deny Consent
9. Looking in the Box
10. 2-sided Affidavits
11. Signature Protection
12. Show them, don't tell them
13. Right to Travel

Government Deception

15. Notary Note Process
16. Bankrupt Canada
17. Assentance for Value
18. The PPSA
20. CC - Criminal Code
21. The PPSA

22. A
23. Ch
24. Violation Tickets
25. Appearance - You can be special
26. Supreme Court Of Canada - SNC
27. Overstayed
28. The Province of British Columbia
THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
29. The Hierarchy of Law + Equity
30. Over the Boundary
31. Condition
32. Notice this
33. Ask and learn
34. Bill
35. Four Wh
36. Only 'Slaves' are REALLY free
37. 'Don't understand'?
38. The Power of Love
39. Miscellaneous Bubbles
40. Summation
41. In Closing

Robert Arthur Menard

An

Elizabeth Anne Elaine Society

Publication

Bursting Bubbles of Government Deception

Publisher: Elizabeth Anne Elaine Society and Freddie Freepickle Productions
In association with the Jimmy Justice Institute of Analytical Reasoning
And the David Dogood School of Logical Deconstruction

Design & Layout: Author

Printing: Yes, on paper.

The information in this book is complete and true to the best of the authors knowledge and belief. The author and publisher disclaim all liability in connection with the use of this book.

The author is not a lawyer and this book does not contain any legal advice.

Knowledge is power, and this book definitely holds a lot of it. What you do with it is entirely up to you.

I cannot be responsible for the acts of idiots.

I have enough problems of my own.

This work is solely for entertainment, education, and discussion purposes. Oh yea, and to try and create a better society.

All work Copyright 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 by Robert Arthur Menard (Except that which I used off the web. I give credit where applicable.)

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American and Inter-Galactic Multi-Species Copyright Conventions.

This book, or any part thereof, may not be reproduced in any fashion whatsoever without the express prior written permission of the author. That permission will be readily given to any group acting for a just social cause, or from another Galaxy. (Just 'because I always wanted to meet someone from another

Galaxy.)

Robert-Arthur: Menard
General Delivery,
Vancouver BC
or
mrmitee@hotmail.com

Disclaimer

All content is provided in accordance with the inalienable right to freedom of speech, and is intended for information, education, entertainment and positive social change purposes only. The information is provided as is, without any guarantee of suitability for any purpose. It is the truth as the author sees it. That does not necessarily mean it **is** the truth. He could be totally and absolutely wrong on all points. Decide for yourself. You are entirely responsible for your use, or misuse, of this information. Before using any information, you are advised to consult a competent professional who can advise you according to your specific circumstances, which will vary from person to person. The author of this work and the information provided within it does not challenge or threaten the competent exercise of authority of any lawful government or agents thereof. The information within and the ways of dealing with Bills mentioned are lawful according to The Common Law and The Bills of Exchange Act. This information is not intended to aid anyone in avoiding lawful debts or duties.

The fundamental purpose of this work and the intent of the author is to help create a freer and more just society. Anyone who doesn't like the goal or means of achieving it is free to move to France.

**When a well-packaged
web of lies has been
gradually sold to the
masses over generations,
the truth will seem utterly
preposterous and its
speaker a raving lunatic.**

Society is NOT a prison and you are NOT my Warden

On Dec 5th, 2000 The Ministry of Children and Family Services 'legally removed' a child that didn't 'legally exist'. They did so without investigation. Because they acted without information, they claimed the infant had only one caregiver. They were wrong. The parents said they would prove in court the infant had two caregivers and they were a family in act and intent. In order to deny the parent's recourse to the Law, the ministry worker said that if they tried to speak the truth in court, she would see to it that the child spent the **first five years of her life going from foster home to foster home to foster home**. This was an act of extortion. This is a society where the government workers feel they have the right to tear apart a family without investigation and then deny the parents recourse to the law. This is the worst form of tyranny and it is one I will not consent to.

We are told that we live in a free society. There is no greater test of freedom than being able to leave. In order to understand this idea better, we need to know some words and their definitions. First off, a society is a group of people joined together by mutual consent to deliberate, determine and act for a common goal. Notice how there is no mention of geographical area? Being in a certain geographical area might give you're the right to join a society; however it cannot create an obligation to join. See that mutual consent part? Pay attention to it, it will become very important.

Now what is a statute? Is a statute law? The answer is yes and no. It is not the law, but it is a rule which has the force of law, within a society. Statutes are the laws of a society. Outside of society, they have no effect at all.

I look at society as a house party, not a prison. At this party, there is food and music. We have a system set up which is supposed to determine what music is played and what food is served. This system is supposed to be democratic in nature, where the majority decides. Now if you don't like the food, music, rules of the house, or the system designed to determine those things, you are perfectly free to leave. Maybe in the house (in society) you can't smoke or own a gun. Does this mean you can't do those things once you leave? Of course not! If you are no longer in the house, its rules no longer apply to you. These statutes which governments call laws, are all the laws of the society, or the house. Leave society, and these rules are no longer your laws. Those remaining behind will still have to obey them, you will not. Of course, you won't be able to eat the food or listen to the music (collect benefits), either.

The simple fact is if this is a free society, we have the right to leave. If we do not have that right, it is neither free, nor a society.

If our society was a house party, this is what we would see. At the food table, they are serving scraps and crumbs, while we hear them in the back kitchen whooping it up with their supplier friends (bankers). The music is either a Military March or a Polka. The waiters (government workers) are acting more and more like prison guards. There are mirrors everywhere, not enough seats and more than enough smoke. The door leading out of this party has been well hidden and hasn't been opened for a long time. They might have even welded it shut. If we are to have a free society, then every once in a while, someone must leave. This will ensure that people know they are free to do so; someone must guard that door and ensure it opens easily. This will also allow those remaining in the house, to see what its like outside, without venturing forth themselves. If they decide its better outside, then they too are free to leave.

I intend to leave society. I am not moving physically, either. As a human being born in this country, I have the Common Law right to travel anywhere within it. I also have the right to join or not join societies as I see fit. I cannot be forced to consent. If I refuse to consent, none of the statutes everyone else calls laws will have the force of law with me.

I am leaving this party, not because I reject society, but because I wish to embrace it. I want a good one. One that is as free as can be. I reject the way in which this society deliberates, determines and acts for the common goal. I am not even sure we all have a common goal anymore. Those we elect to provide us with food and music are not doing their jobs. The servants are getting uppity and actually think they are in charge. They stole my family and did so unlawfully. The RCMP refuses to investigate them and the elected representatives are not doing their jobs. I am sick of the rules of this house, the meager portions and the

blaring music. I will open this long closed door; stand on the other side and wave at you. I will do things lawfully that you cannot do, for you are still in the house.

When I am outside your society and therefore free of its rules, this does not mean there is no law. I do not claim the right to harm another human being, damage property, engage in fraud or extortion or break contracts. I will follow the Law. I just won't give statutes created by governments the force of law. I will achieve this by constructively denying consent to be governed.

When I see that members of society once again have recourse to the Law and those we elect to 'serve the food' are serving more than they eat, when these statutes are less deceptive and I know that the door outside is wide open at all times instead of being so well hidden, when the servants are acting more like servants, when the portions are bigger and there is less reveling in the kitchen, when the RCMP are abiding by the law and willing to investigate government ministries, then I will consider rejoining.

When you see me traveling down the road in my automobile, exercising my Common Law right to travel, and I do not have a license, know I am not breaking the law. Please don't moan about how we all have to follow the same rules. You are in a society, and I am not. You have consented and I have not. You have benefits that I do not. You are free to give up those benefits for more freedom, just as I will have done. Also, please do not think I am rejecting those staying behind in this society. Like a scout doing recon, I am giving up the security you enjoy, to ensure that you don't lose your freedom. At the risk to myself, I am going outside to see what the weather is like. I am doing it for you. I will come back with a report. My actions will clear much of the smoke, and I might break a mirror or two on the way out.

Do not be angry with me for becoming aware of government deception, or for acting against it. Do not be angry with those who have hidden this door to freedom from you for so long. Do not be angry with those who tore apart a family and denied citizens recourse to the law. Do not be angry with the RCMP for refusing to investigate a government ministry just because it is a government ministry. Do not be angry with your elected representatives for refusing to address crimes within that same ministry. Do not be angry with them for using so much deception in their legislation. Do not be angry with the media for constantly referring to new statutes as laws, instead of telling you they are nothing more than the rules of society and that you are free to leave that society if you don't like the new statute. Do not be angry at all; merely learn what their deception is.

The freedom you will achieve by me opening this door and leaving society will cost you nothing and it will empower you over those who claim they are your government. If we are to have a free society, this door must be open at all times. There is not one person among you who can lawfully force me to consent to being governed, nor is there one among you who can lawfully apply society's statutes to me when I am outside of society

Maxim: Fictions arise from the law, and not law from fictions

Oh, what a tangled web we weave when first we practice to believe.

Laurence J. Peter (1919 - 1988), paraphrasing Sir Walter Scott

Speaking the Truth in times of universal deceit is a revolutionary act.

George Orwell

Bubble #1 - Man or Fiction?

Do you know what you are? Are you a 'person'? Are you sure?

So you think you are a 'person', eh? According to Black's Law dictionary, '*a human being is not a person because he is a human being, but because rights and duties have been ascribed to him. Specifically, the person is the legal subject or substance of which rights and duties are attributes. But not every human being is a person, as was the case in Old England when there were slaves*'.

You see, you as a human being have certain inalienable human rights. Your *person* has certain inalienable civil rights. Believe it or not, you are not the one paying taxes, your *person* is. Its not you that votes, your *person* does. You don't get a ticket, your *person* does. The best way to imagine it is to imagine a human being wearing a coat. The human being is a 'man' or 'human being' or a 'natural person'. The coat represents the 'legal person'. The two together is referred to as 'individual'. (Indivisible duo).

If you can understand that so far, you can understand the next as well. You may have many 'persons'. They all have the same name, but have different personalities or functions. See, a person is not determined solely by the name, but by the rights and duties ascribed to that person. When you get a traffic ticket, it is almost as if they are creating a person right there solely to deal with that issue. Once dealt with, the *person* is no longer bound by it. Say you go to vote and on the way you get a ticket. Can the *person* who got the ticket vote? Can you show them the ticket and use that to secure your right to vote? No you cannot. The two entities, although having the same name, have different sets of rights and duties, and therefore are in fact different *persons* or at least different facets of one.

Now ask yourself, where does it say that you have to have a 'person'? Are you obliged to have one? If you do have one, can you give it up? Why have they gone to such trouble to hide from us the fact that they act upon our *persons*? The reason is simple; they need us to be ignorant for their deception to work. Without ignorance, all the deception in the world won't help them hold onto their power. The *person* exists not so they can have power over us, but so we can escape the power they claim if it gets too onerous. If all they can act upon is our *person*, and we can disassociate from that thing anytime we want, we can be in control. If we are never aware it is there, we are slaves. That which YOU will be is entirely up to you.

Bubble #2 – Child Registration

Having a baby? Congratulations! The first time I held little Elizabeth Anne Elaine, moments after her birth, my heart swelled so much it was like I had never loved before. It was like I had spent my life drinking skim milk, and suddenly, I was given a milkshake! It is a miracle of a time, and when you are all excited about having your baby, the government social worker that works at the hospital will approach you with some registration forms, telling you 'you *have to register your baby*'. She will hand you a form and on the cover it says in bold language, '**Every Parent must register**' and '**After a baby is born every parent must register the birth and legal name of their child**'.

Inside it says:

This brochure contains an IMPORTANT form which parents must complete for every baby born in British Columbia. The Registration of Live Birth form is the official Provincial record of the birth and the registration of the child's legal name. Everything you need to complete the form is provided including detailed instructions and a pre-addressed envelope.'

(It is designed to make you believe you have an obligation to register and if you don't the law will get involved and you will be in big trouble.)

Next paragraph reads:

By law, you must register the birth and legal name of your child within 30 days of the birth. Naming a child and registering the birth are your important responsibilities because registration is the only way of creating a permanent legal record of a person's birth. There is no fee to register a baby's birth so long as it is registered within 30 days. Simply fill in the registration form and mail it in the envelope provided, or bring it to any BC Vital Statistics Agency office. See back cover of this brochure for our office locations and telephone numbers.

It then states:

At the same time as you complete the mandatory Registration of Live Birth form, you have the option of ordering a birth certificate for your newborn.

Now let's take a very close look at what they are actually saying.

First paragraph:

This brochure contains an IMPORTANT form which parents must complete for every baby born in British Columbia. – this tells us ONLY the parents can complete it. The government cannot do it on your behalf. They use the word 'must'. Notice they do not use the word 'obligated' or 'obliged'. Must is a very tricky legal word, and when you find out its true meaning in a later bubble is burst, you will see what I mean. Here they use the word 'baby'. They are referring to the human being; blood, flesh and bone vessel of the spirit.

The Registration of Live Birth form is the official Provincial record of the birth and the registration of the child's legal name. - Here they tell you the form is the Provincial record. Not yours. Theirs. They have also now slipped in the word 'child' instead of 'baby'. The reason is there is no doubt in law what a *baby* is; there is ambiguity when you start using words like 'child'. The 'child', legally is the 'person'. Notice how also they tell you that you will be creating a 'legal name'. Not a lawful name, but a legal one. There is a big difference between the two, and it is one bubble that will be burst in following chapters.

By law, you must register the birth and legal name of your child within 30 days of the birth. Again the word 'must'. And why must you do it within 30 days? What exactly is the penalty for registering late? Notice also the use of the words 'child' and 'legal name'.

Naming a child and registering the birth are your important responsibilities because registration is the only way of creating a permanent legal record of a person's birth. - Now the trap is almost shut.

'Responsibility' refers not to what one is obliged to do, but who is to blame after the fact. Notice here also how they are using not the word 'baby' nor 'child' to describe your offspring, they are using the word 'person' and they may not be describing your offspring at all. They tell you straight out, by using the word 'person', that you will be creating a permanent one.

There is no fee to register a baby's birth so long as it is registered within 30 days. – Ah-Ha! Here is why you have to do it within 30 days! To avoid paying a filling fee! Wow so scary! That is why they can get away with using the word must when there are no actual obligations.

Next paragraph, we find this:

At the same time as you complete the mandatory Registration of Live Birth form, you have the option of ordering a birth certificate for your newborn. –They also use the term 'mandatory'. Notice what it is referring to; it is referring to the noun not the verb. The action is not mandatory; the *form* is, if you choose to register. Now we also apparently have some sort of option about ordering a Birth Certificate. Ask yourself this, if you have an option now, what makes you think you didn't have one to begin with? Do you think they have an obligation to tell you what all your options are?

Here is the biggest question of all:

If what they are selling is such a good thing, why do they use so much obvious deception to get us to buy it?

So this is essentially what is happening. When you register your offspring, you are creating a legal entity or **person**, you are associating that person with your offspring and then you are abandoning that entity to the government, who appears to be seizing it under the laws of maritime commerce. This 'person' is in fact chattel property and can and is used for collateral on loans. Your registered baby is in fact a form of pledge and is worth a lot of money. Also, if they ever come for your baby acting under some legislation, it is that chattel property they are acting upon, not your offspring. But because it was all done apparently lawfully and legally, and you maintain the association between that entity and your baby, they have the right to affect your offspring.

The Birth Certificate is not just evidence of the birth; it is evidence that you have abandoned the king of documents: the **Record of Live Birth**. They will not accept a certified and notarized true copy of the original. Nope, they need the original itself.

Imagine creating a raincoat for your offspring, the record of creating that raincoat and evidence of ownership you give to your neighbour. He then comes over and claims the right to remove the coat, with your child still in it. That is exactly the legal mechanism they use to remove our offspring.

BIRTH. The act of being born or wholly brought into separate existence. Black's 1st. See Note, and Note at **birth record**.

Note: A man or a woman is "born," straw men are "wholly *brought into separate existence*." Each event qualifies as a "birth." The **birth** certificate documents a muddled mixture of the two events that allows the system to both claim that it is "your" **birth** certificate yet also claim to hold title to (not _____ ownership of) the corporately colored straw man.

BIRTH CERTIFICATE. A formal document which certifies as to the date and place of one's **birth** and a recitation of his or her parentage, as issued by an official in charge of such records. Furnishing of such is often required to prove one's age. Black's 6th. See Note, **birth, birth record, and document of title, field warehouse receipt, and bond**.

Note: A **birth certificate** is a negotiable instrument, a registered security, a stock **certificate** evidencing, or representing, the preferred stock of the corporation and against which you are the surety; it is a pedigree chattel document establishing the existence of your straw man, a distinct artificial person with a fictitious name; it is a document of title to a straw man; it is a warehouse receipt for your body; delivery receipt; industrial bond between you (flesh-and-blood man or woman) and the industrial society and corporate US Government (artificial person).

In Canada, the original **birth certificate** is generally created at the PROVINCIAL level (in rare instances city level) via **birth** documents from the hospital (for which the hospital receives \$\$\$ from the PROVINCE for causing the registration of the **birth**) and passed to the Provincial and Federal levels, and likely elsewhere. Per the definition of "birth" above, the document references both the newborn and the straw man. Certified copies of the **birth certificate** may be obtained at the Vital Statistics Office. Your **birth certificate** is one of the kinds of security instruments used by the Government to obtain loans from its creditor, under which it is bankrupt.

According to a researcher who worked on a research project for one of the world's largest brokerage houses he discovered that in the year 1936 each American **birth certificate** was assigned a value of \$630,000.00. The investigative journalist's report beginning on page **xxiii** confirms that (new) birth certificates today carry a value of \$1,000,000.00 and that upon notification of the receipt of a new birth **certificate** at the Ministry of Finance, it takes out a loan for \$1-million and purchases a bond, then invests the funds in either the stock market or bond market. The collateral for the loan for the bond issued against the **birth certificate** is you; *i.e.* your body, labor, and property. A man in

Santa Barbara, California who obtained his original **birth certificate** from the Department of Commerce some years ago via a Freedom of Information Act request reported the endorsements of 17 different foreign countries thereon. There may also be other types of **birth** documents used by the Government, or others, to obtain loans/credit.

BIRTH RECORD. Official statistical data concerning dates and places of persons' **birth**, as well as parentage, kept by local government officials. Black's 1st. *See Note*, **birth certificate**.

Note: Under "birth certificate" the definition refers to "one's **birth**," and under "birth **record**" the definition refers to "persons' **birth**." "One" means flesh-and-blood man or woman; "person" means artificial or juristic person. *See individual*.

All truths are easy to understand once they are discovered; the point is to discover them.
Galileo Galilei (1564 - 1642)

Those who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities.
Voltaire (1694 - 1778)

Maxims:

**If you know not the name of a thing, all knowledge of that thing perishes.
The name is the note of a thing.**

Bubble #3 – The NAME GAME is the name of the game.

Your name is the foundation of your identity. There can be no 'person' without a name, yet there can certainly be a human being without a name. It is in fact an intangible thing and has worth. You can read in the paper almost weekly about 'Identity theft'. Why would anyone steal it unless it had worth? Every time you interact with someone who asks for your name, they are asking you to give them something, which to some is the most important thing in the world. Here's the catch though. You have no duty or obligation to have one! Plus, if they are interacting with you and they are a state agent, they are asking for your legal name, or the name of your 'legal *person*'. What they do not have is any proof that you have an obligation to have one of those persons which they can legally act upon. There is a way to understand whether they are acting on the person or human being. Look at the spelling of the name. Is it in all CAPITOL letters? Is the last name first and then the given names or given name and initial? Then that is not you the human being, it is your legal person or 'nom-de-guerre'. **John-Adams: Doe** is the correct way to refer to a human being. It is pronounced 'John Adam, of the Doe's' or 'John Adam of the Doe Clan'. **DOE, JOHN ADAM** is a legal entity and a fiction.

Have you ever read a book and upon opening it had a human being jump out in the flesh? Likely not. You cannot and will not find a human being in a book (unless it is a really big book); you can however find 'characters' which *represent* human beings. They exist only in the book. They are a fiction and so is the story in the book and only fictions can exist within another fiction. You are represented in a larger legal entity and fiction by the name of your person. It is your *character* within the fiction that the government operates within. Question: Can you close the book on government? Can you refuse to continue reading?

"If ye love wealth better than liberty, the tranquility of servitude better than the animating contest of freedom, go home from us in peace. We ask not your counsels or arms. Crouch down and lick the hands, which feed you. May your chains set lightly upon you, and may posterity forget that ye were our countrymen."

- Samuel Adams, speech at the Philadelphia State House, August 1, 1776.

Bubble #4 – When is YOUR birthday? – and how do you REALLY know?

Anytime a government agent wants to deal with you they have to get you to tell them your birthday. Remember now, it's a crime to give false information. So how do you really know when your birthday is? How can you answer that question without relying on hearsay or conjecture? Could you count at that age? Were you able to label the months and years? Have you ever seen your Record of Live Birth? If not, how can you possibly answer that question truthfully? How can they demand you give them that information? They can do it because they do not want the information so much as they want you to either lie or identify a person. 'Birth' also means to be brought wholly in to existence and also refers to the legal fiction or person earlier referred to.

Maxims:

In ambiguous things, such a construction is to be made, that what is inconvenient and absurd is to be avoided.

It is a miserable slavery where the law is vague or uncertain.

Bubble #5 - Must Submit Application for Registration

Much of the power government has over you is a result of your actions, not theirs.

'**Submit**' means 'to agree to bend to another's will or to 'leave to another's discretion'. An agreement is a contract and must be entered into voluntarily. If you are leaving something to someone else's discretion, it must have been yours to begin with, right? Again it is voluntary in nature. You can never be lawfully compelled to submit.

'**Application**' legally means 'to beg, plead, petition, implore, entreat or request' The assumption this creates in court is fivefold; 1) he who begs knows exactly what he is begging for, 2) he knows exactly what he is giving up for it, 3) he is acknowledging the authority to grant OR 4) he is creating it through transference, and 5) he is doing it all voluntarily.

'Registration' was historically the act of a Ship's Captain signing over his ship and all chattel contents over to the harbour master for safekeeping. Chattel contents included the condemned, those in debt, prisoners, anything that could be bought or sold and slaves.

'**Must**' is likely their trickiest word by far. You will find it used with 'application', 'submission' and 'registration' extensively. They try to use it to make you think you have an obligation to act; you do not, for under law, you are never obliged to beg. If I tell you, "You must come to my party through the front door." Does that create an obligation for you to come to my party? Or does it perhaps merely define conditions,

which have to be fulfilled in order for me to have authority over you? If you look in Black's Law dictionary, you find that **'must'** is sometimes **'synonymous with may'**.

One is *never* obliged to 'apply', 'register' or 'submit'.

I feel like I just stepped on bubble wrap.

When you take charge of your life, there is no longer need to ask permission of other people or society at large. When you ask permission, you give someone veto power over your life. Geoffrey F. Abert

Bubble #6 – Marry the government, or not.

Do you need a Marriage License in order to marry lawfully? Well the government will tell you that you do. I am here to say otherwise. You have the right to live together and state your intent to the community and you are in effect married. If you do it through the government, you are actually entering into a contract where there are not two parties, but three. Yeap, you are in fact marrying the government and your mate. See, a license is permission to engage in an action which otherwise would be illegal. Marrying within the legislated framework may require a license; doing so lawfully does not. Plus, that action itself which is licensed must be fundamentally lawful, or else the licensing authority is allowing unlawful activities. You can't get a licence to rape for instance.

Just about anything you can do within the Legislated framework under licence; you are perfectly free to do outside that framework without a licence.

Where you find the laws most numerous, there you will find also the greatest injustice.
Arcesilaus

Maxim: All law has either been derived from the consent of the people, established by necessity, confirmed by custom, or of Divine Providence.

John 18:36 - Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence.

Bubble #7 – Statutes and Society

STATUTE. An act of the legislature, adopted under its constitutional authority, by prescribed means and in certain form, so that it becomes the law governing conduct within its scope. **Statutes** are enacted to prescribe conduct, define crimes, create inferior government bodies, appropriate public monies, and in general to promote the public welfare. Barron's 3rd.

Note: **Statutory** law is concerned with persons (artificial) and their privileges, duties, and obligations within and subordinate to collective public/government welfare. It does not, and cannot, deal with sovereign men and women (people). Anyone who answers to the name of his/her straw man, or who conducts his/her personal or commercial or industrial affairs in the name of his/her straw man (via licenses, permits, *etc.*) is subjecting themselves to **statutory** law by virtue of “benefits” and “privileges” acquired through the transmitting-utility straw man. This liability is removed when one accepts for value title to the straw man, *i.e.* the birth certificate.

We are led to believe everyday, that ‘statutes’ are laws. This is a bit of mendacious fallacy. A ‘*statute*’ is defined as ‘*a legislated rule of society which has the force of law*’. It is a rule and has the force of law, but only within a society. Now we must ask, what is a ‘society’? The definition of a ‘*society*’ has been given as

‘A number of people, joined by mutual consent, to deliberate, determine and act for a common goal.’ We see then clearly that these statutes only have the force of law over those who have consented to be a member of the society governed by those statutes.

‘Consent’ is a tricky legal concept too. It does not require any positive affirmation from you; your silence and inaction will suffice to raise the appearance of consent. Anything with the word ‘Act’ in its title is an Act of the Parliament or a Legislature and is in fact a statute. The simple fact is you have the right to exist without those statutes having the force of law over you.

I believe when Jesus spoke of not being of the existing Kingdom, he was perhaps referring to not being a member of the society the Magistrates where presiding over. Back then, the word ‘Kingdom’ referred to a structured society.

No man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent.

Abraham Lincoln (1809 - 1865)

The marvel of all history is the patience with which men and women submit to burdens unnecessarily laid upon them by their governments.

William H. Borah

Once a government is committed to the principle of silencing the voice of opposition, it has only one way to go, and that is down the path of increasingly repressive measures, until it becomes a source of terror to all its citizens and creates a country where everyone lives in fear.

Harry S Truman (1884 - 1972), August 8, 1950

Matt 5:40 - And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.

Quod per me non possum, nec per alium. **What I cannot do in person, I cannot do by proxy. 4 Co. 24.**

Bubble #8 – You can deny consent to be governed

Consent: An agreement to something proposed and differs from assent. Consent supposes, 1. a physical power to act; 2. a moral power of acting; 3. a serious and determined and free use of those powers. Consent is either express or implied. Express when it is given viva voce, or in writing; implied, when it is manifested by signs, actions or facts, or inaction or silence, which raise the presumption that the consent has been given.

Let's suppose that someone comes up to you and says, "I am your government, pay me taxes." And you then pay, have you not accepted their claim that they are your government? If a demand is made, it rests upon a claim. Meeting the demand means you have accepted the claim. The word 'accept' implies ability to 'reject'. When you reject their claim the demand has no foundation. At that point the claim has to be either abandoned or defended. Defending a claim means that they, as human beings, have to use words.

Consent is not the same as assent. It doesn't require a positive affirmation from you. It is just as easily achieved through your silence as it is through your words.

The Supreme Court of Canada ruled that since Canada enjoys a Common Law Jurisdiction, the government's power to govern comes from the consent of the governed. They did not say consent of the majority of the governed, either.

As I understand it, the only form of government recognized as lawful in Canada is a representative one, and representation requires mutual consent. I cannot act as your agent without your say so; the reverse is also true. If you create a situation where you do not have a representative, then no one can claim that you have a government. If you do not have a government, who has the right to claim they are your government agent? Who has the right to claim that you are a member of that particular society when the defining characteristic of a societal member is the fact that they have consented to being represented?

Denying consent is not all that difficult; all you have to do is give notice and make them aware that he or she is no longer your representative. You simply fire them and tell them you will exist outside of the legislative framework. Since they are only allowed to provide service to the public with respect to the legislative framework, and you are no longer part of that framework, they can no longer lawfully provide you with their 'services'.

Here's a great question for you. As members of society, we agree through consent to give up certain rights and freedoms in exchange for societal benefits. If however, we do not know what rights and freedoms we have given up, how do we know that what we are receiving are in fact 'benefits'? Would you buy a car, and not know what you paid for it, claim you got a great deal? If you don't know what it cost you, there can be no benefit.

A **'benefit'** is defined as **'something gained through a lawful transaction where the receiving party feels he got the advantage or profit'**. Is there any advantage or profit in ignorance? I do not think there is.

I also find it somewhat neat that the quote from the bible says if they ask for your 'cloak', give your 'cloak' also. What if, (just what if), when he said 'coat' he meant 'coat' or material garment and when he said 'cloak' he meant your protective outer garment in the law, or your 'person'. It does in fact 'cloak' us and if we give it to them, they seem to lose a whack of power.

I have looked for someone in the government who would care to dispute our right to deny consent, and was unsuccessful. I spoke with Attorneys in an AG's office who confirmed it for me, although it was like pulling teeth from a rabid wolverine with a water balloon...

Maxims:

- Any one may renounce a law introduced for his own benefit.**
- No one is obliged to accept a benefit against his consent.**
- He who receives the benefit should also bear the disadvantage.**

Bubble #9 – Looking into the boxes

Look closely at just about any government form; you will see a series of boxes. Your name will be in one box, your DOB in another, all the information is compartmentalized as if they are all separate. Ever wonder why they would do that? Try this little experiment. Take something, put it in a box and ask someone to tell you what's in it without opening it. They will not be able to do it, will they? They can't see inside the box if it is closed. The same is true in court. Apparently, a Judge does not have to look at what is in a box and what is in it is not joined to that which is in other boxes on the same page. There is no joinder between the two lawfully, and if you accept that there is, you must be entering their make believe world where things are joined even though they are separate.

You can open up those boxes and create joinder with some White Out liquid paper. Just 'open the box' by covering one line on one side of the box with the stuff and you have opened them up and created joinder. Ta-Da!

For some reason they do not like you opening their boxes too much. They say things like 'Please don't deface the forms'. Tell them you are "Fixing it so they can be held fully commercially liable."

There is no cruder tyranny than that which is perpetuated under the shield of Law and in the name of justice.

Montesquieu (1689-1755)

Bubble #10 – The Double Sided Affidavit

Speaking of things the Judge can't see, sometimes it has been found that they will turn an affidavit face down and tell you "I can't see it. Let's move on." They do this especially if the subject matter is contentious or they do not want to deal with it. This you simply fix, by putting your affidavit on both sides of the paper! When he flips it over and sees it on the other side, he will lose the ability to say he can't see it. Warning: Judges won't like that you pulled a fast one.

Maxim: There is no stronger link between men than an oath.

Bubble # 11 – Signature Protection

SIGNATURE, pract. contr. By signature is understood the act of putting down a man's name, at the end of an instrument, to attest its validity. The name thus written is also called a signature.

ATTESTATION, contracts and evidence. The act of witnessing an instrument of writing, at the request of the party making the same, and subscribing it as a witness. 3 P. Wms. 254 2 Ves. 454 1 Ves. & B. 362; 3 Marsh. 146; 3 Bibb. 494; 17 Pick. 373.

WITNESS. One who, being sworn or affirmed, according to law, deposes as to his knowledge of facts in issue between the parties in a cause.

TO SWEAR. **To take an oath, judicially administered. Vide Affirmation; Oath.**

Your signature is evidence of an oath that the instrument upon which it can be found is valid. Unfortunately we live in a society where you will often be in a position where your signature is demanded or you can face consequences. You may face a threat of jail or other hardships. Under these situations you can and should write “Under **Duress**” *before* you sign the document. Doing so means your oath is invalidated. Once you have signed there are things you can write to protect your rights and freedoms. These are:

Without Prejudice – It means they can’t present this document in a court of law.

All Rights Reserved - means you are reserving all your rights. Whatever happens, the rights you had before signing you still have a solid claim to.

Non-Assumpsit – an Assumpsit is a type of contract, where duties are imposed without full disclosure. By writing this you ensure that you do not accept any obligations that are not expressly stated.

You can also copyright your name merely by putting a copyright symbol next to your name. ♥
If they try using it for any commercial purpose, you can sue them, especially if their commercial activities harmed you in any way.

Bubble #12 – Show them, don’t tell them

Let’s say you are stopped by a cop. He asks for your name. You want to ensure you give him that which identifies the human being and not merely the legal entity. Write it down on a piece of paper like this: John-Adams: Doe. Use the proper capitalization and punctuation. Remember, that piece of paper is your property, and he better return it when you ask for it. Also, he will have to put the name in the computer the way you wrote it and their equipment is not set up for that. If he tries putting in anything but what you showed him, he is unlawfully trying to create joinder between you and some other person. He has no right to do that. It also establishes that you are a human being, not a person and he has to play in that sand box and act as a Peace Officer. Until you show them a Driver’s License, they have no right to act in a Law Enforcement capacity.

Bubble #12(a) – Identify this!

Officers love to ask you for identification. They make it sound like you are obliged to have it, and failure to produce it is unlawful. Even if you ask some straight out “Am I obliged to have Identification?” they will incorrectly answer ‘Yes.’ The argument that one is obliged to have ID falls apart when one looks at the fact that the only way to get government issued ID is to ‘apply’ for it. Who’s obliged to apply?

The following is from an actual conversation with peace officers engaged in with the author. The first one was while I was in a park, with a big sign saying “Marijuana sold lawfully here”. That apparently got the police’ attention and two came to visit. This recount is by memory.

COP #1: What’s your name?

Author: I really wish I could help you, but I do not know if you are acting legally as a Law Enforcement Officer, or lawfully as a Peace Officer, so I do not know if you want a legal name or a lawful one. Sorry.

COP #1: I am acting legally and I want your legal name.

Author: Do you have proof of claim I have an obligation to have such a thing?

COP #1: Uh.... Um... Fine, then I am acting lawfully and I want your lawful name.

Author: OK, You can call me Rob.

COP #2: What’s your last name Rob?

Author: Why do you need that for a lawful discussion? Or are you telling me this is not a lawful discussion and you are not acting lawfully?

COP #2: I'm acting lawfully! I need your name for my report.

Author: That information will be in MY report. Now What's your full name? I will need it for my report...

COP #2: I don't have to give you my name. I can give you my badge number.

Author: OK I agree to that! And, since equality before and under the law is paramount and we are equal, and you do not have to give me your name, then clearly I have no obligation to give you mine. I can just give you MY number, too. Agreed?

COP #1: Oh, and what's your number?

Author: (Smiling) I don't have one. But if I did, I would give it to you.

COP #2: Do you have identification?

Author: Am I obliged to have such a thing?

COP #1: Yes you are!

Author: I looked into that, and found out that the only way to get an ID card was to 'apply' for it. Are you telling me I am obliged to apply? Do you even know what the word 'apply' means?

COP #1: I'm sure you are going to tell me.

Author: Not unless you intend to pay me.

COP #2: Yeah, right. Like that's going to happen.

Author: Let me ask you this. Are either of you willing to claim under oath and upon your full commercial liability, that I have a duty or obligation to apply for anything?

COP #1: (Decided this was a good time to silently examine his shoes)

COP #2: (Digging into his pants pocket) Here's a quarter. What does apply mean?

Author: Thank you. It means, to beg, plead, petition, implore, entreat or request. Either of you want to claim I have an obligation to 'beg'? No? I didn't think so.

COP #2: I am getting tired of this, either you tell me what your name is, or I am arresting you for obstruction of justice and impeding an investigation.

Author: I thought you were acting lawfully, not legally. So you want to know what my name is?

COP #2: YES!

Author: Fine I will tell you exactly what my name is, but you wont like it...

COP# 1: Just tell us what your name is, will you Rob?

Author: My name is... My name is... My name is ... an intangible security interest and is recognized as such by the Personal Property Security Act, which governs ALL transactions concerning security interests. That intangible has immense value, and here you are demanding I just give it to you, with nothing in exchange, no consideration in return and without knowing what you intend to do with it, or if your actions will devalue it in any way. Now, are you familiar with the section of the Criminal Code of Canada relating to the offence of extortion? You really should be up on that. (Looking at nonexistent watch) You know, this might be a good time to exercise one of my other favorite rights, the right to travel. I think I will travel over there somewhere. You guys have a great day, eh?

In this next little discussion, I was sitting at a patio, doing what many authors do. (It involves beer.) A paddy wagon had pulled up and a man had written on it with a felt tip marker "VDP are Pigs!" He got arrested and became quite belligerent and hostile. I calmed him down and did so with respect for the officers. They are human beings, after all. They came over later and offered their thanks and once again asked for information. This was the exchange.

COP: What's your last name?

Author: I'm sorry, I wish I could help you, but I don't have one of those.

COP: HUH? What do you mean?

Author: I don't have a 'last' name.

COP: What do you have?

Author: Hemorrhoids. Just teasing. I have a family name.

COP: (chuckling) OK, what's your family name?

Author: Menard.

COP: OK, and what's your first name?

Author: I'm really sorry, I wish I could help you, but I honestly don't have one of those.

COP: Oh, and what do you have?

Author: (smiling) I have given Christian names!

COP: And what might they be?

Author: They might be anything.

COP: (laughing) What are they?

Author: Robert and Arthur

COP: In that order?

Author: You know I don't mean any disrespect, but you have an awful lot of questions. This would go much quicker if you'd just ask the proper questions. Yes, in that order.

COP: And what's your date of birth?

Author: I really wish I could help you there, but swear to God, I was not counting then. (BIG smile) Honest.

COP: (Laughing) Fair enough. (Slyly) So when do you celebrate your Birth day?

Author: (Big Smile) I do that every single day!

COP: Let me put it this way, if I wanted to send you a gift for your birthday, when should I send it?

Author: You should do that tomorrow! Get me something BIG too; you have been remiss.

COP: I am not getting that information am I?

Author: I am not a psychic. I know I cannot and thus will not provide you with what you seek. I do wish you well though.

COP: Well, I don't have the time. It was nice meeting you, but unfortunately, although I can include your name in my report, we won't know who you really are.

Author: Trust me Officer; your superiors know exactly who I am. They love me, even. (Smiling)

Cop: I'm sure they do. It was nice meeting you, thanks for your help.

Police need TWO things; name and date of birth. It is those two things which define a person and with which they can claim the existence of a one. You can distinguish between a legal and lawful name and provide ONLY the lawful one. You can also refuse to give a date of birth, as there is no way they can claim this is information you know as FACT. Any information you have is merely the result of hearsay, or is merely custom and NOT backed by any affidavit you have ever seen. So how can you really know when you were born? As a human being, you simply can't!

If you take the steps found in this book, they can never get you to agree that you are a person, only that you are acting as an agent for a person. They are not the government; they are only agents for the government. You are not a person; you are merely an agent for a person. Two can play their game.

Bubble #13 – Your existing Common Law right to travel

This is one of their biggest means of gaining control over us. The right to travel is so fundamental to our existence as a society that without it we would likely not even have one. As it is now, they seem to have everyone convinced that we have to get a license to be on the road in an automobile. This is not the case at all. We will take a close look at that right and the Motor Vehicle Act that they use to control your actions.

From the Motor Vehicle Act:

"motor vehicle" means a vehicle, not run on rails, that is designed to be self propelled or propelled by electric power obtained from overhead trolley wires, but does not include a motor assisted cycle;

Read that carefully. See the “quotation” marks? Do you know what they mean? They legally mean “these words”. These “PRINTED” words. It is telling you that anytime you see those printed words, you know it is referring to something that has those attributes. It is telling you all “motor vehicles” will have those listed attributes. Now ask some questions. Is the definition a full and complete one? If not then it stands to reason that there must be further attributes, which are needed to fully describe a ‘motor vehicle’.

Think of it like this: if I say “**apple’ means a round red fruit**”, does that mean all round red fruit are apples? Obviously not, right? After all, there are pomegranates, grapes and certain varieties of exotic Asian pears. They are not saying that all things with those attributes are ‘motor vehicles’; they are saying that all motor vehicles have those attributes. See the difference?

If we look further in the same Act we find under Section 3 the following:

- 3** (1) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the owner of a motor vehicle or trailer must, before it is used or operated on a highway,
- (a) register the motor vehicle or trailer with the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia,
 - (b) obtain a licence for its operation under this section, and
 - (c) obtain for it a certificate of insurance under the *Insurance (Motor Vehicle) Act*.
- (2) Despite subsection (1), a trailer towed by a tractor licensed under section 8 need not be licensed.

(3) The owner must apply for

- (a) registration and licence in the form required by the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia, and
- (b) a motor vehicle liability policy in accordance with the *Insurance (Motor Vehicle) Act* and regulations under that Act.

Remember how to ‘apply’ is a voluntary act and must can mean ‘may’ and no one is ever obliged to beg or apply? Remember how there must be a missing attribute unless the definition is full and complete? Well this is that missing attribute which is required before something with those attributes can be deemed a ‘motor vehicle’. You as the owner have to beg to have them confer upon your automobile the status of ‘motor vehicle’.

In order to register you will have to hand over the MSO or Manufacturers Statement or Origin or the MNVIS (Manufacturers New Vehicle Information Statement). They then give you a Certificate of Ownership with two names on it; yours and theirs. Now they are part owner of that ‘motor vehicle’ and you never even had to register it in the first place!

Matthew 5:25 - Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison.

Luke 12:58 - When thou goest with thine **adversary** to the magistrate, as thou art in the way, give diligence that thou mayest be delivered from him; lest he hale thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and the officer cast thee into prison.

Bubble #14 – The Rule of Law

The Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Constitution Act make reference to ‘The Rule of Law.’ Although many greater minds than mine have studied and expressed just what that is, basically it boils down to this:

Equality before and under the Law is paramount.

Conflict is avoidable, unnecessary, and undesirable and when it raises its ugly head is to be dealt with using discussion, negotiation and then if necessary, adjudication in a court of competent jurisdiction.

If you can understand this, you can use it to seize power. The government is not big on discussing and will try to get you into court without discussing or negotiating. If they succeed, you end up looking like you abandoned the rule of law. You will be the one apparently in dishonour. By understanding this concept, you can force them to discuss matters with you before going to court. If you are in agreement with him or her, there can be no controversy or conflict; therefore the Court has no power, because it is a place for those in conflict. If they refuse to discuss with you and try to drag you into court without benefit of discussion and negotiation, they have abandoned the rule of law and you merely have to show that they are in dishonour. If there is conflict, almost always someone is in dishonour. When two people are both acting honourably, conflict is very unlikely. Your goal in court, should you be unable to avoid it, is to ensure you are not the one in dishonour. Clearly embracing the rule of law and striving to avoid the conflict accomplish this.

Imagine you have two kids playing in the back yard and then suddenly you hear a big brouhaha. You go investigate and find one child with muddy hands and the other with mud all down his back. Who is likely to blame for the conflict? Clearly the one with the clean hands did not engage in mud flinging therefore they are in honour.



Can two walk together unless they both are agreed? Amos 3:3

Whoever is open, loyal, true; of humane and affable demeanour; honourable himself, and in his judgment of others; faithful to his word as to law, and faithful alike to God and man.... such a man is a true gentleman.

Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803 - 1882)

It is honourable to be accused by those who deserve to be accused.

Latin Proverb

Nothing deters a good man from doing what is honourable.

Seneca (5 BC - 65 AD)

Bubble #15 – The Notary Protest – Lawfully Achieving Justice

The Notary is likely one of the most powerful cards in the judicial deck. He's the Joker. As an Officer of the Court, he can fulfill any duty found in any statute. He has the power to attest, operate on your behalf, protest commercial documents and create administrative judgments. Here in a nutshell is what is known as the Notary Public Protest Method. It has been extensively taught by Victoria Joy in her seminars and is certainly sound when it comes to the rule of law. Based upon my experiences and studies, it will work in Canada just as well as it does in the US. It is based primarily on the concept of being honourable, avoiding conflict and agreeing with your potential adversary.

Step 1: You send them a letter by registered mail. In it you mention the rule of law and invite them to discuss. You are in fact extending an offer. Unless they accept your offer, they are going into dishonour.

Step 2: Three days later, you go to your Notary Public with your offer to discuss that your adversary either rejected or ignored and you have the Notary send it again, acting in his capacity of an Officer of the Court. If they again dishonour it, they have dishonoured an Officer of the Court.

Step 3: Three days after they dishonour the Notary, you have him send them a Notice of Dishonour. They are informed of their dishonour and given a chance to correct it. Again, they have three days. If they do nothing, go to step 4.

Step 4: Three days after they received the Notice of Dishonour, if they have not responded honourably, you have the Notary send a Notice of Protest. This is end game, for you have proof that you are in honour and they are not. They have lost the right to claim any conflict and they have no right to enter into negotiations. They have essentially lost. Their hands are dirty and yours are not. Now you go to Step 5.

Step 5: Take your Notice of Protest and bring it to a Justice of the Peace and have an Administrative Judgment entered against your adversary. Begin collection proceedings against them as you would for any court judgment.

This process can be shortened. You can use one of their tricks on them. You can state that dishonour will mean they waive their right to be served a Notice of Protest. Include in your first letter (make sure it is Notarized) a line something like this: **'Failure to honour this offer will be deemed to mean you have waived your right to a Notice of Protest and consent to an immediate Administrative Judgment.'**

If they then dishonour the offer, you take that letter to the Notary and have an immediate judgment rendered against whoever dishonoured you.

All truth passes through three stages. First, it is ridiculed. Second, it is violently opposed. Third, it is accepted as being self-evident.

Arthur Schopenhauer (1788 - 1860)

Bubble #16 – Canada Bankrupt?

Did you know Canada has a Receiver General? Did you know this means we are in receivership? Yes boys and girls Canada is in fact bankrupt. This means they have little right to engage in commercial activities. You can raise this issue in court and watch a Judge almost have a fit. Deputy Sheriffs will suddenly emerge from the walls and you might end up in gaol for a little cooling off period. They do not like you pointing out that the ball they are trying to kick around has no air in it.

You can also use this information if any Government agent comes after you. You simply tell them you do not like doing business with those you don't know and then you ask a few questions. Like: Is Canada bankrupt? If so can I be forced to contract or transact with a bankrupt entity? (NO, you can't)

Bubble #17 – Acceptance for Value

ACCEPTANCE FOR VALUE. Note: **Acceptance for value** is the key to becoming the holder in due course of any negotiable instrument, including your birth certificate. Here, the term "acceptance" refers to the recipient/acceptor and the item accepted (such as one's birth certificate); "value" refers to that which is given by, or flows back from, the recipient of the item in exchange. The term "value," as employed in the

UCC, is a highly significant term and comprehension of the Redemption Process requires full understanding of it.

This bubble is one of the bigger ones and I will not be able to cover it much here. Basically it boils down to your right to accept the charges they bring against you. This removes any conflict or controversy and means the courts should not be involved. You then have them place the charge against your account that they hold.

Imagine you are in a restaurant, and the waitress presents a bill. You look at it and state you wish to speak with the owner. The waitress goes and gets the manager who tells you she is not sure who the owner is. You tell her to find out. Eventually she returns and tells you, "Surprise, you are the owner!" So you take the bill that she presented to you and because you are the owner, you write on it "Accepted for Value, apply to my (the owners) account". Then you sign it. The bill has been settled, it has completed due course and the person who initially presented it, has nothing to complain about, after all they were presenting it for you and to you. That is essentially the Accepted for Value route, although I strongly suggest you do extensive research before trying it. I believe you have to actually redeem your straw man in order for it to work properly; otherwise you are not in the owner position.

Maxims:

When the foundation fails, the entire work fails.
Where the foundation is weak, the work is weak.

Bubble # 18 – Warrants and Affidavits

Did you know when an Officer of the law tries to serve a warrant, you have the right to see the supporting affidavit and that without one, and the warrant is unlawful? You can also use that Affidavit as a foundation of your defense if you need to. Is all the information correct? Was it properly sworn and attested to? Don't ever be happy just seeing the warrant; often times they try to play fast and loose and if you catch them in it, the process can be cancelled.

Laws alone cannot secure freedom of expression; in order that every man present his views without penalty there must be spirit of tolerance in the entire population.

Albert Einstein (1879 - 1955)

It is the spirit and not the form of law that keeps justice alive.

Earl Warren (1891 - 1974)

It was the boast of Augustus that he found Rome of brick and left it of marble. But how much nobler will be the sovereign's boast when he shall have it to say that he found law... a sealed book and left it a living letter; found it the patrimony of the rich and left it the inheritance of the poor; found it the two-edged sword of craft and oppression and left it the staff of honesty and the shield of innocence.

Henry Brougham (1778 - 1868)

Est autem vis legem simulans. **Violence may also put on the mask of law.**

Bubble #19 – Peace Officers and LEO's

Believe it or not, you have rights!

Hello Police Officer.

“Are you a Peace Officer?”

“Yes, I am”

“Have you observed me breach the Peace?”

“No...”

“I hereby exercise my Common Law right to refuse intercourse with a Peace Office who has not observed me breach the Peace. Have a good day.”

You have the right to refuse intercourse with a Peace Officer who has not observed you breach the Peace. You have to get them to admit they are a Peace Officer first, but if you ask they are obliged to inform you of the truth, unless they are undercover, of course. Under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, they also have the duty to instruct you of your right to retain and instruct counsel without delay. That right exists even if you haven't been arrested.

Some will try telling you they are 'Law Enforcement' Officers. If they say that, ask to see a Court Order with your name on it that they are enforcing. Without that order, what exactly are they enforcing? If they try saying they are enforcing a statute, ask what evidence they have that you are a member of the society being governed. If you ask enough difficult questions in a respectful and assertive way, they will not want to mess with you. Be nice to them. They are Officers of the Court and you do not want a charge of dishonouring them leveled against you. This does not mean you can't exercise your rights.

If you are traveling on the road and they ask to see your Driver's License, you are not obliged to show them. You will get a ticket, but that is easy enough to defeat. The reason you do not want to show them your license is because the moment they see it, they will no longer be acting as a lawful Peace Officer, they will be empowered to act as a Law Enforcement Officer and they can and will pull you out of the car and arrest you, especially if you have been questioning their authority. Until they see that Instrument however, they must act cautiously, for you may be someone who knows their rights and is merely exercising them. You might be a Sharpe-Prick in your own right.

Following is from a BCCLA Rights card. Feel free to copy and distribute these.

Statement For Police Officer: If I am under arrest or being detained, please tell me so. If I am free to go, please tell me so. If I am under arrest, please tell me why. I want to exercise all my legal rights including my right to silence and my right to speak to a lawyer before I say anything to you. Until I speak to a lawyer, I will not willingly cooperate with any request you make, unless you command me and explain to me why. Thank you for respecting my rights.

POLICE ARREST: Silence is Golden

Each situation is different, and you must use your common sense.

Stay calm, quiet, and try to remember everything that happens. If you are stopped by police, give them the top part of this card or read it out. If you are in a bar, a cinema, or if they say you broke the law, give your name, address, and birth date. If driving, show your license. Then, do not say anything until you talk to a lawyer. If they command you to do something, politely ask why, and then do it silently. Call a lawyer as soon as you can.

To speak to a lawyer call: 1-888-978-0050

My Rights:

- 1- I can refuse to talk to the police or answer their questions.
- 2- I can insist on my right to speak with a lawyer as quickly as possible.
- 3- I can ask a police officer to tell me his name or badge number. I can get help from a lawyer even if I can't afford to pay.
- 4- Before the police search my house, my car, my belongings or my body, I can insist that they show me a search warrant, or explain clearly why they are searching me and what they are looking for.
- 5- I can leave unless I am being arrested or detained.
- 6- I can insist that I be searched by someone of the same sex.
- 7- I can leave unless I am being arrested or detained

Maxims applicable to Officers

- ignorance of the Law does not excuse misconduct in anyone, least of all a sworn officer of the law.**
- Summonses or citations should not be granted before it is expressed under the circumstances whether the summons ought to be made.
- A delegated power cannot be again delegated. A deputy cannot appoint a deputy.
- An office ought to be injurious to no one.
- A neglected duty often works as much against the interests as a duty wrongfully performed.
- Failure to enforce the law does not change it.
- It is contrary to the Law of Nations to do violence to Ambassadors.
- An Ambassador fills the place of the king by whom he is sent, and is to be honored as he is whose place he fills.**
- The greatest enemies to peace are force and wrong.
- Force and wrong are greatly contrary to peace.
- Force is inimical to the laws.

They use tricks to gain authority over you. If when they stop you, they tell you to open your window and you do it, they have seized authority. Before that can happen, if you get stopped, open the window first, try to foresee what the Officer will ask for and do it before he can ask. Before he asks you for your Identification, turn the tables and ask him for his.

Ex malificio non oritur contractus. A contract cannot arise out of an act radically wrong and illegal. Broom's Max. 851.

Bubble #20 – Contracts and Agreements

CONTRACT. An agreement between two or more persons which creates an obligation to do or not to do a particular thing. Its essentials are competent parties, subject matter, a legal consideration, mutuality of agreement, and mutuality of obligation. Black's 5th.

Note: All **contracts**, whether express or implied, are subject to the universal essentials of **contract** law, pertaining to the fundamentals of the interaction between the parties. These fundamentals are well codified in many places.

A contract is an agreement to do or not to do a certain thing.

Essential elements of contract

It is essential to the existence of a contract that there should be:

1. Parties capable of contracting;
2. Their consent;
3. Lawful object; and,
4. A sufficient cause or consideration.

Who may contract

All persons are capable of contracting, except minors, persons of unsound mind, and persons deprived of civil rights.

Essentials of consent

The consent of the parties to a contract must be:

1. Free;
2. Mutual; and,
3. Communicated by each to the other.

An apparent consent is not real or free when obtained through:

1. Duress;
2. Menace;
3. Fraud;
4. Undue influence; or
5. Mistake.

When contract wholly void

Where a contract has but a single object, and such object is unlawful, whether in whole or in part, or wholly impossible of performance, or so vaguely expressed as to be wholly unascertainable, the entire contract is void.

Effect of its illegality

If any part of single consideration for one or more objects, or of several considerations for a single object, is unlawful, the entire contract is void.

Express contract, what

An express contract is one, the terms of which are stated in words.

Implied contract, what

An implied contract is one, the existence and terms of which are manifested by conduct.

Impossible or unlawful conditions void

A condition in a contract, the fulfillment of which is impossible or unlawful, within the meaning of the article on the object of contracts, or which is repugnant to the nature of the interest created by the contract, is void.

Contracts, how to be interpreted

A contract must be so interpreted as to give effect to the mutual intention of the parties as it existed at the time of contracting, so far as the same is ascertainable and lawful.

Certain contracts unlawful

All contracts which have for their object, directly or indirectly, to exempt anyone from responsibility for his own fraud, or willful injury to the person or property of another, or violation of law, whether willful or negligent, are against the policy of the law.

Fraudulent deceit

One who willfully deceives another with intent to induce him to alter his position to his injury or risk, is liable for any damage which he thereby suffers.

Bubble # 21 - The PPSA

The PPSA is the Private Property Security Act and it is likely some of the driest and most boring reading you will ever come across. It is dryer than a Sahara Desert travel guide. It is designed to make you fall asleep before you understand what it says. Just like Dorothy and the Poppy fields, this Act has within it the power to free you from those who would interact with you under conditions of fraud or misrepresentation. If you can make it to the end, you will find this section:

Conflicts with legislation in general

73 Subject to section 74, if there is a conflict between this Act and any other Act, this Act prevails unless the other Act contains an express provision that it, or a provision of it, applies despite the Personal Property Security Act.

This section tells you very plainly that this Act has more power than just about anything else out there. Any conflict between this Act and any other Act and this one prevails. Now what exactly does this Act deal with? Let's look, shall we?

Section Scope of Act: security interests

2 (1) Subject to section 4, this Act applies

- (a) to every transaction that in substance creates a security interest, without regard to its form and without regard to the person who has title to the collateral, and
- (b) without limiting paragraph (a), to a chattel mortgage, a conditional sale, a floating charge, a pledge, a trust indenture, a trust receipt, an assignment, a consignment, a lease, a trust, and a transfer of chattel paper if they secure payment or performance of an obligation.

Folks, this one isn't going to be easy, you will have to look at a number of definitions and keep them in your head until you get to the last one, then I will pop a nice big bubble.

What's a 'security interest' we must ask. It states:

"security interest" means

- (a) an interest in goods, chattel paper, a security, a document of title, an instrument, money or an intangible that secures payment or performance of an obligation, but does not include the interest of a seller who has shipped goods to a buyer under a negotiable bill of lading or its equivalent to the order of the seller or to the order of an agent of the seller, unless the parties have otherwise evidenced an intention to create or provide for a security interest in the goods, and
- (b) the interest of
 - (i) a transferee arising from the transfer of an account or a transfer of chattel paper,
 - (ii) a person who delivers goods to another person under a commercial consignment, and
 - (iii) a lessor under a lease for a term of more than one year,whether or not the interest secures payment or performance of an obligation;

Now what's an 'intangible'?

"intangible" means

- (a) personal property, but does not include goods, chattel paper, a document of title, an instrument, money or a security, and
- (b) a licence;

"instrument" means

- (a) a bill of exchange, note or cheque within the meaning of the *Bills of Exchange Act* (Canada),

(b) **any other writing that evidences a right to payment of money and is of a type that in the ordinary course of business is transferred by delivery with any necessary endorsement or assignment, or**

(c) a letter of credit or an advice of credit if the letter of credit or advice of credit states on it that it must be surrendered on claiming payment under it, but does not include

(d) chattel paper, a document of title or a security, or

(e) a bond, debenture or similar document evidencing an obligation secured, in whole or in part, by a mortgage of an interest in land unless the interest being mortgaged is, itself, a mortgage of land;

You will also find this:

"value" means any consideration sufficient to support a simple contract, and includes an antecedent debt or liability.

Did you catch that 'antecedent debt' part? It's going to be important... Did you also pay attention to the definition of 'intangible'? What is your greatest intangible asset? Think about it. Important and intangible; what do you think it is?

Why wouldn't that be your identity or your name? Yes friends, your name is an intangible security and you have the utmost interest in it under Natural, Commercial and Common Law. Now why would this be so important?

Many PPSA's across Canada state something along these lines: (this is from Ontario)

Except in so far as they are inconsistent with the express provisions of this Act, the principles of law and equity, including the law merchant, the law relating to capacity to contract, principal and agent, estoppel, **fraud, misrepresentation, duress, coercion, mistake and other validating or invalidating rules of law, shall supplement this Act and shall continue to apply.** R.S.O. 1990, c. P.10, s. 72.

Put it all together and what have you got?

1. Your name is an intangible security interest.
2. The PPSA covers **all transactions concerning security interests.**
3. When someone ask for your name, that is a transaction under the PPSA.
4. That transaction is invalidated by any fraud, misrepresentation, duress, coercion, mistake and other validating or invalidating rules of law,
5. You can become the secured creditor against your 'person' so any debt they try to collect from that 'person' they have to make sure you get paid first.
6. If you create an antecedent debt with the government and when they try to point out that you owe them money, you can point out they owed you first and to apply that debit they are claiming to your credit.
7. Any Instrument creating a duty to act or pay is a security interest. Claims can meet this definition.

The **PPSA** is likely one of the most important statutes for anyone desiring their freedom to understand. It allows you to use commercial instruments when dealing with the government and evens the playing field, so to speak. It is a very dry and difficult statute to get your head around, and I bet they likely did that on purpose. Can't have the minions realizing the rules of the game, now can we?

The national budget must be balanced. The public debt must be reduced; the arrogance of the authorities must be moderated and controlled. Payments to foreign governments must be reduced, if the nation doesn't want to go bankrupt. People must again learn to work, instead of living on public assistance. **Cicero (106 BC - 43 BC), 55 BC**

Bubble # 22 - Antecedent Debts

Antecedent means 'previously existing'. If you can understand this concept, you can create an antecedent debt quite lawfully and although you might never collect on it, when the government tries collecting from you, you can defeat them by pointing out the *antecedent* debt. (Yes I owe you \$10,000. But you have owed me \$1,000,000 for 3 years. Take the \$10,000 off the \$1,000,000 you owe me and see you next year!)

How to create an antecedent debt lawfully is the same way you would create any claim of debt. You present them with a bill charging them for services rendered. The services you charge them for is the use of your straw man for the last X years or for the fraud they have perpetrated, or their misrepresentation.

Bubble #23 - Child of God

The Charter of Rights and Freedoms states right at the beginning, "*Canada is a nation founded upon the belief in the supremacy of God and the rule of law.*"

This tells us that there is a hierarchy, and God is at the very top. This is good and as it should be. Now ask the killer question;

WHO IS NUMBER 2 IN THAT HIERARCHY?

What if I told you that you have the legal right to claim that number two position and that if you did, no one would have authority over you, except God. Would you believe me? If you do claim your status as a Child of God, who has the right to say it isn't so? Who will dispute it? The following document is what you would use to claim your status.

WARNING: do not take this step unless you truly believe in God and that you are in fact a Child of God. If you get caught as an imposter the punishment can be very large. Not just from the Judiciary, but from God too. A Child of God enjoys Grace and acts with honour and the moment you start to act contrary to what is acceptable Child of God behaviour, you will be ejected from the 'party' and your claim will be lost.

Constructive Notice of Child of God Status

Whereas Canada is a nation founded upon the belief in the principles of the supremacy of God and the rule of law, and,

Whereas the above sentence defines a hierarchy, with God at the top, and,

Whereas the number two position in that hierarchy is not claimed by anyone, and,

Whereas the governments of this nation seem to rely on deception to gain the power to govern, and,

Whereas I am desirous of living my life as a 'Child of God, and,

Whereas the only powers able to claim any authority over a 'Child of God' is God, and,

Whereas neither the government, nor it's agents nor it's representatives or employees are God, or above God, and,

Whereas by legally claiming the number two position in the above-mentioned hierarchy, I occupy a position above all governments and their agents and employees and representatives,

Be it known to any and all, that on this date, _____,

I, _____, a free human being, do hereby lawfully claim the status of a 'Child of God'.

Any human being who wishes to claim any authority over me must first prove they exist above God; they are God; they are between God and I; or they have a document upon the face of which can be found the verifiable signature of God granting them authority over me.

Failure to first do one of the above-mentioned things means all claims to authority is abandoned or is unlawful.

Attempting to exercise any authority over me without first fulfilling one of the four above mentioned requirements are an unlawful acts of fraud and/or extortion.

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Witness: _____ Date: _____

Witness: _____ Date: _____

It is a poor wit who lives by borrowing the words, decisions, inventions and actions of others.
Johann Kaspar Lavater

Bubble #24 – Violation Tickets and the Bills of Exchange Act

TICK, contracts. Credit; as, if a servant usually buys for the master upon tick, and the servant buys something without the master's order, yet, if the master were trusted by the trader, he is liable. 1 Show. 95; 3 Keb. 625; 10 Mod. 111; 3 Esp. R. 214; 4 Esp. R. 174.

Have you ever wondered why when you get a tick-et, they give you a copy and not the original? Have you ever wondered why if you pay the fine or ticket, there is still a conviction registered against your name? Ever felt them tickets were something stinky and sneaky? Tickets are actually Bills of Exchange and the entire ticketing process is the Notarial protest in a nutshell!

You are about to learn something exciting; when a tick-et is presented, you have the right and even the duty to take the original ticket and negotiate a payment within three days. If you do this, the Officer cannot give you the defendant's copy and there will likely not be a conviction registered against our name. If they try to stop you from taking the original, they are agreeing to pay it for you!

Let's look at what is happening now. An Officer will pull you over and will issue you a tick-et. You sign it, (often with his thumb still on the ticket) give it back to him, he gives you a copy. That's the process. What would happen if you tried to take the original? Would he let you? This is what Freddie Freepickle thinks; you have a right to take the original ticket and if he stops you, the ticket is dead, or discharged for he is not duly presenting it. Not only do you have a right to take the original ticket, you have a duty and the second copy is really evidence that you failed to accept the first! Ask yourself, and him, what right does he have to deny you the original yet impose a copy? Hmm?? A copy can only be imposed once the original has APPARENTLY been dishonoured.

Let's use the Bills of Exchange Act to examine what is really happening. The first question we must ask is: Is a Violation Ticket a bill of exchange? The definition of bill of exchange, from the BOEA is as follows:

16. (1) A bill of exchange is an unconditional order in writing, addressed by one person to another, signed by the person giving it, requiring the person to whom it is addressed to pay, on demand or at a fixed or determinable future time, a sum certain in money to or to the order of a specified person or to bearer.

Certainly would appear that a Violation Ticket matches that definition. If it is a bill, then when they are giving it to you, they are presenting it. They can prove they presented it too; after all, you have signed it, it must have been in your possession for some period of time, right?

Look at this section:

34. (1) The acceptance of a bill is the signification by the drawee of his assent to the order of the drawer.

35. (1) An acceptance is invalid unless it complies with the following conditions:

(a) it must be written on the bill and be signed by the drawee; and

(2) *The mere signature of the drawee written on the bill without additional words is a sufficient acceptance.*

In the Act, a drawer is the one who creates the bill; the drawee is the one the bill is presented to. Imagine a waitress and a customer. The waitress is the drawer and the customer is the drawee. So they get you to sign it and thus accept it, but then they get it back from you immediately without you getting a receipt. That brings in this section:

They are the drawer of the bill, they have proof you accepted the bill, then failed to pay for it and returned the unpaid bill to them. Obviously you have dishonoured their bill!

The following are key sections of the Bills of Exchange Act.

10. A protest of any bill or note within Canada, and any copy thereof as copied by the notary or justice of the peace, is, in any action, evidence of presentation and dishonour, and also of service of notice of the presentation and dishonour as stated in the protest

11. Where a bill or note, presented for acceptance, or payable outside Canada, is protested for non-acceptance or non-payment, a notarial copy of the protest and of the notice of dishonour, and a notarial certificate of the service of the notice, shall be received in all courts as evidence of the protest, notice and service or copy.

35. (1) An acceptance is invalid unless it complies with the following conditions:

(a) it must be written on the bill and be signed by the drawee; and

(b) it must not express that the drawee will perform his promise by any other means than the payment of money.

(2) The mere signature of the drawee written on the bill without additional words is a sufficient acceptance.

39. (1) As between immediate parties and as regards a remote party, other than a holder in due course, the delivery of a bill

(a) in order to be effectual must be made either by or under the authority of the party drawing, accepting or endorsing, as the case may be; or

(b) may be shown to have been conditional or for a special purpose only, and not for the purpose of transferring the property in the bill.

2) Where the bill is in the hands of a holder in due course, a valid delivery of the bill by all parties prior to him, so as to make them liable to him, is conclusively **presumed**.

40. Where a bill is no longer in the possession of a party who has signed it as drawer, acceptor or endorser, a valid and unconditional delivery by him is presumed until the contrary is proved.

97. (1) Notice of dishonour may be given

(a) as soon as the bill is dishonoured;

(b) to the party to whom notice is required to be given or to his agent in that behalf;

(c) by an agent either in his own name or in the name of any party entitled to give notice, whether that party is his principal or not; or

(d) in writing or by personal communication and in any terms that identify the bill and intimate that the bill has been dishonoured by non-acceptance or non-payment.

98. (1) In point of form, the return of a dishonoured bill to the drawer or endorser are a sufficient notice of dishonour, and a written notice need not be signed.

130. No person is liable as drawer, endorser or acceptor of a bill who has not signed it as such, but when a person signs a bill otherwise than as a drawer or acceptor, he thereby incurs the liabilities of an endorser to a holder in due course and is subject to all the provisions of this Act respecting endorsers.

Imagine you are in the restaurant and the waitress presents you with a bill and when you try to pick it up to pay it, she gets mad and tells you that in this restaurant, customers are supposed to reject the bill and accept a mere copy of the unpaid and signed bill so a bouncer can then beat them up. You say, "I don't want to be beat up, I want to look at this bill and see what I owe so I can pay it." If at that point she takes the bill back without even allowing you to look at it, can she claim you refused to pay it and therefore send in the bouncers? No she can't. They are essentially hood winking us to get us to dishonour their bills. That is why they can put a conviction next to your name. They never said it was a conviction for whatever the offence was did they? No they didn't. It could easily be a conviction for the dishonour of the bill!

Why do they do what they do? Society needed a way to regulate and control its member's actions yet only had and have lawful means at their disposal. The days of the whip and dunking bucket are thankfully over. One of the means available is to present them with a bill or commercial instrument, which already exists under commercial, or common law if they transgress. The problem is that if the bill is accepted and the fine paid, there has only been a lawful transaction and no conviction can possibly result. It was merely the fulfillment of a contract. They have therefore developed a system that allows them to use a lawful instrument and still create a conviction through dishonour. Unfortunately for them, they are dragging you into dishonour, and the very nature of honour demands that one avoid causing any dishonour.

So with this knowledge, what good can we do with it? How do we use this knowledge to stop going into dishonour with the bills when they are purportedly presented?

First when dealing with the Issuer, ask them these questions:

1. Is that a Bill under The Bills of Exchange Act? (In order for a bill to have validity, the drawer has to have the authority and knowledge to create it. If they say they don't know, they are admitting a lack of knowledge)
2. Are you giving me a Ticket? (When he says yes, you have the right to take the ticket, not a copy of a ticket. If he gets mad when you take the original, just tell him "You told me you were giving me a ticket, not a copy of a ticket!")
3. Am I dishonoring your presentment if I sign this and return the original?
4. Are you DEMANDING I return the original bill prior to being able to honour it?
5. Will you give me a receipt for the original before I return it to you? (a receipt is not a copy of it)

Try to do the following actions:

1. Make him properly present the bill. That means in your control and possession. If he has not let go of the ticket, he has not properly presented or served it. Do not try to remove or grab; lay your hands out flat and make him deposit his book or the ticket in your hands.
2. Remove the original before he can stop you. At the very least rip the ticket at the top so you can point to that rip in court as evidence of you trying to accept it.
3. The goal is for him to demand you return that ticket. The moment he does, he has rescinded the presentation and the bill is dead or discharged. If someone does want to collect for it, it will have to come out of his pocket! (You are demanding I return this to you without first paying it? You have a gun and would threaten to harm or arrest me for accepting this bill? Ok.... But now you can't lawfully give me a blue copy, because that copy evidences I was not willing to accept the original.)
4. Educate the Officer. I have spoken with a few of them, they were all receptive, found the information interesting and one just yesterday decided not to issue me a ticket until he could ask his superiors about it. I was happy to leave him my address and invited him to issue bills or tickets to me anytime, as I had a few ways to deal with them as well. The basic premise, that a copy cannot be imposed unless an original was offered and rejected is a hard one to dispute; it is fundamental in law and goes to the best evidence rule. They also acknowledged that in order for a signature to be collected, the bill must be in my possession, and that the signature could in fact be evidence of just such a thing.

ACCEPTANCE OF A BILL OF EXCHANGE. In mercantile law. The act by which the person on whom a bill of exchange is drawn (called the "drawee") assents to the request of the drawer to pay it, or, in other words, engages, or makes himself liable to pay it when due. It may be by parol or in writing, and either general or special, absolute or unconditional; and it may be impliedly, as well as expressly, given. But the usual and regular mode of acceptance is by the drawee's writing across the face of the bill the word "acceptance," and subscribing his name; after which he is termed the acceptor. Black's 1st. See banker's acceptance, bill of exchange, and sight draft.

FACT: A violation Ticket is a **bill of exchange** according to the Bills of Exchange Act. (Section 16(1) BEA)

FACT: A bill returned to the issuer by you with merely a signature on it is evidence of a dishonoured bill.

(Sec 98 BEA)

FACT: A copy of a dishonoured bill is evidence that the bill was presented, served and dishonoured.

(Section 10 BEA)

FACT: The reason they impose the copy on you is because you failed to take the original! You can take the original, not a mere copy.

FACT: If the officer tries to stop you from taking the original, HE IS DISCHARGING THE BILL FOR YOU AND ENDS UP BEING LIABLE! (Sec 84 BEA.)

FACT: You have three days grace to honour the bill (original) once presented to you. (Sec 41 BEA)

FACT: If you sign a bill, it is assumed that you are a party to that bill and are liable for it. (Sec 35 (2) BEA)

FACT: You can accept the bill up to two days after it has been duly presented. (Sec 79(1) BEA)

FACT: You do not have to sign the ticket unless you intend to give it back to the officer dishonoured.

FACT: If the officer presenting the bill is incapable of accepting payment when offered, the bill is considered invalid.

Now lets look on the back of the tickets.

Back of the Tickets:

On the back of the Tickets they tell you that you have three choices; ignore, pay or dispute. If you choose to pay, you are agreeing with them that you are guilty and a conviction is entered against your name. If you ignore, it's the same thing, you are deemed to have accepted the bill and you have to pay. The third option is to choose to dispute and this is where they really trick you. If you accept this option, you are willfully stepping into dishonour. You have not exercised your right to discuss or negotiate and are jumping right into the dispute. Bear in mind, that if you engage in that option, there will be two parties before the court, with only one wishing to dispute. You have lost honour merely by **WISHING FOR DISPUTE**. You have abandoned the rule of Law and there really is no sense going to court, for you have essentially already lost. What you want to do is extend an offer to discuss and have them reject that offer. They are then the ones 'wishing for dispute' and thus are in dishonour. Realize that they are trying to create an adversarial relationship. They are your foe and antagonist. Lets say someone tried to get you to consent to fight and then said "You have to fight me and the first thing you have to do is either bang your head against the wall or kick the curb." Why let your adversary dictate the way you will fight them? Clearly they will try to get you to do something that is in their interest and not yours. Wishing dispute is one of the stupidest things anyone can do. Make **them** state that they wish dispute or force them to discuss it with you. The Officer who issued the ticket will not like that. Defending in court he or she will get paid overtime; dealing with a Conditional Acceptance they will not. Plus, if they do not deal with it, they ends up DISHONOURING THEIR OWN BILL and thus ends up having to pay it themselves.

You can also use precedent to attack those tickets in BC. Try this case:

R. v. YAKUBOWICH (Kamloops Provincial Court, March 1992)

The defendant accused of a traffic violation, claims that the evidence of the ticket before the court is insufficient; that it is a certified copy, which omits some of the elements that appear on the defendant's copy. In particular, the copy before the court omits the address for disputing the ticket. The court likened the ticket to the form of information in these types of proceedings and that, as information or indictments, they must meet minimal requirements "in and of themselves." Because the provincial Offence Act requires that violation tickets include "an address to which a notice disputing the allegation or fine may be delivered", the court declared the violation ticket a nullity.

Bubble #25 - Appearances – You can be *special, very, very special*

Special appearance

n. the representation by an attorney of a person in court for: a) only that particular session of the court; b) on behalf of the client's regular attorney of record; c) as a favor for an unrepresented person; or d) pending a decision as to whether the attorney agrees to handle the person's case. A special appearance is different from a "general appearance" in which the attorney is committed to represent the client in all future matters, hearings and trial of the case unless he/she is allowed to withdraw or is substituted "out of" the case by the client. Quite often an attorney will make a "special appearance" to protect the interests of a potential client but before a fee has been paid or arranged.

Adapted from the web here:

<http://www.supremelaw.org/wwwboard/messages/1180.html>

Special appearances have been the historic vehicle for challenging a court's jurisdiction. If you will dig back through old court records, you may find some pleadings, which utilize the special appearance.

There is a lot of BS floating around about asking the court to do anything automatically "granting" the court jurisdiction. My opinion, for what is worth, is that it is just that -- BS.

If you make a special appearance in order to challenge the jurisdiction of the court over your person, what are you going to do, wave your sword or Uzzi at the court? You are there, in the capacity of a moving party, for the specific purpose of convincing the court that it has NO PERSONAL JURISDICTION to proceed on the merits of the case.

Since today's courts are "moved" to do one thing or the other via motions, you are stuck with it. It is rare that a court will acknowledge some archaic form of pleading that does not conform with the current rules of court.

All courts have enough power to determine, on their own, or on motion, whether or not they have original jurisdiction to proceed. You do NOT grant jurisdiction by appearing to litigate this question.

Notice also that federal court complaints MUST specify the Act of Parliament, which grants original jurisdiction to that court, because federal court jurisdiction is presumed NOT to exist unless positive, affirmative proof is shown in the initial pleadings. The opposite is generally the case in Provincial courts, however.

Traffic courts are usually administrative tribunals, with administrative law judges presiding, who are there to enforce the contract consummated between the State and the "driver," when that "driver" applied for a "driver's" license and was granted the privilege(s) for which that driver applied.

What these traffic courts are generally NOT geared to discuss, is the Province's deliberate failure to disclose the legal interests which that Province obtained, when the manufacturer's statement of origin ("MSO") for your car/truck was conveyed from the first seller (e.g. the new car dealer) to that Province's Minister of Finance. The way to smoke out this MSO is to bring a Quiet Title action in the court of competent

jurisdiction; this, however, is generally NOT the traffic court. Confer in your Province's constitution to determine which court(s) have original jurisdiction over quiet title proceedings.

You can either move the traffic court to transfer your case to the quiet title court, or start the quiet title action in parallel, with a request that the traffic court "stay" its proceeding, pending the outcome of the quiet title proceeding. If the traffic court denies either motion, you are in a great position to request leave to appeal such an interlocutory order. You must carry the burden of proving that the Province committed fraud upon you, by unlawfully conveying the car's MSO to the MOF. This is done by attacking the constitutionality of the statute(s), which so direct the dealers in your Province.

We submitted a NOTICE AND DEMAND to the Texas Attorney General, for all lawful constitutional and statutory authorities compelling dealers to convey the MSO to the DOT; his silence has allowed us to estop the State of Texas on this point, namely, **THERE IS NO LAWFUL AUTHORITY TO CONVEY THE MSO FROM THE FIRST SELLER TO THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.**

In any event, you **MUST** deal with the contract, which the driver entered when s/he "applied" for the issuance of the license (read "permission to exercise a privilege"). Be prepared to rescind that "license" in writing and filed in the court record; otherwise, the existence of an apparently valid driver's license, will give the court all it needs to establish jurisdiction over the contract which it is convened to enforce.

The rule here is this: **equity is a brutal bastard.** If there is a contract, either express or implied in fact, the court has power to enforce that contract's terms, whatever those terms might be. But, a fraudulent contract can be voided ab initio, and all Citizens enjoy the Right of Avoidance, namely, the Right to ignore a "contract" which was consummated by fraud. See the major affirmative defenses in your Provincial Statutes (e.g. fraud, duress, undue influence, mistake, etc.) for statutory authority supporting the Right of Avoidance.

Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.

Counselor at Law, Federal Witness,
Private Attorney General, and Candidate
for the U.S. House of Representatives

The above was slightly modified for Canadian readers. The concepts however certainly appear sound and support this authors finding.

Bubble # 26 - The Supreme Court of Canada – AIN'T!

From the Supreme Court Act of Canada:

3. The court of law and equity in and for Canada now existing under the name of the Supreme Court of Canada is hereby continued under that name, as a general court of appeal for Canada, and as an additional court for the better administration of the laws of Canada, and shall continue to be a court of record.

R.S., 1985, c. S-26, s. 3; 1993, c. 34, s. 115(F).

You thought that **The Supreme Court** must be the HIGHEST court, right? Oh how wrong you are! It is not a *supreme* court anymore, except in name only. Just like THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA is not really a *province*, the ‘Supreme Court of Canada’ is not the ‘supreme’ or ‘highest’ Court in Canada. I think it may have something to do with us being in bankruptcy. Likely the Receiver General has more power. There are some backroom boys who have more power than any Judge in Canada, and I would bet our debt is the cause of it.

See what they do though, eh? They change definitions without changing the words and we are left thinking one thing, when the truth is another. They do it on purpose too, I bet. They must; it benefits them too much for them to not be doing it purposely.

Now what used to be a court of law and equity is now a court of what? Likely it is just Equity or maybe only Admiralty or Maritime. Plus it is no longer the highest court in the land; it is now just a court of appeal. So just what is then the highest court in the land? Anyone know?

“Pay no attention to that man behind the curtain!”

The Wizard, Wizard of Oz

Bubble # 27 - Understanding and Intent

The wording in some statutes can be a very ambiguous thing, and this ambiguity causes much conflict. (Of course, the Lawyers who make \$250 or more an hour have nothing to do with that, right? Nope not a thing; they do not benefit at all from creating conflict and entering litigation. And its not as if lawyers are the ones creating these ambiguous statutes, right?) It is your goal to live your life as you see fit, without causing or looking for any conflict. How do we accomplish that? We do it by being right up front and telling the government exactly what we think we know and what we intend to do with that knowledge. We do it lawfully with a Notice and we tell them our understanding and our intent. Why not, eh? If your proposed actions are lawful, what do you have to hide?

If when you tell them your proposed actions they do not object, they lose their chance to claim dispute or conflict later. If they do make an objection, they have to talk to you and at that point, if you have some difficult questions for them, they will either have to answer those questions or drop their objections.

“When I use a word, Humpty Dumpty said, in a rather scornful tone, it means just what I choose it to mean- neither more nor less.

The question is, said Alice, whether you can make words, mean so many different things.

The question is, said Humpty Dumpty, which is to be master- that’s all”

Bubble #28 – The Province of British Columbia and THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

A person in The Province of Deception...

Back in the last century, pen was put to paper and The Province of British Columbia was created. Prior to this act, the land was already here. A province is a geographical area held and controlled by military might. It is a territory and its name was British Columbia.

It was a thing, named British Columbia and it was a province. We would refer to it as 'the province of British Columbia.'

Then the government got tricky.

The Queen abandoned her military hold on the area, because some Natives were asking tough questions. (Boy, people in power just hate tough questions!) The government of the day then created a legal corporate entity or fictional person. They named this person or fiction, (ready for this?) '**THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**'.

Now there is a thing, that thing is a *legal entity or fiction*, and its full and proper name is **THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**.

When they refer to a 'person in THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA', do you think they are referring to a human being in a geographical area, or to a legal fiction within a larger legal fiction? It is easy to get the government to admit that THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA is a legal entity. If it isn't, it's a geographical area and has no legal powers. It can sue, contract or hire, for instance. Since it can and does do those things, clearly it must have the power to do so, which means it has to be a legal entity and NOT a geographical area. Now, can a human being exist within a fiction?

"Extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice, moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue."

-- Barry Goldwater

Bubble #29- The Hierarchy of Law + Equity

We are often told in the papers about 'new laws' being passed. As we now realize that is a bit of a fallacy. New statutes may be passed, but when it really comes to the law, it doesn't much change. There are only three ways to break the law. These are: harm another, damage property, or use mischief in your contracts. When you break a statute, you are breaking a societal contract and that is why smoking pot is unlawful. The act itself isn't, but because you have 'agreed' not to, you are breaking a contract. You criminal.

The top of the Law Hierarchy is Natural Law. It is in your hearts and boils down to LOVE. Sounds corny but its true. Below that is Commercial Law. It is based mostly on TRUST or TRUTH and allows us to engage in commerce. Below that is Common Law and that is based on COMPASSION and allows us to live in a structured societal environment with some controls on the governing authority.

Below that level, you are not really dealing with Law any more; you are dealing with a system of jurisprudence called Equity. It is in Equity that you will find statutes, by-laws and regulations.

The common law can be stated thus: 'If a man take wrongfully the material which was mine and is permanent, not adding anything thereunto than the form, only by alteration thereof, such thing, so newly formed by an exterior form notwithstanding, still remaineth mine and may be seized again by me, and I may take it out of his possession as mine own. But they say, if he add some other matter thereunto; as, of another man's leather doth make shoes or boots, or of my cloth, maketh garments,

adding to the accomplishment thereof of his own, he hath thereby altered the property so that the first owner cannot seize the thing so composed, but is driven to his action to recover his remedy: however, in a case of that nature depending, the court had determined that the first owner might seize the same, notwithstanding such addition. But if the thing be transitory in its nature, by the change, as if one take raw corn or meal and thereof make bread, in that case I cannot seize the bread. So some have said, if a man take my barley and thereof make malt, because it is changed into another nature it cannot be seized by me; but the rule is: That where the material wrongfully taken away, could not at first, before any alteration, be seized; for that it could not be distinguished from other things of that kind, such as corn, money, and such like; there those things cannot be seized because the property of those things cannot be distinguished: for, if my money be wrongfully taken away, and he that taketh it do make plate thereof, or do convert my plate into money, I cannot seize the same; for that money is undistinguishable from other money of that coin. But, if a butcher take wrongfully my ox and doth kill it and bring it into the market to be sold, I may not seize upon the flesh, for it cannot be known from others of that kind; but if it be found hanging in the skin, where the mark may appear, I may seize the same, although when it was taken from me it had life and now is dead. So, if a man cut down my tree and square it into a beam of timber, I may seize the same, for he hath neither altered the nature thereof, nor added anything but exterior form thereunto; but if he lay the beam of timber into the building of a house, I may not seize the same, for being so set it is become parcel of the house, and so in supposition of law, altered in its nature.'

EQUITY - A system of law designed to furnish remedies for wrongs which were not legally recognized under the common law of England or for which no adequate remedy was provided by the common law.

Here one of the best short(ish) explanations on the differences between law and equity. I got it off the net. (Boy that 'net thingy is cool, eh? Although, I never realized I am 'not the man I could be' until I got all those emails...)

CHANCERY, COURT OF EQUITY - The name of a court, exercising jurisdiction at law, but mainly in equity.

It is not easy to determine how courts of equity originally obtained the jurisdiction they now exercise. Their authority, and the extent of it, have been subjects of much question, but time has firmly established them; and the limits of their jurisdiction seem to be in a great degree fixed and ascertained.

The judge of the court of chancery, often called a court of equity, bears the title of chancellor. The equity jurisdiction in England is vested, principally, in the high court of chancery. This court is distinct from courts of law. American courts of equity are, in some instances, distinct from those of law; in others, the same tribunals exercise the jurisdiction both of courts of law and equity though their forms of proceeding are different in their two capacities. The Supreme Court of the United States and the circuit courts are invested with general equity powers and act either as courts of law or equity, according to the form of the process and the subject of adjudication. In some of the states, as New York, Virginia, and South Carolina, the equity court is a distinct tribunal, having its appropriate judge, or chancellor, and officers. In most of the states, the two jurisdictions centre in the same judicial officers, as in the courts of the United States; and the extent of equity jurisdiction and proceedings is very various in the different states, being very ample in Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina, and more restricted in Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania. But the salutary influence of these powers on the judicial administration generally, by the adaptation of chancery forms and modes of proceeding to many cases in which a court of law affords but an imperfect remedy, or no remedy at all, is producing a gradual extension of them in those states where they have been, heretofore, very limited.

The jurisdiction of a court of equity differs essentially from that of a court of law. The remedies for wrongs, or for the enforcement of rights, may be distinguished into two classes; those which are administered in courts of law, and those which are administered in courts of equity. The rights secured by the former are called legal; those secured by the latter are called equitable. The former are said to be rights and remedies at common law, because recognized and enforced in courts of common law. The latter are said to be rights and remedies in equity, because they are administered in courts of equity or chancery, or by proceedings in other courts analogous to those in courts of equity or chancery.

Now, in England and America, courts of common law proceed by certain prescribed forms and give a general judgment for or against the defendant. They entertain jurisdiction only in certain actions and give remedies according to the particular exigency of such actions. But there are many cases in which a simple judgment for either party, without qualifications and conditions, and particular arrangements, will not do entire justice, *ex aequo et bono*, to either party. Some modification of the rights of both parties is required; some restraints on one side or the other; and some peculiar adjustments, either present or future, temporary or perpetual. Now, in all these cases, courts of common law have no methods of proceeding which can accomplish such objects. Their forms of actions and judgment are not adapted to them. The proper remedy cannot be found or cannot be administered to the full extent of the relative rights of all parties. Such prescribed forms of actions are not confined to our law.

They were known in the civil law; and the party could apply them only to their original purposes. In other cases he had a special remedy. In such cases where the courts of common law cannot grant the proper remedy or relief, the law of England and of the United States (in those states where equity is administered) authorizes an application to the courts of equity or chancery, which are not confined or limited in their modes of relief by such narrow regulations, but which grant relief to all parties in cases where they have rights, *ex aequo et bono*, and modify and fashion that relief according to circumstances.

The most general description of a court of equity is that it has jurisdiction in cases where a plain, adequate and complete remedy cannot be had at law, that is, in common law courts. The remedy must be plain; for if it be doubtful and obscure at law, equity will assert a jurisdiction. So it must be adequate at law; for if it fall short of what the party is entitled to, that founds a jurisdiction in equity. And it must be complete; that is, it must attain its full end at law, must reach the whole mischief and secure the whole right of the party, now and for the future otherwise equity will interpose and give relief.

The jurisdiction of a court of equity is sometimes concurrent with that of courts of law and sometimes it is exclusive. It exercises concurrent jurisdiction in cases where the rights are purely of a legal nature, but where other and more efficient aid is required than a court of law can afford, to meet the difficulties of the case and ensure full redress. In some of these cases courts of law formerly refused all redress but now will grant it. But the jurisdiction having been once justly acquired at a time when there was no such redress at law, it is not now relinquished. The most common exercise of concurrent jurisdiction is in cases of account, accident, dower, fraud, mistake, partnership and partition. The remedy is here often more complete and effectual than it can be at law. In many cases falling under these heads, and especially in some cases of fraud, mistake and accident, courts of law cannot and do not afford any redress; in others they do, but not always in so perfect a manner.

A court of equity also is assistant to the jurisdiction of courts of law in many cases where the latter have no like authority. It will remove legal impediments to the fair decision of a question depending at law. It will prevent a party from improperly setting up, at a trial, some title or claim, which would be inequitable. It will compel him to discover, on his own oath, facts which he knows are material to the rights of the other party, but which a court of law cannot compel the party to discover. It will

perpetuate the testimony of witnesses to rights and titles which are in danger of being lost, before the matter can be tried. It will provide for the safety of property in dispute pending litigation. It will counteract and control, or set aside, fraudulent judgments. It will exercise, in many cases, an exclusive jurisdiction. This it does in all cases of merely equitable rights, that is, such rights as are not recognized in courts of law. Most cases of trust and confidence fall under this head.

Its exclusive jurisdiction is also extensively exercised in granting special relief beyond the reach of the common law. It will grant injunctions to prevent waste, or irreparable injury, or to secure a settled right, or to prevent vexatious litigations, or to compel the restitution of title deeds; it will appoint receivers of property, where it is in danger of misapplication it will compel the surrender of securities improperly obtained; it will prohibit a party from leaving the country in order to avoid a suit it will restrain any undue exercise of a legal right against conscience and equity; it will decree a specific performance of contracts respecting real estates; it will, in many cases, supply the imperfect execution of instruments and reform and alter them according to the real intention of the parties; it will grant relief in cases of lost deeds or securities; and in all cases in which its interference is asked, its general rule is that he who asks equity must do equity. If a party, therefore, should ask to have a bond for a usurious debt given up, equity could not decree it unless he could bring into court the money honestly due without usury.

This is a very general and imperfect outline of the jurisdiction of a court of equity; in respect to which it has been justly remarked that, in matters within its exclusive jurisdiction, where substantial justice entitles the party to relief, but the positive law is silent, it is impossible to define the boundaries of that jurisdiction, or to enumerate, with precision, its various principles. *The 'Lectric Law Library's Lexicon*

Bubble # 30 – Honour the Offer or Offer the Honour

All interactions with government agents are about offers. When they ask for your ID or tell you to open a window, when they send you a tax notice or just about anything, it is an offer. The trick to dealing with offers is to not refuse them, as doing so is dishonour. You want to agree with them and accept their offer, for then there is no controversy or conflict and the courts have no power to adjudicate. Even if they do not want you to treat it like an offer and would prefer you deal with it as an order, the moment you label it an offer and they do not say “That’s not an offer!” it becomes an offer. If they do say “It’s not an offer!” you can then reject it with impunity. If they say “It’s a demand!” ask to see a Court Order empowering them to ‘demand’.

Imagine you are sitting at home and your sweetheart comes and asks you to take the garbage outside. You have four and only four possible options.

- 1) **You ignore.** They keep asking and you just don’t say anything to them, just flat out ignore. Are you going to get any loving that night? Not likely.
- 2) **You reject.** You say flat out, ‘NO!’. Again you have clearly dishonoured and loving is going to be quite scarce.
- 3) **You accept.** No you are no longer going to dishonour, but now you have to accept and that might not be in your best interest. It means you can’t watch the TV like you wanted.
- 4) **You accept conditionally.** This step avoids the dishonour and also allows you to continue watching TV. You say something like “I conditionally accept your offer to agree to take out the garbage upon proof of claim it can’t wait for a commercial.” See, no conflict!

Every time you get a 'Notice' that's an *offer* and when you ignore it, you step into dishonour and it is that dishonour which they will ding you with. Notices can be easily dealt with and dishonour can be avoided. See the next two bubbles.

"I mean that there is no way to disarm any man," said Dr. Ferris, "except through guilt. Through that which he himself has accepted as guilt. If a man has ever stolen a dime, you can impose on him the punishment intended for a bank robber and he will take it. He'll bear any form of misery, he'll feel that he deserves no better. If there's not enough guilt in the world, we must create it. If we teach a man that it's evil to look at the spring flowers and he believes us and then does it - we'll be able to do whatever we please with him. He won't defend himself. He won't feel he's worth it. He won't fight. But save us from the man who lives up to his own standards. Save us from the man of clear conscience. He's the man who'll beat us.

'Atlas Shrugged', Ayn Rand

Bubble #31- Conditional Acceptance

This is your means of avoiding conflict. The government does not like them much, almost as if they like being in conflict with us. (It feeds the beast don't you know!)

Your goal with this is to do the following;

1. Label whatever it is you are dealing with as an offer.
2. Accept it conditionally.
3. Attach conditions which they can fulfill, but likely won't because if they do they reveal their deception or ignorance.
4. Send it out Notarized and then follow with the Notarial Protest Process.

Here's one for an example. Use it only as a template.

Conditional Acceptance of Offer

Re: Violation Ticket AG57934096

September 22, 2003

To the Trans Link Security Officer # 8245 who issued the above mentioned ticket.

I conditionally accept your offer to agree that I am SHARPE-PRICK, WON and that I owe \$46 upon proof of claim of all of the following:

1. Upon proof of claim that I am a 'person' and not a human being.
2. Upon proof of claim that you know what a 'person' actually is, legally speaking.
3. Upon proof of claim that you know what THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA actually is, legally speaking.
4. Upon proof of claim that I showed you some sort of identification establishing an equity relationship with THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.
5. Upon proof of claim that I am in possession of a 'DRIVERS LICENCE' with the number you put on the ticket.
6. Upon proof of claim that you putting the DL number on that ticket and trying to associate me with that number is not unlawful and a potential act of fraud.
7. Upon proof of claim that a human being can exist within THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.
8. Upon proof of claim that I am SHARPE-PRICK, WON and not Won Sharpe-Prick
9. Upon proof of claim that the ticket was the result of a lawful investigation unmarred by prejudice.
10. Upon proof of claim that you offered and I refused a Fare Deferral Receipt.
11. Upon proof of claim that I am a member of the society whose statutes and subsisting regulations you were enforcing.

12. Upon proof of claim that the only three ways to lawfully discharge this ticket is by doing one of the three things on the back of the ticket.
13. Upon proof of claim of your Peace Officer status.
14. Upon proof of claim of your identity.
15. Upon proof of claim that you can act with dishonour and ticket me as well.

Please respond within three days to the address below to avoid dishonoring your own ticket.

Address

Sincerely and without malice aforethought, ill will, vexation or frivolity,

Won Sharpe-Prick

[Please feel free to set up an appointment with me via email if you would like to settle this issue in a more amicable fashion.]

"The society which scorns excellence in plumbing as a humble activity and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy: neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water."

-John W. Gardner

"The politicians don't just want your money. They want your soul. They want you to be worn down by taxes until you are dependent and helpless. When you subsidize poverty and failure, you get more of both."

-James Dale Davidson

Bubble #32 – Notice This

NOTICE. The information given of some act done, or the interpellation by which some act is required to be done. It also signifies, simply, knowledge; as A had notice that B was a slave. 5 How. S. C. Rep. 216; 7 Penn. Law Journ. 119.

2. Notices should always be in writing; they should state, **in precise terms**, their object, and be signed by the proper person, or his authorized agent, be dated, and addressed to the person to be affected by them.

You will find Notices taped to your door, handed to you in person or placed upon your windshield. Yes, parking tickets are a form of Notice.

Also, s they have to be in **precise terms**? What if most of them aren't? If you know what some of their more tricky words are and you are aware that some of those words have ambiguous meanings, then you can discharge any Notice by asking questions and seeking clarification. Here is an example. Be sure to send it Notarized and have a copy placed with the court clerk.

Notice of Discharge of Appearance Notice and Request for Clarification

Tuesday, September 23, 2003

To: The TRANS LINK OFFICER WHO ISSUED APPEARANCE NOTICE #063473 AND AUTHUR OF Police FILE # 03-9881.

You have apparently made allegations of criminal conduct against me.

You have apparently made demands upon me.

I do not understand those apparent demands and therefore cannot lawfully fulfill them.

I seek clarification of your document so that I may act according to the law and maintain my entire body of God given Natural Rights.

Failure to accept this offer to clarify and to do so completely and in good faith will be deemed by all parties to mean you and your principal or other parties abandon all demands upon me.

Who are you? I do not know who you are. You purported to be a 'Peace Officer', wore no identification or number and then went out of your way to create conflict and act against the peace. Please provide identification and proof that you are in fact a 'Peace Officer' and an employee of TransLink.

Your document states **"YOU ARE REQUIRED TO ATTEND COURT ON 2003-10-30 AT 0500 O'CLOCK IN THE FORE NOON IN THE PROVINCIAL COURTROOM NUMBER _____ LOCATED AT 222 MAIN ST. VANCOUVER BC AND TO ATTEND THEREAFTER AS REQUIRED BY THE COURT, IN ORDER TO BE DEALT WITH ACCORDING TO LAW."**

What does the word 'attend' mean and from where are you deriving the definition? I simply cannot correctly do what you wish of me unless I know what that is. Please explain. I reason that if I am attending, then I am an 'attendant'. I looked that word up in a law dictionary and it stated

"ATTENDANT. One who owes a duty or service to another, or in some sort depends upon him. Termes de la Ley, h. t. As to attendant terms, see Powell on Morts. Index, tit. Attendant term; Park on Dower, c. 17."

If I owe you or anyone else a specific duty or service, please tell me when and how such a thing was created and then provide proof of your claim. It seems to me that if I do 'attend', I am agreeing to the supposed debt or duty, merely by my presence. I notice however, that presence is not mentioned in this definition and I wonder if it is possible to be present, and yet not be in 'attendance'. What do you think and what evidence do you have suggesting that what you think is in fact the truth? Would showing up in some way create a debt where none had previously existed? Certainly seems that way to me.

The word 'required' is also causing me some concern. I am certain the word 'required' has two quite dissimilar legal meanings or senses. In one sense it is active and creates an obligation to act, in the other it is passive and merely defines conditions which need to be voluntarily fulfilled in order for a later action to be lawfully undertaken. I also believe that when one issues a document, such as you did, which contains ambiguous words, as this one certainly does, then the interpretation of the ambiguous words must be to the benefit of the receiver and not the issuer. If that is the case, then it is clearly in my benefit to interpret the word 'required' in the passive sense, do you not agree? Also, if the makers of that document had wanted to state that the receiver of them had an obligation to 'attend', why did they not use the word 'obligation' or 'obliged' and thus avoid any ambiguity? The only logical explanation is that it is in fact being used in its passive sense and creates absolutely no obligation upon my part to attend, but is describing conditions which need fulfilling in order for some later action to be lawful. I therefore looked for any mention of later acts.

This brings me to the last part of the above mention portion. After the comma, it states 'IN ORDER TO BE DEALT WITH ACCORDING TO LAW'. The comma and the words 'IN ORDER TO BE' clearly tie directly to the previous words and 'DEALT WITH' is an action. (And not a very pleasant sounding one at that) Since the word 'required' (with all of its inherent ambiguity) is passive, and if I do not accept the imposition of an unproven debt by 'attending', then whatever the court attempts to do to me after that cannot be according to law, and thus will be unlawful. I interpret it as meaning that if I do not 'attend', then the courts actions against me will not be lawful. I will grant that the second 'required' may be active and create an obligation, as it is the courts acting after an appearance. You however are not a judge and therefore cannot tell me I am obliged to do anything. It seems the courts receive the power to deal with me when I 'attend'. If that is not the case will you please provide proof or at least make a lawful claim under full commercial liability to the contrary?

It is not my intent to be difficult, but I exercise and protect my rights and it seems to me not being hoodwinked into accepting a debt or unwillingly granting authority is a fundamental one. This issue would likely be clarified if you and your principal(s) would re-issue the document, replacing the word 'required' with 'obliged' and doing so under full commercial liability. And then of course be ready to prove such a thing.

Finally, I have questions about the very last portion of the Notice. It asks for a 'SIGNATURE OF DEFENDANT'. A signature is legal evidence of an oath and as such in order to have any validity, must be freely given. If extracted under some unlawful threat of violence or otherwise compelled, it simply is not a lawful signature. I remind you that you threatened to arrest me unless I signed your document. Since the statutes which deal with the alleged infraction you were investigating do not inflict a punishment greater than a fine, threatening incarceration or detainment in the course of that investigation cannot be lawful. The investigation cannot be a greater imposition than the punishment for a conviction. Also, the term 'DEFENDANT' implies one engaged in a conflict. If we are in conflict does not honour and the rule of law both demand we sit down and discuss and negotiate before going to court in an adversarial fashion? I certainly feel that is the case and would like to re-issue my previous offer to discuss this matter prior to using up valuable court resources. Also, if in the exercise of my rights and my lawful quest for a more compassionate society I have harmed anyone, I would like the opportunity to apologize and make amends immediately. Who exactly did I harm?

One of my other concerns is the fact that you failed in your duty as a TransLink employee to help me comply with the applicable section of the statute, by failing to offer a Fare Deferral Receipt. Had you offered one of those from the beginning, there would be no conflict. Since that was a lawful option, why did you not exercise it? Do you as a 'Peace Officer' benefit from the unnecessary and avoidable conflict you created?

Please consider your original Notice to be hereby lawfully discharged and re-issue it forthwith without any ambiguity if you intend to present it in a court of law. If you fail to do so please do not attempt to claim any obligation upon my part towards you or your principal. Also be aware that you failing to present this discharge to court if this matter is heard without my presence would likely be a fraud upon the court, as you would be withholding information vital to the proper administration of justice.

Finally, please ask your principal which section of the regulations empowers you to endanger human life by removing someone from the SkyTrain and stranding them miles from their home because they have failed to produce proof of payment.

As this appears to be a criminal matter, and what I am asking is very reasonable and is in fact information you should already have unless you are grossly negligent, you have three days to respond to this Notice or it will be deemed to be dishonored and you will be deemed to have waived the right of a Notice of Protest.
In Pure Trust and without malice aforethought, ill will, vexation or frivolity,

Signature

John-Adams: Doe

Address

Qui bene interrogat, bene docet. **He who questions well, learns well.** 3 Buls. 227.

Qui bene distinguit, bene docet. **He who distinguishes well, learns well.** 2 Co. Inst. 470.

Bubble # 33 - Ask and learn

We have a right to ask questions. More than that, when we ask questions, it must be assumed we do so in order to understand the law and thus keep it. Those who fail to ask questions are assumed to understand everything already; if they didn't understand they would have obviously asked questions right? The questions you want to ask are the most difficult ones you can find. They won't be easy to find either. It's a matter of looking not at what is there, but at what isn't. Imagine you get a jigsaw puzzle, but you only get half the pieces. You have to assemble it the best you can and then you have to infer what the pieces that are missing look like. That is what studying a statute is like. You want to ask them not about the existing pieces, but about the missing ones. Your goal is to get them to say, **"I don't know."**

If someone points to a body of words and claims they give them authority over you and you ask what one simple word means and they reply "I don't know.", what happens to their claim of authority? POOF! It vanishes! They can not tell you what the sense of the word is, so they are using words which to them have 'no sense', or 'non-sense'. They are speaking nonsense and trying to claim authority!

Them: Gaga-goo-goo and whipity whap-whap - Now give me money.

You: What did you say?

Them: Um, I don't know really. Not quite sure what I said now that I think about it. But give me your money anyway.

You: Go away.

Them: Ok, but I'll be back!

You: Will you be speaking non-sense then as well?

Bubble #34 - Hiring a Lawyer- co-counsel

Did you know that a lawyers ultimate oath and allegiance lies not with his client, but with the State? Its true, check the Oath they swear when they are called to the Bar. They cannot give you any information that might have a detrimental effect on the State or its control over you. They are not your friends when you are taking on the 'System'; they are the 'System'. Plus when you hire someone to represent you in court, you are essentially acknowledging incompetence and you lose your right to address the court. Idiots don't speak

when the grown-ups are talking don't you know. This however can be addressed. You do not have to hire Counsel, you can hire them as 'co-counsel' and reserve your right to address the bench, approach the bench and enter into chambers for any discussions. Plus, you do not have to pay as much for co-counsel as you would for full counsel, do you?

Bubble #35 - Four White Flags

There is a guy in the States who came up with this little beauty. It relies upon various international treaties and has to do with WHITE FLAGS. He puts one small white flag on every corner of his vehicle and by doing so announces and gives notice to the world of his desire to avoid conflict and that he wishes a dialogue or conference and not a conflict. Anyone who creates conflict with him is in dishonour of the deepest sort. They are in INTERNATIONAL dishonour.

Here are a few definitions:

American Heritage Dictionary:

A white flag brought or displayed to an enemy as a request for a conference or as a signal of surrender.

Bouvier's Law Dictionary:

TRUCE, intern. law. An agreement between belligerent parties, by which they mutually engage to forbear all acts of hostility against each other for some time, the war still continuing. Burlamaqui's N. & P. Law, part 4, c. 11, §1.

If any Officer stops you and then tries to issue a Violation Ticket, or create any conflict, he is breaking the law. He is breaching an agreement and the transaction can be argued as void ab initio.

Bubble #36 – Only Slaves are REALLY free

This one is one of the toughest to get your head around. Slavery to be free, you say? Remember folks, in the Rabbit Hole, black is white, up is down and whosoever shall be last shall be first. Look at these Law Maxims concerning slaves.

Servants and Slaves

- Whatever is acquired by the servant, is acquired for the master.
- A slave is not a person.**
- A slave, and everything a slave has, belongs to his master.**
- He who acts by or through another, acts for himself.
- He who does anything through another, is considered as doing it himself.
- The master is liable for injury done by his servant.
- He is not presumed to consent who obeys the orders of his father or his master.**

Now take a very close look at the freedom that you can find there. You do not have to be a 'person'. You are not responsible for any ownership of anything and you can't be held to any purported consent. You in fact simply can't consent.

Now the question is, who will be your master? If you say GOD is your master, you have basically freed yourself from the government by accepting status as a SLAVE FOR GOD. You have accepted last place and suddenly, you have seized first! It's better to be a slave to a benevolent and gentle master than a citizen ruled by deceptive and harmful government. Be a slave to something greater than the government and you rise above it instantly.

Bubble #37 – Do you ‘under-stand’?

In court, you will be asked, “Do you understand these charges?” This is one of their best and trickiest sliders. The term ‘understand’ legally is synonymous with ‘under-stand’ and ‘stand-under’. If you say no, the judge will ask you “What don’t you comprehend” or something to that effect. ‘Comprehend’ is a Latin term which means ‘seize’ or ‘grasp’. Do you realize now what they are asking when they say do you ‘understand’ the charges? They need you to grasp, seize, comprehend or stand under their charges. They want to play tug-o-war and are asking if you will pick up the other end of the rope.

Imagine a mouse being asked, “Do you see the cheese? Do you recognize that it is cheese? Do you want the cheese? Will you take the cheese?” A dumb mouse might answer yes to all those questions and before you know it, the trap slams shut. A wise mouse however will say, “Yes, I see the cheese, I recognize it as cheese, I wouldn’t mind some cheese, but I see that big mechanical contrivance attached to the cheese and it looks painful, so no, I am not taking that cheese.” That mouse has every right in the world to reject the cheese and we have every right in the world to choose to not ‘stand-under’ others charges.

Judge: Do you ‘understand’ these charges against you?

You: Your Honour am I obliged to ‘stand-under’ those charges?

Judge: I did not say stand-under, I said understand.

You: Can you tell me the difference?

Judge: (grudgingly) There is no difference.

You: I exercise my right to refuse to stand under or to seize, grasp or otherwise accept any thing which is not in my best interest to seize, grasp, hold or understand.

Good Judge: Case dismissed. Come back when the ‘defendant’ is under-standing these charges.

Bad Judge: Too bad. I am entering a plea of not guilty.

You: Are you doing that under your full commercial liability and will you be fully responsible if your actions harm me in any way?

Bubble # 38 - The Power of Love

Lets suppose for some strange reason, you decide you want to live your life motivated by love, guided by compassion and seeking to act in and with the truth. (I said it was strange!) You decide to look in all the Acts, Statutes, By-laws and regulations and can’t find those words ANYWHERE within them. Do you have an obligation to treat those words on paper with more deference then you do your own love and compassion? Can your government leaders force you to abandon what is in your heart for the words that are on their paper? No they cannot. Lawfully, they cannot force you to abandon love, and truthfully, if it really is love, abandoning it is impossible.

What right does anyone have to tell you that your love is wrong, but his or her deception is right? How can anyone be your leader when you do have a heart full of love and compassion unless they are on the same path as you and are further along it? The fact is you will not find the three words ‘love’, ‘compassion’ and ‘truth’ in any statute or regulation. None of those three things can ever be regulated or licensed.

Bubble #39 – Student Loans

YOU CAN SET-OFF YOUR STUDENT LOAN NOW!!

Free your Bond... your mind will follow!

This information is provided for education, entertainment and positive social change purposes only and does not constitute legal advice. It is not intended to aid any one in avoiding lawful debts.

Its purpose is to secure for all Canadians their right to fully funded post secondary education.

The following is from the Federal Student Loan Act.

Canada Student Loans Act

CHAPTER S-23

An Act to facilitate the making of loans to students

19.1 (1) Subject to this section and section 19.2, no action or proceedings shall be taken to recover money owing under a guaranteed student loan more than six years after the day on which the money becomes due and payable.

Deduction and set-off

(2) Money owing under a guaranteed student loan may 1 be recovered at any time by way of deduction from or set-off against any sum of money that may 2 be due or payable by Her Majesty in right of Canada to the borrower or the estate or succession of the borrower.

1-In the first use of 'may', they are giving permission. That implies TWO parties. What if whoever they are giving permission to, needs permission from two sources? And what if you are the second source of permission? If you never give it, they cannot act.

2- In the second use of 'may' they are defining the level of claim needed to be made. It does not say 'is due or payable'. All you have to do is claim, not claim and prove.

If they owe you money, it can be used to pay off your loan. Here's the thing: **THEY ALWAYS OWE YOU MONEY!!!**

Now look on the back of your Birth Certificate.

You will find a number. (If you are from Ontario, it may be on the front. It's the number they do not identify. It will start with a letter.)

It's a Bond tracking number and every year that bond generates revenue. (Its supported by your pledge of future commercial output and your consent to be taxed.)

That revenue is in fact yours and is part of the Federal Transfer payments the federal government sends to the provincial government every year. The Federal Minister of Finance is acting as a fiduciary over that revenue and bond. Those funds are yours and they owe it to you. (Who else's could it be, when it is supported by YOUR pledge?)

Because you never ask for it or direct how it is to be spent, they send it to your provincial representatives.

When you direct the Minister of Finance to direct funds from the transfer payments (which are in fact yours) and deposit them into an account for the payment or set-off of the debt, you discharge your loan. (It goes to zero.)

The transfer payments received by your provincial representatives will be decreased by the amount transferred, but you as a member of the society will no longer be in debt, and that's actually good for you and your society. Additionally, since you honorably discharged your loan, your credit rating improves, you can justify getting another loan and bringing in even more money to your society.

Plus, your provincial representatives will get **LESS OF YOUR MONEY TO SQUANDER AND WASTE!**
DO THIS:

Read the letters attached and create a similar ones. Send the letter to the MP first, then 7 days later file the Claim of Right. After 30 days serve them a Notarized copy of the Bill of Exchange.

Bring it to a Notary Public and have them notarize it and then mail it via registered mail. The original goes to the Minister of Finance and a certified true copy of the original to the financial institution you are dealing with.

Your debt is set off or discharged. You owe nothing. You have paid by ordering your fiduciary trustee to act. The financial institution will have to go after the Minister, not you.

Have a big party. Invite Rob at mrmitee@hotmail.com

Attend a "Think Free" Seminar and learn even more about the governments' deception. Support The Elizabeth Anne Elaine Society.

Start a great life without a big debt load. Be loving, compassionate and truthful.

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
Adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by General Assembly
resolution 2200A (XXI) of 16 December 1966
entry into force 3 January 1976, in accordance with article 27

Article 13

1. The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to education. They agree that education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and the sense of its dignity, and shall strengthen the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. They further agree that education shall enable all persons to participate effectively in a free society, promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations and all racial, ethnic or religious groups, and further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

2. The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize that, with a view to achieving the full realization of this right:

(a) Primary education shall be compulsory and available free to all;

(b) Secondary education in its different forms, including technical and vocational secondary education, shall be made generally available and accessible to all by every appropriate means, and in particular by the progressive introduction of free education;

(c) Higher education shall be made equally accessible to all, on the basis of capacity, by every appropriate means, and in particular by the progressive introduction of free education;

(d) Fundamental education shall be encouraged or intensified as far as possible for those persons who have not received or completed the whole period of their primary education;

(e) The development of a system of schools at all levels shall be actively pursued, an adequate fellowship system shall be established, and the material conditions of teaching staff shall be continuously improved.

3. The States Parties to the present Covenant undertake to have respect for the liberty of parents and, when applicable, legal guardians to choose for their children schools, other than those established by the public authorities, which conform to such minimum educational standards as may be laid down or approved by the State and to ensure the religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions.

4. No part of this article shall be construed so as to interfere with the liberty of individuals and bodies to establish and direct educational institutions, subject always to the observance of the principles set forth in paragraph 1 of this article and to the requirement that the education given in such institutions shall conform to such minimum standards as may be laid down by the State.

Article 28

The provisions of the present Covenant shall extend to all parts of federal States without any limitations or exceptions.

Q&A's

What is a 'set-off'?

In *Sigurdson v. R. in Right of B.C.*, [1982] 2 W.W.R. 579 (B.C.C.A.), Carrothers, J.A., speaking for a majority, dealt with the concept of set-off at page 592, as follows:

The law relating to true set-off is well settled. A true set-off of indebtedness can take place only between two

debtors who are at the same time one another's creditors. A set-off is merely the remission or cancellation pro tanto of reciprocal debts by applying one's credit receivable from another against one's debt owed to that other. A set-off is a cross-claim for money's worth respecting mutual or reciprocal debts due and owing and to the same parties in the same right.

Arguments:

Won't we be taking money from hospitals, roads, schools and emergency services?

YES. Absolutely. (See there really is no free lunch.) Now tell me, which of those things mentioned can be designed, built, maintained or upgraded without an educated populace? Every penny you invest in education comes back in dollars.

I had to struggle to go to school. Why shouldn't everyone else?

You should hire a lawyer and sue whoever educated you, for they failed to teach you the most fundamental aspects of being a decent human being and community member. 'I suffered so you must also' is the thought process of an angry and bitter person. What is stopping you from thinking "I suffered, so you shouldn't have to!" ? Many died in the last century in World Wars. Because they did so, are we obliged to as well? Or are we perhaps free from those burdens BECAUSE they previously carried them? Please wake up.

Whose Money is it? Your federal representative is transferring money to your provincial representative and neither would have the right to touch that money if not for the fact that they are acting as your representative. So, who must that money actually belong to? Plus the courts have ruled that transfer payments cannot be used for partisan purposes. It has to be spent on the people in the province.

What if they simply refuse to do it?

Remember a few key things:

The only form of government recognized as lawful in Canada is a representative type.

Representation requires MUTUAL CONSENT.

If you revoke your consent, you no longer have a representative and therefore no longer have a government!

No STATUTE will have the force of law over you. No government agent will have any authority over you.

You can in effect SINK YOUR BOND.

Tell them if they refuse to do what you wish, that you will no longer be a member of society and will never consent to governance again. Then ask who will be paying THEIR pensions? Certainly wont be you...

Realize this is your right. It is fundamentally unlawful for your representative government to burden you for wishing to better yourself and your society. The threat of the debt stops many from seeking a higher education. The burdens once placed, harm our families; deny our children their parents' time and resources and result in less volunteer work in our communities. It causes stress and immense harm. The government is the only one who benefits from an ignorant and uneducated populace.

Contact Rob mrmitee@hotmail.com and have him advocate for you. He will argue the government did not fail to meet their obligations. If any government agent wishes to argue under oath and upon their full commercial liability, that the government did fail to meet their obligations, they are free to do so.

Only the educated are free. --- Epictetus

If you can read this, thank a teacher. --- Anonymous teacher

Let us reform our schools, and we shall find little need of reform in our prisons. --- John Ruskin

How to use these documents:

Send the letter (marked 'Notice') to your MP asking the 20 questions.

When they do not respond, send off the second letter and go to the next step.

Create a Claim of Right, get it Notarized and send a certified true copy of the original via registered mail to all of the following:

The Prime Minister
Your MP
The Premier
Your MLA
The Minister of Finance
Receiver General
Head of The Student Loan organization

Craft a simple Affidavit attesting to the fact you have served that Claim of Right on the people in question. (See the example) Have it Notarized and submit both the affidavit and a copy of the Claim into the court registry.

Wait 30 days.

If no one responds, you have established your rights claimed. Congratulations! Now create and send off the Bill of Exchange. The original goes to the Minister, your agent. A certified true copy goes to the student loan organization. (Whoever you would make your payment to) Another gets deposited in the court registry. Three days later, send off the Confirmation of Settlement Letter and have a copy deposited in the court registry.

Congratulations, you are finished! You have not only paid off your loan, you have uncovered a fundamental truth the government never wanted you to find out! Your actions, and those of others at this time will inevitably result in a system of fully funded post secondary education for all Canadians. You are a Hero!

Notice

DATE:

Dear M.P.

I have heard talk lately of the number on the back of my Birth Certificate being a bond tracking number. Apparently our pledge to consent to taxation supports these bonds. I have also heard that we have the right to access funds within those bonds, or the revenue generated by them to pay for our education. If so this would be a great benefit to millions of students throughout this great country.

Also, over the last election, I heard a great deal of talk concerning government accountability coming from those we have elected. I feel that accountability is impossible without honesty, knowledge and competence. Towards that ends I must ask you a series of important questions. These questions are very simple and straightforward and I demand you answer them fully, completely, honestly and immediately. Failure to do so will mean you accept my right to answer these questions myself, and then inform you as my representative, what those answers are. You will then be bound by those answers as if you had supplied them. This seems very fair, reasonable and equitable to me. I have numbered the questions for your easy reference and to aid in our communications.

What exactly is the number on the back (front) of my Birth Certificate?

Why is it not identified as to its function?

Is it a 'bond tracking' number?

If so, when was a bond generated?

Who generated it?

Did they enjoy informed consent?

What is the value of the bond, assuming there is one?

Who owns title to that bond?

Does that bond generate revenue?

Does my pledge, promise, oath or obligation, support the bond, if there is one?
If yes, when did I pledge, promise or make oath?
If there is no money in my bond generating revenue, who stole my money?
Who initially put money in the bond?
Is interest paid on that bond?
If so, to whom and how much interest is paid?
Does the revenue generated by the bond, if there is any, form part of the 'Federal Transfer Payments' the Federal and Provincial levels of government bicker over?
Would either level of representation have the right to control or access those payments if they were not acting as a representative?
To who do those Federal Transfer Payments actually belong?
Is there a fiduciary over the bond?
If so who is it?
If not does this mean NO ONE is in charge of the bond?
Is it true we have the right to deny consent to be represented and thus governed?
Has your hand been 'in the cookie jar'?

Please answer these questions as herein directed. Many people want and need to know the answers to these simple questions. If you cannot or will not answer them, all must conclude that you are grossly incapable of representing me, and appropriate and lawful steps will then be taken.

Sincerely and without malice aforethought, ill-will, vexation or frivolity,
Will U. Tellme DaTruth

All rights reserved, non-assumpsit, With Prejudice

Notice

DATE: _____

Dear M.P. _____

CC: TWIMC

Hi! I am _____ and I recently wrote to you, asking twenty simple questions. I informed you that if you failed to respond and answer those questions, I would answer them for you, and you would be bound by those answers as if they had been your own. As you have had time to respond, and have not, and as I am sure you have seen these questions before, your reluctance to answer is strongly indicative of fraudulent activity. Here are the answers to the questions. Now, if you are ever asked them again, you can refer to this correspondence and your other constituents won't have to wait or otherwise feel they are being defrauded.

What exactly is the number on the back (front) of my Birth Certificate?

Answer: Bond Tracking Number

Why is it not identified as to its function?

Answer: Government does not want us to realize the Bonds' existence.

Is it a 'bond tracking' number?

Answer: YES!

If so, when was a bond generated

Answer: When our parents registered our birth.

Who generated it?

Answer: The government did, with the apparent consent of our parents.

Did they enjoy informed consent?

Answer: NO, they did not!

What is the value of the bond, assuming there is one?

Answer: At least One Million Dollars

Who owns title to that bond?

Answer: Whoever holds The Record of Live Birth (Government)

Does that bond generate revenue?

Answer: If it does not, someone is guilty of either theft, or gross negligence.

Does my pledge, promise, oath or obligation, support the bond, if there is one?

Answer: YES!

If yes, when did I pledge, promise or make oath?

Answer: Your parents initially made oath, you confirmed when you applied for your SIN.

If there is no money in my bond generating revenue, who stole my money?

Answer: This requires an RCMP investigation.

Who initially put money in the bond?

Answer: This requires an RCMP investigation.

Is interest paid on that bond?

Answer: This requires an RCMP investigation.

If so, to whom and how much interest is paid?

Answer: This requires an RCMP investigation.

Does the revenue generated by the bond, if there is any, form part of the 'Federal Transfer Payments' the Federal and Provincial levels of government bicker over?

Answer: YES!

Would either level of representation have the right to control or access those payments if they were not acting as a representative?

Answer: NO!

To who do those Federal Transfer Payments actually belong?

Answer: Whoever is being represented.

Is there a fiduciary over the bond?

Answer: YES, of course!

If so who is it?

Answer: The Minister of Finance

If not does this mean NO ONE is in charge of the bond?

Is it true we have the right to deny consent to be represented and thus governed?

Answer: Absolutely!

Has your hand been 'in the cookie jar'?

Answer: This requires an RCMP investigation.

As all can tell from our agreed upon answers to these questions, there is clearly a need for an RCMP investigation on five or more separate issues. If you do not agree this is the case, please get back to me within 7 days. I will be including a copy of this letter to the Commissioner of the RCMP and informing them that both I and my Member of Parliament feel there is a need for an immediate investigation.

Sincerely and without malice aforethought, ill-will, vexation or frivolity,
Will U. Tellme DaTruth

All Rights Reserved, Non-Assumpsit, With Prejudice

Claim of Right

DATE: _____

I, _____ (Name) _____, a Human Being in a Common Law jurisdiction, born in _____ (***** City) _____ on or about the _____ day in the month of _____ in the year _____ to _____ (mother) _____ and _____ (father) _____ have the ability and power to establish rights by use of a Claim of Right.

I do hereby claim that among my rights are all of the following:

I claim the right to an education.

I claim the right to use the funds either in my bond (evidenced by the bond tracking number on the Birth Certificate issued to me by the government) or to use the funds generated by the bond to either pay off any student loan if I do have one, or to pay directly for my education if I do not have a loan.

I claim the right to use the funds in the bond or revenue generated by those funds to pay for food and shelter and any other rights recognized by the United Nations.

I claim the right to fire any one acting as a fiduciary over my bond if they fail to acknowledge all rights herein claimed.

I claim the right to revoke or deny consent to be represented and in doing so free myself from all statutory obligations and restrictions, if doing so is, in my opinion, in my best interest.

I claim the right to direct my fiduciary as to what to do with the revenue generated by my bond, provided the directives are a benefit to my society and me.

I claim the right to order and direct my federal representatives to transfer directly to me funds and moneys which they would normally transfer to my provincial representatives in the absence of any directives, if doing so is, in my opinion, in my best interest.

These Rights are hereby lawfully claimed and are established as Law thirty days hence.

Any and all concerned parties wishing to discuss or dispute these claims must send a Notice of Dispute or Offer of Discussion within thirty days via Registered mail to the address below.

Failure to do so means that all parties agree that these rights herein claimed are lawfully established and will not be infringed, violated or abrogated in any way.

All parties who have been served proper Notice of this claim and fail to discuss or dispute, and then infringe, violate or abrogate said rights, directly or through their agents, employees or proxies, agree they do so under FULL COMMERCIAL LIABILITY and further agree to pay to me upon my demand a sum certain of One Million Canadian Dollars for every infringement, violation or abrogation.

This Claim of Right is made and served with the intent of bettering my society and myself and, without ill will, malice aforethought, frivolity or vexation.

Claimant: _____

Notary: _____

NOTICE

Date: _____
Addressed To: _____ (Minister of Finance , by NAME)
CTCO: _____ (Financial Institution_
RE: Student Loan #: _____

I am _____ (NAME) _____ and my Birth Certificate registration number is _____ (# From FRONT) _____ and the bond tracking number found on my Birth Certificate is _____ (# on Back) _____.

It is my understanding that the Bond evidenced by the tracking number generates revenue and that you are acting as a fiduciary in Trust to administer that bond and the revenue generated by it for my benefit, within our societal structure.

In the Act governing my student loan, _____ section _____ does state:

Money owing under a guaranteed student loan may be recovered at any time by way of deduction from or set-off against any sum of money that may be due or payable by Her Majesty in right of Canada to the borrower or the estate or succession of the borrower.

Furthermore, Article 13.2(c) of The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, to which Canada is a signatory, was ratified on January 3rd, 1976 and does state:
(c) Higher education shall be made equally accessible to all, on the basis of capacity, by every appropriate means, and in particular by the progressive introduction of free education;

Therefore TAKE NOTICE, that I am hereby directing you my fiduciary in Trust, to seize and direct sufficient funds and no more in the sum certain of \$ _____, generated by my Bond which you administer and to direct said funds to the financial institution herein mentioned to be used solely to set-off and discharge my student loan honorably, fully, completely and immediately.

This lawful directive is a benefit to myself and my society, fulfills the UN Covenant and is well within your fiduciary authority.

Failure to do as you are hereby lawfully directed within THREE juridical days will result in your dishonour, charges of nonfeasance and an immediate termination of your fiduciary responsibilities and Trustee status over my bond.

Failure to discharge this account immediately may also result in legal action being instituted against you by the aforementioned financial institution.

GOVERN YOURSELF ACCORDINGLY.
Jane Q. Student

SIGN _____

NOTARY _____

**Notice of Confirmation of Settlement
With Prejudice
Law of Agent and Principal Apply**

TWIMC

DATE HERE

National Student Loan Centre

Their Address here

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am _____ and my student loan number was
_____.

On _____(DATE of Claim if Right)_____ I created, served and filed a Claim of Right, a copy of which was forwarded to you via Certified Mail, Registration # _____.
According to my records and the registry, you failed to deny or express a desire to dispute my claims.

Among those claims was the right to discharge my student loan with the revenue generated by my Bond, evidenced by the Bond tracking number on the back of my Birth Certificate.

According to my records, I also created and served on your behalf a Bill of Exchange which was properly presented to my fiduciary agent via Certified Mail, registration # _____ directing them to discharge this loan immediately. A certified true copy of that bill was also sent to you via Certified Mail, registration # _____ and another copy of the same was filed in the registry on
_____.

According to my records, I also transferred full liability for this debt to my fiduciary agent and as such have no more obligations to you of any sort. Collection of this debt from my fiduciary agent is entirely your responsibility, as I have exercised what authority I could, to cause them to release to you, funds sufficient to cover this debt.

ORDER: Demand the Minister of Finance honour the Bill of Exchange presented to them and then balance the above account to zero and ensure that your records accurately reflect my honourably discharging this debt, using lawful yet little known means. Failure to do so may have a negative effect upon my credit rating, livelihood and happiness and will be cause for action against you personally for nonfeasance, misfeasance and gross negligence equaling fraud. Failure to do as you have been ordered will also be seen as an acceptance by you, of liability for this debt, and any and all harm your failure to act may cause.

Sincerely and without malice aforethought, ill will, vexation or frivolity,

Print Name

signature

Bubble #40 – Fire that Prosecutor!

Every one knows you can fire your counsel when you are in court. Did you also know you have the right to fire the prosecutor? It's apparently true! What was noticed in court is that the prosecutor ALWAYS at one point speaks on behalf of the accused. As soon as that happens, you have the power to fire him and if they say one more word, you can demand they provide their bond number, name of issuing agency and name of whoever is holding that bond in trust. If you take this step, you will create a situation where there is only you and the judge and if both of you are equal before the law, then all he has are offers. You can then tell him "I thank you for your offer, but I am compelled by my faith to not accept." HE will try very hard to get you to agree with him. Don't do it! Just keep thanking him for his offers and let him know you simply cannot accept his offers.

Bubble #41 – Claim your Rights!

Canada is a Common Law jurisdiction. What this means is you have the ability to establish rights merely by claiming they exist. Give proper Notice to those who may be affected and they have 30 days to raise an issue or express a dispute. If they fail to do so, they agree the rights mentioned exist and may be exercised lawfully. Any court in the land will recognize and support your rights, if properly established. Actually all the rights you have exist because they went through this process in one way or another.

Bubble #42 – Abandoned Bonds!

All government agents are bonded. It means they went and got some insurance and if they act unlawfully, you have some money backing them you can sue against. This is what you do when you sue someone on their bond. However what happens if they are not on their bond? Can you sue them on it, or is it considered abandoned?

According to the Bonding Act (BC) the bonded person's minister holds that bond in trust until someone who has the right to demand it does. They are then obliged to surrender that bond to the one demanding. If they fail to give it up, they can face a charge and possibly be sentenced to 14 years in prison. (Section 337 of the Criminal Code of Canada)

The purpose of the bonds is to ensure they act lawfully. If they act unlawfully, they cannot claim to be on their bonds and have in fact abandoned it. If you catch them in that situation you can lay claim to the bond as abandoned and seize it. Once you have that puppy in your hand, you can take it to the issuing agency and redeem it for the full value on its face.

Bubble # 43 – Have a 'person', do not *BE* a 'person'

We have already established that you are not a person, but you have a person. This next bubble will explain how to have Power of Attorney in fact over your person. Once you take this step, you will enjoy conversations with government agents like this:

Government Agent: Are you Bob Smith*

BS: No, I like you am an Agent. I am an agent for Bob SMITH. What do you have there?

GA: I have a big fat check for Bob SMITH, but if you are not he...

BS: Hold on there Sparky! I happen to have Power of Attorney over Bob SMITH and I have the right to seize and redeem any commercial papers, such as that cheque. Give it here.

GA: Did I say cheque? I meant it's a bill. Bob SMITH owes us money!

BS: That fat rat bastard! He owes me too! Unfortunately for you, I am the registered secured creditor and the line up for payment begins right behind me. Nice day eh?

GA: Did I say bill? I lied. I meant it's a warrant for the arrest of Bob Smith.

BS: Sorry wish I could help you, but I am not that person.

Miscellaneous Bubbles

The Paris Peace Treaty of 1783

Article 8:

The navigation of the river Mississippi, from its source to the ocean, shall forever remain free and *open to the subjects of Great Britain* and the citizens of the United States.

Canadians Citizens can navigate that water way freely. I never knew that!

Summation

1. A human being and a person are not the same thing. Legally they are very different.
2. We are not obliged to register our children. If we do, we are signing our child's person over to the government. (How do you like them apples? Do you like the idea of pledging your child to the same government that lies to you so adroitly?)
3. We have a Common Law right to travel on the highways without a license. We have to ensure we are in an unregistered automobile, though. Just like your offspring, you sign over ownership to the government when you register.
4. We are not obliged to get a business license. We have the right to engage in commerce without first seeking permission from the government.
5. THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA is not a geographical area called BRITISH COLUMBIA; it is a legal entity or person called THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.
6. A human being and a person are not the same thing. A person is like the legal raincoat we wear upon which the government acts.
7. We can take that coat off anytime we want.
8. Statutes only have the force of law over those who have consented to be governed. Deny that consent, and not one single statute will have the force of law over you. (Do you think the government wants you to know THAT?)
9. They are not your representatives because they are your government; they are your government because you allowed them to be your representative.
10. A 'benefit' is a 'benefit' not because you merely receive it, but because you also then refer to it as one. Nothing is a 'benefit' unless you agree it is. You must feel you got the profit or advantage.
11. The government uses our ignorance against us when they serve Notices. They are really more like invitations, which if ignored or rejected will land you in court. Any Notice can be effectively dealt with through a Conditional Acceptance.
12. No court has jurisdiction over you in the absence of a conflict. By accepting conditionally all that comes our way, we can avoid conflict and thus court. At least we should, if our government embraced the rule of law.
13. A Violation Ticket is a 'bill of exchange' and can also be 'Accepted Conditionally'.
14. People who point to a body of words and claim the words give them authority lose all authority the moment they admit they do not know the sense of any word. They are legally speaking nonsense.
15. Anything you can lawfully accomplish with a Birth Certificate, you can also accomplish with the Record of Live Birth. It is the King of Documents and you can make one yourself. You can use it to travel and cross borders.
16. You have the right to claim to be a Child of God and thus exist in the number two position in the hierarchy defined in the first sentence in the Constitution. If you do, you legally exist above the government and above any court.

17. There are really only three fundamental ways to break the Law: harm someone; damage another's property or use fraud or mischief in your contracts. All things under statutes rest upon a foundation of consent or agreement and thus are violations of a societal contract.
 18. Our governments, along with bankers, have committed treason by abandoning the ability to print money. They sold us out to the bankers and we are all hooped because of it. They never create the interest they demand and eventually, they must own everything. Do the math.
 19. You apparently have the right to ride SkyTrain for free. Its *public transit* and you are *a member of the public*. You own it, why should you have to pay? The fact is you do not have to pay. They use deception in those statutes also. You choose to be a 'passenger' instead of being what you are: one of the owners.
-

In Closing

I am sure there a great many more bubbles to be burst out there, but I want to leave some for others. No sense being greedy, eh? Go out and find them bubbles and using nothing more then questioning words, burst them. Those bubbles do not do our society or its members any good; they benefit only those who are benefiting from all the conflict and strife in our country. I believe they do it on purpose. (A lawyer is someone who will spend *your* last penny proving *he* was right.)

I close with a letter I wrote and sent off to as many Government officials as I could. MP's, MLA's, Clerk of the Privy Council, Attorney Generals Offices, Police departments. All I could. Feel free to send them a letter of your own. Let them know what you think and what you know about their little bubbles of deception.

To:

The Crown,
All elected officials in Canada,
All their agents, employees and representatives,
All Peace Officers in Canada,
All Judges, Magistrates, Prosecutors, Justices and Court
Officers in Canada,
All members of the Bar in Canada,
All members of the Press in Canada,
All members of the Banking community in Canada,
All members of the Public in Canada,
TWIMC,

Hello, I am Robert Arthur Menard and about 1000 days ago, a government agent named Celia Huber, an agent with The Ministry of Children, Family and Community Development threatened a two day old infant with permanent and irreparable harm. Her unlawful actions stopped me from speaking the truth in court and resulted in the child being endangered and her mother becoming another broken addict on the streets. It didn't have to be. A little awareness and compassion from one government worker and the entire heartbreaking story could have been avoided. Instead, because of the deception in their mandates and the capricious attitude and unaccountability which they seem to enjoy, a family was destroyed. My family was destroyed. I am NOT happy about that.

My response was to study and investigate and I uncovered what is clearly deception in the mandate of the workers. I do not see how we can possibly build anything worth defending when those whom we empower are themselves deceived. You cannot do evil in the hopes that good might come of it, nor can you use threats to an infant and deception to build a free and just society. I simply won't have it, and you can't make me accept it. In my studies, I have come to the inescapable conclusion, that the blame for this sad state of affairs

can be placed squarely upon the shoulders of all of us, be we the elected, agents or voters. Our society can be compared to a ship, upon which we find Officers, Crew members and passengers. It seems that the passengers have forgotten the obligations they have to the ship and their fellow passengers and now rely on the Officers and Crew to do everything for them. When did this society turn into a cruise ship where the passengers have no duties and endless services? Have we all forgotten our obligations to our fellow man and those who sacrificed to secure for us our freedom? Shall their ultimate sacrifices be all for naught? Do we not have a destination? (Nation's Destiny)

There are so many holes in this ship; it is hard to decide where one should start when listing them. I have had Peace Officers threaten to assault *and then* arrest me. I have had government agents tell me 'you can't afford justice'. I have heard agents tell me I was 'obliged' to 'register', 'file', 'submit' and 'apply'. I have seen those same agents turn white and leave when I started to ask questions concerning the meaning of some of those words; I have seen fathers cry because of feelings of powerlessness within the justice system. I have seen a good woman prostitute herself for food for her children, because she was **denied essential services**. I saw that same woman in tears, with her children, in church the next day. I have seen business owners scared they might lose their businesses because of demands made by government workers, demands, which disappeared once the right questions, were asked. I have seen entrepreneurs give up because every time they lift up their heads, some government worker comes and smacks it back down. I have seen good Peace Officers denigrated and reviled because of the unlawful and un-addressed actions of their fellow officers, actions which tarnished all who wear a badge and led to disrespect for authority. I have heard of this disrespect manifesting itself in violence against our Peace Officers. I have seen those who were elected to do a job turn a deaf ear and a blind eye. I have seen the growing sense of hopelessness and a diminishing level of trust in our representatives and their agents. I have seen hungry children whose parents were trying to escape from despair by climbing down a bottle. I have seen how the growing poverty and government power creates a sense of worry, frustration and anger. I have seen how these feelings affect our children and our interaction with our fellow man. I have heard many decent hard working blue collar types talk of violent revolution. I have seen Veterans who fought, killed and watched comrades die literally cry about our society and what has become of it. I have seen where we are headed. This ship of ours is heading for the rocks.

I feel that as a member of this society, I too have a duty. For any society to work, grow and develop there must be a constant interaction between those who protect and those who critique. When either side has too much power, the result is either stagnation or instability. Both sides must do their part to the best of their ability, not just as protectors or critics, but as human beings. We must continually envision and then strive for higher standards. Towards that end, I think it is important that we establish certain rules of engagement. The simple fact is I am not going to allow threats from the worst amongst you to stop me from interacting with the best amongst you. I am not going to abandon my love for peace and desire for a better society merely because some of you have a love for power and force. I will embrace the rule of law and will invite any or all of you to discuss with me the source, nature and limits of your authority. Failure to accept that invite, means (according to the rule of law) that you give up the right to claim there is a conflict. If you fail to accept the offer, and then later try to claim there is a conflict, I will know that you have abandoned the rule of law and are inviting me to do the same. In my duties as a social critic and defender of the weak, I strive to treat all my fellow human beings with respect and compassion. I do not question the integrity, intelligence, intent or honour of those I face. I question the meanings of the words they use to claim authority and I question that authority if they can't tell me the meanings. As members of society, we all apparently agree to trade certain rights and freedoms for societal benefits. If however we do not know what rights and freedoms we have given up, how do we know what we receive are in fact 'benefits'? Where is the advantage or profit? Would you buy a car and without knowing what you paid for it and then claim 'I got a great deal!'"? I think not. People are waking up. There is no way to lawfully put them back to sleep. Unless you can explain to me how we can possibly put money into circulation *with interest* and not impoverish someone, then I must claim that you have abdicated your greatest duty to this society. We need the tool to interact with each other. This tool is 'money' and its supply is now decided by un-elected faceless powers that have more than enough already. The way we create our money supply, with interest attached yet not created, creates a debt that is then laid upon the shoulders of those least able to carry it. Every loan applied for, creates another victim of

poverty. There is a link between those we see on the streets begging for food, and those we see driving new SUV's. That link is the interest demanded by the bankers. Interest NEVER created or put into circulation. Where is the money to pay that interest going to come from? Look at the poor, hungry, overworked, desperate and destitute. That is where the interest is coming from. That interest is coming from the bellies and futures of our children. You are allowing it.

This situation **must** change. This situation **will** change or our society is dead. I am going to try to change it, not with anger, fear or shame, but with my love for Elizabeth Anne Elaine and my compassion for my fellow man. You may be able to stop me from sharing my love; you can never however stop me from loving. This love is going to manifest itself in a way that is going to be very difficult for you to deal with.

I will be engaging in a lawful course of action which is sure to get the attention of my fellow citizens and will hopefully result in this society radically changing the way it creates money and empowers representatives and their agents. Consider it a spanking. Accept it as your just punishment or it becomes a beating.

Sincerely,

Robert Arthur Menard

Each time a person stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring, these ripples build a current that can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance.

—Robert F. Kennedy

Dedicated to Elizabeth Anne Elaine; I miss you.