

Defending Your Inherent Rights ToolKit

Prepared By: Johnny Hawke

"And there came one of the seuen Angels, which had the seuen vials, and talked with me, saying vnto mee, Come hither, I will shew vnto thee the iudgement of the great Whore, that sitteth vpon many waters:" Revelation 17:1

Disclaimer: This is not legal advice. To give legal advice one has to be complicit with the Private BAR Guilds that have been using merchant law principles to commercialize the law and profit from crime since the Middle Ages; Therefore legal practitioners cannot provide counsel without deliberately injuring the law and perverting the course of Justice. The information provided here is Spiritual Guidance.

Introduction

There is a variety of self representing legal guru's offering their brand of solutions on how to stop the law in its tracks where most of these self-styled experts are termed by the courts as *Organized Pseudolegal Commercial Arguments (OPCA) Litigants*. Some of these legal mavericks even charge a fee to access their information however no one can guarantee success in the commercial courts. The information within this guide is to help you to understand your own way of navigating through the deception developed over the centuries by the Private Bar Guilds.

What many in activist circles refer to as common law rights, natural rights, inherent rights and Indigenous rights are recognized in the legal system as "human rights" or "fundamental rights and freedoms." In the courts we need to start using this term of *fundamental rights and freedoms* as using any other term may categorize us as frivolous and or vexatious litigants and using the term Human Rights and Indigenous Rights may designate us as a creature of statute.

As we engage with the courts we must also be educated on the legal foundation of Canada and its laws. Within its own laws we find that Canada is only a corporation masquerading as a nation, democracy, federal government and a landmass. Canada is only a fiction however its armed forces, militarized police, courts and prisons are very real. The following steps are to show you how to get out of the jurisdiction of the legal person and how to represent ourselves as we engage with the courts.

If we claim to be truly sovereign then we must speak for ourselves. The first step on this journey is to start using our intelligence intelligently. This means we must recognize how we cooperate within our own enslavement. We cooperate through commercial contracts that use tacit agreements to get consent for things we are not explicitly made aware of. We cooperate by continuing to consume the very lifestyle we claim to resist where even our decolonization movement has become big business. The courts are conducting commerce where we are designated as merchants. This guide is to show how our life force is being consumed by the Windigo as we are also in a very real Spiritual war.

The Foundation of Canada Inc.

The foundational Constitutional documents of the colonies of British North America in the landmass referred to as "Canada" is the 1764 Niagara Covenant Chain Wampum Belt which includes the 24 Nations Belt and the Two Row Wampum Belt. This was a collective Treaty Agreement between 24 Indigenous Nations that affirmed a Nation to Nation Relationship based on Peace, Co-existence and Non-Interference between 24 Indigenous Nations and the British.

This collective agreement offered by the British served to interpret and enact the 1763 Royal Proclamation where Indigenous Nations permitted the British to occupy some of its lands through establishment of treaties. The Royal Proclamation is seen as a Treaty Contract which set the rules for the Colonies to respect the fundamental rights and freedoms of its Indigenous allies. This collective agreement and all Treaties are founded on International Law via the Holy See, (Roman Catholic Church) in which the Church claims to rule over all the Earth and all within; As signatories to such agreements the Indigenous Nations were not informed of this provision. This is an example of a tacit contract agreement.

Timeline

- 1670 The Royal Charter for incorporating the Hudson Bay Company was given by King Charles II of England to Prince Rupert for Hudsons Bay in the Northwest part of America for the discovery for minerals, furs and passage into the South Sea for the Kingdom.
- 1764 Niagara Covenant Chain Wampum Belt which includes the 24 Nations Belt and the Two Row Wampum Belt. This was a collective Treaty Agreement between 24 Indigenous Nations that affirmed a Nation to Nation Relationship based on Peace, Co-existence and Non-Interference between 24 Indigenous Nations and the British.
- The 1867 British North America Act an enactment of the UK to consolidate it's colonies in British North America as one Colony or what was termed "Dominion."
- 1869 The Hudson Bay Company signed the deed of transfer to surrender an estimated 1.2 Billion acres of Indigenous territory to the British Crown.¹ These lands were never part of any Treaty and this transfer was a violation of the Royal Proclamation, the 1764 Niagara Covenant.
- 1878 The Letters Patent Revocation Act provided for a permanent Governor General to the Dominion by her Majesty and all future heirs and successors.
- The 1893 Statute Revision Act removed Section 2, the enacting clause of the BNA Act in relation to the future heirs and successors of the monarchy. This means when Queen Victoria died so did the BNA Act and the Indian Act. This does not mean the Monarchy extinguished jurisdiction over the Dominion but only that the BNA Act including the Indian Act was repealed and can no longer be amended or reenacted.
- 1930 British North America Act- Natural Resources Transfer Act
- 1931 UK Statute of Westminster, the UK's extinguishes it authority, jurisdiction and where the Crown in Chancery gave up its possession over all lands in its dominions allowing the dominions to become a free independent states. This also meant all Crown lands obtained by Treaties with Indigenous Nations reverted back to Indigenous Title and Possession.
- October 1, 1947, William Lyon Mckenzie King constituted The Letters Patent Constituting the Office of the Governor General Commander in Chief of Canada. This was an act of fraud. Commissioning Letters Patent for a Governor General to represent a Monarch can only be done by the Crown in Chancery of Great Britain and approved by His/Her Majesty. No Governor General was no longer required as Canada was a free and independent state and Britain hadn't dispatched a Governor General to the Dominion since 1931.
- In 1982, the UK as a foreign government and monarchy who had no longer had legal and lawful right over so called Canada, unlawfully and illegally amended and reenacted the BNA Act through the Canada Act to created the 1867 Constitution Act and the 1982 Constitution Act. The 1982 Constitution Act is not a constitution but only a charter for a corporation.

- **Steps to ratify and enact the Canada Act, 1982:**
 - All Provinces would need to sign Schedule B of the Act
 - Quebec would need to authorize a proclamation to enact Section 23, (1) (a) of the Act
 - Section 23. (1), (a) would be enacted through a proclamation
 - Section 59. (3) would be enacted through a proclamation to repeal Section 59 and renumber the Act.
 - Section 58 would be enacted through a proclamation to pass the Act

A total of 3 Proclamations were needed to pass the Act. None of this Happened.

So What is Canada?

The Federal Government of Canada is a Corporation that only has jurisdiction upon the Water governed by Maritime- Admiralty Law. The corporations name "The Federal Government of Canada" is in name only, just because the term "Federal" and "Government" is used does not mean it is so; Just as is the "1982 Constitution Act" is also in name only as it not a constitution enacted by a free independent people. "Canada Inc" is a foreign corporation owned by "The City of London."

Canada's Interpretation Act 1985

General definitions 35 (1) In every enactment, *Canada*, for greater certainty, includes the internal waters of Canada and the territorial sea of Canada; *Canadian waters* includes the territorial sea of Canada and the internal waters of Canada; Internal waters.

Note: "Canada" by the Interpretation Act needs to be read with the legal rule of "includes"

The legal rule for the word "*includes*" is defined in Blacks Law Dictionary Sixth Edition under "Expressio unius set exclusion alterius" which says, The explicit mention of one thing is the exclusion of another. This maxim, legal rule is that where a statute, contract or other legal document includes a list of items falling into a category, the inclusion of certain items on that list should be presumed to mean that any excluded items are intentionally outside the definition.

By its own legal history, laws and legal definition, the corporation called The Federal Government of Canada, CANADA INC is only a Shipping and Trade Corporation owned by the Roman Catholic Church that only has jurisdiction on the Waters.

The Laws of Canada Inc.

Divine Law

The Roman Catholic Church by its Papal Bull, Unum Sanctum claims it's rule over all the Earth and Peoples where the Pope is the representative of God on Earth known as the Vicar of Christ. The Papal Bull, Aeterni Regis is a canon law which created the Head Sovereign of all Roman Slaves which is the monarchy of England in which the Monarch is the defender of the faith. All Presidents, Prime Ministers, Priests, Judges, Officers are subordinates to this order.

The Bible itself is a divine contract between Man and God in which the Church claims to sit on this hierarchy. The Bible is present in all courts in which everyone swears upon this contract in the courts however this hierarchy has been violation of this contract for millennia.

“The Crown of England” is a sovereign corporation called “The City of London”. The Monarchy of England is not the corporate head of what is referred to as “The Crown” but it is the Pope of Rome. The Roman Catholic Church was given control over the monarchy with the *Concession of England to the Pope* which was between King John I and Pope Innocent III which forever pledged England as a vessel state of the Holy Roman Empire. ² In 1297 *the Concession of England to the Pope* was used as a precedent to incorporate “The City of London”³ as an independent State controlled by this Roman Cult which would govern England with out depending on the monarchy.

Canon Law

The Roman Catholic Church’s Canon Law is a fully articulated legal code⁴ and has been around since the early days of Christianity. The Papal Bulls; Unum Sanctum, Romanus Pontifex, Aeterni Regis, Convocation are canon law that proclaims to rule over the Earth, enslave all People and their Souls. The Papal Bull, Inter Caetera (Doctrine of Discovery) is the foundation of the genocide of Indigenous Peoples and occupation of their lands. All courts are based on the Church’s Sacrament of Penance (Confession) and Indulgences which has been commercialized by the private BAR guilds. Canon Law can be seen as the old adage ‘All roads lead to Rome.’

Maritime-Admiralty Law

The origins of maritime law can be traced all the way back to ancient Egypt. In those days, ships were used to transport goods and a clearly defined set of rules was needed to ensure safety and fair trade and settle disputes between different parties.⁵ Maritime-Admiralty Law is the commercial law on the seas, also known as The Law of Water. This is International Law and governs all ships and corporations.

Common Law

The legal system of Canada like in the English common law system (inherited from its period as a colony of the British Empire), the French civil law system (inherited from its French Empire past). ^{6 7} According to *Black's Law Dictionary*, common law is "the body of law derived from judicial decisions, rather than from statutes or constitutions."

The common law, so named because it was "common" to all the king's courts across England.^{8 9} England spread the English legal system across the British Isles, first to Wales, and then to Ireland and overseas colonies. These common law systems are legal systems that give great weight to judicial precedent, and to the style of reasoning inherited from the English legal system. ^{10 11 12 13}

The Interpretation Act: Duality of legal traditions and application of provincial law;
8.1 Both the common law and the civil law are equally authoritative and recognized sources of the law of property and civil rights in Canada. ¹⁴

Lex Merchant

Lex Mercatoria latin for "merchant law" often referred to as "the Law Merchant, it is the body of commercial law. ¹⁵The commercial law on the land. The Law Merchant has been used for trade since at-least the time of ancient Babylon. It is not a codified body of law, but rather a set

of unwritten rules and customs developed through international trade practices, considered to be autonomous and not formally written down in a single legal document.

Law Merchant merges with Common Law

In the mid 1700's Lord Mansfield of Britain actively incorporated the principles of international trade law and custom into English common law as they saw it: principles of commercial certainty, good faith,¹⁶ fair dealing, and the enforceability of seriously intended promises. ¹⁷ As Lord Mansfield held, "Mercantile law is not the law of a particular country but the law of all nations"¹⁸ , but also that "the law of merchants and the law of the land is the same." ¹⁹

The consolidation of common law and law merchant is not overly taught and for good reason. Law Merchant or Commercial Law is what operates everything. It is the operation of the Courts. All Legislations, Statutes, Enactments of Canada Inc are to create profit for the corporation in which the Judges rule from the Bench aka Bank. UNIDROIT, PPSA, BILLS OF EXCHANGE Act, Uniform Commercial Code.

Trust Law

The Roman Catholic Church's canon law; Romanus Pontifex, Aeterni Regis and Convocation are Testamentary Deed Trusts. These Trusts are created to manage all lands, property, body and soul of everyone register to a birth certificate and SIN number. The Church has made itself the beneficiary to these Trusts. The Church through the 1666 Cestui Que Vie Act ²⁰ declares everyone "lost at sea" and is considered deceased so that the corporate states can be the Executor/Trustee and the Church the Beneficiary of these Trusts.

The The Hague Convention on the Law Applicable to Trusts and on their Recognition, or Hague Trust Convention²¹ is a contract ratified by 14 so called "countries" to administer and implement these Papal Trusts in their own corporation and make such legislation to impose Birth Certificate and the Income Tax schemes on the people to become Roman Slaves.

Statutory Law

Laws created by governments are called "legislation". Legislation may also be called "statute law." The laws which are created by elected representatives in the federal Parliament or a provincial Legislative Assembly are usually called "acts" or "statutes." Statutes are often supplemented by "regulations" or other "statutory instruments" which are typically approved by the relevant government Minister. Legislation is one of the two main types of primary law in Canada, which means it is binding in court. The other main type of primary law is case law: the decisions made by judges in courts.

Contracts

Everything is commerce and is done through contracts. Simply put statutory laws or legislation are commercial contracts. These contracts establish the rules and regulations for each class of person to conduct commerce such as doctors, patients, drivers, farmers, students, employers, employee, Band Council, Indians etc. Unfortunately People do not know they are just chattel via the Birth Certificate contract where taxes are imposed and labour is exploited. Legal Slavery.

Court

All Courts are operating as Banks and are using the same principles and instruments. All Courts are administering the Roman Catholic Church's Sacrament of Penance aka Confession. The Private Bar Guilds have monetized Indulgences and created a monopoly off of Sin. The latin term "pro se" means "for oneself" and "cutis" means "true skin" which is in reference to "representing one's own flesh." A person who is claiming to be you in making the "self accusation" is the Prosecutor. The Courts are conducting commerce just as a Bank. Law

dictionaries define a Bank also as; *A bench or seat; the bench or tribunal occupied by the judges; the seat of judgment; a court.* ²²

Definitions of Legal Representation:

Once you've retained a lawyer, attorney or barrister for legal representation, you've already lost your case as it pertains to upholding the full extent of your inherent rights; Yes there are Human Rights Lawyers, they however operate within the jurisdiction of statutory law which designates those they represent as a legal person in which the legal person has statutory civil rights and not human rights.

The Art (of Law): In the 13th Century in Florence, the Medici organized merchants into private system or five major guilds called "arti mediane" and seven minor guilds called "arti minori"; occult guilds called "Arti" (from which the word "art" is derived). Next to the cloth and wool merchants who were also the first bankers, the Arti dei Giudici e Notai or the "Guild of Judges and notaries" has historically been the second most powerful network of guilds for over seven hundred and twenty years. Instead of using the Anglo-Saxon concept of Placitum- place of justice, the private guilds created "courts" from caution meaning literally "bonding, securitization and bailment of oaths, vows and sureties" for profit the oldest organized crime syndicate dedicated to law corruption in history. ²³

- **Lawyer:** The word lawyer is from the late 16th Century combining the latin words "lar/ lares" which means "customary law" and "iuro/iurare" which means to "take an oath" or "to conspire" meaning "one who has sworn an oath to customary law." The Private BAR Guilds since the middle ages have been using merchant principles to commercialize the law and personally profit from crime; This means that the current justice system is innately compromised as everything is in favour to benefit these Private BAR Guilds; Therefore no lawyer can't be counsel without deliberately injuring the law and perverting the course of Justice.
- **Attorney:** The word Attorn or Attornment is from 16th Century combining the Latin words "at", "to" and "torn" (turn, round off) meaning "To consent, implicit or explicit, to a transfer of a right." Hence the word Attorney means literally " a person to whom rights have been transferred by consent, implicitly or explicitly." In short an Attorney exists to prove you have given up your rights. Therefore no Attorney can't be Counsel without deliberately injuring the law and perverting the course of Justice.
- **Barrister:** The word Barrister is from the late 16th Century combining the Latin words "bar" (dunce, incompetent) "sto/stare" (to stand firm, to be in position) meaning to literally "to stand/represent a dunce/incompetent". Hence the meaning is "a student of the law (of the private Guild) that has been called to the bar". Therefore, no Barrister can be Counsel without deliberately injuring the law and perverting the course of Justice.

6 Key Things to Know about International Law

1. Lex Merchant

Lex Mercatoria latin for "merchant law" often referred to as "the Law Merchant, it is the body of commercial law on the land. This custom law goes back to at least ancient Babylon and set the foundation for international law.

2. Papal Deeds of Testamentary Trusts

The Holy See (Roman Catholic Church) enacted the foundation of modern day International law via its Papal Bull, Unum Sanctum where this "Roman Cult" self proclaims its rule over the Earth in which the Pope represents God on Earth. Additional Papal Bulls, Romanus Pontifex, Aeterni Regis, Convocation claim the Church rules over everyone's Body, Property and Soul, designated a head Sovereign and steward of all Roman Slaves as well as

The etymology of the word "catholic" means "universal"; "religion" means "to bind" and "church" is taken from "circee" a greek goddess that used spells and sorcery on her victims; Therefore the Roman Catholic Religion's Church means "roman-universal-bondage through spells and sorcery." Today the chicanery of the use of language and law and what it "spells" out is sorcery upon the violation of Human Rights. The etymology of "sorcery" means to "bind fate."

3. The United Nations

The UN can be seen as a Consolidated Slave Holdings Company for the powers behind the Holy See, the Roman Catholic Church. Each member State of the UN enacts statutes to create economic slaves, the legal person to expropriate the worlds resources. The UN is a catalyst for a one-world government.

Established as a result of the crimes against humanity in WWII member states are obligated to the UN Charter and such covenants to prevent such acts however states as Canada and the US continue to deny Human Rights and impose genocidal policies upon Indigenous Peoples of the so called Americas. The United Nations is a colonial extension that manifests the Roman Catholic Church's Papal Bull; Unum Sanctum, World Domination. All member States are only satellite administrations of this doctrine. The U.N's Charter and the Charters of its member States while claiming to protect Human Rights allow the State's interest to override such fundamental rights and freedoms.

4. UN Resolution 637 VII "Blue Water Rule" adopted Dec 16, 1952

The "Blue Water rule" also known as the "Belgian Thesis" or the "Salt Water Thesis" asserts that to be eligible for decolonization, the presence of "blue water" between the colony and the colonizing country or a discreet set of boundaries would be needed. Under UN Resolution 637 VII the world's states have agreed that nations located inside UN member states may not seek or obtain independence through self-determination.

5. The United Nation's Declaration of Human Rights: Article 6

"Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law." Caution: "A Person before the Law" means an Artificial Person under a States fictional legalisms. The legal person is subject to the enactments of a state which restricts and limits such fundamental Human Rights.

6. United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples:

UNDRIP is the tokenism and "culturalization" of Indigenous Peoples rights which involves

rendering Indigenous Nations as merely cultures which disregards our “peoplehood” which under international law is tied to the right to self determination.

Minimizing the Rights of Indigenous Peoples within the sphere of “culturalization” has also made it comfortable for Canada’s Supreme Court Chief Justice Beverley McLachlin in 2015 to term Canada’s relationship with Indigenous Nations as “cultural genocide” rather than not just terming it correctly as genocide.

UNDRIP’s Article 46 (1), (2),(3) is essentially a Notwithstanding Clause that permits the State’s interest to override any Indigenous Rights and to interpret and define Indigenous Rights as a State sees fit. UNDRIP basically places Indigenous Rights in the same standing as civil rights of the legal person and akin to minority rights and Section 35 of Canada’s Charter as well as Case law that all fall under the doctrine of discovery.

6 Key Things to Know about “Indigenous” Rights

1. The Indian, Metis and Inuit are the Legal Person

- a. Indian Act: Definitions 2 (1) Indian means a Person. The Legal Person can only have Statutory rights not Human Rights.
- b. Supreme Court of Canada Reference as to whether “Indians” includes in s. 91 (24) of the B.N.A. Act includes Eskimo [1939] S.C.R. 104: The Supreme Court found that for the purposes of section 91(24), Inuit should be considered Indians.
- c. Daniels v. Canada: The Supreme Court of Canada ruled that Métis and non-status Indians are “Indians” under the Constitution Act, 1867.

2. The Indian Act is Dead

- a. The Indian Act: Definitions 2 (1): In this Act, band means; a body of Indians for whose use and benefit in common, lands, the legal title to which is vested in Her Majesty, have been set apart before, on or after September 4, 1951.
- b. The Queen of Canada Proclamation was Feb 1952, the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth II was on June 2, 1953, The Queen they are referring to in the above definition refers to Queen Victoria. This is left in the Indian Act because legally and lawfully it can’t be removed, amended or reenacted as it is an enactment of the Dominion of Canada. When Queen Victoria died so did the BNA Act and the Indian Act.
- c. The Indian Act was a Dominion of Canada enactment that violated the Law of the Land of Indigenous Nations of Turtle Island and the Indigenous understanding and interpretation of the 1764 Niagara Covenant Chain Wampum Belt Treaty.
- d. Indigenous Peoples who choose to stand under the status of an Indian and a Canadian Citizen, a Statutory Creature surrender their Human Rights and Treaty Rights. This also includes accepting to be the class of person under the birth

certificate, drivers licence, social insurance number (SIN) program and all other permits and licences for the citizen.

- e. The Charter of Rights and Freedoms Section 2 (d) Freedom of Association protects everyone from being forced to play the role of a class of person or enslavement which extends to the UN Declaration of Human Rights, Article 4 No one shall be held in slavery or servitude. Indigenous Peoples and Nations are not the “Indian”

3. Assertion of Charter of Rights Section 25 (a)

Indigenous Nationals need to cite Sec 25 (a) which affirms and recognizes our rights and freedoms recognized in the Royal Proclamation. The Royal Proclamation was presented to 24 Nations as the 1764 Niagara Covenant which was accepted in exchange of the Two Row Wampum Belt and set the foundation of a Nation to Nation Relationship affirming and recognizing our allodial title to our Territories and status as Nation States.

Section 25: The guarantee in this Charter of certain rights and freedoms shall not be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any aboriginal, treaty or other rights or freedoms that pertain to the aboriginal peoples of Canada including

(a) any rights or freedoms that have been recognized by the Royal Proclamation of October 7, 1763; and

(b) any rights or freedoms that now exist by way of land claims agreements or may be so acquired.

Note: Subsection (b) is an attempt to place an Indigenous National under the designation of an Indian under the Indian Act.

4. Section 35 is a Trap

Section 35 Rights is for the Indian, a legal person. Section 35 Rights were not defined and are being defined through the Supreme Court of Canada Case Law in which Johnson v.s McIntosh and St. Catherine’s Milling and Lumber Company v. The Queen set the precedent to import the Doctrine of Discovery into Canadian law. Section 35 Rights acknowledge that Canada has Jurisdiction over Indians and Indian Lands.

35 (1) The existing aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed.

(2) In this Act, *aboriginal peoples of Canada* includes the Indian, Inuit and Métis peoples of Canada.

(3) For greater certainty, in subsection (1) *treaty rights* includes rights that now exist by way of land claims agreements or may be so acquired.

5. Mikisew Cree First Nation v. Canada, [2005]

In the 2005 Mikisew Cree decision, Justice Binnie, for the court, confirmed the following excerpt from the Badger decision: “the words in the treaty must not be interpreted in their strict technical sense nor subjected to rigid modern rules of construction. Rather, they must be interpreted in the sense that they would naturally have been understood by the Indians at the time of the signing.

Although the Doctrine of Discovery governs Canadian Case Law this ruling can help raise the argument that the Royal Proclamation was interpreted to Indigenous Nations by the Crown via Sir William Johnson offering the 1764 Niagara Covenant Chain Belt Treaty in which we accepted by the exchange of the Two Row Wampum and understood this to be an eternal Nation to Nation Agreement based on Peace, Co-Existence and Non-Interference that further Acknowledged and affirmed our Title to our Territories and Human Rights.

6. **Singh vs Canada and Suresh v. Canada:**

“The wording of section 7 says that it applies to “everyone” This includes all people within Canada, including non-citizens.” The Charter of Rights and Freedoms protects the Human Rights of Non-Citizens.

As Indigenous Nationals who are standing under our Human Rights as Non-Citizens of Canada, the Charter protects the limitation and abridgement of our Human Rights.

6 Key Things to Know before Self Representation

How to Carry Yourself

Carry yourself in Dignity and Honour. Be Polite, this goes a long way.

- When the Court attempts to address you as the Legal Person, their trademark sign of what appears as a name in all capital letters on the Birth Certificate do not reply. Correct them by stating, “Your Honour, That assumed name is Capitis diminutio maxima. In Roman law, it is The highest or most comprehensive loss of status. When one’s condition is changed from one of freedom to one of bondage, a slave.
 - Address yourself as the Authorized Representative in this matter. Inform them the court can address you as your given and given name name only. Never accept the legal name which is the given name added with a surname in all capital letters. You are of a Family but do not have a surname. The surname makes you the legal person.
1. **The Rule of Law:** The Rule of Law is the supreme primary operation of law that must always be respected. This rule teaches us that as one individual you were born with natural rights, fundamental freedoms that can never be limited or abridged. No government body or power has the right to breach or disrespect this rule. The rule of law is a power that protects you from government corruption.
 2. **You are not the Legal Person:** The Legal Person, Juridical Person is an artificial person, a Statutory Creation and can not have Human Rights but only civil rights governed by statutory law. The Legal Person is created from the Birth Certificate however the Statement of Live Birth recognizes you as a living Human Being. The Statement of Live Birth is what we stand under and not the birth certificate.
 3. **There are Proper Operations of Law:** Every time you make a claim in law, attached to that claim there has to be a corresponding obligation on the other party. The Court can not hear anything that is outside of the proper operations of their law.

4. **Organized Pseudolegal Commercial Arguments (OPCA)** This term was coined in a 2012 in a Canadian court decision as an umbrella term for pseudolegal tactics and arguments. Pseudolaw consists of statements, beliefs, or practices that are claimed to be based on accepted law or legal doctrine but have no actual basis in law and often purported to be based on "common law." though its interpretation of it has no relation to contemporary or historical examples of common law. It may be used by people who engage in vexatious or frivolous litigation. Some of these litigants are known as Freeman on the Land, The Sovereign Citizen Movement and even Indigenous People who find themselves mixing legitimate Rights with OPCA tactics and arguments; There also exists Indigenous Individuals that are disciples of a self styled legal guru named Meredith Quinn whose "teachings" are a mix of cultural and scientific references with pseudo historic international treaties referred to as Camels Eye Treaty, Eye of Isis and others in which such "teachings" also proclaim practitioners of this law can control the weather with songs and special phrases.
5. **UN Declaration on the Rights and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms:**

Article 6: Everyone has the right, individually and in association with others;

- a. (To know, seek, obtain, receive and hold information about all human rights and fundamental freedoms, including having access to information as to how those rights and freedoms are given effect in domestic legislative, judicial or administrative systems;
- b. As provided for in human rights and other applicable international instruments, freely to publish, impart or disseminate to others views, information and knowledge on all human rights and fundamental freedoms;
- c. To study, discuss, form and hold opinions on the observance, both in law and in practice, of all human rights and fundamental freedoms and, through these and other appropriate means, to draw public attention to those matters.

Article 9:

1. In the exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the promotion and protection of human rights as referred to in the present Declaration, everyone has the right, individually and in association with others, to benefit from an effective remedy and to be protected in the event of the violation of those rights.
2. To this end, everyone whose rights or freedoms are allegedly violated has the right, either in person or through legally authorized representation, to complain to and have that complaint promptly reviewed in a public hearing before an independent, impartial and competent judicial or other authority established by law and to obtain from such an authority a decision, in accordance with law, providing redress, including any compensation due, where there has been a violation of that person's rights or freedoms, as well as enforcement of the eventual decision and award, all without undue delay.
3. To the same end, everyone has the right, individually and in association with others, inter alia :
 - a. To complain about the policies and actions of individual officials and governmental bodies with regard to violations of human rights and fundamental

freedoms, by petition or other appropriate means, to competent domestic judicial, administrative or legislative authorities or any other competent authority provided for by the legal system of the State, which should render their decision on the complaint without undue delay;

- b. To attend public hearings, proceedings and trials so as to form an opinion on their compliance with national law and applicable international obligations and commitments;
- c. To offer and provide professionally qualified legal assistance or other relevant advice and assistance in defending human rights and fundamental freedoms.

6. Everyone has a right to be a Self Represented Litigant:

- a. Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Section 15 (1) Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination.
- a. Under R v Swain, R v Imon-Russel, R v Chemama, also state the accused have a right to self represent.
- b. In Pinteá v Johns, The Supreme Court of Canada endorsed the Principles on Self-Represented Litigants and Accused Persons published by the Canadian Judicial Council in 2006.
- c. In Jonsson v Lymer, The Court of Appeal of Alberta decided that vexatious litigant orders should only be used in the most extreme cases, where there has been a clear pattern of previous abuse by the litigant. The Court also pointed out that there are a number of other more appropriate procedural techniques (such as case management interventions by a judge) to make sure litigation is conducted fairly.
- b. In Girao v Cunningham, the Ontario Court of Appeal stressed the important role that trial judges, as well as opposing counsel, need to play to ensure trial fairness where one party is self-represented. The judgment remarks that in this case, the judge and lawyers failed to do their best to uphold the Principles on Self-Represented Litigants and Accused Persons as endorsed and outlined in Pinteá. These principles need to be followed throughout an entire proceeding – this includes how the self-represented litigant is treated in the courtroom, as well as needing the court to be flexible (while ensuring impartiality) in terms of procedures and the admissibility of evidence when one party is self-represented

Guide to Defend your Inherent Rights

1. Assertion of Inherent Rights and Cease and Desist Notice

If you feel your actions of exercising your Human Rights via occupying your Territory, engaging in Trade, Harvesting or Ceremony or not following vaccination mandates and other limitations on your rights may cause a response from citizens and the State respond by issuing an Assertion of Rights and Cease and Desist Notice. Issue this statement before Any action or when confronted by authorities. This is not an enforceable legal order but gives warning of legal consequences of violating your rights.

Sample Letter:

*[Your Full Name][Your Address][City, Province, Postal Code][Phone Number][Email Address][Date][Recipient's Full Name][Recipient's Address][City, Province, Postal Code]Subject: Cease and Desist Notice Dear [Recipient's Name], **Re: [Description of the Issue]*

This is an Assertion of my Human Rights regarding my peaceful occupation, harvesting and trade within the Anishinaabek Five Council Fire Territory. These rights also include the right to refuse vaccinations and protects me from such vaccine mandates and enactments that limit and restricts such rights and freedoms.

I do declare the following in order to establish my claim of recognition; This claim of recognition has been created to notify you and the executive powers of CANADA concerning the limitation and abridgement of my natural rights and freedoms, my human rights;

I was born a free human being as documented in my statement of live birth completed and held on record by Ontario's Registrar General. It is my understanding that CANADA is a common law jurisdiction through the following enactment:

The Interpretation Act: *Duality of legal traditions and application of provincial law;*
8.1 Both the common law and the civil law are equally authoritative and recognized sources of the law of property and civil rights in Canada;

Any enactment and statute attempted to be applied in the limiting and abridgement of my Human Rights I will seek the Administration of Justice of the Rule of Law in a Superior Court which possess Inherent Jurisdiction that recognizes common law rights, my Human Rights in which is protected the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and several International Covenants Canada is signatory to.

I am an Ojibway National of the Anishinabek Confederacy, a Non-Citizen of Canada where the Royal Proclamation, the 1764 Niagara Covenant Chain Wampum Belt Treaty affirms and recognizes our Human Rights and allodial title to our lands which is entrenched in;

Charter of Rights Section 25: The guarantee in this Charter of certain rights and freedoms shall not be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any aboriginal, treaty or other rights or freedoms that pertain to the aboriginal peoples of Canada including (a) any rights or freedoms that have been recognized by the Royal Proclamation of October 7, 1763.

In **Singh vs Canada and Suresh v. Canada** regarding the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, “The wording of section 7 says that it applies to "everyone" This includes all people within Canada, including non-citizens.”

UN Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms

Article 11: Everyone has the right, individually and in association with others, to the lawful exercise of his or her occupation or profession. Everyone who, as a result of his or her profession, can affect the human dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms of others should respect those rights and freedoms and comply with relevant national and international standards of occupational and professional conduct or ethics.

This notice is also to formally demand that you immediately cease and desist from expropriating resources from Indigenous lands, preventing my use of occupying my Nations Territory, vaccination mandates, and other [specific action or behaviour] and such enactments that limits my rights and freedom. Your actions have caused [specific harm, such as financial loss, not able to feed my family, reputation damage, or emotional distress], and they constitute a violation of my Human Rights protected by International Covenants and Canada’s charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The details of your misconduct are as follows: **Incident Description:** [Provide a clear description of the issue, including dates, locations, and evidence.] **Impact:** [Explain the consequences of the recipient’s actions, such as financial losses or damage to reputation.] Under [applicable laws, contractual agreements, or regulations], your conduct is unlawful and has adversely affected my [rights/interests/reputation]. I hereby demand that you: **Immediately cease and desist from engaging in** [specific behaviour]. **Take corrective actions, including** [specific steps, e.g., removing harmful content, discontinuing a practice, or issuing a formal apology]. Failure to comply with this demand by **[specific deadline]** will leave me no choice but to pursue all available legal remedies. This may include initiating a lawsuit, seeking injunctive relief, and pursuing monetary damages to the fullest extent permitted by law. Please note that this letter serves as your final warning. To avoid further escalation, I request that you confirm in writing no later than **[specific date]** that you will comply with the terms of this demand. You may send your response to [your address/email address]. If you wish to discuss this matter or require clarification, you may contact me directly. However, I emphasize that no further delays will be tolerated. Sincerely, [Your Full Name] [Your Signature (if sending a hard copy)]

2. Private Prosecution:

A private prosecution is a prosecution started by a private individual who is not acting on behalf of a law enforcement agency or prosecution service. The right of a citizen to institute a prosecution for a breach of the law is applicable by the Criminal Code of Canada;

Section 504 - Laying Information to a Justice: *Any one who, on reasonable grounds, believes that a person has committed an indictable offence may lay an information in writing and under oath before a justice, and the justice shall receive the information, where it is alleged*

3. Filing a Constitutional Question

All Nation States members of the United Nations are legally obligated to provide process for those whose Human Rights have been violated by the State. This is the process for Ontario, Canada: Form 4F Courts of Justice Act Notice of Constitutional Question.

The Following is a Sample Template on how to fill out Form 4F and File it. First Make an Affidavit that you Swear everything in your document is true.

The Appellant intends to question the constitutional applicability of:

- Vital Statistics Act 9 (1) Birth Certificate Registration
- The Criminal Code, Section 430 (1)(C) Mischief
- Courts of Justice Act, Section 51.2 (1), 125 (1)(2)(a)(b) Use of Official Languages of Court, Official Languages of the Court
- The Indian Act
- Section 121.1 (1) Criminal Code; Prohibits the sale, distribution, transportation, or possession of unpackaged tobacco products or raw leaf tobacco that is not stamped
- Cannabis Act
- Tackling Contraband Tobacco Act
- Emergencies Act
- 1867 British North America Act
- 1930 British North America Act - Natural Resource Transfer Act
- The Constitution Act 1867
- The Canada Act 1867

And seek remedy under subsection 24 (1)(2) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The date, time and location have not yet been established by the Ontario Court of Justice, Respondent and Appellant.

The Appellant intends to claim a remedy under subsection 24 (1) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms in relation to an act or omission of the Government of Canada and Ontario.

Statement of Recognition

I do declare the following in order to establish my claim of recognition; This claim of recognition has been created to notify you and the executive powers of CANADA concerning the limitation and abridgement of my natural rights and freedoms. I was born a free human being as documented in my statement of live birth completed and held on record by Ontario's Registrar General. It is my understanding that CANADA is a common law jurisdiction through the following enactment: ***The Interpretation Act: 8.1 Both the common law and the civil law are equally authoritative and recognized sources of the law of property and civil rights in Canada.***

Any enactment and statute attempted to be applied in the limiting and abridgement of my Human Rights, I will seek the Administration of Justice of the Rule of Law in a Superior Court which possess Inherent Jurisdiction that recognizes common law rights, my Human

Rights in which is protected the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and several International Covenants Canada is signatory to.

I am an Ojibway National of the Anishinabek Confederacy, a Non-Citizen of Canada where the Royal Proclamation, the 1764 Niagara Covenant Chain Wampum Belt Treaty affirms and recognizes our Human Rights and allodial title to our lands which is entrenched in;

Charter of Rights Section 25

The guarantee in this Charter of certain rights and freedoms shall not be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any aboriginal, treaty or other rights or freedoms that pertain to the aboriginal peoples of Canada including (a) any rights or freedoms that have been recognized by the Royal Proclamation of October 7, 1763.

In **Singh vs Canada and Suresh v. Canada** regarding the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, "The wording of section 7 says that it applies to "everyone" This includes all people within Canada, including non-citizens."

The following are the material facts giving rise to the constitutional question:

(Set out concisely the material facts that relate to the constitutional question. Where appropriate, attach pleadings or reasons for decision.)

1. The Crown Attorney in this matter is holding me in servitude by forcing me to play the role of JOHN HAWKE, which is the "Capitis diminutio maxima" and Dog-Latin representing the artificial legal person that was created by the Vital Statistics Act 9 (1) Birth Certificate registration which violates my right of freedom of association. I am a living Human being with a given name and a family name spelled out in proper English as "John Hawke" affirmed by the Statement of Live Birth. I am not a resident of Christian Island Indian Reserve 30 A, ON nor am I an Indian, a legal person under the Indian Act. I am of the Anishinabek Nation, a citizen of the Chippewa Tri Council Territories and reside in the Anishinabek community of Gchimissing.
2. The Crown Attorney is further holding me in servitude by forcing me to play the role of this statutory entity to be brought under the civil jurisdiction of the court and enacting Section 430(1)(c) of the Criminal Code of Canada for exercising my fundamental rights and freedoms on unsundered Anishinabek Lands. This court is obligated to administer justice under its inherent jurisdiction as a court, to apply this matter under the common law jurisdiction in respect to the rule of law.
3. The Police Laying of Information, Crowns Summons and Disclosure are holding me in servitude to a foreign language in violation of the Ontario Court Act which enacts only two official languages it uses in Court and in all court documents. All documents in this matter are unlawfully using a third foreign language known as Dog-Latin and American Sign Language, defined as a foreign language which is holding me in servitude and violating my Human Rights of not to be forced into association.
4. Band Council Enactments, Conservation Officers, By-law Officers, Police restricted me from exercising my fundamental rights and freedoms to trade, fish, hunt, occupy, and harvest upon Anishinabek Territories (*Or name the Indigenous Nation you are in if you are a*

Settler) in which I was removed, property taken and forcibly detained by the State enacting the Cannabis Act, Section 30 (1)(c), Section 121.1 (1) of the Criminal Code.

5. Mandates enacted under the Emergency Act have restricted me from travel, work, trade, hunting, harvesting and subject to medical experimentation via vaccination mandates where application of this enactment happened on (date by these agencies). I was restricted for exercising my rights by the Police and am now further held in servitude to play the role of the artificial person by the Crown Attorney in this matter.
6. The Crown Attorney is holding me in servitude to a foreign Monarchy and Government by applying said enactments listed in this document that restrict my Human Rights; Where such enactments have been created under the 1867 British North America Act, the Constitution Act 1867 by a foreign government and monarchy which recognizes and affirms the unlawful and illegal jurisdiction of said foreign government and monarchy over CANADA and its citizens.

The Crown Attorney is holding me in servitude to play the role of the legal person by applying the 1930 British North America Act- Natural Resources Transfer Act which limits and restricts my Human Rights. I was restricted in my right to hunt, trade, work, harvest, and or occupy Anishinabek Lands. These Lands were never ceded in any Treaty with Canada or the Provinces.

The Following is the legal basis for the Constitutional Question:

(Set out concisely the legal basis for each question, identifying the nature of the constitutional principles to be argued.)

1. Vital Statistics Act 9 (1)

The Crown Attorney in this matter is holding me in servitude to play the role of the artificial person created by the Vital Statistics Act 9 (1) Birth Certificate registration. I am a living being as per the Statement of Live Birth. This court is legally obligated to administer justice under it's inherent jurisdiction to hear this matter under the common law jurisdiction in respect to the rule of law as stated by;

The Interpretation Act: *Duality of legal traditions and application of provincial law;*
8.1 Both the common law and the civil law are equally authoritative and recognized sources of the law of property and civil rights in Canada;

Provincial Offences Act, R.S.O. 1990

Common law defences

80. Every rule and principle of the common law that renders any circumstance a justification or excuse for an act or a defence to a charge continues in force and applies in respect of offences, except in so far as they are altered by or inconsistent with this or any other Act.

Jonsson v Lymer

The Court of Appeal of Alberta decided that vexatious litigant orders should only be used in the most extreme cases, where there has been a clear pattern of

previous abuse by the litigant. The Court also pointed out that there are a number of other more appropriate procedural techniques (such as case management interventions by a judge) to make sure litigation is conducted fairly.

Ontario Court of Justice Act

- 11(2) The Superior Court of Justice has all the jurisdiction power and authority historically exercised by courts of common law and equity in England and Ontario

Vincent v. Ottawa (City), 2007 (ON SC)

- (10) The Charter therefore does not bestow upon the court jurisdiction it previously Lacked. It does, however, grant rights not previously enshrined, which may be enforced by Courts of competent jurisdiction having powers acquired independent of the charter.

(25) The Superior court of Justice has all the jurisdiction, power and authority historically exercised by courts of common law and equity

M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157

That the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

Michie Estate vs. City of Toronto (1967) CanLII 202 (ON SC)

1. 3rd Paragraph: The Supreme Court of Ontario, as a superior court has a broad universal jurisdiction over all matters of substantive law.

Scarola v MNR, 2002 CanLII 741 (T.C.C)

1. Section 25. In Bogies v. The Queen, 97 DTC 1079, Bruce J. Said at page 1080 (3) The Court, as a statutory creation, does not have the inherent jurisdiction (27) In R. V. Unnamed Person, (1985) O.J. N.O 189, Zuber J.A. said The term “inherent jurisdiction” is one that is commonly and not always accurately used when arguments are made with respect to the jurisdictional basis upon which a court is asked to make a particular order. The Inherent jurisdiction of a superior court is derived not from any statute or rule of law but from the very nature of the court as a superior court.

Board v. Board (1919), 48 D.L.R. 13 at pp. 17-8, [1919] A.C. 956, [1919]

Viscount Haldane for the Privy Council in dealing with the question of the nature of jurisdiction of a superior Court said: If the right exists, the presumption is that there is a Court which can enforce it.

R. v. Peel Regional Police Service, Chief of Police, 2000 (ON SC)

[104] The courts too must conform to the rule of law: The rule of law is the very foundation of the Charter It stands to reason then that the courts are duty bound to apply the Charter. The rule of law, however, does more than demand compliance with the law. To validate this demand, the law must provide individuals with meaningful access to independent courts with the power to enforce the law by granting appropriate and effective remedies to those individuals whose rights have been violated.

The Supreme Court of Canada on S. 24(2) Charter of Rights and Freedoms, 2014

The Administration of Justice: The term “administration of justice” in s. 24(2) embraces maintaining the rule of law and its processes and includes upholding charter rights in the justice system as a whole. Procedure: The charter itself contains no procedural

directions. This led McIntyre J. in *R. v. Mills* to declare: There is no need for special procedures and rules to give it full and adequate effect.

Thomson Newspapers Ltd v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research

- While Individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities.

The particularity of corporate privacy interests was discussed by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Hale v. Henkel*, 201 U.S. 43 (1906), at pp. 74-75:

“The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State, and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.”

Divito v Canada (Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness), 2013 SCC 47

- 22- Canada’s international obligation and relevant principles of international law are also instructive in defining the right: The content of Canada’s international human rights obligations is, in my view, an important indicia of the meaning of “the full benefit of the Charter’s protection”. I believe that the Charter should generally be presumed to provide protection at least as great as that afforded by similar provisions in international human rights documents which Canada has ratified.

R. v. Hynes 1999 18979 (NL CA)

83) Prior to the Charter’s advent, *the individual* really had no special means of protecting against incursions upon his or her basic fundamental rights by executive or legislative arm of the state.

84) Respect of the rule of law, upon which, as W. Ivor Jennings in his text entitled *The Law and the Constitution* (University of London Press, 4th ed.) points out at p.42, hinges the existence of public order, mandated compliance with directives and ordinances even if they infringed upon individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

A primary purpose of the Charter was to change this relationship of the individual with the state and its laws by endowing individuals with an effective means of challenging acts of the state in courts on the ground of violation of their constitutionally protected rights and freedoms.

R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCI 66

The “rule of law” not only finds itself in the preamble of the Charter of Rights, its spirit is manifested throughout the document.

The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society, including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new.

The United Nation’s Declaration of Human Rights

- Article 4, No one shall be held in slavery or servitude.

The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms

2 (d) Freedom of Association, which includes the freedom of not being associated as a class of person.

2. Criminal Code of Canada, Section 430(1)(c)

This court is legally obligated to administer justice under its inherent jurisdiction as a court, to apply this matter under the common law jurisdiction in respect to the rule of law.

The Crown Attorney is holding me in servitude to play the role of the legal person by application of Section 430 (1) (c) *Every one commits mischief who wilfully (d) obstructs, interrupts or interferes with any person in the lawful use, enjoyment or operation of property and dealing with this matter under Civil Jurisdiction. I was exercising my Human Rights to occupy and or harvest on Anishinabek Territory. This court is obligated to administer justice under its inherent jurisdiction as a court, to apply this matter under the common law jurisdiction in respect to the rule of law as stated by;*

The Interpretation Act: *Duality of legal traditions and application of provincial law;*
8.1 Both the common law and the civil law are equally authoritative and recognized sources of the law of property and civil rights in Canada;

Provincial Offences Act, R.S.O. 1990

Common law defences

80. Every rule and principle of the common law that renders any circumstance a justification or excuse for an act or a defence to a charge continues in force and applies in respect of offences, except in so far as they are altered by or inconsistent with this or any other Act.

Jonsson v Lymer

The Court of Appeal of Alberta decided that vexatious litigant orders should only be used in the most extreme cases, where there has been a clear pattern of previous abuse by the litigant. The Court also pointed out that there are a number of other more appropriate procedural techniques (such as case management interventions by a judge) to make sure litigation is conducted fairly.

Ontario Court of Justice Act

- 11(2) The Superior Court of Justice has all the jurisdiction power and authority historically exercised by courts of common law and equity in England and Ontario

Vincent v. Ottawa (City), 2007 (ON SC)

- (10) The Charter therefore does not bestow upon the court jurisdiction it previously Lacked. It does, however, grant rights not previously enshrined, which may be enforced by Courts of competent jurisdiction having powers acquired independent of the charter.

(25) The Superior court of Justice has all the jurisdiction, power and authority historically exercised by courts of common law and equity

M. (A.) v. Ryan, 1997 (SCC), [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157

That the common law must develop in accordance with Charter values. A Trespass in common law equals an infringement or denial of a fundamental right or freedom. (listed in the constitution act or the covenants themselves)

Michie Estate vs. City of Toronto (1967) CanLII 202 (ON SC)

1. 3rd Paragraph: The Supreme Court of Ontario, as a superior court has a broad universal jurisdiction over all matters of substantive law.

Scarola v MNR, 2002 CanLII 741 (T.C.C)

1. Section 25. In *Bogies v. The Queen*, 97 DTC 1079, Bruce J. Said at page 1080 (3) The Court, as a statutory creation, does not have the inherent jurisdiction (27) In *R. V. Unnamed Person*, (1985) O.J. N.O 189, Zuber J.A. said The term “inherent jurisdiction” is one that is commonly and not always accurately used when arguments are made with respect to the jurisdictional basis upon which a court is asked to make a particular order. The Inherent jurisdiction of a superior court is derived not from any statute or rule of law but from the very nature of the court as a superior court.

Board v. Board (1919), 48 D.L.R. 13 at pp. 17-8, [1919] A.C. 956, [1919]

Viscount Haldane for the Privy Council in dealing with the question of the nature of jurisdiction of a superior Court said: If the right exists, the presumption is that there is a Court which can enforce it.

R. v. Peel Regional Police Service, Chief of Police, 2000 (ON SC)

[104] The courts too must conform to the rule of law: The rule of law is the very foundation of the Charter It stands to reason then that the courts are duty bound to apply the Charter. The rule of law, however, does more than demand compliance with the law. To validate this demand, the law must provide individuals with meaningful access to independent courts with the power to enforce the law by granting appropriate and effective remedies to those individuals whose rights have been violated.

The Supreme Court of Canada on S. 24(2) Charter of Rights and Freedoms, 2014

The Administration of Justice: The term “administration of justice” in s. 24(2) embraces maintaining the rule of law and its processes and includes upholding charter rights in the justice system as a whole. Procedure: The charter itself contains no procedural directions. This led McIntyre J. in *R. v. Mills* to declare: There is no need for special procedures and rules to give it full and adequate effect.

Thomson Newspapers Ltd v. Canada (Director of Investigation and Research

- While Individuals as a rule have full legal capacity by the operation of law alone, artificial persons are creatures of the state and enjoy civil rights and powers only upon the approval of statutory authorities.

The particularity of corporate privacy interests was discussed by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Hale v. Henkel*, 201 U.S. 43 (1906), at pp. 74-75:

“The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights. He owes no duty to State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State, and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights.”

Divito v Canada (Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness), 2013 SCC 47

- 22- Canada’s international obligation and relevant principles of international law are also instructive in defining the right: The content of Canada’s international human rights

obligations is, in my view, an Important indicia of the meaning of “the full benefit of the Charter’s protection”. I believe that the Charter should generally be presumed to provide protection at least as great as that afforded by similar provisions in international human rights documents which Canada has ratified.

R. v. Hynes 1999 18979 (NL CA)

83) Prior to the Charter’s advent, *the individual* really had no special means of protecting against incursions upon his or her basic fundamental rights by executive or legislative arm of the state.

84) Respect of the rule of law, upon which, as W. Ivor Jennings in his text entitled *The Law and the Constitution* (University of London Press, 4th ed.) points out at p.42, hinges the existence of public order, mandated compliance with directives and ordinances even if they infringed upon individual fundamental rights and freedoms.

A primary purpose of the Charter was to change this relationship of the individual with the state and its laws by endowing individuals with an effective means of challenging acts of the state in courts on the ground of violation of their constitutionally protected rights and freedoms.

R. v. Wagner, 2015 ONCI 66

The “rule of law” not only finds itself in the preamble of the Charter of Rights, its spirit is manifested throughout the document.

The idea that there are certain fundamental unwritten principles that govern all members of society, including legislators and which judges are expected to enforce is not particularly new.

Singh vs Canada and Suresh v. Canada

- “The wording of section 7 says that it applies to “everyone” This includes all people Within Canada, including non-citizens.”

Note: Section 25 Needs to be read in conjunction with the Mikisew Cree First Nation v Canada Case. The Royal Proclamation was interpreted to the Indigenous Nations through the 1764 Niagara Covenant Chain Wampum Belt affirming Indigenous Nations allodial title to their lands and Human Rights and Self Determination.

Mikisew Cree First Nation v. Canada, [2005] 3 S.C.R. 388 at Supra note 24

- In the 2005 Mikisew Cree decision, Justice Binnie, for the court, confirmed the following excerpt from the Badger decision: “the words in the treaty must not be interpreted in their strict technical sense nor subjected to rigid modern rules of construction. Rather, they must be interpreted in the sense that they would naturally have been understood by the Indians at the time of the signing.”

Section 25 Aboriginal rights and freedoms not affected by Charter

- The guarantee in this Charter of certain rights and freedoms shall not be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any aboriginal, treaty or other rights or freedoms that pertain to the aboriginal peoples of Canada including:

(a) any rights or freedoms that have been recognized by the Royal Proclamation of October 7, 1763.

1763 Royal Proclamation

- “And whereas it is just and reasonable, and essential to our Interest, and the Security of our Colonies, that the several Nations or Tribes of Indians with whom We are connected, and who live under our Protection, should not be molested or disturbed in the Possession of such Parts of Our Dominions and Territories as, not having been ceded to or purchased by Us, are reserved to them.”

1764 Niagara Covenant Chain Belt

The Royal Proclamation was interpreted to Indigenous Nations by the Crown via Sir William Johnson offering the 1764 Niagara Covenant Chain Belt Treaty in which we accepted by the exchange of the Two Row Wampum and understood this to be an eternal Nation to Nation Agreement based on Peace, Co-Existence and Non-Interference that further Acknowledged and affirmed our Title to our Territories and Human Rights.

Note: UN Resolution 637 VII needs to be read in conjunction with Canada’s Interpretation Act definition of “Canada” and with the legal rule of the word “includes.” The definition of “Canada” excludes any landmass and is only the waters. Britain’s Crown in Chancery only had title to lands in which it extinguished its title to all lands via the 1931 Statute of Westminster. Canada is not a colony nor a landmass only waters.

UN Resolution 637 VII “Blue Water Rule” adopted Dec 16, 1952

The “Blue Water rule” also known as the “Belgian Thesis” or the “Salt Water Thesis” asserts that to be eligible for decolonization, the presence of “blue water” between the colony and the colonizing country or a discreet set of boundaries would be needed. Under UN Resolution 637 VII the world’s states have agreed that nations located inside UN member states may not seek or obtain independence through self-determination.

Canada's Interpretation Act 1985

General definitions

35 (1) In every enactment, **Canada**, for greater certainty, includes the internal waters of Canada and the territorial sea of Canada; **Canadian waters** includes the territorial sea of Canada and the internal waters of Canada; Internal waters,

Legal Rule of “Includes”: The legal rule for the word *“includes”* is defined in Blacks Law Dictionary Sixth Edition under “Expressio unius set exclusion alterius” which says, The explicit mention of one thing is the exclusion of another.

This maxim, legal rule is that where a statute, contract or other legal document includes a list of items falling into a category, the inclusion of certain items on that list should be presumed to mean that any excluded items are intentionally outside the definition.

The U.N. Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples 1960

4. All armed or repressive measures of all kinds directed against dependent peoples shall cease in order to enable them to exercise their right to complete independence and the integrity of their national territory shall be respected.

5. Immediate steps shall be taken of all other territories which have not yet

attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire to enjoy complete independence and freedom.

U.N General Assembly resolution A/RES/38/17 (22/11/1983)

- "Reaffirms the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples for their independence, territorial integrity, national unity and liberation from colonial domination, apartheid and foreign occupation by all available means, including armed struggle".

United Nations Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms

Article 10

No one shall participate, by act or by failure to act where required, in violating human rights and fundamental freedoms and no one shall be subjected to punishment or adverse action of any kind for refusing to do so.

Article 11

Everyone has the right, individually and in association with others, to the lawful exercise of his or her occupation or profession. Everyone who, as a result of his or her profession, can affect the human dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms of others should respect those rights and freedoms and comply with relevant national and international standards of occupational and professional conduct or ethics.

Nuremberg Principles

- The fact that a person acted pursuant to an order of his Government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him.

- Complicity in the commission of a crime against peace, a war crime, or a crime against humanity as set forth in Principle VI is a crime under international law.

Constitution Act 1982

Charter of Rights and Freedoms

Section 2 Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms:
(d) freedom of association.

The United Nation's Declaration of Human Rights

Article 4: No one shall be held in slavery or servitude.

Article 20

(1.) Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.
2.) No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

Article 1:1. All peoples have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.

Article 11,1. The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living for himself and his family, including adequate food,

clothing and housing, and to the continuous improvement of living conditions. The States Parties will take appropriate steps to ensure the realization of this right, recognizing to this effect the essential importance of international co-operation based on free consent.

United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

Article 1 (1.) All peoples have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.

(2.) All peoples may, for their own ends, freely dispose of their natural wealth and resources without prejudice to any obligations arising out of international economic co-operation, based upon the principle of mutual benefit, and international law. In no case may a people be deprived of its own means of subsistence.

(3.) The States Parties to the present Covenant, including those having responsibility for the administration of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories, shall promote the realization of the right of self-determination, and shall respect that right, in conformity with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

Article 2

(2.) Where not already provided for by existing legislative or other measures, each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes to take the necessary steps, in accordance with its constitutional processes and with the provisions of the present Covenant, to adopt such laws or other measures as may be necessary to give effect to the rights recognized in the present Covenant.

The Charter of the Organization of the American States

A Pan-American treaty that sets out the creation of the Organization of American States. The treaty came into effect on December 13, 1951. The OAS proclaims a commitment for Member States to protect Human Rights. CANADA became a member State in 1990. Canada is Treaty obligated to uphold principles of the OAS.

3. Courts of Justice Act, Section 51.2 (1), 125 (1):

This court is legally obligated to administer justice under its inherent jurisdiction as a court, to apply this matter under the common law jurisdiction in respect to the rule of law.

All documents in this matter from the Arresting File, Court Summons, Court Disclosure are unlawfully using a third foreign language known as American Sign Language and Debased Latin or "Dog-Latin." The Courts of Justice Act 51. 2 (1), 125 (1) only recognize English and French to be used in court and court documents. These documents are not permitted in an Ontario Court where the Documents are using language recognized and defined as:

Chicago Manual of Styles, 16th Edition. Article 11:147

"THIS-IS- PROPER-WRITTEN-SIGN-LANGUAGE-USING-THE-GRAMMATICAL-RULES-OF-LATIN-TEXT"

Blacks Law Dictionary 4th Edition: Debased Latin: "Dog Latin", the language of the illiterate

"THIS TEXT IS DOG LATIN BEING LATIN TEXT BASED ON THE GRAMMATICAL RULES OF ENGLISH" Notice, no hyphens: This is known as:

The main place this all uppercase text is found to be defined as a language, is when American Sign Language (ASL), a signing language used for the deaf, is written. ASL is defined in the The Chicago Manual of Style under the foreign-languages header: American Sign Language (ASL) compound signs, 10.152 and 'glosses, 10.147'. Thus, defining this text as a foreign language.

Putting two or more languages onto a legal document is known in law as a 'Glossa'. Black's Law Dictionary defines: 'GLOSSA' - "It is a poisonous gloss which corrupts the essence of the text". There is no jurisdiction between two separate languages appearing on one document. This is the guts of their deceptive crime: "English" and "Latin" or "DOG-LATIN" can not exist as one jurisdiction.

Canada's Charter of Rights and Freedoms

- Section 2 (d), the freedom of association.

The United Nation's Declaration of Human Rights

Article 3 : Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

Article 4: No one shall be held in slavery or servitude.

The Charter of the Organization of the American States

A Pan-American treaty that sets out the creation of the Organization of American States. The treaty came into effect on December 13, 1951. The OAS proclaims a commitment for Member States to protect Human Rights. CANADA became a member State in 1990. Canada is Treaty obligated to uphold principles of the OAS.

4. The Indian Act

This court is legally obligated to administer justice under it's inherent jurisdiction as a court, to apply this matter under the common law jurisdiction in respect to the rule of law. My Human Rights are being restricted and associated to the status of the statutory rights of an Indian under the repealed Indian Act. Indigenous or Aboriginal Rights are defined as rights of the Indian, a legal person under the repealed Indian Act and incorporated into the Charter by Section 35. Section 35 never defined such Indian Rights in which have been determined by such Case Law in Johnson v. McIntosh; St Catharines Milling and Lumber Co v. R; R v. Sparrow; R v. Van Der Peet; Ontario v. Bear Island Foundation; Tsilhqot'in v B.C; R v. Badger; R v. Pamajewon, Delgamuukw v. British Columbia, Grassy Narrows First Nation v Ontario, Chippewas of the Thames First Nation v Enbridge Pipelines Inc.

The U.K's 1893 Statute Law Revision Act:

"Whereas that certain enactments have ceased to be in force, namely, Section Two. Provisions of this Act referring to Her Majesty the Queen extend also to the Heirs and Successors of Her Majesty."

This Act repealed the Enacting Clause, Section Two of the British North America Act removing Her Majesty the Queen, Heirs and Successors. This Act was never repealed after it was passed and Section 2 of the BNA Act was never reenacted.

When Queen Victoria died so did the 1867 BNA Act 1867 and Indian Act due to the

repeal of Section 2. However this did not remove the British Monarchy because of the Letters Patent Revocation Act 1878. This only ended the BNA Act and Indian Act as no Monarch after Queen Victoria's death could not reenact or amend the BNA Act and Indian Act.

1931 Statute of Westminster

Section 2. *"Validity of laws made by Parliament of a Dominion. 28 & 29 Vict. c. 63.*

(1) The Colonial Laws Validity Act, 1865, shall not apply to any law made after the commencement of this Act by the Parliament of a Dominion.

(2) No law and no provision of any law made after the commencement of this Act by the Parliament of a Dominion shall be void or inoperative on the ground that it is repugnant to the law of England." This Section 2: Removed Colonial Law from the Dominion of Canada,

Section 7: "Saving for British North America Acts and application of the Act to Canada.

(1) Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to apply to the repeal, amendment or alteration of the British North America Acts."

Section 7 is misleading in how it deals with the applicability of this statute to Canada. Subsection 1 attempts to exclude the BNA Act from this Statute. However, the BNA Act was only a statute (guide) of the imperial parliament to aid the Governor General. It could only be effective if there is a duly appointed Governor General. (See Section 12 of the BNA Act 1867) Since the Crown in Chancery who appoints the Governor General gave up allodial title to the lands thanks to Section 11, there can be no more Governor General, Result this subsection is redundant. Subsection (2) Removed Colonial Law from the Provinces to become Free.

Section 11. "Meaning of "Colony" in future Acts. 52 & 53 Vict. c. 63. Notwithstanding anything in the Interpretation Act, 1889, the expression "Colony" shall not, in any Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom passed after the commencement of this Act, include a Dominion or any Province or State forming part of a Dominion."

Section 11: Severed the connection between the Dominion and a Colony of Great Britain. The key word is "notwithstanding". Section 11 overrides the Interpretation Act of 1889 (definition of colony) The Provinces were not joined as one colony of Great Britain any longer. This also removed the Governor General because the Crown in Chancery lost the allodial title to the land.

There is no intermediate status between that of a colony and that of a sovereign state. No confederation happened because the Provinces had never been sovereign states. Section 11 finally raised each Province of Canada from the position of a colony to that of a sovereign state.

All Lands obtained by the Crown in Chancery in Treaties with the Indigenous Nations reverted back to the allodial title to the Indigenous Nations. The Indigenous Nations have no Treaties with the Provinces and Canada. This land mass known as Canada is all Indigenous Territory.

This status has not changed since Dec 11, 1931. No Province has held a constitutional convention. No Province has seated a de jure lawful government. Every Politician, Every Governor General, every Prime Minister, every Law, every Act, everything has been

illegitimate since Dec 11, 1931. Anything that was passed after this date is not applicable to the Indigenous Nations and People of the Provinces.

Indian Act

Definitions:

2 (1) In this Act, *band* means a body of Indians

- **(a)** for whose use and benefit in common, lands, the legal title to which is vested in Her Majesty, have been set apart before, on or after September 4, 1951,

(Coronation of Queen Elizabeth II was on June 2, 1953, Queen of Canada proclamation was Feb 1952. The Queen they are referring to in this enactment is Queen Victoria.)

The BNA Act 1867 and Indian Act 1876 were founding documents for the Dominion of Canada. Crown Land within the Indian Act 1876 was vested to Her Majesty Queen Victoria. Upon her death in 1901 the lands obtained in Treaties went back to the Sovereign original owners the Indigenous Nations. Today that remains unchanged.

Note: UN Resolution 637 VII needs to be read in conjunction with Canada's Interpretation Act definition of "Canada" and with the legal rule of the word "includes." The definition of "Canada" excludes any landmass and is only the waters. Britain's Crown in Chancery only had title to lands in which it extinguished its title to all lands via the 1931 Statute of Westminster. Canada is not a colony nor a landmass only waters.

UN Resolution 637 VII "Blue Water Rule" adopted Dec 16, 1952

The "Blue Water rule" also known as the "Belgian Thesis" or the "Salt Water Thesis" asserts that to be eligible for decolonization, the presence of "blue water" between the colony and the colonizing country or a discreet set of boundaries would be needed. Under UN Resolution 637 VII the world's states have agreed that nations located inside UN member states may not seek or obtain independence through self-determination.

Canada's Interpretation Act 1985

General definitions

35 (1) In every enactment, *Canada*, for greater certainty, includes the internal waters of Canada and the territorial sea of Canada; *Canadian waters* includes the territorial sea of Canada and the internal waters of Canada; Internal waters,

Legal Rule of "Includes": The legal rule for the word *"includes"* is defined in Black's Law Dictionary Sixth Edition under "Expressio unius est exclusio alterius" which says, The explicit mention of one thing is the exclusion of another.

This maxim, legal rule is that where a statute, contract or other legal document includes a list of items falling into a category, the inclusion of certain items on that list should be presumed to mean that any excluded items are intentionally outside the definition.

The U.N. Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples 1960

4. All armed or repressive measures of all kinds directed against dependent peoples shall cease in order to enable them to exercise their right to complete

independence and the integrity of their national territory shall be respected.

5. Immediate steps shall be taken of all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire to enjoy complete independence and freedom.

U.N General Assembly resolution A/RES/38/17 (22/11/1983)

- "Reaffirms the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples for their independence, territorial integrity, national unity and liberation from colonial domination, apartheid and foreign occupation by all available means, including armed struggle".

United Nations Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms

Article 10

No one shall participate, by act or by failure to act where required, in violating human rights and fundamental freedoms and no one shall be subjected to punishment or adverse action of any kind for refusing to do so.

Article 11

Everyone has the right, individually and in association with others, to the lawful exercise of his or her occupation or profession. Everyone who, as a result of his or her profession, can affect the human dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms of others should respect those rights and freedoms and comply with relevant national and international standards of occupational and professional conduct or ethics.

Nuremberg Principles

- The fact that a person acted pursuant to an order of his Government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him.

- Complicity in the commission of a crime against peace, a war crime, or a crime against humanity as set forth in Principle VI is a crime under international law.

Note: Section 25 Needs to be read in conjunction with the Mikisew Cree First Nation v Canada Case. The Royal Proclamation was interpreted to the Indigenous Nations through the 1764 Niagara Covenant Chain Wampum Belt affirming Indigenous Nations allodial title to their lands and Human Rights and Self Determination.

Mikisew Cree First Nation v. Canada, [2005] 3 S.C.R. 388 at Supra note 24

- In the 2005 Mikisew Cree decision, Justice Binnie, for the court, confirmed the following excerpt from the Badger decision: "the words in the treaty must not be interpreted in their strict technical sense nor subjected to rigid modern rules of construction. Rather, they must be interpreted in the sense that they would naturally have been understood by the Indians at the time of the signing."

Section 25 Aboriginal rights and freedoms not affected by Charter

- The guarantee in this Charter of certain rights and freedoms shall not be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any aboriginal, treaty or other rights or freedoms that pertain to the aboriginal peoples of Canada including:

(a) any rights or freedoms that have been recognized by the Royal Proclamation of October 7, 1763.

1763 Royal Proclamation

- "And whereas it is just and reasonable, and essential to our Interest, and the Security of our Colonies, that the several Nations or Tribes of Indians with whom We are connected, and who live under our Protection, should not be molested or disturbed in the Possession of such Parts of Our Dominions and Territories as, not having been ceded to or purchased by Us, are reserved to them."

1764 Niagara Covenant Chain Belt

The Royal Proclamation was interpreted to Indigenous Nations by the Crown via Sir William Johnson offering the 1764 Niagara Covenant Chain Belt Treaty in which we accepted by the exchange of the Two Row Wampum and understood this to be an eternal Nation to Nation Agreement based on Peace, Co-Existence and Non-Interference that further Acknowledged and affirmed our Title to our Territories and Human Rights.

Constitution Act 1982

Charter of Rights and Freedoms

Section 2 Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms:

- (c) freedom of peaceful assembly; and
- (d) freedom of association.

5. The Emergencies Act, Section 8, 9 Orders and Regulations

This enactment has restricted the exercising of my Human Rights including my removal, arrest, detaining and Crown's pursuing prosecution in this matter as a result of this enactment. In a time of public emergency No one shall be held in servitude. My Human Rights in this matter shall not be violated by:

U.N Declaration on Civil and Political Rights

Article 4 (1) In time of public emergency which threatens the life of the nation and the existence of which is officially proclaimed, the States Parties to the present Covenant may take measures derogating from their obligations under the present Covenant to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation, provided that such measures are not inconsistent with their other obligations under international law and do not involve discrimination solely on the ground of race, colour, sex, language, religion or social origin.

Article 4 (2) No derogation from articles 6, 7, 8 (paragraphs 1 and 2), 11, 15, 16 and 18 may be made under this provision.

Article 7 No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. In particular, no one shall be subjected without his free consent to medical or scientific experimentation.

Article 8

- 2. No One Shall be held in Servitude

Charter of Rights and Freedoms

Section 2 (d), The Freedom of Association

6. The 1867 British North America Act, The Constitution Act 1867, The Canada Act

These enactments in this matter have limited and restricted me in exercising my Human Rights on un-surrendered Anishinabek Territories and where the Crown is holding me in servitude to a foreign monarchy and government through said repealed, void and unlawful enactments that continue to violate my Human Rights whereas;

The 1867 British North America Act

“Whereas the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick have expressed their Desire to be federally united into One Dominion under the Crown of the United Kingdom”

Section 2:” The Provisions of this Act referring to Her Majesty the Queen extend also to the Heirs and Successors of Her Majesty, Kings and Queens of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland”

Powers of the Parliament: Legislative Authority of Parliament of Canada
Section 92 (24) Indians, and Lands reserved for the Indians.

Section 109: “All lands, mines, minerals, and royalties belonging to the several provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick at the union, and all sums then due or payable for such lands, mines, minerals, or royalties shall belong to the several provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick.”

The 1889 Interpretation Act defined a “British possession” to be any part of a dominion and it defined the term “colony” to be any part of a dominion. The Dominion of Canada was clearly a colony of Great Britain and NOT an independent country. The colony did not confederate in 1867. The BNA Act was never a Constitution.

Section 109 that enacted all lands, mines, minerals and royalties shall belong to the several provinces was a violation of the 1764 Niagara Covenant Chain Wampum Belt Treaty with the Indigenous Nations.

The 1876 Indian Act

“Whereas it is expedient to amend and consolidate the laws respecting indians: Therefore Her Majesty by and with the advice and consent and the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:”

(2) “The Minister of the Interior shall be Superintendent General of Indian Affairs and shall be governed in the supervision of the said affairs, and in the control and management of the reserve, lands, moneys and property of indians in Canada by the

provisions of this Act.”

The Indian Act was enacted under the BNA Act by the Dominion of Canada and was and is a violation of the Human Rights of the Indigenous Nations affirmed and recognized in the Royal Proclamation of 1763 which was interpreted to the Indigenous Nations by the 1764 Niagara Covenant Agreement. The Indian Act was a violation of this Nation to Nation foundational Agreement. This racist and colonial Indian Act permitted the genocidal Residential Schools and genocidal Starvation Policies.

The Letters Patent Revocation Act 1878. Section 9

“And We do hear-by reserve to Ourselves , Our heirs and successors, full power and authority from time to time to revoke, alter or amend these Our Letters-Patent, as to Us our them shall seem meet.”

This Act instituted the office of Governor General of the Dominion on a permanent basis. Letters Patent are used to grant patent rights by the Crown in Chancery to officially grant titles and office to people or make other declarations. This Act made Section 2 of the BNA Act redundant.

The U.K's 1893 Statute Law Revision Act:

“Whereas that certain enactments have ceased to be in force, namely, Section Two. Provisions of this Act referring to Her Majesty the Queen extend also to the Heirs and Successors of Her Majesty.”

This Act repealed Section 2 of the BNA Act, 1867 removing Her Majesty the Queen, Heirs and Successors. This Act was never repealed after it was passed and Section 2 of the BNA Act was never reenacted.

When Queen Victoria died so did this BNA Act 1867 and Indian Act due to the repeal of Section 2. However this did not remove the British Monarchy because of the Letters Patent Revocation Act 1878. This only ended the BNA Act and Indian Act as no Monarch after Queen Victoria's death could not reenact or amend the BNA Act and Indian Act.

The British North America Act, 1930 - Enactment No. 16

“An Act to confirm and give effect to certain agreements entered into between the Government of the Dominion of Canada and the Governments of the Provinces of Manitoba, British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan respectively.”

This Act was to transfer control of natural resources and Crown lands in the Prairie Provinces of Alberta, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan to the provincial governments. The BNA Act was dead. When Queen Victoria died so did this BNA Act 1867 due to the repeal of Section 2. No Monarch after Queen Victoria's death could not reenact or amend the BNA Act.

1931 Statute of Westminster

Section 2. *“Validity of laws made by Parliament of a Dominion. 28 & 29 Vict. c. 63. (1) The Colonial Laws Validity Act, 1865, shall not apply to any law made after the commencement of this Act by the Parliament of a Dominion.*

(2) No law and no provision of any law made after the commencement of this Act by the Parliament of a Dominion shall be void or inoperative on the ground that it is repugnant to the law of England.” This Section 2: Removed Colonial Law from the Dominion of Canada,

Section 7: “Saving for British North America Acts and application of the Act to Canada. (1) Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to apply to the repeal, amendment or alteration of the British North America Acts.”

Section 7 is misleading in how it deals with the applicability of this statute to Canada. Subsection 1 attempts to exclude the BNA Act from this Statute. However, the BNA Act was only a statute (guide) of the imperial parliament to aid the Governor General. It could only be effective if there is a duly appointed Governor General. (See Section 12 of the BNA Act 1867) Since the Crown in Chancery who appoints the Governor General gave up allodial title to the lands thanks to Section 11, there can be no more Governor General, Result this subsection is redundant. Subsection (2) Removed Colonial Law from the Provinces to become Free.

Section 11. “Meaning of "Colony" in future Acts. 52 & 53 Vict. c. 63. Notwithstanding anything in the Interpretation Act, 1889, the expression "Colony" shall not, in any Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom passed after the commencement of this Act, include a Dominion or any Province or State forming part of a Dominion.”

Section 11: Severed the connection between the Dominion and a Colony of Great Britain. The key word is “notwithstanding”. Section 11 overrides the Interpretation Act of 1889 (definition of colony) The Provinces were not joined as one colony of Great Britain any longer. This also removed the Governor General because the Crown in Chancery lost the allodial title to the land.

There is no intermediate status between that of a colony and that of a sovereign state. No confederation happened because the Provinces had never been sovereign states. Section 11 finally raised each Province of Canada from the position of a colony to that of a sovereign state.

All Lands obtained by the Crown in Chancery in Treaties with the Indigenous Nations reverted back to the allodial title to the Indigenous Nations. The Indigenous Nations have no Treaties with the Provinces and Canada. This land mass known as Canada is all Indigenous Territory.

This status has not changed since Dec 11, 1931. No Province has held a constitutional convention. No Province has seated a de jure lawful government. Every Politician, Every Governor General, every Prime Minister, every Law, every Act, everything has been illegitimate since Dec 11, 1931. Anything that was passed after this date is not applicable to the Indigenous Nations and People of the Provinces.

The Letters Patent Constituting the Office of Governor General and Commander in Chief of Canada 1947:

In 1947, Prime Minister MacKenzie King issues Letters Patent appointing a Governor General. These Letters Patent were signed only by Mackenzie King. To this day, only the Lord High Commissioner of Great Britain (Crown in Chancery) can issue Letters Patent. Nobody else has the power or authority to issue Letters Patent. The last ones that were issued at dated March 23, 1931. Every Politician, Every Governor General, every Prime

Minister, every Law, every Act, everything has been illegitimate since Dec 11, 1931.

The Royal Style and Titles Act 1952

Enacted by an illegitimate Parliament of Canada, in which the Parliament of Canada assented that Elizabeth II can proclaim herself to be the Queen in right of Canada.

The Canada Act, 1982

Language of instruction

23 (1) Citizens of Canada

(a) whose first language learned and still understood is that of the English or French linguistic minority population of the province in which they reside, or

(b) who have received their primary school instruction in Canada in English or French and reside in a province where the language in which they received that instruction is the language of the English or French linguistic minority population of the province, have the right to have their children receive primary and secondary school instruction in that language in that province.

Continuity of language instruction

(2) Citizens of Canada of whom any child has received or is receiving primary or secondary school instruction in English or French in Canada, have the right to have all their children receive primary and secondary school instruction in the same language.

Application where numbers warrant

(3) The right of citizens of Canada under subsections (1) and (2) to have their children receive primary and secondary school instruction in the language of the English or French linguistic minority population of a province

(a) applies wherever in the province the number of children of citizens who have such a right is sufficient to warrant the provision to them out of public funds of minority language instruction ; and

(b) includes, where the number of those children so warrants, the right to have them receive that instruction in minority language educational facilities provided out of public funds.

Commencement

58. Subject to section 59, this Act shall come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation issued by the Queen or the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada.

Commencement of paragraph 23(1)(a) in respect of Quebec

59(1) Paragraph 23(1)(a) shall come into force in respect of Quebec on a day to be fixed by proclamation issued by the Queen or the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada.

Authorization of Quebec

(2) A proclamation under subsection (1) shall be issued only where authorized by the legislative assembly or government of Quebec.

Repeal of this section

3) This section may be repealed on the day paragraph 23(1)(a) comes into force in

respect of Quebec and this Act amended and renumbered, consequentially upon the repeal of this section, by proclamation issued by the Queen or the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada.

Steps to ratify and enact the Canada Act, 1982

- All Provinces would need to sign Schedule B of the Act
- Quebec would need to authorize a proclamation to enact Section 23, (1) (a) of the Act
- Section 23. (1), (a) would be enacted through a proclamation
- Section 59. (3) would be enacted through a proclamation to repeal Section 59 and renumber the Act.
- Section 58 would be enacted through a proclamation to pass the Act

A total of 3 Proclamations were needed to pass the Act. None of this Happened.

The Royal Proclamation, 1982 is only a proclamation stating that there will be a proclamation in the future, Nothing was passed. Nothing was enacted. There is no Constitution Act. The Royal Proclamation, 1983 had nothing to do with the passing of the Canada act, 1982; This act simply converted the status of Aboriginal People from Sovereigns to Persons.

Note: Section 25 Needs to be read in conjunction with the Mikisew Cree First Nation v Canada Case. The Royal Proclamation was interpreted to the Indigenous Nations through the 1764 Niagara Covenant Chain Wampum Belt affirming Indigenous Nations allodial title to their lands and Human Rights and Self Determination.

Mikisew Cree First Nation v. Canada, [2005] 3 S.C.R. 388 at Supra note 24

- In the 2005 Mikisew Cree decision, Justice Binnie, for the court, confirmed the following excerpt from the Badger decision: “the words in the treaty must not be interpreted in their strict technical sense nor subjected to rigid modern rules of construction. Rather, they must be interpreted in the sense that they would naturally have been understood by the Indians at the time of the signing.”

Section 25 Aboriginal rights and freedoms not affected by Charter

- The guarantee in this Charter of certain rights and freedoms shall not be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any aboriginal, treaty or other rights or freedoms that pertain to the aboriginal peoples of Canada including:

(a) any rights or freedoms that have been recognized by the Royal Proclamation of October 7, 1763.

1763 Royal Proclamation

- “And whereas it is just and reasonable, and essential to our Interest, and the Security of our Colonies, that the several Nations or Tribes of Indians with whom We are connected, and who live under our Protection, should not be molested or disturbed in the Possession of such Parts of Our Dominions and Territories as, not having been ceded to or purchased by Us, are reserved to them.”

1764 Niagara Covenant Chain Belt

The Royal Proclamation was interpreted to Indigenous Nations by the Crown via Sir William Johnson offering the 1764 Niagara Covenant Chain Belt Treaty in which we accepted by the exchange of the Two Row Wampum and understood this to be an eternal Nation to Nation Agreement based on Peace, Co-Existence and Non-

Interference that further Acknowledged and affirmed our Title to our Territories and Human Rights.

Constitution Act 1982

Charter of Rights and Freedoms

Section 2 Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms:

- (c) freedom of peaceful assembly; and
- (d) freedom of association.

Section 7 Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.

Section 15 (1) Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.

Note: UN Resolution 637 VII needs to be read in conjunction with Canada's Interpretation Act definition of "Canada" and with the legal rule of the word "includes." The definition of "Canada" excludes any landmass and is only the waters. Britain's Crown in Chancery only had title to lands in which it extinguished its title to all lands via the 1931 Statute of Westminster. Canada is not a colony nor a landmass only waters.

UN Resolution 637 VII "Blue Water Rule" adopted Dec 16, 1952

The "Blue Water rule" also known as the "Belgian Thesis" or the "Salt Water Thesis" asserts that to be eligible for decolonization, the presence of "blue water" between the colony and the colonizing country or a discreet set of boundaries would be needed. Under UN Resolution 637 VII the world's states have agreed that nations located inside UN member states may not seek or obtain independence through self-determination.

Canada's Interpretation Act 1985

General definitions

35 (1) In every enactment, **Canada**, for greater certainty, includes the internal waters of Canada and the territorial sea of Canada; **Canadian waters** includes the territorial sea of Canada and the internal waters of Canada; Internal waters,

Legal Rule of "Includes": The legal rule for the word "*includes*" is defined in Blacks Law Dictionary Sixth Edition under "Expressio unius set exclusion alterius" which says, The explicit mention of one thing is the exclusion of another.

This maxim, legal rule is that where a statute, contract or other legal document includes a list of items falling into a category, the inclusion of certain items on that list should be presumed to mean that any excluded items are intentionally outside the definition.

The U.N. Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples 1960

4. All armed or repressive measures of all kinds directed against dependent peoples shall cease in order to enable them to exercise their right to complete

independence and the integrity of their national territory shall be respected.

5. Immediate steps shall be taken of all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire to enjoy complete independence and freedom.

U.N General Assembly resolution A/RES/38/17 (22/11/1983)

- "Reaffirms the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples for their independence, territorial integrity, national unity and liberation from colonial domination, apartheid and foreign occupation by all available means, including armed struggle".

United Nations Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms

Article 10

No one shall participate, by act or by failure to act where required, in violating human rights and fundamental freedoms and no one shall be subjected to punishment or adverse action of any kind for refusing to do so.

Article 11

Everyone has the right, individually and in association with others, to the lawful exercise of his or her occupation or profession. Everyone who, as a result of his or her profession, can affect the human dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms of others should respect those rights and freedoms and comply with relevant national and international standards of occupational and professional conduct or ethics.

Nuremberg Principles

- The fact that a person acted pursuant to an order of his Government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him.

- Complicity in the commission of a crime against peace, a war crime, or a crime against humanity as set forth in Principle VI is a crime under international law.

Remedy in this Constitutional Question being sought:

Withdraw all charges and all actions where Third Parties, the Ontario Provincial Police, the Crown attempt and or obstruct in the lawful use and enjoyment and operation of the lands of the Chippewa Tri Council in which I as an Anishinabe National have the said Rights to access such lands without interruption must cease and desist. Return all property and or monies confiscated by police in this matter.

If this is unacceptable in the Remedy being Sought this matter may and shall be a part of a collective of violations by Canada on Indigenous Nationals and Tribal Governments who are

taking such grievances to the International Criminal Court and seeking support from the permanent 5 states on the United Nations Security Council to intervene.

Date

Your Name
Address/Contact

To:

Attorney General of Canada
Address/Contact

Attorney of Province
Constitutional Law Branch
Address/Contact

4. Operating in Commerce as a Remedy

“For her sinnes haue reached vnto heauen, and God hath remembred her iniquities. Reward her euen as she rewarded you, and double vnto her double according to her works: in the cup which she hath filled, fill to her double.” Book of Revelations Chapter 18 Verse 5, 6

We can use all constitutional laws, case law and statute laws to attempt to hold Governments accountable for violating our fundamental rights and freedoms but a Judge can over rule anything as the court is not operating within the perceived legal system but operating in law merchant. Since the birth certificate and SIN card created a position for us to act as merchants we can use the merchant law, its principles and instruments to give back double on what was put unto us.

The Law Merchant was a custom law among merchants and was not a codified law however in these modern times it has come to be codified within UNIDROIT (International Institute for the Unification of Private Law), UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts, the Uniform Commercial Code (US) and the Uniform Law Conference of Canada and within the Bills of Exchange Act and Personal Property Security Act in Canada.

There are cases you can find where the Self-styled “legal guru’s” who the courts refer to as *Organized Pseudolegal Commercial Arguments (OPCA) Litigants* have been creating their own commercial instruments to link to what they claim as the “secret trust accounts” created by the birth certificate as they claim as a way to discharge debts, not pay taxes and issue cheques. This process by such OPCA Litigants have resulted where they have found themselves in prison serving long sentences as their actions constitute fraud. This is not the direction I am referring to when I mean using commerce against commerce.

Using the route of engaging in the law merchant with the courts to defend our fundamental rights and freedoms comes with very real consequences if we do not know what we are doing. We must educate ourselves as much as we can however we basically have been

operating as merchants throughout our lives by accepting offers, making counter offers, negotiating, accepting contracts and revoking them in many aspects in society.

The following are the basic but most influential merchant law principles, commercial instruments and process we can start to understand and use in the courts:

1) Principles:

Keep yourself in Honour: Do not refer to your position of presenting any facts and or evidence as arguments. Once you claim that you are making arguments you put yourself in dishonour of a contract.

Four Ways to Respond when Contracting: 1; Full Acceptance 2; Conditional Acceptance (Counter Offer) 3; Remain Silent 4; Argue/Discuss.Fight/Make Statements

With the first two categories you remain "In Honor" with the offeree and with the last two options you put yourself "In Dishonor."

Conditional Acceptance (Counter-offer): an offer made in response to a previous offer by the other party during negotiations for a final contract. Making a counter offer automatically rejects the prior offer, and requires an acceptance under the terms of the counter offer or there is no contract.

Restitutio ad integrum: A Latin term that means "restoration to original condition". It is one of the primary guiding principles behind the awarding of damages in common law negligence claims.

When you asked Do you Understand?: When the Judge asks Do You Understand, you are being asked if you agree with the Contract.

Contracts made under duress are void: No-one can force you to enter into a contract this includes the courts. The courts through the sheriff, police will try to establish jurisdiction over you by arrest and getting you to admit to being the name in all capitals the legal person. Do not physically resist arrest; peacefully state you are not the legal person and they are violating your fundamental rights and freedoms and are liable to criminal charges of kidnapping, assault, unlawful detainment. After they release you upon your own recognizance to appear in court on a date when you make your signature write beside it non negotiable.

2) Commercial Instruments

Financial Administration Act:

Section 2 Definitions;

Money: includes negotiable instruments²⁴

Negotiable instrument: includes any cheque, draft, traveller's cheque, bill of exchange, postal note, money order, postal remittance and any other similar instrument;²⁵

Bill of Exchange Act:

16 (1) Bill of Exchange: 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.

Section 30 Perfecting Bill;

Where a simple signature on a blank paper is delivered by the signer in order that it may be converted into a bill, it operates, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, as an authority to fill it up as a complete bill for any amount, using the signature for that of the drawer or acceptor, or an endorser, and, in like manner, when a bill is wanting in any material particular, the person in possession of it has, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the authority to fill up the omission in any way he thinks fit.²⁶

Financial Asset: means, except as otherwise provided in sections 10 to 16, (a) a security. Part II, Section 13 of the Securities Transfer Act, Bill of exchange, promissory note; A bill of exchange or promissory note to which the Bills of Exchange Act (Canada) applies is not a security, but is a financial asset if it is held in a securities account.²⁷

Default: means the failure to pay or otherwise perform the obligation secured when due or the occurrence of any event whereupon under the terms of the security agreement the security becomes enforceable; (“défaut”)²⁸

Security: includes, (a) any document, instrument or writing commonly known as a security. (b) any document constituting evidence of title to or interest in the capital, assets, property, profits, earnings or royalties of any person or company, (e) a bond, debenture, note or other evidence of indebtedness or a share, stock, unit, unit certificate, participation certificate, certificate of share or interest, (H) any certificate of share or interest in a trust, estate, or association.²⁹

Indemnity bond: Is a surety bond that creates a financial contract between two parties. Indemnity bonds are designed to ensure that if one party doesn't uphold their obligations, the other party can seek a remedy. In a sense, an indemnity bond is similar to an insurance policy. Rather than insuring a piece of property or someone's life, however, indemnity bonds convey a right to collect financial compensation if one party defaults on their responsibilities in a legally binding agreement.

CUSIP Numbers: CUSIP numbers are unique identifiers attached to listed stocks and bonds. They provide a standardized method for identifying securities to facilitate the clearance and settlement of trading market transactions

3) How these Processes are in Operation in Court

Everything you sign with the Government is being created into money. The Bills of Exchange Act section 30 Perfecting a Bill says “a simple signature on a blank paper may be converted into a bill”, “as an authority to fill it up as a complete bill for any amount.” These then become negotiable instrument, a financial asset, bond, security. Our Court Cases are given File Numbers and a CUSIP number.

We need to put a Indemnity Bond on our Case Files and ask for copies when they are processed in court. We then reclaim these Securities with Canada Revenue process and inform

the court. They will have already converted this and sold the security on the market and profited. This will put them in default and in which they do not want to admit to this racket of merchant law in operation.

¹ <https://cashback.yellowheadinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/Corporate-Colonialism-Factsheet-Cash-Back.pdf>

² from. Stubb's Charters, p. 284, translated in Ernest F. Henderson, *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*, (London: George Bell, 1910), pp. 430-431

³ Magna Carta (1297) Acts of the English Parliament 1297 c. 9 (Regnal. 25_Edw_1_cc_1_9_29

⁴ Ramstein, Fr. Matthew (1948). *Manual of Canon Law*. Pg. 49

⁵ <https://www.britannica.com/topic/maritime-law>

⁶ "[Where our legal system comes from - About Canada's System of Justice](#)". September 7, 2016.

⁷ John Dickinson; Brian Young (2014). *A Short History of Quebec*. McGill-Queen's University Press. p. 59

⁸ [Langbein, Lerner & Smith \(2009\)](#), p. 4.

⁹ [Common law | Definition, Origins, Development, & Examples | Britannica](#)". www.britannica.com. 26 November 2024. Retrieved 28 November 2024

¹⁰ *Black's Law Dictionary – Common law* (10th ed.). 2014. p. 334. "2. The body of law based on the English legal system, as distinct from a *civil-law system*; the general Anglo-American system of legal concepts, together with the techniques of applying them, that form the basis of the law in jurisdictions where the system applies..."

¹¹ Garner, Bryan A. (2001). *A Dictionary of Modern Legal Usage* (2nd, revised ed.). New York: Oxford University Press. "common law" is contrasted by comparative jurists to civil law."

¹² Washington Probate, "Estate Planning & Probate Glossary", *Washington (State) Probate*, s.v. "common law" Archived 25 May 2017 at Archive-It, 8 December 2008.; retrieved on 7 November 2009. "2. The system of law originated and developed in England and based on prior court decisions, on the doctrines implicit in those decisions, and on customs and usages rather than codified written law. Contrast: CIVIL LAW."

¹³ Charles Arnold-Baker, *The Companion to British History*, s.v. "English Law" (London: Longcross Denholm Press, 2008), 484.

¹⁴ <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/i-21/page-1.html>

¹⁵ <https://www.lawyr.it/index.php/articles/reflections/1193-lex-mercatoria>

¹⁶ *Carter v Boehm* (1766) 3 Burr 1905

¹⁷ *Pillans v Van Mierop* (1765) 3 Burr 1663

¹⁸ *Luke v Lyde* (1759) 97 Eng Rep 614, 618; (1759) 2 Burr 882, 887

¹⁹ *Luke v Lyde* (1759) 97 Eng Rep 614, 618; (1759) 2 Burr 882, 887

²⁰ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/Cha2/18-19/11>

²¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hague_Trust_Convention

²² <https://thelawdictionary.org/bank/>

²³ Frank O'Collins Explains Roman Law <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C-MvSs9gWRs&list=PLhWWIa4nw39vewbvmrUZRQOb4rK-lQuoq&index=7>

²⁴ <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/f-11/page-1.html#h-227972>

²⁵ <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/f-11/page-1.html#h-227972>

²⁶ <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/b-4/fulltext.html>

²⁷ Ontario's Securities Transfer Act, Definitions.

²⁸ <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90p10>

²⁹ Ontario Securities Act, Definitions