



The Solution to ALL Our Problems

What are you willing to do to regain your freedom?

“None are so hopelessly enslaved, as those who falsely believe they are free. The truth has been kept from the depth of their minds by masters who rule them with lies. They feed them on falsehoods till wrong looks like right in their eyes.”

~ Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (b. 1749 - d. 1832)

Table of Contents (TOC)

Foreword.....	3
Preamble.....	4
Chapter 1 – Human Rights	8
Chapter 2 – Money/Currency.....	14
Chapter 3 – The Legal Name.....	18
Chapter 4 – The Trust/Estate.....	25
Chapter 5 – Appearing in Court.....	31
Chapter 6 - FAQ's.....	38
Appendix A - DFO Affidavit.....	41
Appendix B – Income Tax Affidavit.....	46
Appendix C – Highway Traffic Act offences Affidavit.....	50
Appendix D – Child Protective Services Affidavit.....	58

The Solution to ALL Our Problems!

The Human Rights Defenders League in Canada - Revision Date: 11/4/2012

Foreword

TOC

The sole purpose of this booklet is to impart the information and understanding we have acquired from more than a decade and a half of intense research.

We will explore the internal workings of a system euphemistically referred to as, 'the economy' and our enslavement to it. Further, we will explore how this system has effectively stolen our natural wealth and the fruits of our labour to the exclusive benefit of a small, but particularly powerful, special interest group. Finally we will explore at least one solution to this enslavement.

This booklet is intended to assist those who have awakened to the fact that something is terribly wrong but have no idea what. We will attempt to explain the problem and solution in a manner that is simple and understandable and consequently involves only a cursory review of the subject matter. For a more complete understanding of the subject matter, one should embark upon their own in-depth study and there is much available to assist in that effort.

However, this booklet will reveal a long hidden key to freedom, a condition we are intended to live in, and once again, enjoy the bounty that was bequeathed to us at birth.

To assist you in your study, we recommend you visit some very relevant websites including the following;

www.naturalgod.com/NaturalCommerce.html

www.eternallyaware.com

www.wallydove.wordpress.com

The Appendices to this booklet provide samples of Affidavits which can be used in the most common court issues, and when combined with the information and suggestions herein, should provide you with remedy.

We have developed a process we believe will result in our freedom and control of our wealth, our birthright. If you wish to join our process described within the pages of this booklet, you should send an e-mail expressing your desire to do so, to our co-ordinator, at humanrightsdefendersleague@gmail.com

Preamble

TOC

I was recently reading a document that was a self-proclaimed “*slightly condensed, casually paraphrased transcript of tapes of a seminar given in 1990 by Howard Freeman*”. [available at <http://gemworld.com/UCC-applied.htm>]

Therein Howard was told by a friendly judge during a very private meeting that “*In 1938, all the higher judges, the top attorneys and the U.S. attorneys were called into a secret meeting and this is what we were told: America is a bankrupt nation--it is owned completely by its creditors. The creditors own the Congress, they own the Executive, they own the Judiciary and they own all the state governments. Take silent judicial notice of this fact, but never reveal it openly. Your court is operating in a Admiralty Jurisdiction--call it anything you want, but do not call it Admiralty.*”

We want to emphasize the extraordinary importance of the above statement. “*America*” (as well as Canada since we are indebted to the same Banking Cartel) “*is a bankrupt nation*”. That is straight-forward. The creditors own the government, the judiciary and everything else. At least in their fictional world.

That means it doesn't matter who we elect, they cannot represent us (the people) because they are controlled by and accountable to the creditors - the International Banking Cartel (“**Cartel**”) and as their puppets, the government simply does to we human beings exactly what the **Cartel** wants. The Judiciary was instructed that our courts from the time of bankruptcy to the present were to operate in “*Admiralty Jurisdiction*” but that fact was to be hidden from we human beings.

What is “*Admiralty Jurisdiction*”? The following definition from Wikipedia reads:

Admiralty law (also referred to as maritime law) is a distinct body of law which governs maritime questions and offenses. It is a body of both domestic law governing maritime activities, and private international law governing the relationships between private entities which operate vessels on the oceans. It deals with matters including marine commerce, marine navigation, shipping, sailors, and the transportation of passengers and goods by sea. Admiralty law also covers many commercial activities, although land based or occurring wholly on land, that are maritime in character.

Admiralty law is distinguished from the Law of the Sea, which is a body of public international law dealing with navigational rights, mineral rights, jurisdiction over coastal waters and international law governing relationships between nations.

Although each legal jurisdiction usually has its own enacted legislation governing maritime

matters, admiralty law is characterized by a significant amount of international law developed in recent decades, including numerous multilateral treaties. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Admiralty_law]

The question follows then, “What has Admiralty law got to do with us when we are a common law country, or at least, suppose to be a common law country.”

Under Admiralty law, there is only one Master - the Captain of the ship - and in our situation, the courts are under the direction of the **Cartel**. Our Common Law courts disappeared with the bankruptcy of Canada and were replaced with “Admiralty Law”.

What is the biggest difference between Common Law and Admiralty Law? In Common Law you are innocent until proven guilty and there must be a ‘victim’ (injured party). In Admiralty Law you are guilty unless you can prove your innocence and there doesn’t have to be a victim.

Law is at the whim of the Master. The primary purpose of our Courts now is to act as tax collectors, a bank, for the **Cartel**. They are taxing our energy. If you don’t wear a seat belt - TAX FOR THE MASTER. If you cross the road where they say you shouldn’t - TAX FOR THE MASTER. If we exchange our labour for money – TAX FOR THE MASTER. WE ARE ENSLAVED!

Regardless of the truth of our conclusions, the quote does seem to explain what is going on in our courts today and with the entire system where, in fact, the government no longer cares what we think or have to say. They seem to be carrying out an agenda that has nothing to do with what we, the human beings of this country, or all other countries think or want.

Besides shocking me, this quote got me to thinking.

Yes, we believe what this judge said, it’s proven to be true based on this author’s decade and a half of research and more than 150 days in court representing myself and assisting others.

It got me thinking about the one statement that he made, “*America is a bankrupt nation--it is owned completely by its creditors.*” How could the Americans or any other group of human beings be truly bankrupt? Then I realized that the statement had nothing to do with human beings who are born free and equal in dignity and rights¹, it was all about the fictional world system that had been created at the behest of the Bankers (money-changers of biblical lore).

The first and obvious question that came to mind, to which this book will provide an answer, is, “to whom is America indebted?” The same is true in Canada and every other country on earth (with rare exceptions such as Iran and North Korea – this may answer your questions

¹ Article 1, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

concerning all the “sabre rattling” that goes on in the world today about those two countries).

The next question is “Where did the creditor get the money to make debtors of the entire world (that’s a lot of money)?”

The creditor is, as G. Edward Griffin calls them in his book titled “*The Creature from Jekyll Island*”, the International Banking Cartel. We will refer to them simply as the “**Cartel**”.

From where did they get the money? Well, read on and you will find out, and the answer will shock you and hopefully correct your understanding of how the world system actually works.

What is going on is that two parallel systems co-exist which I like to refer to as **reality** and **fiction**.

Reality is real. For example, human beings are real. The earth is real. The trees are real. The gold is real. The fish are real. Natural law is real because if you fall off your roof the *law of gravity* will ensure that you hit the ground unless something breaks your fall. You get the picture.

Fiction is not real and exists only in the minds of human beings. For example, persons are fiction. Property, or title, in land is fiction. Property, or title, in trees is fiction. Property, or title, in fish is fiction. Statutes or Acts that have the force (emphasis on force) of law, is fiction.

The world of fiction is what is often referred to as a *system of commerce* or the *economy*. It is all based upon a bunch of rules made up by government (predominantly lawyers) at the behest of the International Banking Cartel, as the creditors (the borrower is servant to the lender). Additionally, the system is based upon another fictional concept, **money**.

At this point we would like to say this, **you can join this system/game if you wish, BUT YOU CANNOT BE FORCED TO DO SO!**

This is why we can make another statement, you are free, you just do not know it and/or you do not know how to be free. This book will, we hope, convince you that you can be free and how to be free and enjoy your birthright, dominion over the earth and all things of it.

All of us have joined this system/game, much like joining in a game of Monopoly, but generally we have done so without being **fully** informed and, therefore, without our **informed** consent.

How is that possible?

Were you not told you had to register the birth of your offspring?

Were you not told you had to have a Social Insurance Number in order to work?

Were you not told you had to have a Driver's License to travel around your earth in your private conveyance (automobile)?

Were you not told you had to pay taxes?

Were you not told we have to have rules and everyone must obey the law?

Have you ever asked yourself why all these things are so?

So – ask yourself why all these things are so?

Do you have an answer?

I hope you do not, because THEY ARE ALL LIES!

Open your mind and think about it. Think about it before you read on.

This is how you were enticed or coerced into joining the system and become an obedient citizen/slave.

Of course, there were other means of coercion used against us. There were the government run schools, or what might be referred to as “government indoctrination centres”. We all entered these institutions thinking and acting differently. We all came out thinking virtually the same. And one of the things we were all programmed to believe is that the government has authority over us and their rules (Acts and Statutes) will keep us safe from one another.

And what about this one that I have heard so many times in my life, “we have to have rules”?

All of this is a bunch of crap!

We do not have to join their system and it is certainly not in our best interest to do so, at least not the way it is currently set up, with the government as our Masters and we human beings as their slaves, or what they like to refer to as Citizens.

A Citizen is not a slave you say.

Let's look at the definition of Citizen in the Citizenship Act of Canada and the Oath of Citizenship which states:

OATH OR AFFIRMATION OF CITIZENSHIP

“I swear (*or* affirm) that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Canada, Her Heirs and Successors, and that I will faithfully observe the laws of Canada and fulfil my duties as a Canadian citizen.”

We have underlined what we feel will convince you that a Citizen is indeed a slave.

It does not even matter in fact, what you believe as a result of this quote, if anyone reading this book can actually say they believe they are free in this system they are not really aware of what is going on.

You may be wondering why we said earlier that **“you are free, you just do not know it and/or you do not know how to be free.”**?

We were making a point and we are doing the same now. We are free, but once we enter the system we become a slave. We still have the choice to become part of the system or not. However, now that we are in the system, we cannot be prevented from exiting if we find Te system does not work for us.

You are simply playing the game just as if you were playing the game of Monopoly.

If we were playing the game of Monopoly with a group of people and they started to cheat or change the rules whenever they wanted and without our agreement, we would probably leave the game and we would be free to do so. That is an obvious truth.

Well, the same applies to this game of commerce that we are all playing now.

It will not be easy to do so, but this book will, we believe, help us all understand how to be free again and enjoy the bounty of our birthright, dominion over the earth and all things of it (our wealth that we are currently being deprived of).

Chapter 1

Human Rights

TOC

There is a solution to all our problems.

Many have been searching for a solution/remedy to not only the legal, social, and economic problems we face, but also the loss of freedom and the loss of our birthright (dominion over the earth and all things of it).

Whether our issue is income tax, traffic, prohibition of our right to fish, hunt, or otherwise gather our food, being dispossessed of our offspring, or any number of other issues emanating from government Acts, Statutes and Regulations (so-called crimes but without a victim), the solution is the same.

To understand the solution, we need to first accept and understand that we are in this situation as a result of our own behaviour. In other words, we are, individually and collectively, responsible for our situation and therefore, we are able to change or fix it.

Through our apathy and ignorance, we allowed our present condition to develop simply because we were not diligent in learning and asserting our natural rights. As a result, we failed in our duty and accountability to ourselves and others. Additionally, we have been negligent by not demanding accountability of others for their actions, particularly those choosing to act as our servants, entrusted with the management of our natural resources, such as government.

Those servants have slowly, and increasingly, commenced acting as our Masters without any reaction from we human beings, and that is part of the problem. We allowed them to do what they want (**to quote Trudeau, “you did not send me to Ottawa to do what you want, you sent me to Ottawa to do what I think is right”**), and because we have not been diligent in instructing them, correcting them, and demanding accountability from them in their role as our servants, they commenced taking instructions from the bankers to whom they are indebted because of the operation of our unconstitutional monetary system.

Money is to be created by the people that are the producers, by an agency of our government for our benefit and on our behalf - free of charge! More on that later.

Let's take a look at the difference between a human being (man/woman) and a legal entity

known as a **person**, because that, as it turns out, is the mechanism by which we have all been taken into involuntary servitude, robbing us of our freedom and our birthright, our natural wealth, over which we are given dominion (supreme authority) by our Creator.

A human being can, of their own choosing, assume one or more persona, and the one most commonly assumed is that of a **person**.

Although we have all been taught and believe that we are all persons, a **person** is a legal fiction (creation of law) and is not something that a human being **is** at birth and that is proven by the fact that the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* and the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* recognizes a human being's **right** to be **recognized** everywhere as a **person** before the law. A **person** then, is not something that we are by birth, but it is something that we can be **recognized as "before the law"**.

The Quebec Civil Code, under the heading, ENJOYMENT AND EXERCISE OF CIVIL RIGHTS, Article 1, states "*Every human being possesses juridical personality and has the full enjoyment of civil rights*". This suggests that a **juridical personality** (legal person/fiction) is something that a human being possesses, **not something that a human being IS**.

The preamble to the *ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS ACT* states "*Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world and is in accord with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as proclaimed by the United Nations;*", referring, I humbly submit, to human beings as "*members of the human family*" and commits to "*the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as proclaimed by the United Nations;*".

Additionally, Manitoba's Human Rights Act reads, in part, "*WHEREAS Manitobans recognize the individual worth and dignity of every member of the human family, and this principle underlies the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and other solemn undertakings, international and domestic, that Canadians honour;*" recognizing the worth and dignity of each individual **human being** as a "*member of the human family*".

Further, the preamble to the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* states, "*Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world*"

Further, the Bible, the foundation of our society commonly known as Canada, uses the word "**man**" when referencing the individual human being, and Acts 10: 34 reads, "*Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, 'Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons.'*", and James 2: 9 reads "*But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.*"

The aforementioned declarations by Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, UN and the Bible, clearly recognize the equality², inherent and inalienable rights, worth and dignity of every human being within the human family. This is not true of a **person** (*that legal fiction which a human being can be recognized as, before the law*) and, to the author's knowledge, **there is no law** in Canada **compelling** a human being to be recognized as a **person**, yet, **and get this**, almost all statutes and Acts (the expressed will of government having the force of law), rules, regulations and codes apply to **persons**. In other words, **persons**, not human beings, are subject to these laws, rules, regulations and codes.

- Did you know that a **right** is something we have, not something that we have to earn?
- Did you know that a **right** is something that cannot be forced upon us?
- Did you know that a **right** is something we can waive if we do not want to assert it?

What would it mean then if we **waived** the right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law³?

It is important to understand that since we have a **right** to recognition as a **person**, then a **person** must be something that we are **not**. Remember, we are human beings, not **persons**, at least not automatically in law.

We do, however, have a **right** to recognition as a **person**.

As stated throughout this treatise, all law (statutes and Acts of parliament and the Provincial Legislatures) applies to **persons**, with rare exceptions such as murder, theft, and other acts that harm another or their property, also known as biblical or natural law? These are codified within the *Criminal Code of Canada*© along with a bunch of provisions that apply only to **persons**.

If the *Fisheries Act*, the *Income Tax Act*, the *Child and Family Services Act* and the *Highway Traffic Act*, to name just a few, **apply only to persons**, then if we waive our right to recognition as a **person** before the law, would those Acts apply to us, human beings?

OF COURSE THEY WOULD NOT!! (unless the courts can trick us into somehow associating ourselves with the **legal name** and thus permitting them to recognize us as **persons** – see next Chapter on the **legal name**).

The simple solution to all our problems then, is to acquire knowledge of, assert or waive, and defend, our natural rights, which are, in part, memorialized in a document known as the

2 Article 1, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

3 Article 6, Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Article 16, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

International Bill of Human Rights, documents Canada has signed and ratified.

The long hidden secret that has recently come to our understanding is that we can actually assert **or waive** these rights according to our will. For example, we can waive the human right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law⁴.

The Bible teaches us In Genesis 1:1-28, that God created the heavens and the earth. He then created the fish, the animals, and everything else of the earth.

The Bible also states that God then created man and He gave man dominion (supreme authority) over the earth and all things of it, including the fish and the animals and the other wealth (natural resources), further emphasizing our equal co-ownership of the natural wealth of the entire earth and most particularly, that of the land mass known as Canada. This means that each of us human beings is co-owner of the wealth of this earth, and each one of us in Canada, co-owner of the wealth of this nation.

The document that we rely on for the assertion or waiving of our **human** rights is the *International Bill of Human Rights* ("IBHR"), which consists of three main documents, the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* ("UDHR"), the *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* ("ICESCR"), and the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* ("ICCPR").

Our freedom and equality is further emphasized in Article 1 of the "UDHR" which states, "*All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights...*"

Some of the rights that accompany ownership/possession of anything IS the **right** of peaceful enjoyment, and the **right** of disposal at the sole discretion of the owner/steward.

Article 1(2) of the "ICESCR" states, "*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.*"

Canada, a member state of the United Nations ("UN"), has signed and ratified, in the most important cases at least, the "IBHR", making it legally binding on the government(s) in Canada.

Therefore, by waiving our right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law, we dispossess/disassociate ourself from that of the **person**. Accordingly, we will be separated from the liabilities attached to the **person**, while maintaining the dominion granted to us by God or whatever you may call your creator (so long as you do not enable them to entrap you

⁴ Article 6, Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Article 16, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

by use and operation of the registered name - more on that later).

If one does not believe in a creator then I cannot fathom what one can rely upon to claim equality and dominion - as the very essence of evolution, is that we would have evolved differently and by necessity, unequally.

However, this does not matter, since we rely on the "IBHR" to bind the government and its organs to recognition of those of our natural rights that they memorialized within the four corners of the "IBHR", and thereby committed themselves to recognizing and respecting.

It is worth noting at this point that the "IBHR" does not give us anything, it simply binds the government. Our rights came with us at birth and are commonly referred to as natural or God given rights. The "IBHR" simply memorializes some of them and binds the government to their recognition and defence.

In a recent decision by Judge Roy Moore of the Alabama Supreme Court in *Ankrom v. State of Alabama* ruled that an unborn child has rights and in particular, the right to life. Further, he stated in an interview with WND Faith, "*I get criticized for my professions that God is the basis of all rights or liberties,*" he told WND, "*and yet, the rule of law, being the Constitution, and its companion, the Declaration of Independence, organize the laws of our country on [the premise that] our rights come from God.*"

Government's job, he said, is to secure and protect those rights.

Further, the full Constitution needs to play an active role today, he said."

Read more at <http://www.wnd.com/2013/01/court-rules-unborn-is-child/#1IrivBbKPtA54XHg.99>

By implication, since God did not specifically give one man authority over another nor make any distinction amongst mankind, He intended that all men be equal in rights, dignity and authority (dominion); government's agreement being expressed in Article 1 of the "UDHR" which states, "*All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights...*".

It should also be understood that we have the **right** to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law, as described in Article 6 of the "UDHR" and Article 16 of the "ICCPR" which states, "*Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.*"

A **right** is something you have, not something you have to earn or be given.

The solution then, IS SIMPLE - prevent or minimize the continuing eradication of our freedom and loss of wealth by acquiring a clear understanding of, and willingness to assert, our rights and discharge our duties. We must be fully accountable for our actions, and demand accountability from others - particularly those in government, whose actions most affect us all.

Those entrusted with the management of our wealth and organizing our community activities should be very mindful of the Nuremberg Principles, which state in part that it is not an acceptable defence for their actions to claim “*I was just following Orders*”, and will also not be a defence if they are charged with breach of trust or other wrong doing.

At this point, we should have a much better understanding of our rights and the potential outcome of our actions. Appendices to this document include several forms (Affidavits) to be filed with the court if you are unavoidably summoned to court prior to receiving remedy via our process (described later).

Knowledge can set us free so please enjoy your education through this booklet and other referenced sources.

You may learn more by reading through the rest of this document and attached Appendices, applicable to different situations such as, traffic violations, income tax related matters and child protection services. We are limited only by our imagination.

And the answer to the “what is next” question will be covered by what follows.

There is much more documentation one can use to show man's law must, and in fact does, agree with God's law in the recognition of our (as human beings) dominion over the earth and all things of it. To keep this booklet simple and focused we will not get into any more documentation at this time. This does not have to be complicated anyway.

Another thing we want to emphasize is we should be careful to use proper words when referring to our 'offspring' and should refrain from referring to them as 'children' because a child is defined in the relevant Child Protection Acts as a **person**. It should be noted, as discussed herein, that there is a difference between a human being and a **person**. A human being is God's creation; a person is man's creation. A human being is not a **person** but can be so **recognized** if he/she wishes or is tricked into agreeing to be.

It is critical to understand what is going on, to know what the tools are and how those tools are used to manipulate us. We will then understand the problem and the solution to many, if not all, of our woes.

Chapter 2

Money/Currency

TOC

Money, schools, religion, and laws (statutes and Acts which are not law but have the force of law) are some of the tools used to control the masses, and our ignorance of them has resulted in our enslavement and the unjust enrichment of our manipulators/controllers who are accountable to no one (but God).

Unless we understand the monetary system, we will never understand how these manipulators are controlling us and stealing our entire natural and created (from our labour) wealth.

Money is simply painted up pieces of paper; it is created from nothing, and has value only because we human beings are willing to accept it in exchange for our goods and services.

Money is only a *medium of exchange* that facilitates the free exchange of goods and services amongst human beings and is not a valuable commodity in and of its own self.

Subsections 91(14), (15) and (20) of the Constitution Act, 1982 gives the power to create money to the federal government. The federal government, in contravention of the Constitution Act, 1982 (and the Supreme Court of Canada decision in *Nova Scotia (Attorney General) v. Canada (Attorney General)*, [1951] S.C.R. 31) handed this power over to private bankers.

Banks are private, for profit entities and their loyalty is with their shareholders and to themselves rather than customers and our country. The recent world financial crisis is evidence of these banker's morality and loyalty and reveals an intrinsic flaw in a monetary system that creates money from nothing and loans it at interest.

Private Banks produce money using the signature of human beings who apply for loans, either on their own behalf or on behalf of corporations and/or government, and in this way they control and own 100% of the supply of printed or electronically issued money.

This power is exercised through the Bank of Canada and the Chartered Banks. **All money in Canada is created by the banks (licensed [private] credit grantors) when it is *borrowed* from the banks.**

The banks do not have the money they loan you. They create it at the time the loan is made, based upon our good credit. Our signature on a piece of paper, through an operation of law, allows the bank to grant this credit (money/bank deposit).

To add support to what we have just said, let us quote from page 287 of the Minutes of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce held in 1939:

Question from McGeer: *“But there is no question about it, that banks create that medium of exchange?” [i.e., bank deposits]*

Towers: *“That is right. That is what they are for.”*

McGeer: *“And they issue that medium of exchange when they purchase securities or make loans?”*

Towers: *“That is the banking business, just in the way that a steel plant makes steel.”*

Understanding that we have to go to work and earn the money to repay our loan(s) to the bankers who never had the money to begin with, it should alarm us and be sufficient impetus for us to learn more and determine what we can do about it.

We, through our government, should be creating the money supply for the people and that money should only be a *medium of exchange*, subject to strict rules and those in charge of its creation and control, held to full accountability.

To prove the point, let us quote again from the aforementioned Minutes:

“It is absurd to say that our country can issue \$30,000,000 in bonds and not \$30,000,000 in currency. Both are promises to pay; but one promise fattens the usurer and the other helps the people”, and;

“It is the people who constitute the basis of government credit. Why then cannot the people have the benefit of their own gilt-edged credit by receiving non-interest bearing currency, instead of the bankers receiving the benefit of the people’s credit in interest bearing bonds?”

“Income taxes pay the interest to the bondholders.”

Please understand that the “usurer” referred to in this quote is the private bankers.

Under the present Canadian monetary system, when interest is charged on borrowed money, it creates a mathematical impossibility. That mathematical impossibility is the ability to repay the loan plus the interest because the money with which to pay the interest is never created.

In other words, we will have to pay the interest from the money we borrowed which leaves less money in existence than we borrowed in the first place, thus the mathematical impossibility. After the first interest payment is made there is less money left than we borrowed, therefore it is impossible to repay the loan.

This is slavery and theft because when we cannot repay any part of the loan, because some of the borrowed money had to be consumed in the payment of interest, the bank takes the

goods and services that we acquired with the borrowed funds (bankruptcy).

The Banks put nothing into the transaction but because of the operation of law, ends up with everything.

It is important that everyone understands this next statement; with all the money available to banks, the banks can, and have, taken control of all the media, the food production companies, all transportation, etc., etc., and as debtor to “the Banks” the government is told which laws to pass and how to treat the people, etc. The old biblical saying that *the borrower is servant to the lender* takes on a whole new meaning now doesn't it?

So, now we know who controls this entire system that we live under. It is not the government; it is Banks, “the Cartel”. However, the government can fix the problem because they are the ones that are being used to implement and control the system for “the Cartel”, while governments are just pawns, wittingly or unwittingly.

We must find a way to encourage or legally force the government to make the necessary changes to rectify this problem - a rather easy fix, by utilizing the “IBHR”.

In these documents, the “IBHR”, are memorialized some of our natural rights, referred to as *human* rights, which we can **assert** or **waive**, at our option.

This is as simple as I can make this message about the solution to ALL of our problems.

Before we start doing whatever we want (***which is our actual right as free human beings, as long as we do no harm to another human being or his/her possessions***) we need to properly inform the government that we waive our **right** to recognition everywhere as a **person** by way of a Notice and Claim and/or waiver of our intrinsic natural or human rights according to our will.

Once this process is complete or perfected (regarding both the legal name and the associated person that results from operation of that name), we have standing (status) to enjoy our freedom and access our birthright (our patrimony), dominion over the earth and all things of it.

We have created the documents and developed the process whereby we can attain our freedom by establishing and having our status as human beings (men/women) recognized and allow us all to access our birthright (wealth/Patrimony). How to join us will be explained later.

APPENDIX D and the narrative that follows the Affidavit, will help one understand the extent to which the bankers and their lawyers have gone to create a system based on deceit and trickery to obtain our consent to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law, and

provide themselves with plausible deniability to a potential charge of enslavement or servitude.

Our posterity will suffer far more enslavement than we have and will find it impossible to do anything without permission from their slave-masters. That is inevitable. Look at what has happened to you and the rest of us human beings through even our own short lifetime.

Therefore the duty to our family, our children and grandchildren and others to come, is to address what is going on while we still can.

What we are advocating is simply asserting or waiving certain of our human rights according to our will. There is no criminality involved in that and therefore, nothing to fear.

While we cannot predict the future, we are satisfied things are going to get far worse than they are now because we understand the intentions of "the Cartel" - their intention of owning the entire earth and all human beings upon it and stealing the fruit of our labour along with all our natural wealth.

We can indeed "fight City Hall", and we can win using lawful means!

That's it folks. The rest is up to you.

No one can claim or waive your human rights, **only you can!**

Chapter 3

The legal name

TOC

We would be remiss if we did not warn you of the other important trick they play on us, in order to allow them to **recognize and treat us “AS IF” we are persons** or to proceed on the assumption that we have **not** waived our human right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law.

Waiving this human right means that none of their statutes and Acts (what they call law) apply to us, human beings, since we are not to be recognized as a **person**, having waived our human right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law (*if we avail ourselves of the process freely available to us as noted in the Foreword and at the end of this booklet*).

However, they, particularly the courts, get us to make joinder⁵ with the **legal name** that appears on our Certificate of Birth (*by getting us, by trickery or coercion, to give them a name, and particularly a name that sounds like their legal name*) and by doing so, they have the right to recognize us as a **person** before the law even though we have previously put them on Notice that we waive our human right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law.

First, we must understand that we are not a **name**; we are a human being (man/woman).

If our Creator named us 'man', then that is our name and that ONLY, is our name. We have all been taught, and it is very difficult to rid ourselves of that indoctrination - that we must have a name, if for no other reason, than to distinguish us one from the other.

The problem is that our parents started calling a word/noun/name to get our attention. We, as little human beings, started believing that we were that word/noun/name instead of understanding that we are a human being named 'man'/'woman', with a calling that we respond to. So people who want to get our attention, for example, can call that word/noun/name and we will respond or know that it is us, whose attention they are attempting to acquire.

A “name/calling” is a thing unto itself - a noun, and is something we have just like we have a car, a boat, a barn, etc., but our real or natural name is ‘man’. We also have a calling, which is most often improperly referred to as a name. However, our name is ‘man’ and nothing else. Our calling is something that is used to get our attention and to which we respond.

For example, my Dad & Mom called me Son, my wife calls me Honey, my children call me Daddy, and on it goes.

⁵ Joinder is a legal term which refers to the process of joining two or more legal issues/parties together...

Our parents gave certain required information related to our birth to government under compulsion of law (which did not apply to them as human beings, but applied to them only if they asserted their human right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law⁶), including our calling(s), referred to as *given names* along with the family or surname. The government registered that information and then the given names (callings) were combined with the family or surname, and a **legal name** was created, as an operation of law.

The bottom line is that we cannot admit to having a name other than '**man**' because the minute we do, the courts will assume it is the registered (legal) name and assume we are operating by that legal name/person and recognize us human beings as **persons** and consequently, assume jurisdiction over us.

We are going to tell you what we believe is truly going on in a few paragraphs, but we do not want you to concern yourself with this, but instead stick with the fact that we have no name other than 'man'/'woman', because the truth which follows (indented paragraphs), is going to be very difficult to defend, particularly in court where we are before a very clever judge, and most of them are clever.

The government holds the paper title (birth registration document), more accurately, the evidence of title in the names that our parents gave us. If it is our (given) names (our gift), why is the government holding the birth registration document (document of title), commonly called the Statement of Birth ("SOB"), that our parents completed and sent to the government and the government registered?

It is not their name really; it is our (given) name(s), so the government must be holding the paper title in trust for us, otherwise, IT IS THEFT!

It is to our advantage that the government is the trustee in this situation because there is a large trust called Canada and the SOB is evidence of our share of that trust (our Patrimony).

As trustee, the government is liable for all debts in the legal name and we, as holders of the better title (it is our gift/names), are the Grantor/beneficiary of the Estate and the government being the holder only of the paper (legal) title, is the trustee and as such, they are financially and legally liable for all business done in that legal name. The government holds the paper title to the things purchased, while we beneficiaries have possession and enjoyment.

The holder of the legal title in property is the one the law recognizes and holds liable as the owner (see Black's Law Dictionary if you wish confirmation).

6 Article 6 of the "UDHR" and Article 16 of the "ICCPR"

In reality, things do not operate this way because we got in the way and thinking that we were the trustee for the legal name, assumed all commercial and legal liabilities in the legal name, believing that we are the owners of the things registered in that name.

The fact is, we are not the owner and we are not the trustee, at least not on paper, and it is the paper that matters in the commercial system and in that system the trustee (government) is to take care of the debt and we enjoy the assets/benefits. It could not be better, if it was actually working that way.

These truths are not going to be easy to defend, so we prefer that you use the logic that we have and will lay out below, and use the procedures in court that we recommend. They are simpler to understand and implement in court – a very difficult place for a human being to be and keep his/her senses about them.

Let's continue then.

We are not a name and if we have put them on Notice that we waive our human right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law, then we are not to be recognized as a **person**. If they are to obtain authority/jurisdiction over us, a human being, they must then resort to trickery and deceit to entice or coerce us into making joinder with the **legal name** (*the name appearing on your Certificate of Birth*), thus giving them (mostly the courts), at least in their minds, the authority to deem that we are wishing to be recognized “as if” we are a (legal) **person** before the law.

The **calling of the name** to which we are referred, may be John-Henry and we may be of the family or lineage of Doe. The family name, or surname as the government calls it, is not even part of the **calling of the name** to which we are referred. That surname is nothing more than a description of our ‘roots’ or lineage. That is not to say that the way to answer the question, “what is your name?” is to simply not give them your family name. Again, **our name is ‘man’**. The calling of **the** name (not our name) ‘John-Henry’ is the means to gain our attention or to refer to (not recognize) us.

However, if we give them our calling, they will still assume it to be the legal name and recognize our operation of that name as our willingness to be recognized as a **person**. That is why we are suggesting that one NEVER give them any name other than the name given to us by our creator, “**Man**”.

Under authority of the *Vital Statistics Act*, the government compelled our parents to provide certain information to the government (the Registrar General) concerning the event of our birth.

As stated earlier, using that information, the government then created a Registered (**Legal**) **Name** by using the given names (calling(s)) and combining it (them) with the name of the

lineage into which we were born, Doe. Since it was born of the law, that name becomes a **legal name**, (*from which the person emerges*) whether or not we request a Certificate of Birth.

Now that the name is registered, we have a right to conduct commerce (*opening a bank account and buying and selling*) in that **legal name**. In fact, to conduct commerce, we MUST use that **legal name**.

Operating in or as that **legal name**, however, is not without consequences because that legal name does not belong to us, it belongs to the government because the government registered it and is holding the title document (*unless they are holding it in trust for us which is not how things are operating today, so let's stick with what we can prove - the government is holding the title document so it must be their legal name*).

I believe that the system is designed so that we should simply be able to use the **legal person** to conduct commerce without any negative personal (human) consequences, with the government being liable for the debts (legal and financial). However, that is not what the agents of the government recognize as our right and the government's responsibility.

This makes sense only if we understand that all natural resources belong to we the people and the government is simply managing them on our behalf. When these resources are disposed of, the government is to retain sufficient funds to cover the cost of its own operations and then turn the remainder over to us.

This is essentially confirmed in the "IBHR" which states at Article 1(2) of the "ICESCR", "*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.*"

When we present a Certificate of Birth to anyone in the system and they ask us if that "name" is you or is that *your* name and we answer yes, we have done two things. First, we have lied because that **legal name** is born of the law and belongs to the government that registered it (and is holding the paper title), and that **legal name** cannot **be** us, we can only act "as if" we are it. A man is a human being but a name is an "it" and a person is an 'it' and a defendant is an 'it' and a Judge is an 'it'. A human being can only **be** a human being whose name is 'man'.

Secondly, we have agreed to operate as "if we" are the name, or to act "as if" we are something over which the government and all its agents have authority or what they call jurisdiction, the **legal name**, or JOHN HENRY DOE.

In other words, our action of operating "as if" we are the name effectively makes joinder (combined with) between us and their **legal name**. This, at least in the mind of a judge, expresses our (tacit) consent to assert our human right to recognition everywhere as a

person before the law. This then, gives the judge the jurisdiction to administer all their statutes and Acts that apply exclusively to **persons**, against us, human beings, because we are operating “as if” we are the **legal name, a person**.

To summarize, if we have given a Notice of waiver of our human right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law, but then give the court any name other than ‘man’, particularly one that sounds like their **legal name (or part of your legal name, i.e. John or John Henry)**, we have just effectively reversed our decision to waive that particular right and we will be recognized as a **person** by the court.

This permits the court to deem us (*because of the joinder with their legal name*) to be acting “as if” we are a **person** and giving the court jurisdiction over us, a human being, and the right to administer the provisions of all statutes and Acts that apply exclusively to **persons**, to us, human beings (*because we have operated in or as if we are the legal name/person*).

This becomes very important because when the government or its agents lay charges, they ALWAYS have to use a name on their charging instruments (*except for real crimes such as harming another or damaging their property*) and that name is ALWAYS the **legal (registered) name** which they own.

When we show up in court and give the court a name, particularly one that sounds exactly like their **legal name (or a derivative of that legal name)**, we effectively make joinder with their **legal name** (*we are no longer recognized as a human being, we are treated “as if” we are a person*) and **we**, the human being, combined with the **legal name** we are operating, form a new entity that is recognized everywhere as a **person** before the law and the court assumes that this is our will and our voluntary act and deed.

However, it will not matter what name we give a court other than ‘man’, the court will assume it to be their registered **legal name** and we are making joinder with it and thus we will be recognized everywhere as a **person** before the law and having studied this booklet to this point, we should have an understanding of the negative implications of that recognition.

There is something else we should bring to your attention at this point.

The question is, “Who is ‘**you**’?”

A judge will NEVER say, “*I sentence you, John Doe, to...*” If the judge said this, he/she would be sentencing a human being and they have no authority/jurisdiction over human beings, they only have authority/jurisdiction over **persons (legal fictions)** (*again, unless we have committed the real crime of harming another or their property*).

A judge may say something like, “**John Doe, I sentence “you” to...**” In this example, the judge is simply telling you that he/she is sentencing the **legal person** over which he/she has

authority/jurisdiction, not the human being.

For example, what the judge said is like saying, “*John, I am sentencing Harry to...*” If this happened, we would probably (at least I hope we would) ask, “Who is Harry?” At the very least, we should be asking who “you” is.

The sentence has nothing to do with us, but if we believe that we are the **legal person**, then we will volunteer to pay the price. We are tricked into going to jail for offending fictional laws, not natural or real law where there is harm to another or damage to property. Most human beings are in jail today because they volunteered to do so.

It is exactly like the game of Monopoly. If our token (legal name/person) is sent to jail, we would not go to jail but in the courts today, we actually do – and it is all voluntary!

It is entrapment at its very best. I said before, they are very clever.

These are some of the tricks that they play on us to gain jurisdiction over us human beings and to execute their laws (statutes and Acts) against us - otherwise free and equal human beings (men and women).

Chapter 4

The Trust/Estate

TOC

In order to complete our understanding of what is going on in our country and the courts today, it is necessary to complete the puzzle by inserting one more piece, and that piece is an understanding of whether there is a trust relationship between we human beings and the government.

It will become obvious how this can be used in combination with our human rights issues when we get to the next Chapter and review the suggestions for dealing with the courts.

The issue of the existence of a Trust/Estate is critical because if there is a Trust/Estate, then we human beings are the Grantors and sole Beneficiaries of the Trust and that makes the government and all its agents the Trustee(s).

If we advance the position that we waive our human right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law, indeed, it follows, that none of the Statutes and Acts that apply to persons, apply to us, human beings who have so waived this right, and the Statutes and Acts do indeed apply exclusively to **persons** as outlined in previous Chapters.

However, if we fail to address the existence of the Trust/Estate, then others who consider themselves authorities, particularly the courts, could move against us as Trustees in breach of trust of our own Trust /Estate because we failed to inform them that we are the Grantor and sole Beneficiary of that Trust/Estate.

What we believe is going on in the courts for example, is the government/Crown considers itself the Beneficiary of the Trust/Estate, the judge is the Executor and we are considered a Trustee in breach of trust. This may or may not be the case but we are unable to prove it one way or the other, but it certainly is a fact that we are not being treated as the Grantor and sole Beneficiary that we really are.

If we are indeed the Grantors of that Trust/Estate and if the government is the Trustee(s), we are the king(s), euphemistically speaking and government is our servant.

It would then make sense to say the government is managing our natural resources for our benefit and ask the question, "where is our cheque?"

As authoritative support for our position on human rights, we look to the **International Bill of Human Rights ("IBHR")**, as pointed out in previous chapters of this book. The "IBHR" is authoritative support in that it is legally binding upon the government and recognizes (keep in

mind it does not **give** us any rights) some of our natural rights we were born with, calling them human rights.

With this Trust issue, however, we have no authoritative document to which we can turn to prove the existence of the Trust, we simply have to use logic and reasoning combined with the definition of certain terms such as *Trust*, *Trustee*, *Estate*, *Constructive Trust* and *Trustee De Son Tort* to name just a few.

Therefore, let's start with some definitions.

The following definitions are taken from Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia:

Trust:

In [common law](#) legal systems, a **trust** is a relationship whereby [property](#) (real or personal, tangible or intangible) is held by one party for the benefit of another. A trust conventionally arises when property is transferred by one party to be held by another party for the benefit of a third party, although it is also possible for a legal owner to create a trust of property without transferring it to anyone else, simply by declaring that the property will henceforth be held for the benefit of the beneficiary.

A trust is created by a [settlor](#) (archaically known, in the context of trusts of land, as the *feoffor to uses*), who transfers some or all of his property to a [trustee](#) (archaically known, in the context of land, as the *feoffee to uses*), who holds that trust property (or *trust corpus*) for the benefit of the [beneficiaries](#) (archaically known as the *cestui que use*, or *cestui que trust*).

In the case of the self-declared trust, the [settlor](#) and [trustee](#) are the same person. The trustee has legal title to the trust property, but the beneficiaries have equitable title to the trust property (separation of control and ownership). The trustee owes a [fiduciary](#) duty to the beneficiaries, who are the "beneficial" owners of the trust property. (Note: A trustee may be either a human being (known in law as a natural person), or an artificial person (such as a [company](#) or a [public body](#)), and there may be a single trustee or multiple co-trustees. There may be a single beneficiary or multiple beneficiaries. The settlor may himself be a beneficiary.)

The trust is governed by the terms under which it was created. The terms of the trust are usually written down in a trust instrument or [deed](#) but, in England and Wales, it is not necessary for them to be written down to be legally binding, except in the case of land.

The terms of the trust must specify what property is to be transferred into the trust (certainty of subject-matter), and who the beneficiaries will be of that trust (certainty of

objects). It may also set out the detailed powers and duties of the trustees (such as powers of investment, powers to vary the interests of the beneficiaries, and powers to appoint new trustees). The trust is also governed by local law. The trustee is obliged to administer the trust in accordance with both the terms of the trust and the governing law.

The [settlor](#) is also called the trustor, grantor, donor or creator. In some other jurisdictions, the settlor may also be known as the "founder".

Estate:

An **estate** is the [net worth](#) of a person at any point in time. It is the sum of a person's [assets](#) – legal rights, interests and entitlements to [property](#) of any kind – less all [liabilities](#) at that time. The issue is of special legal significance on a question of [bankruptcy](#) and death of the person.

Depending on the context, the term is also used in reference to an [estate in land](#) or of a particular kind of property (such as [real estate](#) or [personal estate](#)). The term is also used to refer to the sum of a person's assets only.

Superimposed on the legal estate and interests in land, English courts also created "[equitable interests](#)" over the same [legal interests](#). These obligations are called [trusts](#) which will be enforceable in a [court](#). A [trustee](#) is the person who holds the [legal title](#) to property, while the [beneficiary](#) is said to have an equitable interest in the property.

So, what we can logically conclude from the above definitions is that the two terms, Trust and Estate, are somewhat interchangeable, but not exactly.

We suggest the best definition to use when referring to a situation where title is split, is probably Trust, but I truly like Estate. Since it really does not matter, this author will use Trust/Estate and in that way there can be no misunderstanding of what we are speaking.

A Trust exists when the title in anything is divided or split between two or more parties. When Equitable title is held by one party and Legal title is held by another, then a Trust relationship exists.

The following definitions are taken from Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia:

The **equitable title** is the right to obtain full ownership of [property](#), where another maintains legal title to the property. **Legal title** is actual ownership of the property. When a contract for the sale of land is executed, equitable title passes to the buyer. When the conditions on the sale contract have been met, legal title passes to the buyer in what is known as **closing**. Legal and equitable title also arises in [trust](#). In a trust,

one person may own the legal title, such as the [trustees](#). Another may own the equitable title such as the [beneficiary](#).

Therefore, it makes sense that when we were born and inherited an equal share of the earth and all things of it (our birthright), it was transferred/granted to the government/trustee via the birth registration process. The government/trustee became the legal title holder of our birthright and we, human beings, became the Grantor(s) and sole beneficiary(ies), the equitable title holder(s)/owner(s).

There are other terms that must be defined and understood before one can determine if there is really a trust relationship between we human beings and the government. However, the foregoing is very persuasive.

The following definitions are taken from the Dictionary of Canadian Law 2nd Edition by Dukelow & Nuse:

Trust. *“...A trust arises...whenever a person is compelled in equity to hold property over which he has control for the benefit of others (the beneficiary) in such a way that the benefit of the property accrues not to the trustee, but to the beneficiaries.”*

Trustee. 1. *“Someone who holds property in trust.”*

Trustee De Son Tort. *“A person treated like a trustee even though not appointed as a trustee, who assumes responsibility to hold trust property for a beneficiary.”*

Constructive Trust. *“...[A] remedy against unjust enrichment and that before unjust enrichment may...exist, three elements must be shown – an enrichment, a corresponding deprivation and the absence of any 'juristic reason' for the enrichment.”*

Since the government holds the best evidence of title (legal/paper title) in the name of child appearing on the birth registration document (“SOB”), and since that evidence of title and the names on it, may have been intended for the child, then the government must be holding the document of title in Trust, making the “Crown” the **Trustee** or the **Trustee De Son Tort**, as the case may be. **Because there is a trust relationship, we are the equitable owner of that legal name/Trust/Estate.**

It is irrefutable that the government is also holding the legal title of all assets in the possession of all human beings on this land mass commonly known as Canada, and is also holding and managing the earth and all natural resources thereof, resources that were deeded to all human beings equally, by our Creator (Genesis 1:26-28).

It is not expected that anyone will argue that the natural resources of this nation do not belong to the human beings who occupy the land mass commonly known as Canada.

In the event anyone wishes to argue that there is no trust or trust relationship between government/Crown and we human beings, then this argument must fail because of an operation of law which is intended to provide remedy, in the form of a **Constructive Trust**.

As Grantor of the Trust/Estate, we are the king, euphemistically speaking, and the government and all its agents (*everyone who is acting as an authority over us*) are the Trustee(s). If we do not like the way they are managing or administering our Estate, then we certainly have the power to revoke their Power of Attorney ("**POA**") to administrate our Trust/Estate, the JOHN HOWARD DOE, Trust/Estate.

Further, there is no reason we cannot do this revocation individually without having to do it collectively. However, if we do it individually, we should only be able to do so over our share of the Trust/Estate.

Of course, if we do individually revoke their POA, over our fish for example, that would allow us to fish without any interference from the so-called authorities and who is to say which fish is our share. I would personally say that any fish I catch is the one that represents my share. Who can argue?

We hope that you are convinced and can satisfy another that a Trust/Estate truly does exist wherein the government as Trustee is managing our natural resources (our birthright) on our behalf and that we are the Grantors and sole Beneficiaries of that Trust/Estate and further, the name of that Trust/Estate is the name appearing on the Birth Certificate.

If this is not so, then the government, who is controlling and managing the natural resources of this country, are doing so illegally, having committed theft, or are guilty of unjust enrichment or some such illegal act.

We do agree that because we cannot point to any document or words on a piece of paper to prove the existence of a Trust/Estate, we must establish such existence by the process of logical deduction and that is what we hope we have done.

The following was taken from a book titled "A Trustee's Handbook" by Augusta Peabody Loring:

"In addition to the complications that may arise from the relationship to the beneficiary, the trustee assumes all the liabilities involved in the ownership of property, and for neglect or errors in judgment in its management. He may be required to give bonds with sureties for the faithful performance of his duties." [underline mine for emphases]

Obviously then, we are right when we claim that the government, as Trustee (holder of legal title) of our Trust/Estate, must pay for everything and must not damage us in any way including executing any of their Statutes and Acts against us, the Beneficiary (holder of

equitable title).

Additionally, we became the Grantor of the Trust/Estate when we became of age since our birthright was granted to the government (Trustee) at birth by our parents.

We should also keep in mind that aside from the obvious existence of a Trust/Estate, everything is a contract.

There are certain elements of a contract that must exist for the contract to be valid in the common law tradition and they include, offer, acceptance, and consideration. The parties themselves must be capable of contracting and must have the intention to create legal relations.

When we complete an Application for a Driver's License we are entering into a contractual relationship with the government. The problem, of course, is that no one ever told us we were entering into a contract which infers that we have the option of not doing so and of course, as free men and women, we did not have to do so.

This non-disclosure would void the contract if we wished to do so, and at some point we may want to do so with all contracts.

In conclusion, we are the Grantor and sole Beneficiary of the Trust/Estate bearing the name on the Birth Certificate and the government is the Trustee(s). We are the authority and the Trustee is the servant.

We hope this is clear now.

Chapter 5

Appearing in Court

TOC

If we are summoned to court under one or more of the government Acts or Statutes, this booklet would be incomplete without some specific suggestions on how to behave and hopefully, defeat them at their game – and it is a game.

Although the following has not yet been *extensively* tested in the courts since this information is so new, it has been successfully tested on a very limited and isolated basis.

Thus far, in the limited number of cases in which this has been tested, the Crown has withdrawn the charges so the matter did not even come before the court.

We take this opportunity to inform everyone in the event that if what we suggest hereunder does not have the desired effect, we are presently working on documents that will allow us to appeal to a higher court for remedy against any unfavourable decision of a lower court. So take heart and believe in what you now know.

In any court matter involving an offence under a statute or Act that applies exclusively to **persons**, such as the **Fisheries Act**, the **Income Tax Act**, the **Child and Family Services Act**, the **Highway Traffic Act**, and many others, one must prepare an Affidavit (*see Appendix A to D – remember, we must change all yellow highlights to fit our individual particulars*), or some other document, that makes it perfectly clear we are waiving our human right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law (*Article 6, Universal Declaration of human Rights and Article 16, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*).

Additionally, one must keep in mind when entering the courts today, the Judge on the Bench is in a very serious conflict of interest. Judges are appointed and paid by the same employer that appoints and pays the Crown Attorney - the government. The proof of this is contained in the following quotation from the Supreme Court of Canada in *Canada (Human Rights Commission) v. Canadian Liberty Net [1998] S.C.J. No. 31*;

“The provincial superior courts have always occupied a position of prime importance in the constitutional pattern of this country. They are the descendants of the Royal Courts of Justice as courts of general jurisdiction. They cross the dividing line, as it were, in the federal-provincial scheme of division of jurisdiction, being organized by the provinces under s. 92(14) of the Constitution Act and are presided over by judges appointed and paid by the federal government (sections 96 and 100 of the Constitution Act).”

What, then, is the solution?

The solution lies in the right to be tried by a jury of one's peers, known as *Trial by Jury*, not what is commonly confused with this right today, a Jury Trial (trial by judge and jury).

The following quotations from a book titled "*Trial by Jury*" authored by a 19th Century American Lawyer by the name of Lysander Spooner, might explain how court should operate:

For almost eight hundred years --- that is, since Magna Carta, of 1215 --- there has been no clearer principle of English or Canadian constitutional law, than that, in criminal cases, it is not only the right and duty of juries to judge what are the facts, what is the law, and what was the moral intent of the accused; but that it is also their right, and their primary and paramount duty, to judge the justice of the law, and to hold all laws invalid, that are, in their opinion, unjust or oppressive, and all people guiltless in violating, or resisting the execution of, such laws.

Unless such is the right and duty of jurors, it is plain that, instead of juries being a "palladium of liberty" --- a barrier against the tyranny and oppression of the government --- they are really mere tools in its hands. Tools for the execution of any injustice and oppression it, the government, may desire to have executed.

But for their right to judge the law, and the justice of the law, juries would be no protection to an accused person, even as to matters of fact; for, if the government can dictate to a jury any law whatever, in a criminal case, it can certainly dictate to them the laws of evidence. That is, it can dictate what evidence is admissible, and what is inadmissible, and also what force or weight is to be given to the evidence admitted. And if the government can thus dictate to a jury the laws of evidence, it can not only make it necessary for them to convict on a partial exhibition of the evidence rightfully pertaining to the case, but it can even require them to convict on any evidence whatever that it pleases to offer them.

That the rights and duties of jurors must necessarily be such as are here claimed for them, will be evident when it is considered what the trial by jury is, and what its object is.

"The trial by jury," then, is a "trial by the country" --- that is by the people as distinguished from a trial by the government.

What we have today, trial by government appointed and paid judges, is most adamantly not what the people need to protect their freedoms. Such a situation will absolutely result in the total eradication of freedom – as is currently happening today in Canada.

The following are general instructions concerning the Affidavits that appear in the Appendices.

As regards the "style of cause" (that is what they call the heading where it names the court

and the accused, etc.), always make it the same as what they use. They will insert the name of the accused as the name of the **legal person** and we should insert it in the exact same manner as they do.

Finally, never use a “signature”, that is identifiable as a “signature”, such as writing the name that we heretofore thought was ours, as many do. Simply make a “mark” where we have to sign the Affidavit. In this way if the judge asks if that is our “signature”, we can honestly reply, **“no, that is not my signature”**. They will try to make joinder between us, the human being, and the **legal name** in many ways, and this is just another way in which they attempt to do that.

This document, the Affidavit, should be placed in the court file before the matter comes before the court.

Once this is done, the court is aware of our waiver of certain of our human rights (*again a right is a choice, otherwise it is not a right and it is a compulsion*).

If the matter proceeds, we should be aware that the courts often play upon our ignorance of procedure.

For example, if the Affidavit is simply placed in the court file, it is not yet evidence that the court MUST consider in making its decision. We have been personally instructed by a judge that in order for the information in the Affidavit to be evidence; the Affidavit MUST be read from the witness box with us as the witness. This means that we can be cross examined by the Crown.

We do not believe it will ever go this far, but we need to be prepared in the event that it does.

We suggest three separate options if one is ever summoned to court. Use the one that suits you the best.

Option 1:

When you appear in the court and the matter is called, go forward and stand there and wait for the court to do the right thing – dismiss the matter (our limited experience to date is that the Crown usually withdraws the charges). If the court does not do the right thing and asks who you are, or what your name is, you should say, ***“I am here by special appearance to correct a mistake. The Crown appears to believe that I am the party charged and that I am recognized everywhere as a person before the law. I am here to inform the Crown and this court that I waive my human right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law and as such your Statutes and Acts do not apply to me, a human being. Further, the Crown believes that he/she is the administrator of my Trust/Estate, which he/she is not. I am the Grantor and sole Beneficiary of the JOHN HOWARD DOE, Trust/Estate and the Crown is a Trustee and because of its breach of trust for attacking my Trust/Estate, I am revoking his/her Power of Attorney, effective immediately, for***

cause. These are the mistakes that I am here to correct and the only reason I am here.”

In child welfare cases, things are different and I might say the following; *“I am here to put you on Notice that I (or we) waive my right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law and I (or we) am doing the same for my offspring. Further, you are attempting to administrate my offspring's Trust/Estate for which I (or we) am the Grantor, until my offspring becomes of age and my offspring is the sole Beneficiary. I (or we) am informing you that I (or we) am revoking your Power of Attorney, effective immediately, for cause I (or we) am demanding the return of my offspring since neither you, nor the “FCS” have jurisdiction over my (or our) offspring that were seized at 123 Any Road, Any town, Any Province, on (insert date here), since they are human beings and not to be recognized as persons. ”* **Note:** We should not refer to our offspring by name. Simply refer to when and where our offspring were seized.

If the judge does not simply dismiss the charges at this point and starts to threaten you in an attempt to entice or coerce you into giving him/her a name, we **MUST NOT GIVE HIM or HER A NAME UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES** because we now know what he/she is up to. They are trying to get us to make joinder with or act in, or “as if” we are operating, the **legal name** and thereby essentially entrap us into effectively reversing our decision of waiving our human right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law.

What we suggest is that one respond by saying, *“my name is 'man' and it is not registered.”* (Our name is the same as every other human being on earth and does not belong to us exclusively and it certainly is not registered).

If the judge continues to insist we provide the court with a name other than the one we just gave him/her, which is truly the only name we can prove we have, we suggest that one say, *“I am curious as to why you require a name since my only purpose here today is to assist the court in correcting a mistake. Is the reason you want me to give you a name so you can pretend I am operating as if I am that (registered) name, thereby enabling you to recognize me as a person before the law and in that way, gain jurisdiction to administer your statutes and Acts against me, a human being?”*

“Are you asking me to testify against myself?”

This really ought to end it. The court cannot possibly find us in contempt of court since we have simply asked a question that the court is apparently not prepared to answer and if we continue to repeat the question, then a stalemate will exist and the court will, I predict, give up and send us on our way.

Option 2:

When we walk into court, whether or not we have provided the court with an affidavit (**which**

we strongly urge everyone to do if there is sufficient time and if there is no time to do so, then we should take one with us), you simply walk forward at the calling of the matter and say, ***“I am a human being. I am not a name, I am not a person, I am not a Defendant. They are all legal fictions that cannot stand before you or speak as I am now.***

I am clearly a human being. This (whatever document that they sent you demanding your presence in court) was given to me and it is clearly for a name or person or Trust/Estate the legal title (ownership) in which is being held by the Province and I am the Grantor and sole Beneficiary of that Trust/Estate.

Further, jurisdiction that devolves from the Act devolves to you over persons and I have waived my human right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law and this law, therefore, does not apply to me, a human being.

You do whatever it is that you wish to do to the legal name/person/defendant BUT MAKE DAMN SURE IT DOES NOT AFFECT THIS MAN! I am hereby revoking your Power of Attorney to administrate the Trust/Estate and demand that you dismiss this matter immediately”. Then you simply leave.

Option 3:

When the matter is called, walk forward and simply state, ***“With all due respect, I waive my human right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law. The law is the law! Further, I am the Grantor and sole Beneficiary of the JOHN HOWARD DOE, Trust/Estate and you are the Trustee(s). As such, I hereby inform you that I am revoking your Power of Attorney to administrate my Trust/Estate, effective immediately, for cause”***

If the judge does anything other than dismiss the matter and starts asking questions, the only thing we say is, ***“With all due respect, I waive my human right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law. The law is the law! Further, I am the Grantor and sole Beneficiary of the JOHN HOWARD DOE, Trust/Estate and you are the Trustee(s). As such, I hereby inform you that I am revoking your Power of Attorney to administrate my Trust/Estate, effective immediately, for cause”***

We are providing an answer to the judge's questions while not being disrespectful, so eventually the judge should give up and dismiss the matter because it is unimaginable how the court could charge us or even threaten to charge us with contempt of court.

If they proceed, they are proceeding against the **legal person**, so we should either leave or say, ***“It looks like my business here is done. Unless there is something else I can assist the court with, I'll be leaving now unless I can be of further assistance to you?”*** and then leave.

When we successfully avoid giving the court any name other than “man”, combined with the waiver of our *human* right to recognition as a **person**, we have circumvented their game of deceit and trickery and established who we really are, a human being and not a human being operating *in* or *as if* he or she is a name or a **legal person**. They then have no jurisdiction over us, human beings, and they have no legal right to execute their statutes and Acts (what they call law) against us, human beings.

Remember, our name is 'man' or 'woman'. We were named such by our Creator (Genesis 1: 26 and Genesis 2: 23). There are various callings to which we respond including, but not limited to dad, honey, mom, son, daughter and in our example, john. None of these should be considered a name, they are a *calling*.

According to the compilation of the most ancient writings on earth, the Bible, we are told that God will give us a new name someday (*Revelation 2: 17 & 3: 12; Isaiah 62: 2*). But until then, our name is man, with various callings that other human beings use to get our attention, but our name remains ‘man’.

We are now free and equal with all other human beings, while all legal fictions, such as government, lawyers, CRA agents, etc., are our servants, not our authorities. This is so because legal fictions are created by man (law) and certainly cannot have authority over human beings.

Remember, this will not work where one is charged with harming another or damaging their property, nor should it, because those violations are *real* crimes and no name is even necessary to prosecute them. There is a damaged human being and possibly witnesses, who can point to the perpetrator and say that this is the human being who harmed another or me.

In the event one may be thinking that all of the things revealed in this booklet are just one more of the theories promulgated by a group of fanatics, or an "Organized Pseudo- Legal Commercial Argument⁷", please understand that every thing we are saying is supported by law, either domestic or international, and we hope we have been able to demonstrate this fact to your satisfaction.

The following information is second hand, but it is my understanding that Jonathan (the man who is behind our website) has been in regular dialogue with an informal “Committee” of government people and together they have been working on strategies to help bring about remedy and at least some of those “Committee” members, have also filed our **Universal Declaration of Private Law** and intend to follow the process outlined below.

Further, it is our understanding that this “Committee” was established as a result of someone being assigned by the Office of the Governor General to review and make suggestions as to

⁷ Meads v. Meads, 2012 ABQB 571

how they should respond to our previous Claim of Right documents sent to them, and his questions arising from that document, stimulated this dialogue.

The intentions of the committee seem to include their commitment to meet with the recipients of our **Declaration** and explain what it is all about and try to “pave the way” for us to either obtain remedy, or help make the necessary changes so that our desired remedy can and will result.

For further study, please watch the videos at www.etrnallyaware.com. Please keep in mind this site does not deal with the issue of the **legal name** in any meaningful way, which as we have discussed in this section, is the way, we believe, the courts trick us into acting as if we are the **legal person**.

Additionally, please visit www.naturalgod.com/NaturalCommerce.html

Finally, you may find some helpful material at www.wallydove.wordpress.com

We have already completed documents to enable everyone to commence the **process** of notifying the government of his/her status, make demands on them, including a demand for our Patrimony, and if there is no response or remedial action forthcoming from government, then we have also prepared a report for everyone to send to the Petitions Committee of, or related to, the Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights at the United Nations.

The documents are the **Declaration of Private Law**, the **Notice and Demand**, and finally, the **Report to the Petitions Committee** at the United Nations requesting an investigation of the violation of our human rights.

There are, as far as we can tell, three kinds of people on this planet. First, there are those who wish to control others, and just like parasites, live off the productivity of others. Second, there are those who wish to be controlled, recognizable as those who will say, “We must have rules”, or “If people are free then they will abuse our resources (as if that is not happening now)”. Third, there are those who do not want to be either, who do not want to control or be controlled. In other words, they want to be free as we were all born to be.

If you are in the third category of people mentioned above, and wish to join with us in this **process**, please send an e-mail to our co-ordinator, at humanrightsdefendersleague@gmail.com

Have a happy life.

Chapter 6

FAQ's

TOC

We have added this Chapter to address Frequently Asked Questions in order to avoid having to revise the booklet each time we discover there are questions that have not been fully answered within the contents of the booklet itself. If we had to revise the booklet each time we discovered a question that was not answered to the satisfaction of the reader, we would undoubtedly be revising the booklet constantly. By adding this Chapter, we can simply add to it each time we are asked a question that is not completely answered in the booklet.

Question: 1 If I file my Declaration, waiving my right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law, does this mean I cannot obtain my Real Estate License since I need to be recognized as a person in order to do so?

Answer: No, it does not mean you cannot obtain a Real Estate License. The legal person (name) is exactly the same as a token we receive when we play the game of Monopoly. That token entitles us to play in the game but it does not mean we are the token. In the same way our legal person has been given to us to enable us to play in the game of Commerce (buying and selling), but when it is used to do so, **it does not make us the legal person?**

The problem to date, of course, is that those agents of government and others, including ourselves (heretofore), believe we are that legal person (token) and treat us as if we are. This is a mistake we are correcting with our Declaration and other follow-up documents.

Question: 2 If I file the Declaration does it mean that I will lose (or not be entitled to) my Canada Pension?

Answer: Of course not. The CPP is something that you are entitled to for having contributed to it. You would be entitled to everything you are currently entitled to i.e. Disability, Employment Insurance, subsidized housing, Old Age Security, Guaranteed Income Supplement, etc. It should all be viewed as simply a portion of your Patrimony (the value of the natural resources harvested from this country). In fact, you are entitled too much, much more than the pittance you may be receiving in retirement and that is part of what we intend to rectify with our process, in addition to our freedom of course.

Question: 3 Should the Declaration (or Notice and Demand if we have sent it), be attached to our Affidavits if it is necessary to file them with the court?

Answer: Yes, it is a very good idea to add the Declaration and the Notice and Demands as an **Exhibit** to an Affidavit that you are intending to file with the court and serve upon the Crown.

Question: 4 Can I choose which human rights I waive and which human rights I assert?

Answer: Of course we can. Rights are individual and not collective. One does not have to choose to waive or assert all our rights; otherwise it would constitute obligations, not rights. In fact, we can choose in any given circumstances to either exercise a particular right or to waive that right. Remember that human rights are simply a memorialization (writing down on paper) certain of our natural rights. The International Bill of Human Rights ("IBHR") is a document that records some of our natural rights and is binding upon governments. The document does not give us anything; we are born with our rights. The IBHR simply binds governments to recognition of certain of those natural rights.

Question: 5 What about Driver's Licenses and Passports. Do I need them if I file my Declaration and establish my status.

Answer: Once you file your Declaration and continue with the process, you are to be recognized as a human being with not only full capacity, but with the right to do anything other than harm another or damage another's possession(s).

There are no limits on you so you do not need a Driver's License, etc. But the reality of the matter is, that until we have concluded our status negotiations with the government, we should do nothing to attract trouble to ourselves. The Cop on the side of the highway knows nothing about this so it is best to just do what they seem to think is required of us and carry a Driver's License, etc. In due course none of these things will be required of us.

Question: 6 How does joining this process and filing my Declaration, etc., affect my CPP, Old Age Security, etc.

Answer: The simple answer is that it does not affect them. The government owes you much, much more than the pittance they are currently paying out in those kinds of benefits.

The government (Crown) has seized control of your birthright (the earth and all things of it, including natural resources) and they are to be managing them on your behalf and for your benefit.

What they should be doing is selling those resources (if we accept that commerce is acceptable and necessary) for sufficient money to pay for their own operations and sending the remainder to you and I in equal portions.

This is not happening and amounts to nothing less than breach of trust. Of course their plausible deniability is that they have no reason to believe that we did not assert our human right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law and thus we wished to be part of their system of commerce, a citizen (servant/serfs) and avail ourselves of their benefits and to pay taxes, etc., etc.

Question: 7 Why is it important to not be recognized as a person. I thought I was already a person.

Answer: If you are already a person, then why does the International Bill of Human rights recognize your right to be recognized as a person. This automatically means that you are not (recognized as) a **person** naturally and are only recognized as a **person** before the law, once you assert your human right to be so recognized.

Further, since Article 1 of the “**UDHR**” states that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights, the only way that any human being or group of human beings can have authority over other human beings is if they are recognized as **persons** before the law, as opposed to human beings. The laws are then written to be applicable to **persons** and not human beings.

If the laws were written to apply to human beings then those human beings who wrote them and gave themselves authority over other human beings would be guilty of practising slavery or holding others in involuntary servitude.

APPENDIX A

Court file No.: 123456-5689-00

**ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(City)**

BETWEEN;

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES & OCEANS (or HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN)

-and-

JOHN HENRY DOE

AFFIDAVIT OF STATUS of 'man'

I, a human being whose name is 'man', your Affiant, sometimes responding to the calling John, being a living embodiment of the Divine Spirit, over the age of 18 years, competent to testify, and being duty bound to tell the truth as regards the facts related herein, state that I have first-hand knowledge of the facts stated herein and believe these facts to be true to the best of my knowledge.

1. I am a member of the Human Rights Defenders League in Canada and assert the rights and claim the protection outlined in the *Declaration on Human Rights Defenders; UN Resolution, A/Res/53/144, 8 March 1999*.
2. The *International Bill of Human Rights*, which is legally binding upon this court, DFO, the government of Canada and all its organs, is composed of three separate documents, the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (hereinafter "**UDHR**"), the *International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights* (hereinafter "**ICESCR**"),

and the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* (hereinafter “**ICCPR**”).

3. Specifically, and for greater certainty, I, a human being, am **waiving** my human right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law [*Article 6, “UDHR”* and *Article 16, “ICCPR”*], and my right to participate in government [*Article 21, “UDHR”*].
4. Further, I, a human being, am **asserting** my human right not to be held in slavery or servitude [*Article 4, “UDHR”, and Article 8, “ICCPR”*] and my right to privacy and to be free from arbitrary interference in my family, home or correspondence [*Article 12, “UDHR”*].
5. The *Fisheries Act*, RSC 1985, c. F-14 (hereinafter “**Fisheries Act**”), defines, “fishery officer” means a person who is designated as a fishery officer pursuant to subsection 5(1);”
 - ⤴ **25.** (1) Subject to the regulations, no person shall place or set any fishing gear or apparatus in any water, along any beach or within any fishery during a close time.
 - ⤴ **33.** No person shall purchase, sell or possess any fish that has been caught in contravention of this Act or the regulations.
 - ⤴ **40.** (1) Every person who contravenes subsection 35(1) is guilty of...
 - ⤴ **40.** (2) Every person who contravenes subsection 36(1) or (3) is guilty of...
 - ⤴ **40.** (3) Every person who...
6. It is very clear that a “**person**” is obligated under the “**Fisheries Act**” but **NOT** a human being. Neither this court nor the Department of Fisheries & Oceans (“DFO”)

can obligate a human being to be a **person** because if they do, they violate the *International Bill of Human Rights*.

7. As can be clearly seen, a fisheries official is a **person** and only **persons** are subject to the "*Fisheries Act*". Since I, a human being, have waived my right **to recognition everywhere as a person before the law**, then the "*Fisheries Act*" does not apply to me, a human being.
8. To force me, a human being, into compliance with the "*Fisheries Act*" would be to hold me, a human being (man or woman), in involuntary servitude (*Article 4, "UDHR" and Article 8, "ICCPR"*), amongst other violations.
9. Further, there is the issue of the JOHN HOWARD DOE, Trust/Estate.
10. It is an irrefutable fact that I was granted dominion over the earth and all things of it (natural resources/wealth) (Genesis 1:26-28).
11. Since the government(s) is/are controlling and managing my birthright (the earth and all things of it), they must be doing so in Trust for me.
12. A Trust exists when title is divided and one party, the holder of legal title, holds the property for the benefit of another, the Beneficiary or Equitable title holder.
13. That, of course, is a perfect description of what is happening as regards my birthright. My birthright was Granted to the government(s) by the very act of birth registration by my parents and upon achieving the age of majority, I became the Grantor and sole Beneficiary of that Trust/Estate with the government(s) remaining the Trustee, accountable to me, a human being whose name is 'man' and who is sometimes called john.

- 14. As Grantor and sole Beneficiary of the JOHN HOWARD DOE, Trust/Estate, I am revoking the Power of Attorney of all agents of government known as DFO Officers to administrate my Trust/Estate, for cause (breach of trust).
- 15. I am requesting that this court issue an Order for the DFO to return all the property they have taken from me, through my **legal person**, over the past 10 years, or in the alternative in legal tender plus interest at the pre-judgment and post-judgment rate.
- 16. Further violations of my natural, human or legal rights as waived or invoked according to my will, shall be deemed a breach of trust and a human rights violation to be dealt with in the appropriate manner.

Sworn/Affirmed before me at the City of

_____, in the Province of

Alberta, on the _____ day of _____ 2012.

 Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
Name of Lawyer
 LSUC #
 Barrister, Solicitor & Notary Public

A human being with intrinsic natural and human rights **'man'**

Instructions:

All yellow highlights in the Affidavit must be amended to reflect your circumstances.

This Affidavit is to be taken to the court to be placed in the court file prior to the hearing of your matter. Jurats must be whole as in all on one page.

The court may give you a hard time because it may not meet the pre-established criteria but I would simply say *“that is o.k. then, I will simply present it to the judge in court and explain to him that I did not want to surprise him/her with this document but I had no choice since the court office would not accept it and place it in the court file as I requested on (insert date here)”*

What I would probably say in court, if you choose to say anything other than what was suggested earlier in this booklet, is as follows: The DFO obtains its authority/jurisdiction from the *“Fisheries Act”*. The Fisheries Act applies exclusively to **persons**.

I, a human being who has been named 'man', have a recognized **right** to be recognized everywhere as a **person** before the law (*Article 6 of the “UDHR” and Article 16 of the “ICCPR”*).

A **right** is not a compulsion. No one can force me to be recognized as a **person** and remember, I am a **human being** and cannot **BE** anything else including a **person** but I can be **recognized** under law, **AS** a **person**.

If one can waive his right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law, then the *Fisheries Act* does not apply to him because the *“Fisheries Act”* applies exclusively to **persons**.

I put you on Notice that I waive my right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law. The government, however, assumes that I wish to assert all my recognized **rights**, all of them, including the **right** to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law, and that is why they exercise authority under the *Fisheries Act* against me, a human being, because they recognize me as a person before the law.

The only way government, DFO or any other **person** (government and all its agents are recognized as **persons**), has jurisdiction over me is because I have allowed them to recognize me as a **person** and in a group recognized as **persons** there is inequality but in a group recognized as **human beings**, there is equality.

I was born free and equal in dignity and rights (*Article 1, Universal Declaration of Human Rights*).

[TOC](#)

APPENDIX B

Court file No.: **123456-5689-00**

ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(City)

BETWEEN;

REGINA

-and-

JOHN HENRY DOE

AFFIDAVIT OF STATUS of 'man'

I, a human being whose name is 'man', your Affiant, sometimes responding to the calling John, being a living embodiment of the Divine Spirit, over the age of 18 years, competent to testify, and being duty bound to tell the truth as regards the facts related herein, state that I have first-hand knowledge of the facts stated herein and believe these facts to be true to the best of my knowledge.

1. I am a member of the Human Rights Defenders League in Canada and assert the rights and claim the protection outlined in the *Declaration on Human Rights Defenders; UN Resolution, A/Res/53/144, 8 March 1999*.
2. The *International Bill of Human Rights (hereinafter "IBHR")* which is legally binding upon this court, CRA, the government of Canada and all its organs, is composed of three separate documents, the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (hereinafter "*UDHR*"), the *International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights* (hereinafter

“ICESCR”), and the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* (hereinafter **“ICCPR”**).

3. I, a human being, am **waiving** my human right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law [*Article 6, “UDHR”* and *Article 16, “ICCPR”*], and my right to participate in government [*Article 21, “UDHR”*].
4. Further, I, a human being, am **asserting** my human right not to be held in slavery or servitude [*Article 4, “UDHR”, and Article 8, “ICCPR”*] and my right to privacy and to be free from arbitrary interference in my family, home or correspondence [*Article 12, “UDHR”*].
5. Section 248(1) of the *Canadian Income Tax Act*, R.S.C. 1985 (5th Supp.) c.1 (hereinafter **“ITA”**), as amended defines **“corporation”** as, **“includes an incorporated company”**.
6. Section 248(1) of the **“ITA”**, defines **“taxpayer”** as, **“includes any person whether or not liable to pay tax”**.
7. Section 248(1) of the **“ITA”** defines **“person”** as, **“...or any word or expression descriptive of a person, includes any corporation, and any entity exempt, because of subsection 149(1), from tax under Part 1 on all or part of the entity's taxable income and the heirs, executors, liquidators of a succession, administrators or other legal representatives of such a person, according to the law of that part of Canada to which the context extends”**.
8. It is very clear that a **“person”** is obligated under the **“ITA”** but **NOT** a human being. Neither this court nor Canada Revenue Agency (hereinafter **“CRA”**) can obligate a human being to be recognized as a **person** because if they do, they violate the **“IBHR”**.

9. As can be clearly seen, a taxpayer is a **person** and only **persons** are subject to the “**ITA**”. Since I, a human being, am waiving my right **to recognition everywhere as a person before the law**, then the “**ITA**” does not apply to me, a human being.
10. To force me, a human being, into compliance with the “**ITA**” would be to hold me, a human being (man or woman), in involuntary servitude (*Article 4, “UDHR” and Article 8, “ICCPR”*), amongst other violations.
11. Further, there is the issue of the **JOHN HOWARD DOE**, Trust/Estate.
12. It is an irrefutable fact that I was granted dominion over the earth and all things of it (natural resources/wealth) (Genesis 1:26-28).
13. Since the government(s) is/are controlling and managing my birthright (the earth and all things of it), they must be doing so in Trust for me.
14. A Trust exists when title is divided and one party, the holder of legal title, holds the property for the benefit of another, the Beneficiary or Equitable title holder.
15. That, of course, is a perfect description of what is happening as regards my birthright. My birthright was Granted to the government(s) by the very act of birth registration by my parents and upon achieving the age of majority, I became the Grantor and sole Beneficiary of that Trust/Estate with the government(s) remaining the Trustee, accountable to me, a human being whose name is 'man' and who is sometimes called **john**.
16. As Grantor and sole Beneficiary of the **JOHN HOWARD DOE**, Trust/Estate, I am revoking the Power of Attorney of all agents of government known as **CRA Agents** to

administrate my Trust/Estate, for cause (breach of trust).

17. I am demanding this court issue an Order for CRA to return all the monies they have taken from me, a human being, through my **legal person**, over the past 10 years plus interest at the appropriate legislated rate.

18. Further violations of my natural, human or legal rights as waived or invoked according to my will, shall be deemed a breach of trust and a human rights violation to be dealt with in the appropriate manner.

Jurat

Sworn/Affirmed before me at the City of

_____, in the Province of

Alberta, on the _____ day of _____ 2012.

Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
Name of Lawyer
LSUC #
Barrister, Solicitor & Notary Public

A human being with intrinsic natural and human rights **'man'**

TOC

APPENDIX C

Occurrence No. **OP123456**

ONTARIO COURT OF JUSTICE
Provincial OFFENCES
(City)

BETWEEN;

REGINA

-and-

JOHN HENRY DOE

AFFIDAVIT OF STATUS of 'man'

I, a human being whose name is **'man'**, your Affiant, sometimes responding to the calling **John**, being a living embodiment of the Divine Spirit, over the age of 18 years, competent to testify, and being duty bound to tell the truth as regards the facts related herein, state that I have first-hand knowledge of the facts stated herein and believe these facts to be true to the best of my knowledge.

1.I am a member of the Human Rights Defenders League in Canada and assert the rights and claim the protection outlined in the *Declaration on Human Rights Defenders; UN Resolution, A/Res/53/144, 8 March 1999.*

2.Pursuant to Section 794 of the *Criminal Code of Canada* (hereinafter "**CCC**") I have an exception, exemption, proviso, excuse or qualification as regards the charges in this matter under the *Highway Traffic Act.*

3. What follows discloses that such exception, exemption, proviso, excuse or qualification prescribed by law, does exist and jurisdiction over me, a human being does not exist under the *Highway Traffic Act* (hereinafter "**HTA**").

4. A Driver is defined in the "**HTA**" as, "**a person...**".

5. I am a human being whose name is (man or woman).

6. As a human being, I have a **right**, which I hereby inform this court that I **waive** my human right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law. Instead I assert/invoke my *natural* right to recognition everywhere as a human being.

7. If anyone enforces the provisions of the "**HTA**" against me, a human being, they will be effectively forcing me, contrary to my express will, to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law since the "**HTA**" applies only to **persons** and not human beings. Additionally, this would constitute a violation of another of my human rights, that being the right not be held in involuntary servitude.

8. It is acknowledged that legal dictionaries define the term **person** as being of two classes, **legal person** and **natural person**. A **natural person** includes a human being.

9. However, it cannot be argued that I am a **natural person** and therefore, subject to the "**HTA**", since I have waived my right to recognition everywhere as a **person** (of any class) before the law.

10. If you proceed against the **legal person**, JOHN HENRY DOE, and it is convicted, then you must speak to the holder of the *legal title* document, the Statement of Birth, for satisfaction of any financial or legal obligations, which holder, I understand, is the government of Alberta *(or the Province in which you were born)*.
11. Interference in any way with my **right** to freely travel about the earth over which I have been given dominion, is a violation of my **liberty**, a guarantee to which the government of Canada has committed to recognizing and respecting in Article 7 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and certainly which has been further recognized in the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (hereinafter "UDHR") in Article 1 thereof, which states, "*All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.*"
12. The "UDHR" further states at Article 9, "*No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.*" I, a human being, have certainly experienced a violation of that human right.
13. The "UDHR" further states at article 21, "*Everyone has the right to take part in the government...*" a **right** which I also **waive** and could therefore not be performing a function of government at the time of this incident.
14. Further, there is the issue of the JOHN HOWARD DOE, Trust/Estate.
15. It is an irrefutable fact that I was granted dominion over the earth and all things of it (natural resources/wealth) (Genesis 1:26-28).
16. Since the government(s) is/are controlling and managing my birthright (the earth and all things of it), they must be doing so in Trust for me.
17. A Trust exists when title is divided and one party, the holder of legal title, holds the

property for the benefit of another, the Beneficiary or Equitable title holder.

18. That, of course, is a perfect description of what is happening as regards my birthright. My birthright was Granted to the government(s) by the very act of birth registration by my parents and upon achieving the age of majority, I became the Grantor and sole Beneficiary of that Trust/Estate with the government(s) remaining the Trustee, accountable to me, a human being whose name is 'man' and who is sometimes called **john**.

19.As Grantor and sole Beneficiary of the **JOHN HOWARD DOE**, Trust/Estate, I am revoking the Power of Attorney of all agents of government known as **Crown Attorneys and Law Enforcement Officers, etc.** to administrate my Trust/Estate, for cause (breach of trust).

20.Therefore, the charges in this matter, as regards me the human being, must be dismissed.

Jurat
(sample)

Sworn/Affirmed before me at the City of

_____, in the Province of

Alberta, on the _____ day of _____ 2012.

Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
Name of Lawyer
LSUC #
Barrister, Solicitor & Notary Public

A human being with intrinsic natural and human rights **'man'**

More Information:

The following was cut from the original version of the Affidavit but is included here for your information.

We feel it is not necessary or advisable to include this in the Affidavit because it our experience that if there is any argument in the Affidavit the Judge can overcome, he/she will do that and simply ignore the thing that is most important and that he/she cannot deal with, such as the human rights issue, which, in our opinion, is the only issue that should be raised and the only one that is relevant.

The Right to travel is a Right, not a privilege:

The right to access to the highways of this country is reflected in the definition of the term "highway" contained in Section 2 of the "**CCC**", which states, "*'highway' means a road to which the public has the right of access, and includes bridges over which or tunnels through which a road passes;*" [underlining & bolding mine for emphasis]

A right is defined in Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition as, "*As a noun, and taken in a concrete sense, a power, privilege, faculty, or demand, inherent in one person and incident upon another. "Rights" are defined generally as "powers of free action."*"

Black's Law Dictionary also defines Liberty as, "*Freedom; exemption from extraneous control...The power of the will to follow the dictates of its unrestricted choice, and to direct the external acts of the individual without restraint, coercion, or control from other persons.*"

Liberty also includes the power of locomotion, according to Black's Law dictionary 5th Edition.

This **right** to liberty is recognized in Section 7 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

Therefore, I have the **right** to locomotion, and that includes doing so without license of any sort, while traveling in my **voluntary conveyance**.

If access to the highway is a **right** afforded to the public, then that **right** cannot be compromised in any manner by anyone, including but not limited to the requirement for a human being (man or woman) to have a license such as an "**Alberta** Operator's License" or any other license for that matter.

The definition of license in the Dictionary of Canadian Law is, “*1. The permission given to do something which would otherwise be unlawful.*”

The exercising of a **right** cannot, therefore, be interfered with by requiring a license of any sort since use of the highways is a **right**. Combined with my **right** to locomotion (liberty), means these charges must be dismissed as against me, the human being.

Adhesion Contract:

If the Crown wants to argue that I, a human being whose name is (man or woman), am bound to the “HTA” due to the existence of a contract and contractual obligations, then I remind the court that the contract entered into is an adhesion contract and void for lack of disclosure.

An adhesion contract is defined in the Free Dictionary by Farlex as, “*A type of contract, a legally binding agreement between two parties to do a certain thing, in which one side has all the bargaining power and uses it to write the contract primarily to his or her advantage.*”

The application for Driver's License and subsequent contractual agreement in this matter was prepared by the Plaintiff and I, the human being, had no negotiating power and it can be assumed that the Plaintiff drew up the terms and conditions to favour it.

Regardless, I, the human being, was never told that I was entering into a contract that I was under no obligation, as a human being, to enter into.

Further, I was not told I had any choice but to enter into the contract to obtain a Driver's License and in fact, I was told I could not travel via my chosen private means of locomotion without entering into this adhesion contract which was not even presented to me as a contract, adhesion or otherwise.

Because the contract was drawn up in its entirety by the state, my position has not been protected and makes the contract unconscionable.

Many adhesion contracts are unconscionable; they are so unfair to the weaker party that a court will refuse to enforce them.

An example would be severe penalty provisions for failure to pay loan installments promptly that are physically hidden by small print located in the middle of an obscure paragraph of a lengthy loan agreement. In such a case a court can find there is no meeting of the minds of the parties to the contract and the weaker party has not accepted the terms of the contract.

Unconscionability is defined in the Dictionary of Canadian Law as, “*...[E]quity will grant relief where there is inequality combined with substantial unfairness, and that in its modern application*

poverty and ignorance combined with lack of independent advice on the part of the party seeking relief (plus, presumably, some evidence of unfairness) places an onus on the other party to show that the bargain was in fact fair....)” *Smith v. Szep* (1992), 8 C.C.L.I. (2d) 81 at 90, 63 B.C.L.R. (2d) 52, [1992] 2 W.W.R. 673, 10 B.C.A.C. 108, 21 W.A.C. 108 (CA), Taylor J.A. (Wood J.A. concurring)

There can be no doubt this contract is both an adhesion contract and unconscionable.

Additionally, the issuance of the original Driver's License to the legal person, **DOE, JOHN HENRY**, and thereby suggesting that I, the human being, received or am receiving some sort of a benefit, is, in fact, ***a constructive fraud***, unless it can be proven that I, the human being, indeed did receive, or am receiving, a benefit.

More:

The **“HTA”** does not re-define the term **person** so the definition found in Section 85 of the Legislation Act, 2006 (*or the appropriate section of your Provincial Interpretation Act*) applies to the **“HTA”**, which is, **““person” includes a corporation; (“personne”)”**

“Includes” is a limiting term and excludes any other thing such as a human being. In fact though, the Legislation Act defines individual as, **“individual’ means a natural person;”**, which automatically excludes a human being from the definition of **person** for purposes of the **“HTA”**.

For a definition of the meaning of **“includes”**, let us take a look to Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition which defines the Latin term from which “includes” is derived, the term, ***Inclusio Unius Est Exclusio Alterius***. It is defined as, ***“The inclusion of one is the exclusion of another. The certain designation of one person is an absolute exclusion of all others. 11 Coke, 58b; Burgin v. Forbes, 293 Ky. 456, 169 S.W.2d 321, 325.”***

A **person**, therefore, means a corporation and nothing other than a corporation.

Further, Section 60 of the **“CCC”** states in part, ***“no person shall be deemed to have a seditious intention by reason only that he intends, in good faith, (a) to show that Her Majesty has been misled or mistaken in her measures;...”***

My intention is, ***in good faith***, to point out there was no lawful justification for the issuing of the offence citations in this matter as against me, a human being (man or woman).

Section 126 of the “**CCC**” states in part, “*Every one who, without lawful excuse, contravenes an Act...*”

What follows, amongst other things as outlined above, provides an explanation of my, a human being's, “**lawful excuse**”.

Further, I am not the **person** charged in this matter. In fact, as a human being and not a **person** or a **legal name**, this court lacks jurisdiction over me, including but not limited to the fact that the “**HTA**” applies only to **persons** and consequently, does not apply to me, a human being.

[TOC](#)

APPENDIX D

Court File No. **OP123456**

ONTARIO COURT OF JUSTICE
(Family Services Division)
(City)

BETWEEN;

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

Applicant

-and-

JOHN HENRY DOE and JANE DOE

Respondent(s)

AFFIDAVIT OF STATUS of 'man' & 'woman'

We, human beings whose names are **'man' & 'woman'**, your Affiants, sometimes responding to the callings **John & Jane**, being living embodiments of the Divine Spirit, over the age of 18 years, competent to testify, and being duty bound to tell the truth as regards the facts related herein, state that we have first-hand knowledge of the facts stated herein and believe these facts to be true to the best of our knowledge.

1. I/we am/are a member of the Human Rights Defenders League in Canada and assert the rights and claim the protection outlined in the *Declaration on Human Rights Defenders; UN Resolution, A/Res/53/144, 8 March 1999*.
2. Pursuant to Section 794 of the Criminal Code of Canada© we have an exception, exemption, proviso, excuse or qualification as regards the administration of the provisions of the *Child and Family Services Act, R.S.O. 1990, CHAPTER C. 11 (hereinafter "CFSA")*, for ourselves and our offspring.

3. What follows discloses that such exception, exemption, proviso, excuse or qualification prescribed by law, does exist and jurisdiction over our offspring, a human being(s) does not exist under the “CFSA”.
4. We waive our human right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law (*Article 6, Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Article 16, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*).
5. Additionally, we waive our offspring's human right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law.
6. As co-creators of our offspring, we are the only ones with the authority to so waive or assert this, or any other human right, on behalf of our offspring.
7. Consequently, no artificial entity such as “FCS” agents (persons or artificial entities), or this court, (persons or artificial entities), has authority over us or our offspring. In particular, they do not have the authority/jurisdiction to administer any Act or statute that applies exclusively to **persons**, against us or our offspring, once we waive, as we have done, our human right, and the human right of our offspring to be recognized as **persons** before the law.
8. The “CFSA” defines child as, ““**child**” means a **person** under the age of eighteen years; (“**enfant**”)” [underline mine for emphasis]

9. The *Children's Law Reform Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter C.12 Section 1.(1)* states "...for all purposes of the law of Ontario a **person** is the child of his or her natural parents..." It is clear that "**child**" and "**person**" are defined as being the same.
10. Therefore, a '**child**' is a "**person**".
11. More to the point, when we waive our human right and the human right of our offspring to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law, which is our absolute right, we and our offspring are not to be recognized as a **person** and the statutes and Acts that apply exclusively to **persons**, such as the CFSA and *Children's Law Reform Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter C.12*, does not apply to us or our offspring.
12. All human beings, according to the Quebec Civil Code, possess a juridical personality (legal personality). Specifically, the Code states, "*Every human being possesses juridical personality and has the full enjoyment of civil rights.*"
13. It is respectfully submitted, the only way in which a human being can enjoy *civil rights* is through a juridical personality. The Quebec Civil Code is being quoted solely because this fact is expressed so clearly therein. It is very unlikely that anyone, including this court, could say that everyone in other Provinces of this country do not possess a similar juridical personality.
14. Section 223. (1) of the Canadian Criminal Code© states "*A child becomes a human being within the meaning of this Act when it has completely proceeded, in a living state, from the body of its mother, whether or not (a) it has breathed; (b) it has an independent circulation; or (c) the navel string is severed.* Therefore, our offspring were not born a

'**person**/child/corporation', they were born **human beings**.

15. A human being can only be a human being; but, apparently, a human being can be **recognized as a person/child/corporation**.

16. Article 1, *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* states "**All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.**" Therefore, no human being, and regardless of the title they may attach to themselves, can have authority/jurisdiction over another human being, save and except the authority of a human being over his or her offspring.

17. Authority/jurisdiction must be obtained by consent, and in the case of our offspring, that consent must come from the human beings who are co-creators of that offspring. Unfortunately, in our system today, this consent is almost always obtained through deceit and trickery.

18. A **right** is not a compulsion and as our *Declaration of Private Law Expressed Under Claim of Right* attached and marked as **Exhibit "A"** states and as we are also stating herein, we **waive** our right and our offspring's right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law and instead invoke our natural right and our offspring's natural right to recognition everywhere as human beings only.

19. The "UDHR" further states at article 21, "**Everyone has the right to take part in the government.**", a right which we also waive, on behalf of ourselves and our offspring, and do not therefore, consent to the authority of government or its agents to remove our offspring from our authority, control and care.

20. It seems that Child and Family Services, Applicant in this matter, in order to justify taking or assuming authority over the offspring that belong to us, have mistakenly attached the names of children (its) to our offspring, who are, in fact, human beings, and they have done so without our consent, and we are the only human beings with the authority to give such consent and we have not, and do not, give such consent.
21. We have never consented, nor do we consent, to the use of our Patrimony or our offspring's Patrimony, for the purpose of caring for our offspring by anyone other than ourselves or to or in, any facility other than our home.
22. The “CFSA” applies only to **persons** and consequently, does not apply to us or our offspring, all of us being human beings, who are not to be recognized as **persons**.
23. If anyone enforces the provisions of the “CFSA” against us or our offspring, all human beings, they will be effectively forcing us and our offspring, contrary to our express will, to recognition everywhere as **persons** before the law since the “CFSA” applies only to **persons** and not human beings. Additionally, this would constitute a violation of another of our human rights, that being the right to not be held in involuntary servitude⁸.
24. It is acknowledged that legal dictionaries define **person** as being of two classes, **legal person** and **natural person**. A **natural person** includes a human being.
25. However, it cannot be argued that we or our offspring are **natural persons** and therefore, subject to the “CFSA”, since we, and on behalf of our offspring, have waived our right to recognition everywhere as **persons** (of any class) before the law.

⁸ Article 4, Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Article 8, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

26. Therefore, our offspring must be returned to us immediately, as this court lacks jurisdiction to administer the provisions of the “CFSA” against us, human beings, and/or our offspring, also human beings.

27. Interference in any way with our **rights** to freely raise our offspring, over which we have been given dominion by our creator and by the very fact that we are co-creators of our offspring, is a violation of our **liberty**, a guarantee to which the government of Canada has committed to recognizing and respecting in Article 7 of the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and certainly which has been further recognized in the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* in Article 1 thereof, which states, “*All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.*”

28. Further, the “UDHR” states at Article 9, “*No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.*” We and our offspring, all human beings not to be recognized as **persons**, have certainly experienced a violation of that human right.

29. Further, the “UDHR” further states at Article 16(3) “*The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.*”

30. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights states at Article 23 “*The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.*”

31. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights states at Article

10, “*The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize that: 1. The widest possible protection and assistance should be accorded to the family, which is the natural and fundamental group unit of society, particularly for its establishment and while it is responsible for the care and education of dependent children.*”

32. All involved in taking or continuing to hold our offspring should consider Section 322, (1) of the Criminal Code which states: (underlining is ours),

“Every one commits theft who fraudulently and without colour of right takes, or fraudulently and without colour of right converts to his use or to the use of another person, anything, whether animate or inanimate, with intent (a) to deprive, temporarily or absolutely, the owner of it, or a person who has a special property or interest in it, of the thing or of his property or interest in it;

33. Further, there is the issue of the **JOHN HOWARD DOE**, Trust/Estate.
34. It is an irrefutable fact that I/we was granted dominion over the earth and all things of it (natural resources/wealth) (Genesis 1:26-28).
35. Since the government(s) is/are controlling and managing my/our birthright (the earth and all things of it), they must be doing so in Trust for me and another for my/our offspring.
36. A Trust exists when title is divided and one party, the holder of legal title, holds the property for the benefit of another, the Beneficiary or Equitable title holder.
37. That, of course, is a perfect description of what is happening as regards my birthright and the birthright of my/our offspring. My birthright and that of my/our offspring was Granted to the government(s) by the very act of birth registration by my/our parents

and was done by me/us on behalf of my/our offspring and upon achieving the age of majority, I/we became the Grantor and sole Beneficiary of that Trust/Estate with the government(s) remaining the Trustee, accountable to me/us, a human being whose name is 'man'/'woman' and who is sometimes called **john**.

38. More specifically, I/we am the Grantor (euphemistically the king) of my/our offspring's Trust/Estate.

39. As Grantor and sole Beneficiary of the **JOHN HOWARD DOE**, Trust/Estate, and the (Name of offspring in ALL CAPS), Trust/Estate, I/we am revoking the Power of Attorney of all agents of government known as **Crown Attorneys and “CFS” agents, etc.** to administrate my/our Trust/Estate, or the Estate of my/our offspring, for cause (breach of trust).

40. Since this court and “FCS” have been Noticed via this Affidavit that you have no authority over either we human beings or our offspring, you are without **“colour of right”** to do what you have done or about to do – steal our offspring.

41. **Since the “IBHR” has been ratified by Canada (at least the “ICESCR” and the “ICCPR” have) and is thus binding on Canada and all its organs, including this court and Family and Children's Services, and since I/we am the Grantor of the Trusts/Estates and you are the Trustee, I/we hereby demand the return of my/our offspring (private property) immediately.**

Jurat

Sworn/Affirmed before me at the City of

_____, in the Province of

Alberta, on the _____ day of _____ 2012.

Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
Name of Lawyer
LSUC #

Barrister, Solicitor & Notary Public

'man'
A human being with intrinsic natural and human rights

'woman'
A human being with intrinsic natural and human rights

TOC

Parents (the following is included for your further study):

The first thing we should try to do is to not refer to our offspring as **children** because under the Family Services Act a child is a **person**...

As the product of our male/female union, our offspring are our property and we are totally responsible for them until they become of age and that is not an arbitrary number of years set by government or anyone else. That is a number of years determined by the parents and the offspring.

When you register the birth of your offspring, then the government pretends or actually believes they are the owner of that offspring calling it a child.

Whether you want to accept what I have just said or not, it is the truth, and that is why a lawyer recently walked into court with copies of Statement of Births (birth registration documents completed by the parents, as **Informants**, of the children) and stated to the court, **this is what gives us authority over those children (offspring)**.

Therefore, it is the same situation as any other, including fishermen, farmers, drivers, etc., once we waive the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law⁹, the authority under the Family Services Act (or whatever it is called in your Province) does not exist over you as parents or your offspring, if you waive that right on behalf of your offspring, which you have the absolute right to do.

It is necessary, as always, to put the so-called authorities on Notice of this waiver of certain rights according to our will and then to educate them. Once this is done, the government no longer has authority over you or your offspring.

In this way, all the criminality of the Child Protective Services people can be reversed and/or prevented.

Before we conclude this discourse on our offspring and the rights of those who are their co-creators, we should touch upon a document that has caused some concern amongst the ranks of our researchers.

The document is the **Convention on the Rights of the Child**, Entry into force 2 September 1990, in accordance with article 49 of the United Nations.

In this document, Article 1 is of most concern, because it states, **“For the purposes of the present Convention, a child means every human being below the age of eighteen years unless under the law applicable to the child, majority is attained earlier.”**

⁹ Article 6, Universal Declaration of Human Rights and article 16, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

This, at first glance has caused our researchers to question if this convention applies to our offspring because a **child** is defined as a **human being**.

This, of course, is not true because as **human beings** we are all born free and equal in dignity and rights... (Article 1, Universal Declaration of Human Rights).

If this is so, then no other **human being** has authority or jurisdiction over us and if they are practicing such authority or jurisdiction, then they must be doing so under the assumption that we, the parents, have consented to such authority or jurisdiction.

This consent is assumed because they are assuming we have asserted our right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law (Article 6, Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Article 16, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights). If we waive that right, then no such authority or jurisdiction exists.

As co-creators of our offspring, we are the only ones who have the right to assert or waive this human right and once we waive that right, then even if this Convention defines a child as a human being, no authority or jurisdiction emanates therefrom, to government or its agencies, particularly private agencies.

This Convention does go on later in its provisions, to refer to **persons** many times and **persons** do not, and cannot, have authority or jurisdiction over human beings who have waived their right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law.

Nothing has changed because of the existence of this Convention. Human beings are all born free and equal and the way to ensure this remains the case, is to waive our right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law and we, as stated earlier, are the only ones with the true authority to so waive on behalf of our offspring.

I would not think anything else is necessary for human beings to understand, and you are all encouraged to join in our process.

And remember, this is a process and we should not expect things will be corrected overnight, but they will be corrected and that is a certainty – read Revelations Chapter 18.

The details below are provided for your in-depth study and understanding:

The “CFSA” does not re-define the term **person** so the definition found in section 85 of the Legislation Act, 2006 **(or the appropriate section of your Provincial Interpretation Act)** applies to the “CFSA”, which is, “**person**” **includes a corporation; (“personne”)**”.

“**Includes**” is a limiting term and excludes any other thing such as a human being. In fact though, the Legislation Act of Ontario defines individual as, “**individual**” **means a natural person; (“particulier”)**”, which automatically excludes a human being from the definition of

person for purposes of the “CFSA”.

For a definition of the meaning of “**includes**”, let's take a look to Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition which defines the Latin term from which “includes” is derived, the term, **Inclusio Unius Est Exclusio Alterius**. It is defined this way, “**The inclusion of one is the exclusion of another. The certain designation of one person is an absolute exclusion of all others. 11 Coke, 58b; Burgin v. Forbes, 293 Ky. 456, 169 S.W.2d 321, 325.**”

A ‘child’ is a “person” and **person**, means a corporation and nothing other than a corporation.

The Statement of Live Birth(s) relating to our offspring and submitted to the Province of Alberta, certified all information provided as true and correct and was signed by us as “mother” and “father” in the capacity of **Informants**.

The *Vital Statistics Act R.S.O. 1990, Chapter V.4 (hereinafter “VSA”)* defines “**“birth Parent”, in relation to an adopted person, means a person whose name appears as a parent on the original registration”**”.

Therefore, a birth parent is (recognized as) a **person** and the name of a parent is the name of a **person**. A ‘registered name’ is the name of a ‘person’ and as a ‘child’ is a **person**, the name of a ‘child’ is the name of a **‘person’**.

The “VSA” *Section 2. (1)* states “...the Registrar General shall direct a uniform system of registration of births, marriages, deaths, still-births, adoptions and changes of name...”.

The “VSA” *Section 9.(1)* states “**The mother and father or either of them, in such circumstances as may be prescribed, or such other person as may be prescribed, shall certify the birth in Ontario of a child...**”.

The “VSA” *Section 9.(3)* states, “**The Registrar General may register the birth of a child.**”.

Therefore, the parents are certifying the **event** of a birth, not the name. It is without question that it is **events** that are registered, not human beings. If this were not so and human beings were being registered, then they would be slaves as one cannot register that which he does not own.

So, what is being registered is the **birth (event)** of a **child/person (just like a corporation)**.

Further, the birth registration document (Statement of Birth) is the document of title and the government is holding it and the Statement of Birth and the Certificate of Birth are both proof of that fact.

The Statement of Live Birth also contains a section titled “Name of Child”, the “name of child”

is the name of a **legal person**, similar to the name of a corporation (name of **event** of birth).

The “VSA” Section 14.(7) states “...**the Registrar General shall note the change of name on the birth registration and issue a new birth certificate to the person ...**”.

It is obvious that the **name of the child** entered on the birth registration document (Statement of Live Birth) by the Informant/parents/persons/corporations is the name the Province takes ownership of and the name it names the birth event they registered, as evidenced by the Birth Certificate. It is the name of the **event (legal person)**, similar to a corporation) that is registered.

The “VSA” Section 31.(1) states “.... **the name of a person whose birth is registered in Ontario ...**”. So, the name on the birth registration document (Statement of Live Birth) and on the Birth Certificate is the name of a **person/child/corporation**.

That legal name is probably NOT the property of the government, but it is holding the document of title, the Statement of Birth. It can be argued that this is the name that was given to our offspring, giving them best title, but since the government holds title in it then the child is not financially liable for it, which suggests the establishment of an Estate for the benefit of the child.

All human beings, according to the Quebec Civil Code, possess a juridical personality (legal personality). Specifically, the Code states, “**Every human being possesses juridical personality and has the full enjoyment of civil rights.**” In fact, the only way in which a human being can enjoy **civil rights** is through a juridical personality. The Quebec Civil Code is being quoted solely because this fact is expressed so clearly therein. It is very unlikely that anyone, including judges, could say that everyone in this country does not possess a similar juridical personality.

It is arguable that the Quebec Civil Code does indeed apply to every Province in Canada since the **Interpretation Act:** (Canada, 1867) states, under “**Territorial Operation; “8. (1) Every enactment applies to the whole of Canada, unless a contrary intention is expressed in the enactment.**”

The legislature could have and would have said, had it intended it, that this section applies only to federal enactments, we respectfully submit that it chose not to for a reason.

Section 223.(1) of the Canadian Criminal Code© states “**A child becomes a human being within the meaning of this Act when it has completely proceeded, in a living state, from the body of its mother, whether or not (a) it has breathed; (b) it has an independent circulation; or (c) the navel string is severed.** Therefore, our offspring were not born a ‘person/child/corporation’, they were born human beings.

A corporation (legal fiction/person), and therefore, a person/child are ‘its’. A corporation

cannot be a human being and a human being cannot be a corporation or an event, a name, a respondent, a judge, a social worker or any other 'it'. A human being can only be a human being; but, apparently, a human being can be **recognized as a person/child/corporation**.

Article 6, **Universal Declaration of Human Rights** states, "**Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law**" and Article 16, **International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights**, the latter being ratified by Canada and thus legally binding upon Canada and all its agents, including this Court and Family and Child Services, states, "**Everyone shall have the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law**".

We are:

We are human beings whose names are "man" and "woman". We have no other name for the reasons stated previously.

However, at the expense of adding confusion to the matter, it can be argued that the registered names are indeed our names and at the same time, represent a trust – our share of the natural and created wealth of the trust called Canada.

Most importantly though, we are not the **persons** referred to in this matter as **Respondents**. In fact, as human beings we cannot be recognized as **persons** or **legal names** or **respondents** or **any other description or title**, unless we assert our human right to recognition everywhere as a **person** before the law, a right which we put you on Notice herewith, that we waive on behalf of ourselves and our offspring.

A **name** is an 'it', a **person** is an 'it', a **respondent** is an 'it', a **judge** is an 'it', a **social worker** is an 'it', a **lawyer** is an 'it', a **pencil** is an 'it' and a **child**, pursuant to your legal definitions, is an 'it'. An 'it' cannot be a human being and a human being cannot be an 'it'.

However, we agree that a human being can be **recognized as a person** and all the above.

It is acknowledged that legal dictionaries define **person** as being of two classes, **legal person** and **natural person**. A **natural person** includes a human being.

However, it cannot be argued that we or our offspring are **natural persons** and therefore, subject to the "CFSA", since we, and on behalf of our offspring, have waived our right to recognition everywhere as **persons** (of any class) before the law.

There is only one reason we can think of for the extraordinary creation of the 'person/child/corporation and its legal name', and that is that neither government, courts, lawyers or FCS and not even other human beings have authority over another human being or their offspring without their consent.

So, they have used deceit and trickery to obtain the unwitting consent of human beings to

relinquish their freedom, liberty, access to their patrimony, and worst of all, their authority over their offspring.

How can a corporation such as FCS or a government (another fictional entity) have authority over a human being? Which came first ... man or institutions? Institutions exist to serve man, not man to serve institutions. When government or institutions cease to serve and begin to rule, human beings are then either enslaved or in servitude.

The *Vital Statistics Act R.S.O. 1990, Chapter V.4* ("VSA") *Section 2.(1)* states "**...the Registrar General shall direct a uniform system of registration of births, marriages, deaths, still-births, adoptions and changes of name...**".

Therefore, it is obvious that it is **events** that are registered, **not people**.

The "VSA" *Section 9.(1)* states "**The mother and father or either of them, in such circumstances as may be prescribed, or such other person as may be prescribed, shall certify the birth in Ontario of a child...**".

The parents are certifying the **event** of a birth. It is without question that it is **events** that are registered, not human beings. If this were not so and human beings were being registered, then they would be slaves as one cannot register that which he does not own. The Province of Ontario owns the information on the Statement of Live Birth because it registered it and is holding the document of title, the Statement of Live Birth.

The "VSA" *Section 14.(7)* states "**...the Registrar General shall note the change of name on the birth registration and issue a new birth certificate to the person ...**".

It is obvious that the **name of the child** entered on the birth registration document (Statement of Live Birth) by the Informant/parents/persons/corporations is the name the Province takes ownership of and the name it names the birth event that was registered, as evidenced by the Birth Certificate. It is the name of the **event (legal person)**, similar to a corporation) that is registered.

The "VSA" *Section 31.(1)* states "**.... the name of a person whose birth is registered in Ontario ...**". So, the name on the birth registration document (Statement of Live Birth) and on the Birth Certificate is the name of a **person/child/corporation**.

That legal name is the property of the government, at least on paper, and it cannot be argued that this is the name that was given to our offspring since the government holds title in it and it cannot, therefore, be the property of our offspring.

As offensive as it may sound to refer to one's offspring as private property, that is in essence what they are of necessity in order that those who created them are able to provide for their needs which they cannot provide for themselves. That which one creates or co-creates,

MUST belong exclusively to them. Every Province created fictitious or **legal persons** with names that are registered and belong to them. Those **legal names/persons** cannot be attached to our offspring without our consent and they absolutely do not have our consent and never have.

So, they have used deceit and trickery to obtain the unwitting consent of human beings to relinquish their freedom, liberty, access to their patrimony, and worst of all, their authority over their offspring.

[TOC](#)

TOC