



From the desk of:

Captain E. G. da Costa Duarte

To: **Her Majesty The Queen**
Buckingham Palace,
London SW1A 1AA

October 13, 2012

Re. Campbell River Harbour Authority - Corporation #3390764, BN #87839599 – Criminal Court File 37556, CA39471 and CA039548 - Federal Court File T-1003-10 – Past Criminal Files 67891-1, 63646-1, 67140, 36999-1, 37034-1 and 37462-1

Your Majesty:

At the beginning of these paragraphs I reiterate the common belief that Canada is an independent nation with an ability to decide on its future endeavors. In the minds of most Canadians the preceding statement holds true, yet Canada is a Parliamentary Democracy and a Constitutional Monarchy. Specifically, I am addressing my letter to Your Majesty, the Queen of Canada with full understanding that Your Majesty is the Sovereign Head of Canada, dismissing the idea of an independent state;

“Canada is a parliamentary democracy and a constitutional monarchy. This means Canadians recognize The Queen as our Head of State. Canada’s Governor General carries out Her Majesty’s duties in Canada on a daily basis and is Canada’s de facto Head of State”.

Historical Narrative

Reflective of an ancestry dating back to the discovery of Canada, I am a direct descendant of Captain Alvaro Martins Homem, **Knight of the Order of Christ**, discovering Canada along with two other knights; João Vaz Corte Real and João Fernandes Labrador, names that are displayed on the first and early charts of Canada. My ancestries were the pioneers of ocean routes that brought the first European settlers to the shores of the Americas. These historical facts originate from archived manuscripts and not from fictional academic re-creations of history that distract from reality to accentuate leadership manipulations of society, specific to planned wrong doing.

Canada, a Portuguese word, well displayed on ancient nautical charts of the New World (North

America), showing territorial boundaries separating Portuguese Crown land from land settled by French colonies dating back to the late fourteen hundreds, has since undergone academic historical falsehoods, with an explanation that it derives from a language spoken by native people of the New World. Entertaining the thought that various navigators crossed the deep waters of the Atlantic Ocean before the Portuguese, it was the navigators originating from the House of Dom Henrique, Administrator of the **Order of Christ** that first carried the news of the existence of the New World to the shores of Europe, with enough scope to involve the majority of Kingdoms forming 14th, 15th and 16th century Europe. This feat of world discovery involved the following Portuguese navigators;

Captain Alvaro Martins Homem - prior to 1450	Captain João Fernandes Labrador – 1492
Captain João Vaz Corte Real – prior to 1450	Captain Pedro de Barcelos – 1492
Captain Gaspar Corte Real – 1487 and 1501	Captain Alvaro Fagundes – 1520
Captain Miguel Corte Real – 1487	Captain João Martins – 1588

Boundary lines and territorial names are clearly drawn and written on the maps that survived the ages, supporting the undisputed presence of the Portuguese on the formation of Canada before any other European. A decade later the French followed suit, colonizing the territories to the west of the Saguenay River. The characteristic of the Saguenay River, located on the Province of Quebec, Canada, played an important part on the origin of the name *canada* as applied to the nation's name, Canada.

The said river is bordered by steep cliffs that guide its very high water flow to the St. Lawrence River, which, in turn, flows into the Atlantic Ocean. Historically, the Saguenay River was an important trade route into the interior of the Province for local native people and later, during the French colonization of Canada, the river was a major route for the fur trade. Tadoussac, located on the shores of the river, is France's first trading post in Canada, established in 1600. The river takes its name from the legendary Kingdom of Saguenay.

The modern definition of the Portuguese word *canada*; simply means passage, corridor, narrow road and, for centuries, indicates a border mark between two distinct pieces of land or territories to identify limits of ownership. The majority of maps showing the eastern part of Canada, produced during the early fifteen hundred, reaching mid seventeen hundred, display the word *canada* directly over the area of the Saguenay River, a dividing line between the territories belonging to the Portuguese Crown and French settlements that followed, accentuating the boundary between two distinct ownerships, Portugal and France. Furthermore, the map produced by Paolo Forlani sometime in 1566, two words - *canada pro* - are shown, asserting that French territory is beyond the *canada*, better said, beyond the water passage. The Portuguese word *canada* maintains its usage today with as much frequency as it was in the fourteen and fifteen hundreds. For example, various streets near my house of birth, begin with the word *canada*, specifically; *Canada Nova*, *Canada dos Filadais*, *Canada do Mato* and many more, all located within the limits of the City of Angra do Heroismo, Island of Terceira, Açores.

Taking a glance at the above list of navigators, namely Captain João Vaz Corte Real and Captain Alvaro Martins Homem, my ancestral grandfather, the first to discover the shores representing the

Atlantic Region of Canada where the said shores were given the following names, well documented on charts, maps and documents of the time; *Terras dos Corte Reais, Terra do Labrador, Terras dos Bacalhaus, Terra de Estêvão Gomes and Terra Nova.*

Portugal – England’s oldest ally – since 1373

The relationship between Portugal and England dates back to 1373 and is best described by quoting the Honourable Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill when he addressed the British Parliament on October 12, 1943;

*“I have an announcement to make to the House arising out of the Treaty signed between this country and Portugal in the year 1373 between His Majesty King Edward III and King Ferdinand and Queen Eleanor of Portugal. This Treaty was reinforced in various forms by Treaties of 1386, 1643, 1654, 1660, 1661, 1703 and 1815 and in a secret declaration of 1899. In more modern times, the validity of the old Treaties was recognized in the Treaties of Arbitration concluded with Portugal in 1904 and 1914. Article I of the Treaty of 1373 runs as follows: **‘In the first place we settle and covenant that there shall be from this day forward ... true, faithful, constant, mutual and perpetual friendships, unions, alliances and needs of sincere affection and that as true and faithful friends we shall henceforth, reciprocally, be friends to friends and enemies to enemies, and shall assist, maintain and uphold each other mutually, by sea and by land, against all men that may live or die.**’ This engagement has lasted now for over 600 years and is without parallel in world history. I have now to announce its latest application. At the outset of the war the Portuguese Government, in full agreement with His Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom, adopted a policy of neutrality with a view to preventing the war spreading into the Iberian Peninsula”.*

The Honourable Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, further stated;

“His Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom, basing themselves upon this ancient Alliance, have now requested the Portuguese Government to accord them certain facilities in the Azores which will enable better protection to be provided for merchant shipping in the Atlantic”.

*“In the view of His Majesty’s Government, this Agreement should give new life and vigour to the Alliance which has so long existed between the United Kingdom and Portugal to their mutual advantage. **It not only confirms and strengthens the political guarantees resulting from the Treaties of Alliance, but also affords a new proof of Anglo-Portuguese friendship and provides an additional guarantee for the development of this friendship in the future**”.*

“On the conclusion of these negotiations my right hon. Friend the Foreign Secretary, who has, I think, conducted them with the very greatest skill and patience, has exchanged most cordial messages with the Portuguese President of the Council. In his message, my right hon. Friend affirmed his conviction that the facilities now granted by the Portuguese Government would greatly contribute to the effective defence of our shipping and thus prove an important factor in shortening the war”.

“I take this opportunity of placing on record the appreciation by His Majesty’s Government, which I have no doubt is shared by Parliament and the British nation, of the attitude of the Portuguese Government, whose loyalty to their British Ally never wavered in the darkest hours of the war”.

The above-mentioned quotes, originating from the Honourable Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, reflect a friendship that survived the test of time; *“never wavered in the darkest hours of the war”*.

The Canadian Judiciary

Addressing Your Majesty, originates from my failed attempts before the Criminal Courts for the Province of British Columbia to correct the current state of Fraud and Judicial decay facing Canada's Rule of Law, begging Your Majesty to intervene and assist at correcting a wrong in times of great need. The Canadian Judicial system is in shambles and our Coastal waters are plagued with fraud practices that extend to society as a whole. My failed attempts encountered determined and deliberate perversion of justice originating from the offices of the Attorney General of Canada and the Attorney General of British Columbia supported by numerous presiding Judges and Justices that purposely breached the Rule of Law to accommodate criminal activity.

The following quote, originating from the Web Pages of Mr. John Carten, a Canadian lawyer, summarizing aspects of my experiences inside the Courts of British Columbia;

*“The Canadian judiciary is completely politically appointed and it is **riddled with corruption, especially in British Columbia**”.*

*“This is not to say that there are not some honest judges in Canada or in British Columbia but those judges are not permitted to preside on a case unless the Chief Justice permits it. **When a crooked decision is needed for a political or business reason, the Chief Justice or Chief Judge has a group of crooked judges he knows he can rely on**”.*

*“A number of Canadian legal commentators, including Ontario Justice Marshall and British Columbia Justice Bouck, have written on these issues. Some suggest that to prevent this evil the Chief Judges should be elected by the other judges and for a fixed term in the office such as five or six years. **Others suggest that all judges should be elected including the Chief Judge just like politicians are elected**. In the United States judges are elected - at the State level. There have been corrupt judges who take bribes and fix cases. They are often caught, prosecuted, and put in jail. **In Canada, there have been corrupt judges and they are often exposed by their victims but there are no recorded cases of a judge being prosecuted for corruption on the bench in Canada**”.*

Mr. John Carten – www.waterwarcrimes.com

Mr. Carten's Web Pages are not pages of information to be dismissed. Yet, I must admit, when first introduced to the massive amount of information compiled by Mr. Carten, the first reaction was general disbelief. Unfortunately, my Court experiences brings forth a shocking truth that the judicial system is far from its mandate to protect society from criminal activity. Rather, purposely adapted to protect the criminal interests of corrupt officials of whatever government crime of the day happens to be ongoing. Moreover, my two year involvement uncovering government sponsored criminal activity, already involves thousands of document pages relating to Transport Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada and useless members of the Crown and police.

Fully understanding the attitude of the Honorable Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, in times of great

need, requesting assistance from my Nation of birth, Portugal and home to my ancestry that honored such request; **I beg Your Majesty to reverse this disastrous trend currently facing Canada.**

Your Majesty commands Canada's military forces, our courts bear your name, our Federal Police Force, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) bears your name and institutionalizing shame upon Your Majesty's good name and Role to enforce and prosecute the criminal element under the Rule of Law, the Crown Prosecutors paralyze such mandate on behalf of Your Majesty.

Bastard Feudalism; a reference

By definition, Bastard Feudalism is a term used to describe feudalism in the Late Middle Ages, primarily in England. The main characteristic is military, political, legal, or domestic service in return for money, office, and/or influence. Moreover, *"the gentry began to think of themselves as the men of their lord rather than of the king"*. Individually they are known as the *"retainers"*, and collectively as the *"affinity"* of the *"lord"*.

Omitting, in length, descriptions of such a cultural behavior, assured that Your Majesty is knowledgeable with all aspects of Bastard Feudalism, I will instead draw from its simplified definition, above-mentioned, to associate the following words with current Canadian cultural mannerisms; military, political, legal, or domestic service. Adding that the words *"retainers"*, *"affinity"* and *"lord"* apply with aspects of determined human behavior. Therefore, beginning with the word **military** relating to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and its paramilitary style of behavior, the word **political** relating to elected members of the Federal and Provincial governments, the word **legal** relating the Canadian Judiciary and the words **domestic service** relating to individuals and organizations that emerge from present day Canada.

Accentuating my reason for referencing Bastard Feudalism, does not involve complicated analogies of a rigorous type. Simply, my experiences before various Canadian Courts spanning a ten year period resulted in conclusive evidence that Canadian culture whole heartily participates and promotes Bastard Feudalism. Regardless of the exact percentage of participants decaying the Canadian lifestyle with participation in aspects of Bastard Feudalism, evidence indicates that Canadian society is governed by such a disgusting Feudal practice. While my involvement with Canadian criminal courts spans a ten year period of litigation, this letter addressed to Your Majesty is drawn from court experiences involving the last two years where the fraud practices of the Campbell River Harbour Authority Corporation suffice to exemplify a state of judiciary decay that negatively affect society.

The *"retainers"*, bastards by definition, emerge as individuals that are not genuine, better said stupid with a crescendo of words; irritating, ridiculous, intellectually inferior and dubious of origin showing irregular genetic formats. Yet when I reach for the word *"lord"* to describe the Canadian lord that manipulates and engages the *"retainers"*, Canada differentiates from the old days of England by displaying a secretive clique determined to obliterate human dignity from within the shores of Canada. Who are the lord Bastards that effectively control the Police, Judges and Justices, members of the Crown, etc ...; *"retainers"* that willingly allow themselves to perform humiliating and criminal acts

of servitude? Identifying the "lord" serves no purpose when the multitude of "retainers" barricade such entity from the reaches of public accountability, transparency and criminal prosecution.

An excerpt from a recent article published on the Web Pages of Ms. Elizabeth May, Member of the Canadian Parliament, titled *The Search For Heroes*, it states the following;

"Currently, Ottawa is in the throes of oppression. Scientists are muzzled, but why don't they defy bosses and speak out anyway? They are afraid of losing their jobs. Some in industry have told me they avoid public criticism of the Prime Minister because they have children working in the civil service. They are afraid for their children's jobs. Reporters have been cowed by higher ups in their media corporations telling them to lay off criticizing the PM. They are afraid for their jobs (several reporters have lost their jobs for offending the PMO). Little wonder the members of Harper's caucus are silent. They know from Helena Guergis' experience just how painful, and complete, banishment can be".

Ms. May's Web Page article centers on aspects of current "retainers" serving the Harper government, whether these "retainers" serve the "lord" willingly or by force of intimidation is a mute point, the fact surfaces that it is happening and with great majority. Yet when the name Stephen Harper enters the arena of "lordship", something is amiss. Drawing from a forty year Merchant Navy career displaying a never ending sea of challenges where every human character entered my realm, Stephen Harper is no feudal "lord", better said a "puppet-on-a-string" serving a "lordship". Furthermore, I must dismiss the previous statement that my assessment of Stephen Harper originates from character comparisons. Instead, factually my assessment of Stephen Harper and his government originates from numerous private conversations with a multitude of high level individuals emerging from the Canadian government and marine industry.

My world of honor, dignity, integrity, morals, self-respect, ethics, etc ..., does not involve mannerisms of a "snitch", specifically when information received via private conversations involve my word not to identify the source. Moreover, entering a court of law with information deriving from "snitchings", fails Law and Order. Without a doubt, evidence presented in court must not originate from hearsay gossip or hearsay that identifies a culprit with no paper trail or firsthand witness evidence.

A failure to identify a party manipulating "retainers" for their own advantage is not difficult, most "retainers" sooner or later "spill-the-beans" by giving accurate details of their "affinity" to the "lord". The difficulty arises when the Judiciary are part of the "retainers" with a specific mandate to block the rightful pursuit of factual evidence aimed at criminal prosecution. For example, given my Private Prosecution against the Board of Directors of the Campbell River Harbour Authority (CRHA), court file 37556, all judges and Justices that presided over the file refused to issue a Production Order and sign witness Subpoenas. Specifically, when the issue of signing a Production Order enters the investigative process, a peace officer is entrusted to approach the court and request such. Therefore, the determined attitude to Obstruct Justice, involving court file 37556 displays two culprits, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, presiding Judges and Justices that with intent and malice ignored prima facie evidence originating from government invoices showing that a high amount of taxpayer's money is missing, **approximately two million dollars when the CRHA is brought into account.**

In summary, the need to bring forth numerous amounts of information from sources identifying a

common "*modus operandi*" used by politicians and senior civil servants preceding the Harper government is a total waste of my time given that the totality of court files involving my good name versus the Campbell River Harbour Authority, in a "nut-shell" expose the current overall failed system of government supported by a failed Canadian Jurisprudence. **And, when the Feudal Bastards drawn from either segment of "retainers" and "lord" operate under the umbrella of Your Majesty's Sovereign name, it becomes an issue for immediate clarification as to what side or part Your Majesty is playing. I can assure Your Majesty that if my name was exposed to such malfeasance, I would use all means available to bring extreme clarity to the public eye.**

Code of Silence - The Feudal Bastards Standard Practice

The mode of conduct employed by Canadian Feudal Bastards, namely "*retainers*" and "*lord*", as per the above-mentioned definition, involves numerous practices, from specific "*modus operandi*" of approaching Parliament requesting monies that eventually are channeled through Not-for-Profit Corporations into the pockets of the "*lord*" to methods of behavior when allegations of corruption emerge from the public. *Silence* is a tool of choice, emerging from the likes of Stephen Harper, Christy Clark, Members of Parliament, Ministers, senior RCMP officers, senior civil servants and wherever "*retainers*" and "*lord*" are found.

Expanding the *Code of Silence*, as per my definition; a well defined internal and secretive set of rules designed to fence off allegations of fraud, obstruction of justice, perjury, etc ..., with intent to intimidate an accuser, especially when the accuser is a lone citizen or small group of concerned citizens. Given that Bastard Feudalism is well established in Canada and where the power currently resides, the good citizen, sooner or later, finds the battle to be a "*David and Goliath*" event. Unfortunately, adding to the demise of the good citizen, "*Goliath*" is a controlling power that involves all the weapons available to the public, such as the courts of justice, the police, etc.... Therefore, when the *Code of Silence* is administered against an individual/s the well defined, internal and unspoken set of rules paralyzes all aspects of publically available weaponry, leaving the citizen surrounded by a deafening *Code of Silence* that by purpose is highly intimidating. The manifestation of such *Code* takes various forms and is mainly carried out by "*retainers*". For example, engaging the Crown Prosecutor with allegations of government corruption, the *Code of Silence* begins. And, taking such allegations to a higher level, before the bench, the *Code of Silence* becomes deafening.

Explaining the *Code of Silence* that I experienced during numerous court actions alleging criminal activity originating from a variety of government officials and related enterprises, is best done via factual evidence rather than summarized examples. Therefore, I entrust Your Majesty to exercise Royal powers that far surpass mine to examine all available evidence with an attitude to prosecute the criminal element regardless of where it resides. Yet a fact about the behavior of "*retainers*" that apply to the *Code of Silence* demands further explanation. Along with my, above-mentioned definition of "*retainers*", they operate in a *pecking order*, better said in an *ass-kissing* fashion. The weaker *kiss the ass* of the more powerful with remarkable discipline. And, when the Board of Directors of the Campbell River Harbour Authority (CRHA) is brought forward to exemplify such, the numerous audio recordings available between CRHA Director Tim Hobbs and two CRHA members, Sailmaster

Ronald Griffin and Mr. Manfred Binger, clearly identify how the "retainer" Tim Hobbs controls other CRHA Directors to the betterment of the "lord". Two of the previously mentioned audio recordings are available from the Web Pages of www.sealegacy.com for general review by the public.

Combining the *pecking order* with the *Code of Silence*, evidence available from the Board of Directors of the CRHA Corporation demonstrates the "retainers" obedience and quickness to apply the *Code of Silence* when the need arises. To date, no CRHA Director provided evidence as to the missing Federal Grant monies awarded to the CRHA Corporation as per the provisions of the CRHA lease agreement and the Canada Corporations Act. Specifically, a Not-for-Profit Federal Corporation managing Your Majesty's property with absolutely **NO** ACCOUNTABILITY and Transparency. **Am I also to expect the Code of Silence from Your Majesty upon review of my letter? Given that Canada is a remnant of the British Empire, I already expect it.**

The Canadian Rule of Law and the Criminal Code

The excerpts that follow, originating from the Law Reform Commission of Canada, © Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, 2003, describe segments of my letter, specific to Corporate Crime;

"Our present Criminal Code has its roots in nineteenth-century England. Enacted in 1892, it has undergone a number of ad hoc revisions, with the result that we now have a Criminal Code which does not deal comprehensively with the general principles of criminal law, which suffers from a lack of internal logic and which contains a hodgepodge of anachronistic, redundant, contradictory and obsolete provisions. The end result is that Canadians living in one of the most technologically advanced societies in human history, are being governed by a Criminal Code rooted in the horse-and-buggy era of Victorian England".

The above-mentioned excerpt, in its simplicity, deals with an accurate description of the current Criminal Code, what it does not say is far more disturbing a trend, practiced everyday in our Canadian Courts. The Judges, Crown and officers of the court (lawyers) that deal with the provisions of the said Code, on a daily basis, adapt confusing rhetoric legal language from within the Criminal Code to intimidate a newcomer seeking to apply the Rule of Law for the betterment of society. Certainly, the Private Prosecutor is a targeted victim, giving the Crown prosecutor an edge to practice discretionary powers of the flagrant type. The said excerpt continues;

*"Many observers argue that people who fit the typical offender profile are over-policed, while those who commit serious harms but do not hold these characteristics are typically under-policed. Often people from poor and working class backgrounds charged with committing street crimes are less able to resist the use of criminal law, whereas the **business and professional classes** who engage in **corporate wrongdoing** are better able to resist the criminal label as a result of their influence and financial resources. Many argue that as the gap between rich and poor widens, those who have been "left out" are seen by the "haves" as the cause of disorder. This has led some observers to argue that, "while the rich get richer, the poor get prison".*

"In contrast to our stereotypical notions of who is a criminal, studies using self-report data reveal a different portrait of who commits crime. Using confidential interview and questionnaire techniques, researchers have asked people if they have ever committed a crime. The results suggest that almost everyone has committed a crime at some point. This raises interesting questions of why we criminalize certain people in society for

*behaviour that we may all have committed at some time. **Researchers who study the harmful conduct of corporations offer a number of explanations for why authorities fail to prosecute these offences, even though corporate wrongdoing affects many more people and is probably more costly than street crime.** The difficulties of making a successful prosecution, difficulty of detection, a belief that regulatory bodies are more effective for changing corporate behaviour, and the need to protect the marketplace from too many restrictions are some of the explanations that have been provided”.*

*“Much of our thinking about the power of the criminal law is based on notions of deterrence: we assume that if we make behaviour a crime and attach penalties to the action, people are less likely to engage in the conduct. However, deterrence involves at least three elements: swiftness of punishment, severity of punishment and certainty of being caught. When people demand longer and harsher penalties, they are focusing on the severity element of deterrence. **Research has shown that certainty of punishment, rather than severity of punishment, has the greatest deterrent effect.** The use of criminal law may not be efficient when it requires enforcement resources that may be difficult to marshal”.*

My attempt at placing in perspective issues of concern, imparting Canadian society and Your Majesty, with information that brings forth present day Bastard Feudalism, currently robbing Canada of a just system of law, exemplifies segments of Canadian Government and society in need of corrections and criminal prosecution. Together with the above-mentioned excerpts, the legal profession in Canada is privileged with bias assertions influencing a system that, at best, is in a state of crisis, specific to chaotic endeavors that sustain a legal profession that otherwise would flop if it functioned within a half-organized legal system with traces of honor, integrity and common sense. Bearing in mind that Canadian Judges and Justices are politically appointed lawyers, a scenario that facilitates the recruitment of “retainers”. The following quotes originate from the pages of Richard Susskind’s book - *End of Lawyers*;

“Against this backdrop, I should be honest about one issue from the outset. I do not believe lawyers are self-evidently entitled to profit from the law. As I have said before, the law is not there to provide a livelihood for lawyers any more than illness prevails in order to offer a living for doctors”.

“I argue that the market is increasingly unlikely to tolerate expensive lawyers for tasks (guiding, advising, drafting, researching, problem-solving, and more) that can equally or better be discharged by less expert people, supported by sophisticated systems and processes. It follows, I say, that the jobs of many traditional lawyers will be substantially eroded and often eliminated”.

Augmenting the above quotes, the following excerpts originate from a CBC news article published on August 15, 2011 at 2:06 PM ET; **NDP accuse Clement of using G8 cash as 'slush fund'**. The said CBC article refers to a \$50-million fund that was able to avoid normal checks and balances because of how the Minister of Industry, Tony Clement (a lawyer) set it up.

“In fact, it appears that this slush fund was set up in such a way that it kept both the Canadian public and the auditor general in the dark,” said NDP MP Charlie Angus, moreover;

“Because Minister Clement (Tony Clement) used his constituency office, this wasn’t subject to the normal channels of review,” said Angus (MP Charlie Angus). *“The use of a constituency office to funnel money is very disturbing. It smacks of the creation of a **personal private fiefdom** where taxpayers’ money becomes pocket*

change for Tony Clement to give out. That's a very disturbing process if we allow this."

"The NDP obtained the documents through freedom of information laws from the Huntsville and Bracebridge municipal governments. Angus said the documents were beyond the auditor general's reach. The auditor general only has the authority to access federal departments, not local governments, and Angus suggested Clement "bypassed bureaucracy" by running the fund through his local office".

The Minister of Industry, Tony Clement (a lawyer) applied the "Code of Silence" against my good name after I informed his Ministry of the various breaches of the Canada Corporations Act by the CRHA Corporation, Board of Directors. Certainly a strong indication that Tony Clement is a suspect of Harbour Fraud practices.

On March 6, 2011 CBC News published an article; **Fraud costs nearing drug trade, RCMP say.**

"Speaking to CBC News at an Ottawa conference, an RCMP (Insp. Kerry Petryshyn, head of major fraud for RCMP in Ottawa) expert said fraud in Canada is approaching the size and scope of the drug trade".

"Total losses are actually \$30 billion a year, police estimate. "Which is pretty close to the drug industry here in Canada, however a lot more victims," he said".

"Fraud is an offense that is woven in amongst all the other criminal activities, so smugglers and drug dealers and all other sorts of criminals also all commit fraud," said Petryshyn. "So by gathering together that fraud information, what you end up doing is being able to identify these large criminal networks."

Bringing the above-mentioned excerpts together, elevating fraud into a state of national crisis, the article by Karen Mazurkewich of the Financial Post, published on November 25, 2009 at 9:43 AM ET, describes Canada, "the fourth most fraudulent nation in the world";

"Now a recent report by PricewaterhouseCoopers suggests Canadian companies make great targets for fraud. In their latest global economic crime survey, Canada was the fourth most fraudulent nation in the world -- behind Russia, South Africa and Kenya".

"The most common type of fraud encountered in Canada is asset misappropriation, although accounting fraud and money laundering are also prevalent".

"We're not as bad as many [developing] countries, but if you look around the OECD, the really developed economies with strong democratic governments, I think we are pretty high on the list for having a high incidence of commercial fraud," says Mr. Grout. He says the reason for that is the lack of deterrents. "We don't put anyone in jail," he said.

In principle, addressing Your Majesty, I bring forth judiciary practice of sophistry that impedes crime prevention in Canada, into a state of perpetual abuse hurled at the honest citizen, better said the "non-retainers", where the key players escalating crime, occurring within Canada, are Court Judges/Justices, the Crown, Police and the Canadian political governance that maintains a chronic state of corruption, with an ability to avoid prosecution when caught.

For example, a court Judge or Justice obstructs justice, whenever he or she refuses to listen to high level criminal evidence indicative that a crime occurred, followed by creative excuses with intent to

thwart the Rule of law. The following methods that I witnessed, impede the Rule of Law;

- a. refusing to sign subpoenas,
- b. outright refusing to provide directions when the rules are confusing or conflicting,
- c. ordering an Informant out of Court after refusing to examine written submissions,
- d. contradicting a request from a previous Judge/Justice by stating that a Judge or Justice has sole authority within his court,
- e. refusing to issue process when a *Prima Facie* case is obvious, deriving from evidence before the court,
- f. discouraging an Informant to proceed because the Courts are in a state of crisis.
- g. And, to add tragedy to the above-mentioned experiences, the ruling of Appeal Court Madam Justice Nielson, on February 17, 2012, where she outright changed criminal proceedings into civil proceedings for the sole purpose of penalizing my good name with future court cost awarded to the Attorney General of Canada and Federal Court Justices involved in Obstructing Justice. Certainly a Bastard Madam Justice showing the mannerisms of a high level "retainer" purposely appointed to the bench to thwart justice.

The two paragraphs (f) and (g), branches into aspects of failing to implement the Rule of Law where, mainly, such failures bring the courts into disrepute. And, the Attorney General a fraud, by not providing the services of a court, paid by the taxpayer.

The Crown

The below-listed Crown representatives, directly relate to issues herein narrated, involving three Attorney Generals for the Province of British Columbia. The below-mentioned twenty-one individuals took part in court files related to issues of concern that never reached a just resolution. The said issues date back to 2002, involving the totality of criminal files that I took part. While I express no praise for the below-listed individuals, there are exceptions; I praise Mr. **Julian Greenwood a senior Crown Prosecutor and an English gentleman**, for his common sense at preventing a miscarriage of justice involving my good name. Further, Mr. **Julian Greenwood** must also be praised for his efforts at acquiring important details associated with high level government "retainers", unfortunately, when the judicial system is mainly based on ignoring criminal evidence against government employees, Mr. Greenwood's and my efforts served no purpose.

Robert Nicholson – *Attorney General Canada*

Bruce Stewart - *New Westminster Crown*

W. Oppal – *Attorney General B.C.*

Julian Greenwood – *New Westminster Crown*

B. Penner - *Attorney General B.C.*

John Boccabella – *Campbell River Crown*

Shirley Bond - *Attorney General B.C.*

Todd Gerhart – *Federal Crown*

Robert Gillen – *Deputy Attorney General B.C.*

L. Lachance - *Federal Crown*

Peter Juk – *Regional Crown, Vancouver Island*

Nathan Murray – *Federal Crown*

Lesley Ruzicka - *Crown, Vancouver Island*

Irene Plett – *New Westminster Crown*

Vittorio Toselli - *New Westminster Crown*

L. Kiner – *New Westminster Crown*

Mathew Canzer – *Federal Crown*

Messina Gillespie - *New Westminster Crown*

Richard Romano - *New Westminster Crown*

Jasvinder S. Basran - *Federal Crown*

Adrienne Venturini - *Campbell River Crown*

When the “retainer” Robert Gillen (recently resigned), Assistant Deputy Attorney General for British Columbia, enters the arena; Robert Gillen judged criminal cases before our Court Judges had a chance to hear the evidence. He used the famous phrase; “*no charges will be laid, there is no substantial likelihood of conviction it is not required in the public interest*”. Since 2002, I heard these words originating from various Crowns, while holding several pieces of “Black and White” evidence that according to the Rule of Law and case law will assure a conviction. Again, all carried out in the name of Your Majesty (the Crown).

“POLICY; Under the Crown Counsel Act, Crown Counsel have the responsibility of making a charge assessment decision which determines whether or not a prosecution will proceed”.

“In discharging that charge assessment responsibility, Crown Counsel **must fairly**, independently, and objectively examine the available evidence in order to determine:

1. whether there is a substantial likelihood of conviction; and, if so,
2. whether a prosecution is required in the public interest”.

When Crown Counsel Policy is applied to a community that is mainly made-up of “retainers” involved in covering up Fraud, specific to land and water lots, owned by HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN, in right of Canada as represented by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) and acting through the Regional Director, Crown counsel without hesitation, hurls the phrase; *there is no substantial likelihood of a fraud conviction it is not required in the public interest*, effectively killing the whole court process and nullifying the job of the Courts; to hear evidence before a judge and the public. Criminal Court files above-listed involving the Campbell River Harbour Authority, exemplify all aspects of the preceding statement.

The Crown’s Control of the Courts - Private Prosecutions?

Bringing the issues to a more complex legal level, my September 22, 2011 Petition to the Supreme Court of British Columbia asks for clarifications involving Private Prosecutions specific to pre-enquete procedures. My argument is outlined below, as follows;

- a. Are pre-enquetes ex parte?
- b. Are pre-enquetes in camera?
- c. Am I limited to only presenting eye-witness evidence deriving from witnesses that show-up at the hearing on a voluntary basis? Are subpoenas not allowed?

d. Should pre-enquetes become full trials where all the evidence is presented to the Judge or Justice?

“The Ontario Appeals Court on May 17, 2010 in the case of R. v. McHale, 2010 ONCA 361 (CanLII) ruled against the Crown but also ruled that a person is an accused at the moment an information is sworn out”;

“[86] ... It seems to logically follow from the decisions mentioned that laying an information falls within “proceedings in relation to an accused”. The same could be said of a pre-enquete, a proceeding to determine whether process should issue”.

The above-mentioned decision reverses a 1990 ruling by Ontario Court of Appeal in Southam Inc. v. Coulter; a person who the information is filed against is still labeled a person, however, he becomes the accused if process is issued.

“[para. 8] There is no “accused” until a Justice of the Peace decides that a warrant or summons should be issued”.

The Supreme Court in 1987 in R. v. Kalanj [1989] 1 S.C.R. 1594 stated:

“I would therefore hold that a person is “charged with an offence” within the meaning of s. 11 of the Charter when an information is sworn alleging an offence against him, or where a direct indictment is laid against him when no information is sworn”.

The said rulings raise serious questions regarding the procedures of pre-enquetes. Are pre-enquetes ex parte? Section 507(1) (a) (Public Prosecutions) states the justice shall 'hear and consider, ex parte'. The phrase 'ex parte' does not appear in s. 507.1 for private prosecutions. Moreover, in 2002 Parliament added Section 507.1 and removed the 'ex parte' phrase from the proceedings requirements. Since then it appears courts have continued the 'ex parte' requirement out of habit and not because of statute. Are pre-enquetes in camera? Section 486(1) states;

“Any proceedings against an accused shall be held in open court,..”

Now with the ruling from the Ontario Appeals Court that a pre-enquete is a proceeding against an accused, it now appears pre-enquetes should not be in camera. Are we, the informants, limited to only presenting eye-witness evidence deriving from witnesses that show-up at the hearing on a voluntary basis? Are subpoena witnesses not allowed? In the case of R. v. Edge, 2004 ABPC 55, it states;

“Where proof of the prima facie case depends on witnesses other than the informant, those witnesses need to testify in the same manner. The absence of witnesses to prove a prima facie case will mean that no process will be issued. Of course, the judge may, in appropriate circumstances, afford the informant the right to an adjournment to obtain further evidence. If no process is issued, the informant still has an alternative to reapply within six months if there is new evidence”.

This ruling or observation by Judge Allen (R. v. Edge), raises the question whether any evidence outside of eye witness evidence is permissible during pre-enquetes including the following;

a. Video and photo evidence

- b. Affidavits from witnesses
- c. RCMP Occurrence reports etc.
- d. Exhibits from other Court cases
- e. Witnesses by subpoena

Should pre-enquetes become full trials where all the evidence is presented to the Judge or Justice?
Considering the following apparent facts;

- a. All evidence must be provided through witnesses, and;
- b. The Crown's authority to stay informations prior to issuing of a charge, and;
- c. The Crown's position that only informations where there is enough evidence to get a conviction should proceed,
- d. Is the Informant now required to conduct a full trial to ensure not a *prima facie* case but a case beyond reasonable doubt?

The Crown may have the authority to stay information, but does the view by the Crown that private informants, **me**, must provide during the pre-enquete evidence beyond a reasonable doubt void the *prima facie* requirement both of statute and of common law? Is a local administration of justice served in accordance with the will of Parliament by the Crown compelling average citizens to do what organized investigators (police) cannot do which is to have all the evidence necessary for a conviction prepared properly at the pre-enquete? We should be reminded of the words of Judge Allen in the Edge case;

“Many private informants have little knowledge of the type of proof necessary to prove the guilt of an accused, or the laws of evidence. Moreover, in many cases no investigation has been done, and the informant has done little to preserve the evidence”.

In short, must we conduct a full trial which may include numerous days of evidence by several witnesses in order for process to issue? Certainly, I affirm the need for such.

The preceding arguments and questions are outlined as per Court procedures involving Private Prosecution. Yet when a common sense analysis is carried out, the underlying motive for a confusing and ridiculous process involving the practice of Private Prosecution comes to the surface with a demanding question; why such practice, when it serves no practical purpose? Moreover, it deters Private Prosecutors from reaching the trial stage, specific to the interests of the Crown, to block Private Prosecutors from presenting all the evidence before a Judge or Justice in open court (Public).

Firstly, the protection of an accused brought to Court via a Private Prosecution must be addressed. There are no laws preventing a citizen that initiates a Private Prosecution from making all allegations public. Allegations against an accused are assertions of fact, therefore immune from Canadian defamation laws.

Secondly, **the purpose of a Crown Prosecution or a Private Prosecution is to bring criminal evidence before the Court.** When Crown initiates a Prosecution based on false evidence, alike an

Informant that does the same, they are both liable and must face the Rule of Law that dictates punishment for false accusations. Again, the need to have a locked Court to preserve the evidence of a Private Prosecution should process not issue, has no rationale, moreover, an insult to the efforts of a Private Prosecutor to bring a criminal to justice.

How many times the Crown files charges against an accused only to find that the evidence does not support a crime? Subsequently, dropping the charges before the case reaches trial; the resulting evidence is not sealed in a court file, rather the Crown makes sure everyone knows, making it public from the onset of laying charges.

Augmenting the above paragraph, New Westminster Court file 67140 involved a false charge of Forgery against my good name. Given I am now aware that the said charge was created by an RCMP officer and Transport Canada officials to protect the criminal behavior of a "lord" residing within the Canadian government. The Crown, from the start, made sure the whole world knew that I was charged with falsifying a ship's document, even when the Crown, Irene Platt, stated to Judge Angelomatis that she did not understand the evidence.

In the end, court file 67140 did not reach trial, a senior crown stay the charge and I received a letter of thank you from the United States Coast Guard and Homeland Security for my attempts at preventing an unseaworthy vessel from departing Canada endangering the lives of the public and crew. Shouldn't Court File 67140, alike others that Crown "screws up", deserve the protection of a pre-enquete, allowing for a *prima facie* requirement before the public is made aware of the charge? Needless to say, the totality of Court File 67140 was a determined attempt by "retainers" originating from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Transport Canada and the Judiciary to prevent me from alerting the public that a Canadian Feudal "Lord" allowed dumping unseaworthy Canadian vessels into the United States and beyond.

There is no protection for an accused when the evidence is factual, thus bringing forth the question; should an accused receive protection from allegations of wrong doing?

Fundamentally, it is wrong to allow the Crown to have sole authority to prosecute when democracy is at play. The Crown is Your Majesty the Queen of Canada, a monarch with sovereign powers. Therefore, is Canada a Monarchy or a Democracy? In practice, the two don't mix. Either, Canadians, obey Your Majesty or they practice Democracy. Bringing forth my nation of birth, the king of Portugal was shot dead sending a strong message to Portuguese citizens that a dictatorial Monarch seized to exist and democracy began; a clear cut measure with a strong statement that Monarchy and Democracy do not mix. The other aspect of the preceding statement involves Your Majesty to institute Law and Order as per the Rule of Law.

For example, should the Board of Directors of the Campbell River Harbour Authority (CRHA) Corporation and Phyllis Titus relax? Will a prosecution of Fraud (Court File 37556) and other crimes that they committed, involving the CRHA Corporation and its Board of Directors, reach a conviction? What provisions are available to me, the informant, when the Crown is a corrupt entity and denies prosecution when fully aware of compelling evidence against them? Again I remind Your Majesty that you are the Crown. Perhaps I am wrong and in actuality the real Crown is the Feudal "lord".

RCMP Practices

The following names represent RCMP officers directly related to the issues herein narrated.

Randy Wilson – RCMP Chief Superintendent B.C.	Norm Rooney – RCMP Cpl. Vancouver ITCU
Paul Darbyshire - RCMP Inspector (“E” division)	Norm Rooney – RCMP Cpl. Vancouver ITCU
Paul N. Cheney - RCMP Inspector (Island HQ)	Graham Eadie - RCMP Cpl. Security Engineering
M. G. Peers - RCMP Sgt. West Coast Marine	Darren A. Lagan – RCMP Cpl. (Media Relations)
T.S. Dhut – Det. New Westminster Police	B. M. Valentine - RCMP Cst. West Coast Marine
P. S. Attrell - RCMP Sgt. West Coast Marine	K. J. Haycock – RCMP Cst. West Coast Marine
B. Gordon – RCMP Sgt. West Coast Marine	<u>Campbell River RCMP</u>
B. I. Morrison - RCMP Sgt. West Coast Marine	Lyle Gelinias – RCMP Inspector (Campbell River)
Kim McDonald - RCMP Sgt. West Coast Marine	Craig Massey – RCMP Sgt. (Campbell River)
Witworth - RCMP Sgt. Security Engineering	Anna Mallard – RCMP Sgt. (Campbell River)
Bruce Clark – RCMP Sgt. Vancouver ITCU	William Pickering – RCMP Cst. (Campbell River)
Andrew Cowan – RCMP Sgt. (“E” division)	Jacqueline Weiler – RCMP Cst. (Campbell River)
Angela Wardricks - RCMP Cpl. Vancouver	Wallace – RCMP Cst. (Campbell River)
Colin Cree - RCMP Cpl. Vancouver ITCU	Clow – RCMP Cst. (Campbell River)
	Dormuth - RCMP Cst. (Campbell River)

The participation of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) mimics the mannerisms of the Crown, where the RCMP ignores evidence of fraud and other crimes as per the needs of the “lord”. The CRHA Board of Directors and CRHA Staff sanctioning the overall crime of depriving the community of a well managed marine facility, free of fraud, etc..., brings forth the RCMP and its slew of “retainers” ignoring my requests to investigate. Specifically, given that the totality of the CRHA financial gains are not used to promote the upkeep and development of the CRHA Harbour as per the provisions of the Canada Corporations Act, Part II, the CRHA by-laws and the DFO-CRHA Lease Agreement. The preceding documents are available from Website – www.sealegacy.com – for public review.

Furthermore, via my frustration dealing with an aloft local police force, the Campbell River, RCMP Detachment, I contacted RCMP Sgt. Andrew Cowan, “E” Division, Commercial Crimes Unit, Victoria B. C., demanding answers as to the lack of interest originating from the local RCMP at investigating Fraud.

Setting forth a detailed description of Sgt. Cowan's answers, serves no purpose to the intended purpose of this letter, rather the result of my interaction with Sgt. Cowan, matters; I became engulfed

in a learning process with intent at bringing my methods of evidence presentation to the standards of the RCMP. Praising Sgt. Cowan for his initial attention was merited yet the overall involvement of the RCMP was a disgrace, conducive with a police force that supports criminal activity indicative of an organization oriented at serving the "lord". Certainly "retainers" of the highest level and when the RCMP is singled out it shows a disgraced force that should be terminated with hopes that a better force takes its place. Unfortunately, bringing forth a better police force would not solve anything, because the problem starts with the Crown dictating who gets prosecuted and who does not, regardless of available evidence.

The RCMP's misdeeds in British Columbia are as notorious as it is lengthy. Just when I begin to think that I identified the final episode of frustration and upset with the RCMP, the national police force finds a way to produce another one. To begin with, the mishandling of the Air India inquiry, the length of time it took to catch serial killer Robert Pickton, the airport Taser death of Robert Dziekanski (and the upcoming perjury trials of the officers), the execution of Ian Bush, the upcoming trial of Kelowna RCMP Const. Geoff Mantler for using excessive force in two arrests, and that's just some of the examples. Now, four senior RCMP officers investigating the Surrey Six murders have been charged with obstruction of justice, breach of trust and fraud, including one who had an affair with the ex-girlfriend of one of the killers and Const. Mitch Fiddick cruelty to a police dog (a puppy in training). When will RCMP officers begin cruelty to their horses?

Many British Columbians say they lost faith in the RCMP when blame also goes to Crown for not prosecuting RCMP officers that committed murderous crimes. Thus, allowing a police force that is infested with criminals to continue employing such, brings the Crown and the Attorney General of British Columbia into a state of flagrant impropriety.

The British Columbia Court of Appeal in "*Werring and the Alberta Court of Appeal in Kostuch*" both adopted the statement that a flagrant impropriety can only be established by proof of misconduct bordering on corruption, violation of the law, bias against or for a particular individual or offence.

"The Attorney General (AG) is responsible for ensuring that public administration is conducted according to the law and as such, he is the chief advisor of law to the government, in addition to overseeing the court system and Sheriff Services. Under the Queen's Counsel Act, the Attorney General is automatically appointed a Queen's Counsel upon swearing into office. He or she also serves as an ex officio Bencher of the Law Society of British Columbia".

Providing full descriptions of relevant case files would require the review of several thousand document pages giving Your Majesty a "Royal headache". Instead summaries are in order, with an understanding that any request to review specific documents, I will promptly comply. My Web Pages already contain a partial list of exhibits and documents; www.sealegacy.com.

Regardless of blame placed upon our Judiciary, etc... Ultimately, it is Canadian's fault for allowing our Canadian democratic system to run amuck, governed by an ever increasing number of "retainers" serving the well protected Feudal "lord". Your Majesty, the Head of the Canadian State, must address issues that follow, in numbered paragraphs below and decide whether the dilemma within the

Canadian Right of State dismisses honor, to a condition of criminal participant, an attitude that I find reprehensible.

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) continuously fail to address crime with purposely developed methodologies created to hide Government wrong doing, reflecting Your Majesty's name, because it does it with complete regard to the Head of State with intent to establish that it has absolute powers; a practice that dictates to Canadian Society that Her Majesty, being the absolute Head of the Canadian State, prevents democratic practice to take hold and the Rule of Law does not apply. Certainly, a dangerous precedent to follow and one that can result in conflict when Canadian democracy evaporates and Your Majesty's name is dragged into blame.

Should my criticisms hurled at the RCMP seem excessive, I bring forth a simple and straight forward example that took place on September 18, 2011. One of many examples experienced by Sailmaster Glenn Lusk and I, when a large oil spill occurred within the CRHA facility. It follows, Sailmaster Glenn Lusk reported the oil spill to Environment Canada and I collected an oil sample. Initiated by Environment Canada the Campbell River Fire Department were dispatched to the scene. During their assessment of the Oil spill, the fire truck captain called Phyllis Titus, CRHA facility Manager and upon her arrival at the scene, she proceeded to discredit both of us and attempted to destroy the oil sample that I collected. Witnessed by several firemen, Phyllis Titus kicked the oil sample bottle with her foot, sending the said bottled sample rolling across the pier head planks. Miraculously, the said bottle did not break and it is currently under our care as a testimonial to numerous other oils spills occurring on a regular basis since my arrival at the CRHA facility, sometime in 2008.

Given Phyllis Titus, a self-proclaimed "*bitch*", usual mannerisms of aggression and incompetence we asked the Fire Truck captain to call the police. Soon after, RCMP Cst. Dormuth arrived accompanied by a female RCMP Constable. Instead of assessing the oil spill Environmental damage, RCMP Cst. Dormuth assaulted Sailmaster Glenn Lusk together with numerous threats against his good name. The whole episode needs no recollection given that it was audio recorded for criminal evidence purposes. Minus the physical assault I experienced the same. In other words, the police took the side of the criminals ("*retainers*") while assaulting the good citizens.

Alike numerous large oil spills occurring within the CRHA facility, no oil spill containment took place initiated by the CRHA facility Staff with full support of the RCMP constables and the Campbell River Fire Department that declared the oil spill a minor event. The oil sample collected shows otherwise, that it was a large oil spill for such a small harbour facility. Other events purposely ignored by the RCMP; Fraud, physical assault causing bodily harm, endangering the safety of a vessel, theft of CRHA property and perjury.

Criminal Court Files 67891-1, 63646-1 and 67140

Justice Pitfield – *Supreme Court B.C.*

Judge Dossa - *New Westminister Courts*

Provincial Courts

Judge Pothecary - *New Westminister Courts*

Judge Angelomatis – *New Westminister Courts*

Judge Steinberg - *New Westminister Courts*

The following are summarized hard facts, involving my early legal practice and Courtroom experiences, originating from issues involving the RCMP and Transport Canada.

1. On July 30, 2002, while docked at Allied shipyard located in North Vancouver, BC, the owners of the ex-Gulf Ivy, O.N. 170259, IMO Ship I.D. No. 5180520, received a detention order from officials of Transport Canada under section 310 (1) of the Canadian Shipping Act. Mr. Shon Nickel and his wife Ms. Lee Keevil, both US citizens, co-owned the ex-Gulf Ivy since January 24, 2000, when it was removed from Canadian Registry. From the date of purchase to ship detention, Mr. Shon Nickel, modified his ship from its original design as a deep-sea tug to a passenger ship to carry paying passengers. Mr. Nickel's modifications met no rules, endangering the safe navigation of the ship. According to the Canadian Criminal Code section 78.1 endangering the safety of a ship or fixed platform is a crime. Unfortunately, the idea of unsafe did not enter the incompetent heads of three individuals in-charge of detaining the ship in 2002, namely, RCMP Sgt. Mark G. Peers from the West Coast Marine detachment and two incompetents, Brian Kenefick together with his subordinate Colin Currivan from Transport Canada, Ship Safety Branch, Vancouver, BC. Sometime in 2005, I interviewed Mr. Bud Streeter, Director General, Transport Canada, Marine Safety, the following, in his own words, summarizes Marine safety;

"There is no doubt that marine safety is dysfunctional right now for sure basically what you got is a whole bunch of regional directors that don't take any direction from Ottawa plus you don't have anybody in Ottawa that is giving any direction".

"They are having their problems in marine safety they have problems with enforcement they have problems with standards and they have problems with personnel".

"I don't think it is as simple as one person being incompetent it's a problem with the whole organization and I will be very honest after one trip to the heart institute in the back of an ambulance, five years in marine safety was enough for me. I had a heart attack in February 2002, and I took an opportunity that was presented in May of 2002".

"And I am not surprised there has been a number of things particular in the west coast that have not made a lot of sense, the analogy that I heard used was the inmates are in charge of the asylum out there".

2. From the date of detention to ship's departure bound for the deep waters of the Pacific Ocean, sometime in November 2002, the above-mentioned Canadian officials watched Mr. Shon Nickel continue to modify and add equipment to an unseaworthy ship. At the end of the four months, July 2002 to November 2002, they allowed the ship to depart in a worse condition than before the detention. To date, Transport Canada, RCMP and the Attorney General of BC failed to provide an explanation for this criminal activity. The only reply regarding Mr. Shon's ship came from Mr. Stan T. Lowe, Office of the Attorney General, Communication Counsel, Criminal Justice Branch,

in a statement given to me on December 1, 2006 regarding IMO conventions signed by Canada.

"....a signatory to that agreement is not the (Canadian) justice system the justice system is not bound by that agreement (IMO Conventions)".

3. Following the above-quoted statement, I sent several letters addressed to the then Attorney General of British Columbia, Judge Wally Opal, strongly recommending that he educate his subordinates on IMO conventions dealing with SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA and the enforcement of such. No reply was ever received to numerous issues that I raised regarding ship safety and the Criminal Code within Canadian waters.
4. On March 16, 2006, the Supreme Court of British Columbia granted a Judicial Review of the facts involving the activities of the above-mentioned individuals, initiated by me under my Private Prosecution against RCMP Sgt. Mark G. Peers formerly serving the RCMP West Coast Marine Detachment, Nanaimo, BC. Unfortunately, under pressure from the Bench to withdraw my Private Prosecution and seeing that my efforts were being blocked by the usual number of "retainers" originating from all segments of government, I took the advice of Provincial Court Judge Angelomatis, New Westminster, BC, when he said that a continuation of my efforts would result in my martyrdom. Unfortunately, six days later the BC Ferries vessel M/V Queen of the North sank on March 22, 2006, once again indicating the backwardness and incompetence of Transport Canada allowing a One Compartment passenger ferry to navigate the open waters of the Pacific Ocean. A ship with a Gross Tonnage of 8,806, built in 1969, with a Car Capacity of 115 and able to carry 700 passengers. My article about M/V Queen of the North tragedy written on July 1, 2006 is available for review from the Web Pages of www.sealegacy.com under the title "Welcome Aboard".
5. And, when victims of RCMP criminal acts are brought forward, I must mention the involvement of RCMP Sgt. M. G. Peers at bringing a false charge of Forgery against my good name; New Westminster Court File 67140. Subsequently, I filed a Private Prosecution against him, New Westminster Court File 67891-1, where the determined efforts of Court Judges and the Attorney General prevented process. When these Court Files are reviewed to ascertain worthiness of prosecution abilities, better said at protecting society and the public interest requiring prosecution, the "retainers" are prominent. Specifically, the "retainers" are easily identified; Judges, Crowns and Police; saboteurs of Justice that enrich themselves by supporting a system that fails the Rule of Law and ultimately plays servitude to the "lord".
6. Moreover, RCMP Sgt. M. G. Peers, West Coast Marine Detachment, falsified a search warrant and contravening the Canada Shipping Act. The Courts of New Westminster, British Columbia, failed to issue process and prosecute a wrong. Criminal Court File 67891-1.
7. On October 12, 2005 Captain Patrick G. Gerrity, United States Coast Guard and Homeland Security, sent me a letter of thank you, addressing the failure of the RCMP and the Attorney General of British Columbia at preventing a ship from departing Canada in an unseaworthy condition. These case files remain open and in need of prosecution because they involve RCMP and Transport Canada Officials committing several crimes. The RCMP and the Crown did a very

good job at bringing shame to Canada. Certainly, an issue that refuses to go away, instead it appears that shaming our nation is an endorsed practice.

8. The said criminal files, above-mentioned, also involve the unseaworthy Ex-Canadian Registered vessel, departing the Port of Vancouver, authorized by Transport Canada Steamship Inspectors (Port State Control), **after falsifying my stability booklet showing the said vessel to be unstable.** A genuine Transport Canada approval stamp is depicted on a falsified page that originated from falsified copies of my stability booklet.
9. **While I have a low opinion of the RCMP, fortunately there are exceptions.** Thanks to honourable RCMP officers from the West Coast Marine Detachment, Nanaimo, British Columbia, other than the said RCMP Sergeant that falsified the above-mentioned search warrant, I have evidence to show in court where my Private Prosecution against the said RCMP officer was purposely blocked by presiding Judges of the Courts of New Westminster, British Columbia.
10. Subsequently, after the said vessel departure, the **United States Coast Guard and Homeland Security** issued a letter of thanks addressed to me for my attempts to stop the vessel, yet the United States officials are not aware that Transport Canada officials falsified my stability booklet. Furthermore, an additional Canadian Naval Architect issued similar warnings about the unseaworthy status of the vessel; both warnings were completely ignored by Transport Canada. Currently this case is not resolved before the Courts of British Columbia. Criminal Court File 67891-1 and Court files 63646-1/67140.
11. Numerous commercial vessels (tugs and fishing) of various tonnages, registered in Canada, continue to navigate within the British Columbia coastal waters, without adequate stability. These stability booklets bear the official approval stamp of Transport Canada; they contravene the Canada Shipping Act, 1975 Stability Criterion. This fact includes the Tug "Inlet Challenger" that I re-fitted with sponsoons in 2009, to correct its stability that was approved thirty years ago by Transport Canada when the vessel sailed with less than adequate stability, endangering the crew and the marine public. Unfortunately, no one was killed or injured, yet the same did not save numerous others that capsized. Sometime following my work to correct the stability of the Tug "Inlet Challenger", I met with officials from Transport Canada Marine Safety assuring me that Transport Canada continues to operate under the same umbrella of incompetence of years past.
12. The events, above-described, reflect approximately TWO THOUSAND pieces of paper, exhibiting; letters, faxes, documents, certificates, court applications, ship drawings, court transcripts, and stability data. In Addition, approximately TWELVE HOURS of recorded interviews with witnesses and graphic information released from United States of America, Homeland Security, all add testimony to the severity of neglect and criminal activity displayed by Canadian Government officials, namely a member of the RCMP, Sgt. Mark G. Peers and five officials of Transport Canada, James Lawson, Brian Kenefick, Colin Currvan, David Motion and Goeff Sedan. No official was ever convicted for criminal behavior. The following are excerpts from my letter written on January 15, 2007 to Judge de Couto, Courts of New Westminster, Administering Judge;

“This event, allowing an unseaworthy and dangerously modified ship to leave port, is the focal point of all other events involving the M/V Gulf Ivy/El Conquistador and the relationship between Shon Nickel and Transport Canada/RCMP Sgt. Mark G. Peers team. Summarizing what the evidence clearly demonstrates, I will outline within paragraphs that follow, specifics of such evidence with an interest to prevent future comments from the Judiciary, under your administrative rule, showing an interest to protect civil servants from criminal prosecution. Specifically, Judge Challenger’s past conduct, also remembering and attesting to the neutrality shown by the majority of Judges. In General, it is imperative, that a ruling Judge fully comprehend the evidence before rulings or bench comments are forwarded to the participants”.

*“The amount of evidence detail, presently available, reflects the respect and cooperation awarded to me by members of the RCMP West Coast Marine Services. I am sure, Your Honor will agree, that blaming the RCMP for the criminal activity of one member and failing to praise those that cared to bring forth truth, from within such institution, serves no purpose to the rule of law. Also, allowing an unseaworthy ship to depart Canada, while charging me with forgery, **(Forgery charge dismissed by the Crown against my good name in 2006, perplexing the United States Coast Guard as to the reason for the charge)** the only individual that continuously tried to stop such, subsequently embarrassing the whole nation before our USA neighbors, merits a judiciary resolution. I am sure this preceding statement is shared by most of us that care to preserve the rule of law within our Great Nation, Canada”.*

*“No official from Transport Canada, from the Minister down, ever intervened in these events, now spanning five years, with an interest to correct their wrongdoing or apologize to me and our USA neighbors. This attitude is extended to the Attorney General of BC **(Wally Opal and Robert Gillen)** for his flagrant impropriety behavior before Court Judges under your honor’s administrative rule and before Supreme Court Judge Pitfield”.*

*“The Attorney General of BC has wide powers to intervene in a private prosecution, choosing to ignore the evidence that was available to him from the RCMP. Instead, he met the standard of flagrant impropriety, with proof of misconduct bordering on corruption, violation of the law, bias against or for a particular individual or offence. Three letters, September 23, September 26, and October 17, 2005, were sent to this individual, **(Wally Opal)** mandated to prosecute criminals. The letter sent on October 17, 2005 included a copy of a letter originating from the United States Coast Guard (USCG), Homeland Security, signed by the Captain of the Port, thanking me for my commitment to detain the M/V El Conquistador for unseaworthy reasons. The letter also included a detail description of the vessel’s unsafe condition. These statements are fully supported by the behavior of Stan Lowe, Irene Plett and Bruce Stewart, all representatives of the Attorney General of BC. Rather than describe in detail the behavior of the Attorney General’s office, I will detail events that remain in my mind, attesting to their less-than-honorable conduct”.*

Criminal Court File 67891-1 and Court files 63646-1/67140. These files are archived within the Courts of New Westminster.

Criminal Court Files 36999-1, 37034-1, 37462-1 and 37556

Court file 37556 received the following numbers from the Appeal court for the Province of British Columbia; CA39471 and CA039548. The list of Judges and Justices follow;

Justice Hall – *Appeal Court of B.C.*

Provincial Courts

Justice Nielson - *Appeal Court of B.C.*

Judge Saunderson – *Campbell River Courts*

Justice Halfyard – *Supreme Court of B.C.*

Judge Doherty - *Campbell River Courts*

Justice Johnson - *Supreme Court of B.C.*

Judge Jake - *Campbell River Courts*

Justice Harvey - *Supreme Court of B.C.*

Judge Neal - *Campbell River Courts (Satellite)*

Justice Romilly - *Supreme Court of B.C.*

Judge Cowling – *Campbell River Courts*

Justice Truscott - *Supreme Court of B.C.*

Judge Saunders - *Campbell River Courts*

Justice Bruce - *Supreme Court of B.C.*

13. Campbell River Harbour Authority (CRHA), involving case files 36999-1, 37034-1 and 37462-1, charges financial fraud and so far the court process is an obstacle rather than a facilitator. These case numbers were transferred to the Supreme Courts of BC involving my application for Winding-up of the CRHA. Charges of Fraud along with other criminal charges are currently before the Provincial Courts of Campbell River, BC under a new criminal court file number; 37556. **These charges were sworn on December 15, 2010 with no date given by the court to see a judge and issue process, thus far. Again, attesting to a Judicial failure. When eight months passed with no court date in sight, the evidence is clear; the court is preventing prosecution for the purpose of protecting suspected Government corruption.**

14. The Board of Directors of the Campbell River Harbour Authority clearly exemplify how easy it is to defraud the general public and the membership of a Not-for-profit Corporation (CRHA) of money and services to the betterment of themselves. The following excerpts derives from my court submissions under the “Synopsis” header, Criminal Court File 37556;

“The Informant, Capt. E. G. da Costa Duarte, acknowledges that his ignorance of Corporate facts involving the Campbell River Harbour Authority (CRHA), at the onset of his arrival, sometime during the Spring months of 2008, prevented his detection of fraudulent practices”;

“Yet, the blunt disregard for maritime practices involving oil pollution control and unseaworthy vessels plying the CRHA facility, prompted Capt. E. G. da Costa Duarte to inquire as to the governance and law enforcement applied to everyday running of the CRHA facility”;

“From 2008 to the end of 2009 any verbal inquiry, originating from the Informant and directed at CRHA staff and/or CRHA Board Members; as to the type of organization the Campbell River Harbour Authority fell under, the answer was definitive, indicating that the CRHA facility was part of Small Craft Harbours under the control of Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO)”.

“Reflective of a state of constant conflict since the Informant, Capt. E. G. da Costa Duarte, requested to review the finances of the Campbell River Harbour Authority, initiated sometime in January 2009, it became obvious that the Board of Directors of the Campbell River Harbour Authority are part of criminal

activity to defraud the Informant, the CRHA Corporation and the CRHA membership, of monies and services”;

“Specifically, when all the Informant’s rights and privileges as a member of the CRHA Corporation were illegally removed; the right to vote, the right to review the CRHA finances, the right to address issues of concern before the membership seeking a resolution and the right to enjoy a facility paid by Taxpayers for the usage of taxpayers”;

“Further, corporate fraud is exemplified by CRHA directors and staff misappropriating corporate assets, providing incorrect and/or misleading information to the CRHA membership, specific to a lack of financial accountability and resorting to physically assaulting the Informant while the Informant was taking a picture of an unseaworthy vessel sinking within the CRHA facility”;

“While this attitude of physical assault is of a grave criminal concern, it is a common occurrence at the CRHA facility, where Manfred Binger was also threatened with physical harm by CRHA Directors for questioning the CRHA finances”;

“The persistence of the Informant demanding financial accountability and transparency from the CRHA Board of Directors, eventually lead to a frivolous and vexatious Federal Court lawsuit (T-1003-10) filed by the CRHA Corporation, under the direction of the said Board of Directors, against the Informant, for unpaid moorage fees that were increased to nearly ten times the normal fee applied to all other harbour users”.

15. When summarizing the issues involving my relationship with the Campbell River Harbour Authority, it basically states that I caught them stealing a large sum of taxpayer's money - approximately two (2) Million dollars. The large portion of money, awarded to the CRHA, is Government Grants that I believe made a “U-turn” at the CRHA office and diverted to unknown suspected government officials that manipulated the said money to the betterment of them. Also, given current media publications, I believe that the Clerk of the Privy Council, Member of Parliament Tony Clement and the Attorney General of Canada are, somehow, connected to the summation of CRHA activities herein described.

16. List of available exhibits follow;

<p>Exhibit A Capt Duarte Request for Financial Review Exhibit B Tom Forge Letters Exhibit C Incident Report Exhibit C Incident Report Submitted to Federal Court Exhibit D CRHA Letters Patent By-Laws Exhibit E CRHA Lease Agreement Exhibit F Berthage Agreement Exhibit F01.1 DFO Invoice Spreadsheet of Grants ATIP Exhibit F01.2 DFO Webpage PO Documents Exhibit F01.3 ICE Annual Report 2008-2009 Exhibit F01.4 CRHA Treasures Report 2008-2009</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Images and Audio Recorded Exhibits</p> <p>Exhibit W Phyllis Assault November 4 2010 Exhibit P January 2010 Manfred Bindger-TimHobbs Exhibit Q01 December 2 2010 Max-Tim Hobbs Exhibit Q02 April 15 2011 Max-Tim Hobbs Exhibit R TomTimLetter01 Exhibit R TomTimLetter02 Exhibit R TomTimLetter03 Exhibit S July 5 2010 Tape 2-Phyllis Titus-Glenn Exhibit S July 6 2010 Tape 3-Phyllis Titus-Glenn Exhibit S July 27 2010 PM Tape 5-Glenn-Phyllis</p>
--	--

Exhibit F01.5 FAC Code Definitions - DFO	Exhibit S July 27 2010 Tape 4-Glenn-Phyllis
Exhibit F01.6 Excel Spreadsheet of DFO PO Documents	Exhibit T July 5 2010 EGdCD-Kent Moeller
Exhibit F01.7 Excel Spreadsheet of DFO Invoices (ATIP)	Exhibit T October 4 2010 EGdCD-Kent Moeller
Exhibit F01.8 FAC CODES	Exhibit U November 12 2010 EGdCD-Sgt Massey
Exhibit F02.1 CRHA Berthage Fees 1999	Exhibit V July 1 2010 EGdCD-Ted Thompson
Exhibit F02.2 Percentage Calculations	Exhibit X April 4 2010 Shredding Truck (1)
Exhibit F02.3 Excel Graphs Revenue vs Boat Counts	Exhibit X April 4 2010 Shredding Truck (2)
Exhibit F02.4 CRHA Revenue Increases by Percentage	Exhibit Y February 13 2010 130 PM Dave Ostler
Exhibit G CRHA Membership Card and Receipt	April 14 2011 459 PM Max-PhyllisTitus
Exhibit H Live Aboard Request	April 15 2011 202 PM Max-Tim Hobbs
Exhibit I Tom Forge Letter to CRHA Members	April 20 2011 704 PM Max-Revocation Meeting
Exhibit J CRHA Financial Statements 1999-2007	August 23 2010 400 PM Phyllis Titus - Max
Exhibit K Part I CRHA AGM Minutes 1999-2008	August 23 2010 549 PM Manfred-Phyllis
Exhibit K Part II CRHA AGM Minutes 1999-2008	February 12 2011 Noon EGdCD-Art Beaulieu
Exhibit L CRHA Boat Counts	February 24 2011 CRHA AGM - Max Recording
Exhibit M Moorage Receipts	February 2 2011 CRHA S. Meeting - Max Recording
Exhibit N AGM 2010	April 16 2011 CRHA Oil Spill - Glenn Lusk Video
Exhibit O Affidavit Titus	September 18 2011 – Oil spill Sample
March 30 2011 CRHA Letter to Glenn Lusk	

17. Analyzing Exhibit F01 forming part of Criminal Court File 37556 and involving sub-exhibits - F01.1, F01.2, F01.3, F01.4, F01.5, F01.6 and F01.7 – relates to DFO disclosure of Contracts Over \$10,000.00 downloaded from DFO website, compared to CRHA declared DFO Grant monies; resulting in \$ 447,192.00 Dollars unreported. Moreover, an email received from Marlene Fournier, Deputy Director ATIP Operations, Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) confirms the said DFO contract disclosures.
18. Exhibit F01, provides strong evidence of financial fraud masterminded by DFO - Small Craft Harbours, Pacific Region and the CRHA Board of Directors. The issues forming a series of financial discrepancies involving the Campbell River Harbour Authority and DFO-Small Craft Harbours, Pacific Region follows;
19. Subsequent to the acquisition of the disclosure of Contracts Over \$10,000.00, I initiated a new Access to Freedom of Information (ATIP) requesting printout data of all the invoices awarded to the CRHA from DFO - Small Craft Harbours. The DFO - ABACUS accounting software program produced a spreadsheet of all the invoices, resulting in different financial numbers than those posted on the DFO disclosure of Contracts Over \$10,000.00 dollars posted on the DFO website.
20. The DFO disclosure of Contracts Over \$10,000.00 Dollars, downloaded from the DFO website, did not represent the monies given to the CRHA Corporation. The disclosure of contracts originating from Purchase Orders Numbers (P.O. No.) were never fully awarded to the CRHA Corporation,

rather it differs from the invoices originating from the ABACUS printouts awarded to the CRHA Corporation. **Therefore, the proactive discloser of contracts policy implemented in 2004 by the Harper Government is simply a cover-up as to the reality of money spent.** The following statement appearing on DFO's Website is misleading; it represents PO numbers of contracts that were not fully awarded.

"The proactive Disclosure report provides the contract figures contained in our ABACUS Financial System and are current as of the posting date for the report. The most up to date contract values are contained in our contract files".

21. The total PO numbers of contracts (2004- 2010) is **\$2,365,000.00** Dollars. The total invoices (1998-2010) awarded to the CRHA is **\$2,587,678.93**.
22. Therefore, the total of invoices awarded to the CRHA (1998-2010) is \$2,587,678.93, compared to CRHA declared DFO Grant monies; resulting in \$337,842.93 unreported. The preceding unreported dollar figure is also misleading, indicating a larger amount of money missing, because the years 1999, 2000, 2003, 2006, 2007 and 2009 the reported CRHA dollar figures are higher than the DFO invoices awarded to the CRHA, a factual indication that the \$337,842.93 of unreported money represents a conservative low figure.
23. Exhibit F01 displays scenarios where results indicate financial discrepancies originating from both DFO - Small Craft Harbours, Pacific Region and the Campbell River Harbour Authority. Regardless of the type of analysis used, Public monies were purposely directed to outside parties;
24. Additionally, other issues emerge that corroborate the unreported monies mentioned on the preceding paragraphs.
 - a. Contract work carried out at the CRHA facility, does not match the DFO monies awarded to the Campbell River Harbour Authority, thus representing approximately two (2) Million Dollars of taxpayers' money that vanished. A better word – stolen.
 - b. The Island Coastal Economic Trust (ICE T) awarded \$120,000.00 dollars (2008-2009) to the Campbell River Harbour Authority to upgrade the same dock floats that DFO - Small Craft Harbours awarded \$250,000.00 dollars. Representing a large amount of money than needed to complete the assigned work carried out at the CRHA facility.
 - c. Attached to DFO - Small Craft Harbours invoice numbers awarded to the Campbell River Harbour Authority, show FAC numbers. The abbreviated FAC represents the word "facility" that in turn means the specific infrastructure area of the CRHA facility. This fact simplifies project accountability, clarifying that invoice money was not applied to the CRHA facility infrastructure.
 - d. Alike the DFO - ABACUS spreadsheet of invoices received from DFO - Freedom of Information officials (ATIP) it took approximately one year to obtain the FAC Code definitions. Again, these code numbers do not reflect the work carried out at the CRHA facility, giving strong supporting evidence that DFO - Small Craft Harbours grant money was not spent to maintain or upgrade the CRHA facility. Thus the malicious intent

originating from DFO Officials at blocking financial information from reaching my hands. The ABACUS spreadsheet of invoices was sent to me because the software director did not know anything about the criminal issues facing the CRHA and DFO.

25. When Criminal Court File 37556 was sworn on December 15, 2011 the Campbell River Courts and the Crown was under the understanding that my prosecution derived from the Proactive disclosures published on the DFO Website. **Their attitudes changed thereafter when DFO learned that I acquired their computer printouts of invoices, establishing that DFO, Law Courts and Crown are all connected at covering and preventing criminal prosecution involving Government corruption. Again, the "retainers" at play.**

Douglas Micheal Flynn, 1938 - 2008

The mysterious death of Mr. Douglas Michael Flynn continues to question the motives of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Campbell River Fire Department and the Coroner. On December 22, 2011, I submitted three impact statements to the British Columbia Court of Appeal on behalf of the following family members; Mrs. Lorraine Flynn, Ms. Monica Flynn and Mr. David Flynn. The said letters are self-explanatory, yet they represent a high volume of document evidence involving the death Mr. Douglas Flynn, past Campbell River Harbour Authority (CRHA) Director. The said letters are available for review from the Web Pages of www.sealegacy.com.

Needless to say, the Judiciary Bastards that received the forwarded impact statements completely ignored such with an assurance that "retainers" within the Judiciary can and will block high level criminal evidence to protect the "lord".

Being fully aware that Your Majesty is a wife and mother, should strong evidence of a possible murder be ignored by Your Majesty's **Royal** Canadian Mounted Police?

The following is an excerpt derived from the impact statement of Mrs. Lorraine Flynn, wife of the deceased;

"I have recently, very inadvertently, become aware of a criminal court proceedings brought on by Capt. E.G. da Costa Duarte against the Campbell River Harbour Authourity (CRHA), its Board of Directors and staff. To date, no one has officially contacted me despite the fact that my late husband, Douglas Michael Flynn, was an original signatory to the Letters Patent issued in 1997".

"He had been talked into becoming involved to represent pleasure boat patrons of the harbour . From what I remember he was only a board member for a short time".

"This new discovery, which involves charges of fraud, perjury and assault are very serious and have become very disconcerting to me in light of unanswered questions around my husband's tragic death Dec.8, 2008".
"Some insurance and banking concerns around his estate have added to my stresses and cause me to wonder if his estate is somehow implicated with the CRHA corporation , although I have clearance papers from CRA"

*"Questions surrounding my husband's death (explained as carbon monoxide poisoning) on a fishing buddy's pleasure boat **linger to this day despite my numerous questions for the police and coroner. His death***

came just over a year after his sister's sudden death. My husband questioned, quite vocally, the circumstances around her death, including making a phone call to the coroner to have it investigated. (It wasn't)."

"This case was poorly handled by local police, firemen, paramedics and the coroner, as somewhat admitted to in the Independent Police Commissioner's final report of Dec. 2010. At the time I accepted the fact that at least my issues had been heard. Since then, I am informed that under the gale force wind weather conditions that evening/morning (he had been missing for over 14 hrs) CO poisoning would not have been likely. Other information that I was given has also been questioned by others. I was told by the coroner that he died instantly but no estimated time of death was indicated in the report. The doctor's report to the insurance company had the box checked beside inquest however, I was told none was done. Too many questions remain unanswered and now this court case, #37556, is raising more issues".

Federal Court of Canada File T-1003-10

Without a doubt, the essence of Federal Court File T-1003-10 was to intimidate and prevent my determined plight of discovering the real money flow that originated from Fisheries and Oceans Canada and awarded to the CRHA Corporation, where it mysteriously disappeared. The same applies to unreported Harbour User's fees and misleading financial statements that fail accountability and transparency. Specifically, when all my written and verbal submissions to the Federal Court of Canada were mainly dismissed and purposely ignored. The methods employed by the Federal Court Judiciary to intimidate a litigant such as me, defending a law suit brought on by government official or a Not-for-Profit Corporation managing Your Majesty's property involved in fraud are simple and straight forward. From the onset of the case any motion presented to the bench, the Judge or Justice simply ignores the evidence and awards monies to the Plaintiff, better said the Bastard "retainers" serving the "lord" barricaded by government. Within a matter of a short time, I found myself owning a great amount of money the CRHA Fraudsters via the Judiciary Bastards controlling the Federal Court of Canada.

Moreover, I conclude with strong suspicion that Prothonotary Judge, Roger R. Lafreniere and Federal Court Justices named in Provincial Court File 37556 and Appeal Court File CA039458 purposely prevented the dismissal of Federal Court File T-1003-10 while Provincial Court File 37556 was before the Criminal Courts for adjudication. Augmenting the issue further, **Federal Court File T-1003-10 began nearly four months after I commenced criminal proceedings against the CRHA and the CRHA Board of Directors for misleading financial statements and government grant money that disappeared.** To date, nearly two and half years later, the monies are unaccounted together with other criminal activity that demand conviction.

Within the Order of Prothonotary Judge, Roger R. Lafreniere, dated July 20, 2011, he quoted from case law - Carten v Canada 358 FTR 118, 2009 FC 1233 – a review of the said case law allowed for an understanding of Mr. John Carten's current legal plight involving the Federal Court of Canada. The following excerpts originating from Mr. Carten's Web Pages summarize my understanding and the purpose of the Federal Court of Canada;

"Federal Court system Canada, Organized by Politicians and Government Insiders to Block Legitimate Claims and Cover Up Crimes By Politicians in Canada".

Federal Court File T-1003-10 contains hundreds of documents, perhaps better said more than a thousand, that require a legal review with aim to prosecute the presiding Judge and Justices for Obstruction of Justice. Certainly, within the scope of a Royal Commission, allowing for Your Majesty's prerogative power to order an investigation into the behavior of politically appointed lawyers to the bench that thwart justice to serve the needs of the "lord".

The following excerpt originates from a letter sent on January 13, 2012 to the Chief Justice of the Federal Court of Canada;

"The Federal Court of Canada was well informed of my predicament, yet it chose to adjudicate with intent to injure me then and continues to do so today, with endless Orders that it has no jurisdiction to issue".

"How will the Federal Court cover-up all this evidence, clearly showing acts of bad faith? Certainly, I no longer need to read Mr. Carten's conclusions about Federal Court practice; it is bluntly obvious that several Justices of the Federal Court are purposely causing interference with intent to prevent Federal Government accountability and transparency".

"The failure of Prothonotary Roger R. Lafreniere to grasp the criminal on goings of the CRHA Corporation and Fisheries and Oceans Canada, involving misappropriations of funds, generates a negative image of the Federal Court and reflects an image that it is above the Rule of Law".

"Apparently, the Federal Court issues judgments with no regard for the victims it creates. I, along with Harbour users; Mr. Manfred Binger, Mr. Glenn Lusk and Mr. Ronald Griffin are victims of abuse, where the CRHA Corporation and the Federal Court are robbing us of our rights, specifically, the Federal Court via Prothonotary Roger R. Lafreniere and Justice Mandamin failed or better said; do not want to address the problems they created".

Letters to the British Columbia Premier and Attorney General

Two letters addressed to the British Columbia Premier and Attorney General were sent on March 23 and May 22, 2012 requesting a formal reply. To date no such reply was received. The said letters are available for review from the Web Pages of www.sealegacy.com. Needless to say, the Government of British Columbia is currently under a state of crisis as per my belief that both, the Premier and the Attorney General, are "puppets-on-a-string" and need to realize that they are paid to perform the duties of an elected official, mandated to safeguard society from the criminal element.

The above-stated letters received the "Code of Silence" giving me, once again, a strong indication of the extent that Bastard Feudalism plays at controlling all levels of government. The following is an excerpt from the letter sent on May 22, 2012;

"Rather than repeating myself with excerpts from my, numerous, submitted court documents that you both are determined to ignore, in hopes that it magically disappears, I will instead give you clear evidence of fraud practices that all fourteen judges of the Provincial Courts purposely ignored and fixed. And, to accentuate my

experiences before the said Provincial Judges, I understand them to be Judiciary Bastards engulfed in perpetuating criminal activity within the Province of British Columbia”.

Conclusion

My experiences described in this letter involving exposure to the Criminal Courts of British Columbia and the Federal Court of Canada is a mere glimpse at the Canadian Judiciary that serves little purpose at controlling the criminal element. Better said, a Judiciary suited at preserving Bastard Feudalism that assures the criminal element an acceptance to the practice of defrauding taxpayers of their money. What this letter to Your Majesty does not describe in detail, given that it would involve the creation of a book, relates to the fact that my exposure to various forms of government corruption within maritime Canada spanning my marine career from beginning to present day (forty years), shows a determined attitude to stalemate a nation with limitless possibilities for positive progress and wellbeing. Unfortunately, I cannot place the blame solely on the Feudal “lord” that gathers and manipulates the “retainers” for purposes of defrauding Canada of its financial resources, the majority of Canadians must share the blame for their adaptability to the ranks of “retainers”.

Numerous times, I asked high level “retainers” why they accepted large government handouts to cover high level corruption, when their lifestyle did not need the extra financial windfall. Also, I asked about their lack of pride at spending taxpayers resources aimed at creating a better industry to instead pocket it for the sole purpose of satisfying their greed; certainly, their reprehensible acquisitiveness displaying an insatiable desire for wealth specific to more material wealth than one needs or deserves resulted in a nation deeply engulfed in debt and fraud.

Today I am assured that the average Canadian is not aware of the financial facts involving the construction of the “Spirit Class” BC Ferries and the aluminum Catamarans resulting in a major setback to the Canadian shipbuilding industry. Elevating ship construction to a national level the last Navy Frigates built in Canada must also enter the scene of public financial wastages. Yes, the financial facts are many and very disturbing to me that endeavored to bring reason to numerous high level “retainers” to stop and do something worthy for the prosperity of the Nation. I failed and while some of these scoundrels (“retainers”) are death, some keep appearing in the Canadian media after receiving the Order of Canada. Extending this narration to include Parliamentarians, I maintain a lengthy list of Members of Parliament that purposely ignored my numerous letters describing in detail government corruption, instead to cowardly apply the “Code of Silence” or while some understood the seriousness of the matter at hand wrote back with rhetorical statements of passing my concerns to others, eventually resulting in a circle of time wasted. Today, I have no faith in the powers of the Canadian Parliament, a waste of taxpayers' money employing useless Canadians elected by a low percentage of the population. Given that numerous Canadians no longer believe in the electoral process and in the belief that Canada is a nation of progressive and well intended people. Certainly “retainers” are not well intended people.

The Campbell River Harbour Authority Corporation, a Not-for-Profit Corporation, installs in Canadians the fact that fraud practices involving taxpayers monies are easily diverted to the pockets of Bastard “retainers” and the Bastard “lord”. Better said, a major improvement from past practices of

diverting money. Now it is done quite openly and in full view of the community that openly accepts such criminal practice; extending such openness to statements that Canada is a great country with a declining crime rate. Bearing in mind that fraud is under reported in Canada and ignored by Police, are Canadians willing participants? **Placing Your Majesty's name in the fraud scene, the Campbell River Harbour Authority, Board of Directors, asserts Royal acceptance to their practices, given that it is carried out from within Your Majesty's property. Moreover, Your Majesty is the Crown that commands our Judiciary.**

And, bringing forth the above-mentioned words; criminal practice, it is important to mention that Mr. Douglas Flynn lost his life under very suspicious circumstances pointing to suspects of murder. Specifically, when the manipulators of the facts are members of the Campbell River RCMP, the Campbell River Fire Department, the Coroner and individuals with shady backgrounds. Again, indicatives of major improvements - criminal improvements - from past practices of diverting monies into the pockets of scoundrels.

Upon Your Majesty's review of this letter, will I receive the "Code of Silence"? If so, it must be said that I revert to aspects of disdain at accepting the fact that Your Majesty is free from participation in criminal endeavors associated with Canada's Bastard Feudalism. Sincerely and with great respect for tradition involving more than seven centuries of friendship between my ancestors and Your Majesty's ancestry, I hope that Your Majesty is above the Canadian crisis herein described, able to clarify Your Majesty's Sovereign Role of Honor and dignity befitting a monarch.

Sincerely,



Captain E. G. da Costa Duarte

Canadian Merchant Navy Veteran – Cold War 1972 - Vietnam 1973

Department of Transport - Certificate of Discharge No. 121945

Bundesrepublik Deutschland – Seefahrtbuch 599/71

Contact Info;

Telephone: 1 (250) 202-1518

Email: egduarte@sealegacy.com or egduarte@live.com

