

WITHOUT PREJUDICE

LEGAL NOTICE

An Act of Mercy, Tendered in Good Faith and Without Controversy

April 12, A.D. 2026

TO: The Honourable Sean Fraser, P.C., M.P.
Attornatus Generalis Regis — Chief Law Officer of the Crown
Procureur général du Canada
Department of Justice Canada
284 Wellington Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H8

CC: The Rightful Heirs to Canada's constitutional order
By lineage, bound by natural allegiance (*ligeantia naturalis*), and holding the
common law liberties inherited at birth
Citoyens de droit — *Cives jure proprio*
By way of publication in the *Ottawa Citizen* and at commonlawcanada.ca and
canadagunrights.ca

FROM: Martin
The Heir, acting in person
Citoyen de droit

RE: *Ignorantia Juris Non Excusat* — *Scienter*
Respecting the matter of *Canadian Coalition for Firearm Rights et al. v. Attorney
General of Canada*, SCC File No. 41859

Mr. Fraser,

*“The guarantee in this Charter of certain rights and freedoms **shall not be construed** as denying the existence of any other rights or freedoms that exist in Canada.”*

— Section 26, *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*

I. Preamble

This notice is delivered without prejudice, in good faith, and without controversy. The Heir does not seek to harm the Crown. The Heir does not seek confrontation with the Crown's first law officer or with any officer acting under the authority of the Crown. What the Heir seeks is the recognition of a liberty that preceded the instruments now placed against it—nothing more, and nothing less.

This notice is tendered as an act of mercy. We cannot, in good conscience, remain silent where the law is plain, the consequences foreseeable, and the instruments of immediate correction are, respectfully, entirely within your purview as the Crown's first law officer.

There is no accusation of wrongdoing in this notice, nor any implied accusation of wrongdoing. No admission is demanded. The Heir holds the Crown harmless. That position at law, however, will be displaced by the evidence of whichever course of action is decided by your judgement upon receipt of this notice.

We wished we never had to write this letter to your office. But we are duty-bound not to remain in silence, much as you are obligated to discharge the office faithfully and without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion.

For the avoidance of doubt: this notice is a constitutional supremacy argument grounded in the *Constitution Act, 1867*, the *Constitution Act, 1982*, the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, the *Criminal Code*, and the common law of Canada. The Heir affirms allegiance to the Crown, accepts the authority of the constitutional order, and is subject to the common law. This notice does not reject the authority of the state. It identifies a deficiency in the exercise of that authority and calls upon the Crown's first law officer to correct it using instruments already codified in statute. Any characterisation of this notice, its author, or the position advanced herein as "sovereign citizen," "freeman on the land," or any analogous pejorative is false, defamatory, and actionable at law. The Heir reserves the right to pursue all remedies in tort, including but not limited to defamation, injurious falsehood, and misfeasance in public office, against any person—whether private or holding public office—who publicly mischaracterises this notice or the Heir's standing. Each publication constitutes a separate cause of action. Every article, every broadcast, every official communication, every public statement that repeats the mischaracterisation will be pursued individually and without exception. This is not a hollow reservation. It is a statement of intent, placed on the record in advance, so that no defendant may claim they were not warned.

II. *Ignorantia Juris Non Excusat*

It is a foundational maxim of our law that ignorance of the law excuses no one. This principle is enshrined at section 19 of the *Criminal Code*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, and applies with equal force to the Crown and its Ministers as it does to any subject.

The Crown's first law officer is held not merely to the standard of the ordinary citizen but to a heightened standard of legal knowledge and fidelity to the law. The Heir is deeply concerned by what appears to be a blindness to, or ignorance of, the law as it existed before Confederation and as it continues to exist under the constitutional order—a law that is being applied indiscriminately and in violation of an existing liberty that no Parliament created and no Parliament has authority to deny.

You are, presumably, the first holder of this office since the Constitution came into effect on the 1st day of July, 1867, to be made aware of this self-evident error—an error that becomes apparent upon the simple juxtaposition of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, the *Constitution Act, 1867*, and the Acts of Parliament, including the *Firearms Act*, S.C. 1995, c. 39. The error is this: the impugned Acts are inapplicable to, and void *ab initio* as against, every natural person who is a rightful Heir to Canada's constitutional order by lineage, bound by natural allegiance (*ligeantia naturalis*), and holding the common law liberties inherited at birth. The Acts were never constitutionally capable of reaching such persons. The error has persisted not because it is hidden,

but because no one with the authority and the duty to act has placed the instruments side by side and drawn the obvious conclusion. That juxtaposition has now been placed before you. What was overlooked by your predecessors cannot be overlooked by you.

Liberty is not a question that will be debated in a Court. That book is closed and the arguments have already been held. Your prerogative is public safety and the administration of statutory creations—not the denial of a constitutionally protected liberty to persons over whom the impugned instruments have no jurisdiction.

The Heir accepts that the Crown may administer its creatures, including statutory citizens whose relationship to the constitutional order is mediated by the instruments that constituted it. The Heir does not challenge the Crown's authority to regulate those it created. However, the law does not permit the collapse of the distinction between the *citoyen de droit* and the *citoyen par loi*, nor the substitution of a licenced privilege for a liberty. The liberty of the Heir is shielded by constitutional supremacy (*Constitution Act, 1867*, preamble; *Constitution Act, 1982*, s. 52(1)) and is outside the jurisdiction of Parliament.

It follows that every Heir who obtained a Possession and Acquisition Licence did so under duress (*contrainte*) ^{à l'arme} ~~à l'arme~~ *metus*—the alternative being criminal prosecution for the exercise of a pre-existing liberty. Submission to a licensing regime under threat of prosecution is not consent; it has the character of coercion. The PAL, as applied to the Heirs, was never a voluntary submission to the jurisdiction of the *Firearms Act*; it was a coerced compliance with an instrument that had no constitutional authority to reach them. This notice places on the record that every PAL held by an Heir was obtained under duress (*contrainte*) and without informed consent to the surrender of a constitutionally protected liberty. The maxim applies: *quod ab initio non valet, in tractu temporis non convalescit*—that which had no lawful beginning has no lawful end. The licensing regime, being void *ab initio* as against the Heirs, confers no authority upon the Crown to reclassify, prohibit, confiscate, or compel the surrender of any firearm or arm lawfully held by an Heir. All firearms and arms in the possession of the Heirs are and have always been outside the jurisdiction of the impugned instruments. There is no lawful taking. There is no buyback. The Crown cannot buy back what it never had jurisdiction to regulate, and it cannot confiscate under a programme whose legal foundation does not exist.

Given that ignorance of the law is no excuse—and given the heightened standard imposed upon the chief law officer of the Crown, holding the highest legal office in the land—all prior Attorneys General who have overseen the encroachment of the liberty of the Heirs are jointly and severally liable, to the full extent of the law, for their ignorance of said law and said liberty, as protected under section 7 of the *Charter*. Each had access to the same law library. Each was entrusted with the duty to verify the lawfulness of the Acts which they signed off on and defended. Each failed. Each failed to discharge the duties of the office, without lawful excuse. Whether by incompetence, gross negligence, or wilful blindness, the result is the same: a constitutionally protected liberty was encroached upon, incrementally and systematically, under the watch of the very officers charged with its protection.

The following holders of the office of Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada have, since 1977, overseen or failed to prevent the encroachment of the constitutionally protected liberty of the Heirs, each having had the authority, the duty, and the means to identify and correct the error:

Under a certificate programme—the Firearms Acquisition Certificate (“FAC”)—the error was presided over by, among others, the Honourable Otto Lang (1978); the Right Honourable Jean

Chrétien (1980–1982); the Honourable Donald Johnston (1984); the Honourable John Crosbie (1984–1986); the Honourable Doug Lewis (1989–1990); the Right Honourable Kim Campbell (1990–1993); and the Honourable Pierre Blais (1993)—each of whom presided over a regime that extracted a fee for the exercise of a liberty that no Parliament created and no Parliament had authority to condition. The following former holders of the office are deceased and are therefore not named as accused but whose tenures form part of the record: the Honourable Ron Basford (1975–1978, d. 2005); the Honourable Marc Lalonde (1978–1979, d. 2023); the Honourable Jacques Flynn (1979–1980, d. 2000); the Honourable Mark MacGuigan (1982–1984, d. 1998); and the Right Honourable Ray Hnatyshyn (1986–1988, d. 2002).

From 1995 onward, each successive Attorney General compounded the error. The Honourable Allan Rock (1993–1997) oversaw the enactment of the *Firearms Act*, S.C. 1995, c. 39, which not only continued to charge a fee but implemented a comprehensive licensing regime—the PAL—which ought to have maintained a legal distinction between those who hold a pre-existing liberty and those whose relationship to the constitutional order is mediated by statute. No such distinction was made. The error was compounded under the Honourable Anne McLellan (1997–2002); the Honourable Martin Cauchon (2002–2003); the Honourable Irwin Cotler (2003–2006); the Honourable Vic Toews (2006–2007); the Honourable Rob Nicholson (2007–2013); the Honourable Peter MacKay (2013–2015); the Honourable Jody Wilson-Raybould (2015–2019); the Honourable David Lametti (2019–2023); the Honourable Arif Virani (2023–2025); the Honourable Gary Anandasangaree (2025); and yourself—each of whom defended or permitted the continuation of a regime that collapsed the distinction between the *citoyen de droit* and the *citoyen par loi*, treating the free and the unfree as though they were constitutionally equivalent.

This notice does not accuse any of the foregoing of wrongdoing. It places on the record that the error persisted across their tenures, that the law was available to each of them, and that the duty to identify and correct constitutional deficiencies was inherent in every one of their commissions. The current holder of the office is the first to be expressly notified. What distinguishes you from your predecessors is not the error—it is the knowledge of it.

The record admits of only two conclusions: either the foregoing has the character of a conspiracy to usurp the constitutional order of Canada by inverting the relationship between the Crown and the Heirs, or it has the character of the most egregious and long-standing display of incompetence and disregard for the Rule of Law in Canadian history. The Heir does not presume to determine which. The Heir observes only that the result is the same under either conclusion—a constitutionally protected liberty was denied, systematically and incrementally, across the tenure of every officer named above—and that the distinction between the two conclusions is a matter for the conscience of each officer and, if necessary, for a court of competent jurisdiction.

Under either conclusion, a further dimension presents itself. The constitutional vocabulary—the very words in which the *Charter*, the *Constitution Act, 1867*, and the impugned statutes are written—is held under Crown copyright. Those words are the intellectual property of the constitutional heritage. Section 26 of the *Charter* **shall not be construed** as denying existing rights. To construe it otherwise—to build a reading that gives the appearance of constitutional order while producing its negation—is to counterfeit (*contrefait*: made against the original) the constitutional order itself. The Crown’s own copyrighted language, deployed by the Crown’s own instruments, to produce a simulacrum of constitutional order for the inducement of the Heir to act against the Heir’s own interest. At common law, counterfeiting the King’s coin was treason—because the coin bore the sovereign’s image. The constitutional vocabulary bears the Crown’s image in the same manner.

Where the image is false, the coin is void, and the obligation it purports to impose is without force. Every step of the counterfeit was monetised: the licence fee, the renewal fee, the registration cost, the confiscation of property, the fines for non-compliance, the prosecution costs consumed in defending against charges laid under void provisions. Each extraction was accomplished through the simulacrum—the induced compliance of the Heir under threat of criminal sanction. The obtaining of something of value through coercion has the character of extortion. The retention of what was obtained without lawful authority has the character of unjust enrichment (*enrichissement injustifié*): the Crown has been enriched, the Heirs correspondingly deprived, and the juristic reason is absent—the instrument had no lawful beginning. *Quod non habet principium non habet finem*. What was collected without right cannot be retained.

III. The Duty Not to Conceal

The Crown’s first law officer bears a constitutional duty of candour before the courts. This duty is not discretionary. Where the Crown is aware, or is now made aware, that the legislative scheme it defends cannot be sustained on a principled constitutional basis, the continued prosecution of that defence is not mere advocacy—it has the character of concealment by omission of what the Crown’s first law officer has a duty to disclose.

The matter is beyond ambiguity. The historical record is not in dispute. The constitutional deficiency is not novel or speculative; it is structural and demonstrable. A challenge to the impugned regime is presently before the Supreme Court of Canada, though no party to that proceeding has identified the deficiency described herein. Ignorance of the law is not an excuse. To continue to defend, or to instruct Crown counsel to defend, a regime that infringes the principles of fundamental justice under section 7 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* is to knowingly lend the authority of the Crown to the suppression of a constitutionally protected liberty.

IV. The Risk of Dishonour to the Crown

The Crown is already contentious. The constitutional order of Canada has endured sustained strain, and public confidence in its institutions is not inexhaustible. The continued prosecution of a regime under which a constitutionally protected liberty is knowingly suppressed does not merely expose the Crown’s first law officer to personal jeopardy—it risks tarnishing the Crown itself, placing it into dishonour before the people to whom it owes a reciprocal duty of protection.

This is an avoidable stain upon the Constitution of Canada. The dishonour is not inevitable—it is a consequence of choice. Every day the impugned regime is defended by the Crown’s first law officer in the face of actual knowledge of its constitutional deficiency is a day the Crown’s honour is further compromised. The honour of the Crown is not an abstraction; it is a constitutional principle with legal force (*Haida Nation v. British Columbia (Minister of Forests)*, 2004 SCC 73, at para. 16). A Crown under which the suppression of an inherited liberty is knowingly defended—a liberty it is duty-bound to protect—does not act honourably. It acts in contradiction of its own constitutional character.

The Heir does not wish this upon the Crown. The Heir is loyal to the constitutional order and desires its integrity, not its degradation. It is the Heir’s sworn allegiance to the Crown that brings this notice to you—even though the law has been drawn on the wrong side of the Heir, even though the instruments of the Crown have been turned against the very persons they were constituted to

protect. It is precisely to avoid bringing the Crown into disrepute that this warning is delivered. The Heir is discharging a duty—the duty of a loyal subject to speak plainly when the constitutional order is imperilled by those entrusted with its care. We expect reciprocity. The Crown owes the Heir protection; the Heir has given the Crown allegiance. The bond is reciprocal, and we call upon it now, so that the dishonour may be averted and the stain upon the Constitution may be avoided while the means to avoid it remain within your hands.

The gravity of the situation cannot be overstated. The knowing inversion of a constitutional order does not remain within the confines of Canada. Canada's Constitution is founded on principles inherited from and shared with the Commonwealth of Nations and the wider common law tradition. A constitutional violation of this character—the systematic denial of a pre-existing liberty in favour of a licenced privilege, maintained by the Crown's first law officer with actual knowledge—implicates the Commonwealth and international law. The honour of the Crown is not a domestic matter alone; it is a principle recognised across every jurisdiction that shares the common law inheritance. The precedent set by Canada's conduct, or misconduct, reverberates beyond its borders. What is done here is observed, and what is tolerated here establishes what may be attempted elsewhere. This extends to treaties to which Canada is a party—treaties which are predicated on Canada being a constitutional supremacy and a democracy founded on fundamental justice. The knowing subversion of that foundation is cause for breach and vitiation of the very instruments by which Canada engages with the international order. A state that cannot uphold its own constitutional law internally cannot be relied upon to honour its obligations externally—which in itself attaches a dimension of incalculable liabilities for all parties implicated by the evidence. All of which is avoidable, if your office uses the powers already at its disposal.

V. Engagement of the Criminal Code

You are hereby placed on notice that the **knowing** continuation of the impugned regime engages conduct that may fall within the ambit of the following provisions of the *Criminal Code*, whether by the continued defence of the impugned instruments before the courts, or by the continued enforcement of those instruments against the Heirs on the ground—including but not limited to the laying of charges, the execution of search warrants, the seizure or confiscation of lawfully held firearms and arms, and the prosecution of any Heir for the exercise of a liberty that no Parliament created and no Parliament has authority to deny:

Section 122 — Breach of trust by a public officer, in the execution of the duties of office;

Section 139 — Obstructing justice, including any attempt to obstruct, pervert, or defeat the course of justice;

Section 380 — Fraud, including any deceit, falsehood, or other fraudulent means affecting the public interest;

Section 126 — Disobeying a statute, where no other penalty is prescribed.

To be clear: these provisions are engaged on two distinct fronts. The first is the continued defence of the impugned regime before the Supreme Court of Canada—the advancement of a position the Crown's first law officer knows, or upon receipt of this notice now knows, cannot be sustained on a principled constitutional basis. This engages the duty of candour, the prohibition on concealment, and the breach of trust inherent in lending the authority of the Crown to a defence under which a constitutionally protected liberty is suppressed. The second is the continued enforcement of the impugned regime against the Heirs on the ground—the laying of charges under void provisions, the

execution of search warrants and inspection powers under instruments that have no constitutional authority to reach the Heirs, the seizure and proposed destruction of lawfully held firearms and arms, and the prosecution of Heirs for the exercise of a pre-existing liberty. This is not mere advocacy before a court; it is the active deployment of the coercive apparatus of the state against persons over whom it has no jurisdiction, with actual knowledge that the jurisdiction does not exist. Both fronts are captured. Both are enumerated. Both attach to the natural person who authorises, instructs, or permits them to continue.

Prior to receipt of this notice, the standard was constructive knowledge—the Crown’s first law officer *ought to have known*. Upon receipt of this notice, the standard is actual knowledge—the Crown’s first law officer **now knows**. The elements are present: actual knowledge, a duty to act with candour, a position of trust, and the continued prosecution of a matter in the face of that knowledge. The maxim *ignorantia juris non excusat* forecloses the defence of inadvertence. The law itself forecloses the defence of ignorance. The duty not to conceal forecloses the defence of silence.

Ignorantia juris non excusat applies to the state with the same force it applies to the subject. The state’s failure to recognise its own constitutional law does not excuse the consequences of having acted contrary to it. The law is there for everyone to consult. The record is not hidden. Every act taken hereafter in continuation of the encroachment is taken knowingly—*sciemment*. Justice delayed is justice denied, and knowledge—once acquired—is an instantaneous attachment. There is no grace period. There is no interval between knowing and being bound by what is known.

As an officer of the law, you will appreciate that the *Criminal Code* attaches to the natural person, not to the office. The veil of the office will be pierced. No ministerial immunity, no administrative convention, and no claim of Crown prerogative shields the natural person from the operation of the criminal law. The *Criminal Code* does not recognise a distinction between the Minister and the man. The provisions enumerated above apply to you in your personal capacity—to the person who reads this notice and who chooses, with full knowledge, whether to continue or to desist. The administrative mechanism by which the constitutional order is being inverted does not generate a shield for the person operating it. It generates evidence and exposure. The very instruments that effect the inversion—the licensing regime, the inspection provisions, the criminal sanctions imposed upon the exercise of a pre-existing liberty—are the instruments by which the offence is constituted, and the person who knowingly sets them in motion, or knowingly permits them to continue, is the person upon whom liability attaches.

VI. An Act of Mercy

As stated at the outset, this notice is an act of mercy from one who recognises that *nemo tenetur seipsum accusare*—no man is bound to accuse himself—and that the moment to step back from the precipice is before, not after, the fall.

The personal exposure described above compounds with each passing day and with each act taken in furtherance of the impugned regime. The consequences to the Crown have been stated. The consequences to the constitutional order, the Commonwealth, and the international obligations of Canada have been stated. None of these consequences are inevitable. All of them are avoidable. Failure to act does not confine the consequences to your person or your office. It becomes Canada’s problem. Your office holds the statutory power to effect the correction directly, without awaiting the judgement of the Court. The instruments are already in your hands:

Section 10(2) of the Director of Public Prosecutions Act, S.C. 2006, c. 9, empowers the Attorney General, after consulting the Director of Public Prosecutions, to issue directives respecting the initiation or conduct of prosecutions *generally*—not merely in a single case, but across all federal prosecutions. Such directives must be in writing and published in the *Canada Gazette*. This is the statutory vehicle for a Standing Order binding upon all Crown agents.

Section 579(1) of the Criminal Code empowers the Attorney General, or counsel instructed by the Attorney General, to direct a stay of proceedings at any time after proceedings are commenced and before judgement. This power is a core element of prosecutorial discretion, confirmed by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Krieger v. Law Society of Alberta*, 2002 SCC 65, at para. 46. It is the instrument by which proceedings that improperly collapse the Heirs into the scope of the impugned regime may be corrected.

Section 5 of the Department of Justice Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. J-2, entrusts the Attorney General with the powers and duties of the Attorney General of England by law or usage, including the regulation and conduct of all litigation for or against the Crown. The Attorney General's duty to see that the administration of public affairs is in accordance with the law is set out at section 4(a).

Section 4.1 of the Department of Justice Act imposes upon the Minister of Justice the duty to examine every bill and regulation for inconsistency with the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and to report any such inconsistency to the House of Commons. This is the constitutional reporting obligation that compels the Minister to flag the deficiency now placed before him.

Taken together, these provisions vest in the Attorney General the complete authority to issue a **Standing Order** under section 10(2) of the *Director of Public Prosecutions Act*, binding upon all Crown agents, to **cease and desist** from the enforcement of the impugned regime as against the Heirs, and to begin, on this day, to recognise a long-standing liberty which was overlooked or omitted by clerical error across successive legislative instruments from 1892 to the present. Such a Standing Order would render all Acts and provisions which are contrary to the constitutionally protected liberty **non-enforceable** as against the Heirs, and would **exempt and confer immunity** upon all Heirs from the operation of the impugned instruments, given the self-evident nature of the liberty and the character of the encroachments effected by the Acts as they apply to persons whose relationship to the constitutional order predates the instruments themselves. Current proceedings would be stayed under section 579(1) of the *Criminal Code*. The inconsistency would be reported to the House of Commons under section 4.1 of the *Department of Justice Act*.

This is offered not as a concession but as a recognition that the Attorney General possesses the statutory authority to correct the error without awaiting the judgement of the Court. The power to cease an unconstitutional prosecution is codified at section 579(1). The power to direct all Crown agents is codified at section 10(2). The duty to report *Charter* inconsistency is codified at section 4.1. What is required is not new law. What is required is the recognition of existing law, and the will to act upon it.

In doing so, the Attorney General would restore Public Order—*ordre public*—the foundational constitutional condition in which the law as it is corresponds to the law as it was inherited. The present disorder is not the work of the Heirs. The disorder was introduced by the instruments that encroached upon a pre-existing liberty without constitutional authority to do so. The recognition of the liberty and the cessation of its suppression does not create a new condition; it restores the

condition that existed before the encroachment. Public Order (*ordre public*) is not served by the continued enforcement of a void instrument. Public Order is served by the alignment of administrative practice with constitutional law. The Standing Order described above would accomplish precisely that alignment—protecting the Crown’s honour, the Heir’s liberty, and the public’s confidence that the constitutional order means what it says—and re-establishing the hierarchical order between the Crown and the Heirs: the reciprocal bond of allegiance and protection upon which the constitutional order was built, in which the Crown protects and the Heir is protected, rather than the inverted arrangement in which the Crown suppresses and the Heir submits.

We are not our brother’s keeper. We owe no duty to shield any officer of the Crown from the consequences of his own acts or omissions. But this notice is tendered in a spirit of fairness, concern, and mercy, so that it cannot be said hereafter that no warning was given or that the Crown’s first law officer did not know. What you do with this notice is a matter for your own conscience.

Should you choose to continue the prosecution of the impugned regime in the face of this notice, you will be walking into a trap of your own making. The trap is not laid by the Heir. The trap is the law itself—the very law you have sworn to uphold. Every element of the offences enumerated above will have been satisfied by your own hand, on your own knowledge, by your own continued action. No one will have placed you there. You will have placed yourself there. This notice is the last clear chance to step back.

To be explicit: no form of response short of the corrective action described above will discharge the duty now activated by this notice. Acknowledgement without action is not compliance—it is evidence of deliberation followed by inaction. Referral to counsel is not compliance—it is the delegation of a non-delegable duty. A promise to review is not compliance—it is the substitution of process for substance where the substance is already determined by the law itself. Silence is not compliance—it is the most damning response of all, for it establishes that the notice was received, that the duty was known, and that the officer chose neither to act nor to answer. Partial measures—such as undertaking to “study the matter” or to “seek further advice”—are not compliance, because the law does not require further study; it requires recognition. The constitutional deficiency identified in this notice is not ambiguous, is not novel in principle, and does not depend on the resolution of any disputed question of fact. It is a question of law, and the law is settled. Any response that does not include the issuance of the Standing Order described at Section VI, the staying of proceedings under section 579(1), and the reporting of the inconsistency under section 4.1 of the Department of Justice Act constitutes a continuation of the encroachment and a further accumulation of the personal and institutional liability described herein. There is no intermediate position. There is no partial credit. The duty is binary: discharge it, or bear the consequences of having failed to discharge it with actual knowledge of its existence.

The delivery of this letter forms, in part, the body of evidence, and shall constitute an official record upon receipt.

This notice shall also be published in the *Ottawa Citizen*, the newspaper of general circulation in the national capital, and at commonlawcanada.ca and canadagunrights.ca, as a matter of public interest and for the benefit of all affected Heirs to the Constitution who are entitled to know that their constitutionally protected liberty has been identified, that the Crown’s first law officer has been placed on notice, and that the instruments of correction are within the power of the office to

which this notice is addressed. The publication constitutes constructive notice to the public and an independent, third-party record of the date, contents, and existence of this instrument.

DO NOT REPLY. No response is requested, expected, or welcome. There is nothing in this notice that is subject to debate, negotiation, or discussion. The law is not a matter of opinion. The Heir stands on the right to silence and will not receive, acknowledge, or enter into correspondence arising from this notice. Any reply directed to the Heir will be returned unopened. The only response that has legal effect is the corrective action described at Section VI. All other responses are addressed to the conscience of the officer who receives this notice, not to the Heir who delivered it.

VII. Reservation of Rights

Nothing in this notice constitutes a waiver of any right, claim, or remedy available at law or in equity. All rights are expressly reserved, without prejudice and without controversy.

GOVERN YOURSELF ACCORDINGLY

Delivered without prejudice, in good faith, and without controversy,

/s Martin

The Heir, acting in person

Rightful Heir to Canada's constitutional order by lineage, bound by natural allegiance (*ligeantia naturalis*), and holding the common law liberties inherited at birth

Natural Person, *citoyen de droit — civis jure proprio*

All rights reserved, without prejudice and without recourse.

No waiver of any right, express or implied, is conceded by the delivery of this instrument.

Delivered under the common law of Canada.

Nunc pro tunc. This instrument speaks for itself.

E.&O.E.