

In the Supreme Court of British Columbia

Between

Samuel Michael Frank, petitioner

and

BC Attorney General, respondent

Darren Childs
#305 - 2929 Nootka St
Vancouver, BC
V5M 4K4

I, Darren Childs, affirm that:

I have personal knowledge of the facts and matters herein referred to by me except where indicated to be on information and belief, and where so stated I verily believe them to be true.

I have been a citizen of Canada since my birth.

I continue to exercise good faith in my allegiance to Her Majesty Elizabeth II, Queen of Canada.

I have been provided a measure of fairness, security, and accountability for my actions through the rule of law as upheld by the Crown in Canada, for which I am grateful.

I was the first duly elected Prime Representative of the Interactive Sovereign Society, for the first year of the society's existence, from December 2010 until December 2011.

During my time as Prime Representative, with some collaboration, I created the summation of the principles of lawful conduct to which the members of the society still remain responsible.

The intent behind the creation of the Interactive Sovereign Society Summation of Principles was to define a code of conduct such that anyone following it would maximally contribute to and enjoy the benefits of membership in a free and democratic society.

To my knowledge, all present members agree that the original principles created during my time in office constituted a set of rules requiring the same manner of conduct from those agreeing to them as the principles as they are presently written, despite changes in wording to improve their comprehensibility.

According to the Interactive Sovereign Society Charter and the electoral standings maintained by the present Electoral Clerk, I am presently a Main Collaborator to the Prime Representative, meaning that the same number of members have cast a vote for me as prime representative as the number that have cast a vote for Rick Durie, the present Prime Representative.

I hold it as my constitutional responsibility as a Main Collaborator of the Interactive Sovereign Society to assure to the extent of my abilities that any changes proposed to the principles of the Interactive Sovereign Society receive the comprehension of the full membership, any objections to such proposals are reasonably heard and considered by the full membership, and modifications be found to those proposals so that no objections remain.

I believe I have seen active participation in the Interactive Sovereign Society bring about positive changes to members' outlook on life, relationships with other people, feelings of self worth, and gratitude for the existence of freedom and democracy, and I believe these changes can be attributed to the society's principles and to the inherent respect for an individual created by uninterrupted democratic enfranchisement.

The right to vote in an election of members of a legislative assembly is never denied for any period of time for an Interactive Sovereign Society member, unless that member has laws imposed upon Her or Him by another institution that denies this right for periods of time.

The Interactive Sovereign Society has now existed as an institution of democratic law for over three years, and during that time, to my knowledge, no justification has been demonstrated as to how denying the right to vote in an election of members of a legislative assembly for any period of time might be considered a reasonable limit in a free and democratic society.

A vote in an election can be used as a form of recourse toward the actions of politicians whose role might be used to democratically include the wishes of their constituents. An interactive electoral system is a vehicle that allows immediate use of this recourse.

When laws are made by periodically elected legislative assemblies, I have found that the officials choosing those laws are not typically living in conditions of marginalization or economic or other disadvantage that many of the constituents live in, despite those constituents being affected by laws relevant to the marginalized portions of society as a whole. This can mean that such laws are not sensitive to those situations.

The right to vote can serve as a political mechanism for people in disenfranchised or marginalized circumstances to have a meaningful way to react when laws exist that are not sensitive to their circumstances. Therefore denying the right to vote for periods of time can leave them without any voice to have their concerns acted on.