

FROM:

Psam Frank
#305 - 2929 Nootka St
Vancouver BC V5M 4K4
phone: 604-765-1496
email: psamfrank@gmail.com

TO:

Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP)
6355 Deer Lake Ave
Burnaby BC V5G 2J2
Telephone: 604-646-9999
Fax: 604-646-9704

Public Prosecution Service of Canada (PPSC)
British Columbia Regional Office (Vancouver)
Robson Court
900 - 840 Howe Street
Vancouver, BC V6Z 2S9
phone: 604-666-5250
email: ppsccoru@ppsc-sppc.gc.ca

To the attention of any officer of the RCMP qualified to initiate charges for trafficking as per the *Controlled Drugs and Substances Act* (the “Act” herein), as well as any member of the PPSC qualified to advise enforcement authorities on conduct of any such charges,

I confess herein to the intention to traffic cocaine, with a constitutional defence for this conduct that I believe is consistent with prior precedent in courts.

I previously used this same constitutional defence when I [confessed](#), to several authorities, to the possession of a quantity of cocaine valued at \$100, and then later confessed to intention to traffic, [in person at VPD headquarters](#), on December 31, 2021.

To determine the validity of the constitutional defence that I provide, I would prefer if reference questions were addressed to the courts as per [s.53\(1\)\(a\)](#) of the *Canada Supreme Court Act*. However, authorities responsible for initiating such reference questions have not been responsive to my [requests](#); consequently, the only avenue that I know of by which to test the validity of this defence is to present it to courts in response to any proceedings that might be initiated by authorities regarding my conduct, conduct which appears to me to be within my realm of liberties based upon an interpretation of the Constitution of Canada that holds reasonable consistency with previous judicial precedent.

An untested constitutional claim that I shall make as a part of my defence is that periods of time when the rights enumerated in [s.3](#) of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (“section 3 Charter rights”) are not available to be exercised qualify as denials of these rights under s.24 of the *Canadian Charter*. This would mean that an appropriate and just remedy for the denials of these rights may be constitutionally warranted. If courts dismiss this claim then I have no further

defence to any such charges; however, my response would be to express my dissent to such a dismissal through an intentionally potentially terminal hunger strike.

Constitution Act, 1982

3 Every citizen of Canada has the right to vote in an election of members of the House of Commons or of a legislative assembly and to be qualified for membership therein.

24 (1) Anyone whose rights or freedoms, as guaranteed by this Charter, have been infringed or denied may apply to a court of competent jurisdiction to obtain such remedy as the court considers appropriate and just in the circumstances.

1 The *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* guarantees the rights and freedoms set out in it subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society.

52 (1) The Constitution of Canada is the supreme law of Canada, and any law that is inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution is, to the extent of the inconsistency, of no force or effect.

I am an adherent of a legislative assembly that uses an interactive electoral system, meaning each voter has one vote that can be cast for any candidate at any time that the voter wishes and changed to any other candidate at any time after that, with no deadline or finish date. Section 3 *Charter* rights are available to be exercised at all times. The legislative assembly is named the Canada Interactive Legislature (CIL). The nature of this legislative assembly is defined in the CIL *Charter*. Appendix A of the CIL *Charter* presents the details of the arguments, contending that adjudicating my conduct according to legislation enacted by an organization that never denies section 3 *Charter* rights, instead of adjudicating my conduct according to legislation enacted by an organization for which section 3 *Charter* rights are only occasionally available to be exercised, would be a full, effective, and meaningful remedy for the denial of fundamental democratic constitutional rights.

The CIL has legislatively enacted a *Charter of Commerce* by which specified licensees may, according to the CIL, conduct transactions otherwise deemed unlawful by the *Act*. My fundamental democratic constitutional rights are available to me at all times in the continuity of application, or deliberation upon revision, of the conditions of this *Charter of Commerce* that govern my conduct with respect to any involvement in production, transaction, or usage of any such drug or substance. I fully consent to governance by legislation enacted in a way that makes these rights available at all times. I unapologetically wish to disclose that I harbour substantial, venomous contempt toward anyone who condones imposition of legislation upon me that is enacted in a process in which my democratic rights are only occasionally available to be exercised when permission is given by authorities.

If authorities wish to adjudicate my conduct in relation to the *Charter of Commerce* enacted by the CIL, then I wish to candidly and supportively encourage any reasonable and lawful investigations into my conduct to assure my compliance to satisfy those authorities. This *Charter of Commerce* is included herein and I fully consent to any such investigation. However, I do not consent to having my conduct adjudicated as per the *Act*, for reasons of conscience that concur with much of what the Supreme Court of Canada (SCC) has stated about fundamental

democratic rights, including the recent *Frank v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2019 SCC 1, [2019] 1 S.C.R. 3, decision in which the SCC states (at para. 1) that “[a]ny limit on the right to vote must be carefully scrutinized and cannot be tolerated without a compelling justification”.

In addition to the arguments presented in Appendix A of the CIL *Charter* to indicate why it is contended that it would be unconstitutional for my conduct to be adjudicated according to the *Act* instead of the CIL’s enacted *Charter of Commerce*, there are *supplementary arguments* presented in an additional document enacted by the CIL concurrently with the CIL *Charter*. If I am charged under the *Act*, the full defence that I would present to a court in response to any charges is presented in Appendix A of the CIL *Charter* and the accompanying *supplementary arguments*. Both of these documents are included herein.

The constitutional reference questions discussed earlier are introduced in paras. 135-139 of the *supplementary arguments*, contained in part G of that document.

Additional actions that I have taken in contravention of the *Act* since my confession to the VPD include commencing an auction, as of January 31, 2022, for the \$100 worth of cocaine that I previously confessed to possession of, and acquisition of a further quantity of cocaine valued at roughly \$2000, keeping it at a safe deposit box in my bank in Burnaby.

If I receive notice that constitutional reference questions are being recommended by the Minister of Justice and I am accordingly requested to cease and desist my auction and intention of commerce, then I intend to honour this request in good faith pending the decision of the Court as to whether periods of time when fundamental democratic rights are not available to be exercised qualify as denials of these rights under the Constitution, as well as whether demonstrable justification exists for the denial of these rights and whether it is appropriate and just to subject me to alternative legislation, enacted by a legislative assembly that never denies these rights, as a remedy for these denials.

I shall remain transparent with authorities if asked as to the progression of this auction, with the closing day for bidding set on June 20.

If, after half of the duration of the auction has elapsed, I have not been charged, nor informed of any intention of initiating relevant constitutional reference questions, then I intend to make the remainder of the product in my safe deposit box available to eligible buyers who prefer to acquire their products through legitimate avenues out of a desire to eliminate fears of intervention by authorities in their transactions. I will then also be offering my assistance to the extent of my abilities to any person who has previously conducted commerce in drugs and substances to help them avail themselves of the constitutional defence described herein so that they may subsequently conduct their commerce without fear of intervention by authorities.

The safe deposit box in which my product is stored has two keys. I am willing upon request to provide one of these keys to the RCMP if it would assist in confirming the details presented herein for whatever purposes the RCMP deems lawfully appropriate.

I offer my genuine intentions in good faith to rely solely upon the arguments included in the CIL *Charter* and accompanying *supplementary arguments* if I am charged with an offence under the *Act*. I do not wish to obstruct justice by concealing any element of reasoning, that I might invoke in view of a court, from the Public Prosecution Service of Canada, Ministry of Justice, or any other interested constituent or party comprised in the sovereign People of Canada in service of whom the *Act* is held in force.

All of the documents herein are presented publicly at www.issociety.org along with all materials regarding all legislative resolutions enacted since the formation of the society that uses the IES, from which the CIL was formed.

If the Constitution is upheld as I am asking, either by abstention of authorities from intervention in my transactions out of tacit acquiescence to the reasonable nature of my constitutional claims or else by decisions of courts affirming consistency of my constitutional arguments with court interpretation, then I humbly and gratefully pray that the entity described as God in the [preamble](#) of the *Constitution Act, 1982* render its blessings upon Her Majesty the Queen for her assent, as given April 17, 1982, to a supreme law that conveys protection for democratic rights more resolutely than had previously been asserted in the history of the evolution of democracy. These prayers extend to every individual involved in the negotiation process that led to the enactment of this supreme law. I owe the democratic enfranchisement that I have pursued for fifteen years to them and I shall endeavour to include my overwhelming respect and gratitude to them, for this great service, in any discussion of their time in public service. These prayers also extend to present authorities who are willing to comply with these constitutional protections of fundamental democratic rights. There has been no pleasure in my life that has exceeded my expectations of the personal joys of mutual deliberation with fellow citizens upon our part in the collective imbuelement of public conscience into the enforceable norms of society as a part of common every day life, rather than living under an unreachable veil of authority whose decisions are sufficiently beyond our influence, that our complaints about their decisions can be treated with ridicule due to their utter ineffectiveness. Any public authority who is complicit in upholding a strengthened protection for democratic rights guaranteed under the supreme law of Canada, as described herein, is just as significant in my most vulnerable feelings when making such prayers as the Queen herself.

I look forward to hearing back from any of the honourable members of the RCMP or PPSC regarding the matters discussed herein. Thank you for your time and consideration.

With sincere respect,

Psam Frank