

Dear Chris and Dear Audience of "A Warrior Calls",

As my legal fiction recently became a Member in Good Standing of the Bar of Ontario, also known as the "LAW SOCIETY OF ONTARIO BARREAU DE L'ONTARIO (203813)" a non-for-profit corporation incorporated pursuant to the laws of Ontario in the year 1872, I can confirm that within the preparatory materials for the Bar Exam, the words "man" or "woman" are not used and that the term "person" is used instead. I can also confirm that in the context of Family Law, the term "birth parent" is used instead of "mother" and that the words "mother", "father", "brother" and "sister" are not used. I believe that this is done intentionally and by design and is not a coincidence.

Furthermore, I can confirm that in the standard language of the by-laws of any corporation, the word "person" is defined as:

"Person" includes a body corporate, corporation, company, partnership, syndicate, trust and any number of aggregate persons"

Additionally, Bar members are prohibited from criticizing the Ontario Bar in public, as they may face allegations of professional misconduct and have their licenses revoked.

My personal first interaction with the Ontario Bar occurred after I graduated from a well-established Ontario law school and I had to take the two-part Bar exam in order to become a member of the Ontario Bar and to work as a lawyer. I was informed that each sitting for the exam costs around \$700 and that licensing candidates also have to pay about \$130 per exam for the study materials, as well as pay several hundreds of dollars just to file a couple of one-page forms. Additionally, licensing candidates also have to pay \$3000 to the Ontario Bar prior to being called to the Bar, for basically no reason whatsoever. All these fees are collected from each licensing candidate prior to being called to the Bar; once you become a Bar member, of course you have to continue paying hefty annual fees just to keep your license.

Now, back to the two-part Bar Exam, if I had to be completely honest, I would say that it is essentially an absurd test on a policy manual. It is absurd, because it is designed in such a way that those who take the exam retain essentially nothing. In fact, it may be easier to pass the exam, without actually reading or understanding the study materials at all.

After I passed the first Bar Exam, I had to of course take the second exam. The first exam took place during the COVID lie and non-existent, fake virus, and as a result had to be taken online. By the time I had to take the second exam, the Law Society of Ontario announced that they experienced an online cyber security breach (which I believe to be a lie) and so they moved the exams to in-person sittings (Thankfully, at least they did not require a vaccine passport, so I was able to sit for the exam). When I registered for the second exam, in addition to the exam fee of nearly \$700, I was expected to pay additional \$130 for the materials. However, I already had the materials, because a friend of mine gave them to me. So, they did not allow me to sit for the exam, because I had not paid the \$130 for materials and delayed me to the next cycle.

Once I was finally allowed to sit for the exam, I answered all of the questions and I was well-prepared, but as they did inform us how long it would take to transfer my answers to a mandatory Scantron sheet, I did not budget enough time for that and only managed to transfer half of my answers. As a result, they treated my exam as incomplete and failed me. I was forced to wait to re-take the exam, paying the fees all over again and delaying my employment opportunities by many months, while the interest on my student debt continued to accumulate. Overall, I was forced to pay about \$10,000 to the Law Society of Ontario, prior to even becoming a Bar Member, just to satisfy all of their absurd bureaucratic rules, which had nothing to do with my knowledge or my skill.

I want to note that in general, the practices of the Law Society are, for the lack of a better word, quite "shady". For example, at the conclusion of each exam, their practice is to confiscate all exam materials from all licensing candidates and to shred them. I believe that the reason for this is so that licensing candidates have to buy the exam materials each time and also so that these materials do not become available to the public. Furthermore, in my experience with interacting with the Ontario Bar, I found out that the men and women who work for the Bar are nameless and faceless bureaucrats (they are not even lawyers!) who do not even provide their full names when interacting with me. I also found that they are unable to justify their policies and when asked "why is this rule in place", they simply quote the by-law or rule and cannot explain the reasoning behind it. But remember that criticizing the Bar is grounds for professional misconduct, so no one dares to speak out.

A colleague lawyer once told me "the public must not know how the legal system works, or else they won't have any confidence in it". In my experience, his words are extremely accurate... Truthfully, I don't even know where to begin to explain all the flaws and absurdities of the legal system, but I will try.

First, the legal education system is designed in such a way that junior lawyers begin their careers with significant amount of debt, at approximately \$90,000 on average, for which reason they are typically deeply afraid of losing their licenses and their source of income. They are kept in-line not only by their debt, but also by an education system that emotionally and morally cripples their psyche, creating deeply insecure, rule-following automatons, who essentially cannot even advocate for their own rights.

Second, the way in which laws are created is absurd. Laws are created in such a way that they are not understood by 99.9999% of the general public, against whom these laws are then enforced. It is a legal principle that "ignorance of the law is no excuse", but this is absurd, because the parliament creates thousands of pages of statutes in any given year, which are then given meaning through thousands of pages of "judicial interpretation" (a fancy word for the opinions of the judges). How then is the public expected to abide by all these laws that are constantly produced, when the public cannot reasonably read or understand all of them? Moreover, what little recourse does the public have against an absurd law (such as the many absurd laws we saw implemented and enforced against us over the past 3 years)? The time, money and effort it takes to challenge any given law makes it almost impossible. Let alone that a judge always has the final word and a judge is never really accountable to the public.

Furthermore, not even the men and women who work at the parliament have read, understood or learned the hundreds of thousands of pages of laws that they create and neither have the lawyers of judges who are responsible for applying and interpreting them. For example, judges regularly fall asleep during hearings; contravene their own judicial interpretations (opinions); they make decisions based on their sympathies; they rule to uphold absurd laws; and regularly make decisions based on their own feelings and personal connections. Judges have regularly proven to lack the moral standing, wisdom and knowledge to be entrusted with making the type of life-changing decisions that they do.

Due to the reasons that I stated in this letter and many more reasons that would take hundreds of pages to describe, it is my firm belief that the entire legal system needs to be replaced or reconstructed with a system of simple, high-consciousness rules that guide the public to heartfelt living, where each man or woman can be empowered to present his or her claim in simple words, without the need of consciousness-corrupting lawyers, judges, parliamentarians, police, etc.

Sincerely,

A novice Ontario Bar Member