ORIGINAL

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON
(A UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY AGENCY/DEPARTMENT)

STUART A. TREBY
ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL
U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
11555 ROCKVILLE PIKE
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20852

September 22, 2000.

RE: Factual Findings of September 14, 2000
Endorsed by STUART A. TREBY on behalf
of The Chairman.

I have received your communication and Findings of Fact dated September 14, 2000 addressing The minor issue of whether The Oregon Hanford Waste Board is a direct Subsidiary of The UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION, and which concludes That IT IS NOT.

However, and regarding The primary claim or issue brought TO The Chairman OF The NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION For resolution, That being The Oregon STATE SUPREME COURT and Judicial SYSTEM having been UNCONSTITUTIONALLY PLACED Under direct control OF, and regulation by, Said U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION pursuant TO Oregon Laws 1981 SS CL. 1, SS 3, no response, denial or resolution TO This CONSTITUTIONAL problem was provided. (See ALSO Oregon Revised STATUTE 1.002)

Consequently, and in That your Agency's Findings of Fact Failed TO deny The (Legislatively Created Fact) Oregon has placed ITS Judicial SYSTEM under your Jurisdiction, Authority and Interstate Commerce Control, all FUTURE Correspondance and/or Judicial Litigation Concerning These CONSTITUTIONAL MATTERS, as were explicitely addressed in The attachments TO my Letter OF AUGUST 11, 2000 (That is a petition TO The Oregon Supreme COURT and party yrayuen), They will be Taken as True and henceforth stated as agreed Fact From This date Forward.

UNLESS I hear FURTHER FROM YOU within TWENTY (20) days OF The date OF This Communication, no FURTHER

Factual dispute or debate is necessary concerning the above matters, leaving them open for review by the appropriate court(s) of these United, yet sovereign, states of America.

It has been stated by the United States Supreme Court in Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43 (1905) that "The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights as a [state] citizen. He is entitled to carry on his private business in his own way. His power to contract is unlimited. He owes no duty to the state or to his neighbors to divulge his business, or to open his door to an investigation, so far as it may intend to inchiminate him. He owes no such duty to the state, since he receives nothing therefrom, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the state.... He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights." Yet, the sovereign state of Oregon, who allegedly provided constitutional rights to its citizens, and vowed to protect their life and property, has itself chosen through its legislature, courts and Governor's office to trespass on those constitutional rights by seizing them into a foreign jurisdiction operating in interstate commerce, making mere merchandise of those people with no constitutional state court remaing to protect their sovereign state rights. Exactly what "administrative" remedies or procedures are available within the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission to contest or challenge this unlawful and chiminal seizure? Would Title 18 U.S.C. §§ 1201 protect a state citizen under such circumstances?

Thank you for your time and assistance in these most important matters. It is interesting to note that neither chief justice Carson of the Oregon Supreme Court, Ms. Patty Hagven, or Governor Kitzhaber had respect enough to even respond.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Orville Burgess
Fraudulently Restrained at:
Box 3577269 SRCI
777 Stanton Blvd.
Ontario, Oregon 97914

c.c.: Governor Kitzhaber
Chief Justice Carson
Ms. Patty Hagven, Oregon
Hanford Waste Board