



*** <b>MAY JUSTICE ALWAYS PREVAIL®</b> ***		
<b>From: Mr G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B. 107 Graham Road, Viewbank 3084 Victoria, Australia</b>		
<b>Blog: <a href="http://www.scribd.com/inspectorrikati">www.scribd.com/inspectorrikati</a></b>	<b>Email: <a href="mailto:admin@inspector-rikati.com">admin@inspector-rikati.com</a></b>	<b>LH-20160921-06</b>
<b>THE MORALS OF A SOCIETY CAN BE MEASURED AS TO HOW IT LOOKS AFTER THE DISABLED</b>		
<b>Please note:</b> <i>The opinion(s) expressed in this letter by the writer, are stated considering the limited information available to him and may not be the same where further information were made available to him, is not intended and neither must be perceived to be legal advice!</i>		
<b>WARNING</b>		
Constitutional & Paralegal Independent Consultant & Author	<b>INSPECTOR-RIKATI®</b>	Series of books on certain constitutional and other legal issues
<b>PEOPLES POWER</b> Reclaim our State and Federal constitutional and other legal rights, and hold politicians and judges accountable!		

Manager  
 Black Economy Division  
 Langton Cres, Parkes ACT 2600  
 Email [blackconomy@treasury.gov.au](mailto:blackconomy@treasury.gov.au)

5-8-2019

**20190805-G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B. to Black Economy Division-  
 SUBMISSION Re Cash usage limitations-etc**

Sir/Madam,

The following is my submission:

\* Gerrit, with this submission to [blackconomy@treasury.gov.au](mailto:blackconomy@treasury.gov.au) are you not concerned they may misconceive what we are on about?

\*\*\*\*\* INSPECTOR-RIKATI®, I had at times lawyers warning me that I should publish our conversations without showing your consent in doing so but I explained that while our discussions may appear real that INSPECTOR-RIKATI® is my alter ego and part of INSPECTOR-RIKATI® book series.

\* About this black economy are you going to include in your submission what we discussed in your 4-8-2019 PRESS RELEASE?

\*\*\*\*\* I am doing so below.

\* Did you get any responses?

\*\*\*\*\* I must admit that politicians from various states actually provided responses regarding the issues such as Euthanasia, etc. So, they are taking notice.

I also will reproduce an email below from Jacqui. As she did also forward it to [blackconomy@treasury.gov.au](mailto:blackconomy@treasury.gov.au) then clearly it is not a restricted email.

QUOTE Email received 4-8-2019

**Subject: Re: see attachment 20190804-PRESS RELEASE Mr G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B. ISSUE - Re ISSUE-63-Cash transactions**

From [jacqui.cornwell](mailto:jacqui.cornwell)  
 To [admin@inspector-rikati.com](mailto:admin@inspector-rikati.com) [blackconomy@treasury.gov.au](mailto:blackconomy@treasury.gov.au)  
 Date Today 09:24

Hi

It is my will that you do not breach my right to choose how I wish to pay for any goods or services

Banks have already proven their stupidity given the royal commission findings. Notwithstanding that there have been several failures of electronic methods of payment whereby people have been unable to access funds to pay for even basic food therefore is not a reliable method of payment.

p1

5-8-2019

© G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B.

**INSPECTOR-RIKATI® about the BLACK HOLE in the CONSTITUTION-DVD**

**A 1<sup>st</sup> edition limited special numbered book on Data DVD** ISBN 978-0-9803712-6-0

Email: [admin@inspector-rikati.com](mailto:admin@inspector-rikati.com). For further details see also my blog at <http://www.scribd.com/InspectorRikati>

With the huge increase in fraud and identity theft this will open the floodgates and anyone who has suffered these will tell you hard it is to resolve. It also has the biggest impact on the most vulnerable as banks will become greedy as they will see it as a way to charge more for services. This bill gives power to private, for profit corporations.

This is like the movie "Enemy of the state" where an individual who dissents could lose everything via the click of a few keys or there is a "haircut" where funds are reduced with no warning as happened in Cyprus.

All this without even considering the constitution and the fact you are there to serve the people not the corporations!

Am disgusted at the rush to push this through with little to no consultation so clearly we should smell a rat and it is most likely the banks driving this one!!!!

**From:** Mr G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B. <admin@inspector-rikati.com>

**Sent:** 03 August 2019 18:27:44

**To:** Inspector Rikati <inspector\_rikati@yahoo.com.au>

**Subject:** Fwd: see attachment 20190804-PRESS RELEASE Mr G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B. ISSUE - Re ISSUE-63-Cash transactions

END QUOTE Email received 4-8-2019

And I can only compliment Jacqui for her comments. After all I have been at times unable to withdraw monies from an ATM and so left without cash, because the ATM was out of money or a technical problems or simply a power black out. Hence, having cash with you is what I always do.

**\* But if they are merely restricting using monies to above \$10,000 then surely that is not a problem?**

\*\*\*\* I recall in 1987 I went to a property some 350 kilometres away and well arrived at about 11pm. I was in need of buying a house (I will save you the set out of the circumstances) and upon arrival decided to purchase the place. Now being in a small country town with no ATM's nearby I was lucky to have \$10,000.00 with me to pay a deposit. I still own the property. It is now intended to be used by one or more of my adult children. And why should I be denied the opportunity to transact being it \$10,000 or more as long as I lawfully came into possession of the monies?

If the intention is to get taxation paid by those currently not paying their fair share of taxation then there are other ways to achieve this.

As I indicated despite the horrendous complicated system to activate a simcard all under the claim to fight terrorism it are the politicians who in fact caused/created the terrorism. As I proved I can purchase hundreds of simcards and so can anyone else, including someone who intends to use it for criminal activities and then the person can activate them and well as Nicola Gobbo of Lawyer X fame and other police showed they can still activate simcards under false identities.

As the article below makes clear that limiting the usage of monies will not likely dent black money businesses.

As I will show below there are easier ways to cut down on black money markets, and in the process recoup unpaid taxes. The issue is that the ATO might not be willing to do so.

Let me use an example away from taxation:

We have all those laws purportedly to protect us against terrorism, but if you were to read at <https://truepublica.org.uk/united-kingdom/british-complicity-exposed-in-latest-cia-torture-unredacted-report/>

## More British complicity exposed in latest 'CIA Torture Unredacted' report

4th August 2019 / [United Kingdom](#) it becomes very clear that in the UK case it actively participated in the torture and so what are we arguing to seek to prevent terrorism if the government itself is participating in it? And this is what we should keep in mind with this so called proposed Cash Ban that it might not address the real issues. After all we will still have ample of people who will continue to use off shore tax heavens. We will still have politicians using all kinds of ways to underpay taxation.

As such making ordinary life of innocent citizens difficult is not going to resolve anything. Remember how they were demanding to register every mobile phone. Well, I once went to a store and purchased 10 mobile phones. The staff member so to say threw her arms in the air for having to complete 10 forms. In the end she decided not to do so. Perhaps for being a senior citizen was for her enough to trust me. Now I am not aware anyone bothers to register a purchase of a mobile phone.

Let be honest I can simply electronically transfer \$9,999.99 and do so again and any reporting system about \$10,000 will be avoided. Likewise I could Say pay \$9,999.95 in cash and do so again and well not breach any so called black market laws.

And those who are selling stolen goods at Sunday Markets will continue to earn tax free monies to which nothing is being done, despite my writings to Mr Peter Costello when he was treasurer. As such I view this is not really about black market monies as ignoring to act upon it at least 15 years underlines this is a gimmick to try to control the population.

Let use another example:

<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-08-04/bendigo-woman-first-victorian-use-voluntary-assisted-dying-law/11382332>

### **Bendigo woman Kerry Robertson becomes first Victorian to use Voluntary Assisted Dying Act**

How then was it I attended on 5 July 2019 to a funeral of a man who died using Euthanasia provided for by the hospital albeit at his home? See: **20190724-PRESS RELEASE Mr G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B. ISSUE - Re ISSUE EUTHANASIA OR UNLAWFUL KILLING(S)**

What we have is legislation that really does no more but gives the Government power over people nothing in my view to protect citizens.

This whole proposed Cash limitations might now be claimed to deal with \$10,000 but what would stop anyone to alter it to say \$100 or even \$5.00?

As with the terrorism issue when you have a government invading unconstitutionally another country and on large scale mass murder people who did no harm to any of us and even bombing babies in their cribs then surely it lacks any moral and ethical as well as any legal standing to try to claim it seeks to protect us. As such when politicians lost their standing then who can you trust?

Let us not ignore the fact that a police officer as I understand it Made known to the royal commission investigating Lawyer X and others like her that the Victorian Police so to say couldn't bother about moral and ethivcal issues.

And it seems the ATO likewise seems not bother about that or legal issues, as despite that I notified them about the court ruling About AVERMENT which applies to all Commonwealth matters unless otherwise provided for, the ATO to my understanding nevertheless ignored to advise the trial judge about this.

So, let us not assume that any public servant will act honourable regarding taxation matters. Indeed when it unconstitutionally engages Debt Collectors without any court order then it already has violated embedded legal principles in the constitution that both sides shall be heard.

This quotation is merely a part of it all and better one read the entire article.

<https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2018-08-30/india-s-cash-ban-was-a-farce-by-a-99-3-verdict>  
**By a 99.3% Verdict, India's Cash Ban Was a Farce**

**The exercise was supposed to freeze out black money, but virtually all flooded back.**

**QUOTE**

The RBI issued guidelines; scrapped them; made new ones, only to roll them back again. The opposition Congress Party accused it of changing the rules around withdrawals and deposits [126 times in 43 days](#). Hence the unflattering moniker: the Reverse Bank of India. Even before the cash crunch could ease, supporters of demonetization started extolling the virtues of canceled currency. Since one of the stated goals of the exercise was to immobilize "black money" – wealth gotten illegally or avoiding taxes - people wanted the RBI to reveal the exact amount returned. When Patel told a parliamentary panel last July that the central bank was [still counting](#) the old notes, he became the butt of social-media jokes and memes.

**END QUOTE**

If the aim is to deal with unpaid taxes that otherwise might be collected let us look at the ATO itself:

In ATO v Melton this was an unconstitutional settlement as the ATO nor any court can ignore the constitution or override its embedded legal provisions. The Melton issue in my view was beyond both the ATO and the courts powers as it would be absurd that the ATO and/or the Court can make some agreement in violation to the constitution. As I have made clear in many publications the term LOCAL GOVERNMENT applies to the State Government and the term CENTRAL GOVERNMENT applies to the Commonwealth.

The misuse of the term of Local Government for Municipal/shire councils should be stopped. They are corporations and corporations cannot be a form of government. Hence, as the Framers of the Constitution made clear not even the Colony of Victoria now State of Victoria could avoid paying import taxes upon rails because it was a Commonwealth taxation power. While Municipal/Shire councils may exercise at times State delegated legislative powers this doesn't make it a level of Government. Private businesses are contracted by governments to act for and on behalf of a government but that doesn't make them to be a level of government. And, any private business being a corporation or otherwise must make sure that all monies collected for and on behalf of the Government are deposited in the State Consolidated Revenue Funds. Failing this then those organisations must be taxed as it being their income. As on 10 November 1910 the Commonwealth commenced to legislate as to the land Tax Office, the forerunner of the ATO then the states no longer retained the concurrent legislative powers to raise land taxes and so neither could delegate land taxation powers to the municipal/shire councils. Hence, any monies collected by the municipal/shire councils cannot be claimed to be for and on behalf of the government as none of it goes into the State Consolidated Revenue Funds.

And the nonsense that rates are to cover the cost of garbage collection, etc, also is exposed when municipal/shire councils are charging in addition of their rates also cost for collecting garbage. And the are fining people for putting the wrong items in the wrong bins, and yet at the tip they are dumping recycling and general rubbish together and some tips are then put on fire to burn it all. As such the rules/regulations and whatever are pretended to preserve the environment while it is merely a cash cow for councils while they themselves are causing harm to the environment. As such let us not fall for the nonsense of cash restrictions for the sake to recover lost taxation monies because it is all excuses to seek to control the population and slowly reduces the amount

of cash that can be used and then as Jacqui indicated also by a mere click on a computer a person can be so to say wiped out of any access to monies. And while it may be claimed afterwards it was an error, we cannot afford to take that risk.

We have constantly hackers accessing government data bases, etc, and hence cash in your pocket is the ultimate security.

I was downloading video's when I cam across the building of huts, etc, regarding people living of the grid, without any electricity, etc. It may not be my kind of life style but I accept that each individual has the right to live their life as he/she may desire within the rule of law.

I used twice a Myki card (Melbourne transport) and then the Government changed that the old cards no longer can be used. I had to purchase another one and on 4 different occasions tried to get my monies back from the old cards but each time I was told that they didn't deal with that. And well I just will not use public transport anymore unless I can use cash, as I am entitled upon by Section 115 of the (federal) constitution.

Let us look also at politicians who were rightly or wrongly deemed not validly elected due to S44 of the (federal) constitution. As such their monies were not earned or obtained otherwise because they were politicians and while the Federal government didn't want them to repay the monies paid to them it is another matter for the ATO, this as where monies were earned tax free as a politicians to avoid any undue pressure upon any politician where then they were not validly politicians then the ATO should by hindsight have made amendment taxation notices.

All persons must be equally assessed and not some getting exemptions unconstitutionally.

But let us look also at the Ministers who are drawing not only a salary to which they are entitled upon but then unconstitutionally also claim ALLOWANCES.

**Hansard 30-3-1897 Constitution Convention Debates** (Official Record of the Debates of the National Australasian Convention)

#### QUOTE

**Mr. REID:** Yes, the minimum; maximum to them. That would be a change which certainly should recommend itself to the representatives, I will not say of the smaller States-because that term always seems to me to be entirely mistaken-I will say to the smaller populations, because in the Draft Bill the Lower House - and again I do not object to those familiar phrases to which we are accustomed-had an advantage of seventy-two members over the Senate. Under my suggestion, however, there would be a difference of only twenty-four. My reasons for this basis are simply these, that, having regard to the work which it is proposed to allot to the Federal Parliament, it should not contain a [start page 270] larger number of members than ninety-six. **Then, again, without seeming to belittle the system of payment of members, I think that the annual allowance might well be fixed at £300, with a certain allowance for travelling common to all Federations, which are generally of great extent.**

**Sir GEORGE TURNER:** That would come to as much as £500 without travelling expenses, as proposed in the Commonwealth Bill.

**Mr. REID:** Oh, no.

**Sir GEORGE TURNER:** More, I should think.

**Mr. REID:** The allowance I would strictly limit to something like £50.

**Sir GEORGE TURNER:** It would depend on where the Parliament sat.

**Mr. REID:** The free railway passes help one along very comfortably.

**Mr. TRENWITH:** They do not pay hotel bills.



**Mr. REID:** Of course, if my friend Sir Joseph Abbott has his way, and the capital is fixed somewhere in the internal wilds of New South Wales, I admit that my figures would be inadequate. I see, however, the chance of saving something like £50,000 per year on the figures of the draft Bill. I make no difficulty about equality of representation in the Senate. As to the franchise of the Senate, I think, in the interests of those who wish to make it a strong national body, that they should not follow the American method.

## END QUOTE

**Hansard 2-4-1891 Constitution Convention Debates** (Official Record of the Debates of the National Australasian Convention)

## QUOTE

Clause 45. Each member of the senate and house of representatives shall receive an annual allowance for his services, the amount of which shall be fixed by the parliament from time to time. Until other provision is made in that behalf by the parliament the amount of such annual allowance shall be five hundred pounds.

**Mr. WRIXON:** I am not going to violate my own rule, and raise a point on the drafting here, except to suggest to the hon. member in charge of the bill that the wording is not, I think, the best that could be adopted. I think that to describe the payment mentioned in the clause as an allowance for services is a misdescription. It is really an allowance for the reimbursement of expenses.

**Mr. CLARK:** We argued that out in committee!

**Mr. WRIXON:** I should prefer to see the wording which is used in some of the statutes of those colonies which have adopted payment of members, namely, that it should be put as the reimbursement of expenses, because otherwise you get into the public mind the idea that members of parliament are actually paid a salary for their work, which they are not.

**Mr. MARMION:** I do not see why these words "for their services" should be included at all. Why not say that each member of the senate, and of the house of representatives, shall receive an annual allowance? I move as an amendment:

That the words "for his services," line 3, be omitted.

**Mr. GILLIES:** I beg to move:

That the Chairman report progress, and ask leave to sit again to-morrow.

If hon. members will take the opportunity of looking at the laws in the several colonies, with reference to the payment of members, they will find that a series of provisions ought to be inserted in the bill which are not inserted. If they look at the New South Wales act, they will find provisions which take into consideration the salaries that are paid to ministers, to officials, and so on. Some provision is required in order to guard against officials being paid double. When a member of parliament becomes a minister of the [start page 654] Crown, the amount he was previously paid as member of parliament lapses. There is no provision of that kind in the clauses of this bill. It is not at present contemplated in this bill to make any other provision than the bald provision already made. Surely it is not contemplated that in the event of a member of parliament who was being paid £500 a year accepting office, he is to receive his salary as a minister of the Crown plus his salary as a member of parliament. We have to consider these questions in a rational manner; and to settle a matter of this kind without consideration is not likely to commend it to our own judgment, and certainly not to the judgment of the public.

**Sir SAMUEL GRIFFITH:** I certainly think that we have done as much work as we are likely to do well to-day, and I doubt very much whether the Committee is prepared to give proper attention to further work to-night. I should like to say a word or two in reference to what the hon. member, Mr. Gillies, has stated in regard to the absence of provision on matters of detail. The omission was intentional so far as the drafting committee was concerned, because we thought it was not our business to encumber the constitution with matters of detail. One of the first things to be done by the parliament of the commonwealth in its first session would be to settle the salaries of ministers, and a great number of other matters of that kind. We have, therefore, given them power to deal with this subject. We did not think it necessary to make this in an sense a payment of members bill. We lay down, however, the principle that they, are to receive an annual allowance for their services, and we thought that it should start in the first instance at £500.

Motion agreed to; progress reported.

## END QUOTE

What we have is effectively DOUBLE DIPPING by Ministers.

310 And when a Member of the House of Representatives stands for re-election then technically he is  
no longer a Member of Parliament, this because when the seat is declared vacant he is like any  
other candidate in a political election. Yet you find they use taxpayers funded (purported)  
entitlements and travel at cost of tax payers around to campaign for their re-election and use  
315 mobiles, etc, also at cost of taxpayers and yet none of it is as a Member of Parliament. While  
ordinary Senators (other than in a DOUBLE DISSOLUTION) standing for re-election are still  
Members of Parliament, however you cannot have double standards that a person who was a  
Member of Parliament is denied using taxpayers funded election campaigning and a Senator can.  
Hence, Senators also should be prohibited from doing so and any taxpayers funded campaign  
must be taxable as like any ordinary person would be as an income.

320 We have members of parliament on the one hand claiming that their wife's/husband's/partner  
income/business holdings are not relevant while on the other hand they claim their  
wife's/husband's/partner can travel at cost of taxpayers because of the relationship. Well, either  
you are claiming in entirety or not.

325 I was in this court case where the mother made clear that she wasn't working and so didn't have  
to pay child support and her husband income could not be considered as he was not the  
biological father of the child. I had absolutely no issue with this husband not being liable to  
contribute to child support, however as she claimed her husband's employment expenses as part  
of her expenses then the Court should include his income on that basis. **The Court did so!**

330 Likewise, if any Member of Parliament claims the right of a wife/husband/partner to travel as  
taxpayers expenses on parliamentarian or other government business trips then I view the ATO  
must consider for that purpose this other persons income and business interest and so should the  
register of interest of a parliamentarian shows this also.

335 Likewise, the so to say golden handshake for a politicians to get say \$40,000 if not re-elected  
also is nonsense, this is because it got nothing to do with service in the parliament.

The same with this nonsense to provide officers for former Prime ministers/Governor-Generals  
and the so called one day Prime ministers. None of it can be justified within the context of our  
constitution and as such the ATO should issue retrospective taxation assessments to them all.

340 It should be clear that the ATO could likely recover hundreds of millions if not billions of dollars  
of underpaid taxation.

The Commonwealth cannot excuse any person from not paying taxation as the rules are strict  
that it must be uniform and on a sliding scale.

345 Hence the so to say gun toting former Wheat board manager who allegedly was paid \$1 million  
to go to Iraq still should be re-assessed for not having paid taxes. It is nonsense to hold that  
somehow the Government can declare that a person gets a tax free income. The Constitution  
doesn't provide for this.

350 That is also why not-for-profit organisations must declare their income and show how much of  
that income actually was used to assist the vulnerable, etc.

355 There is also an issue that the ATO cannot assume anything and then issue debt collectors. As I  
successfully defeated the Commonwealth on 4 August 2005 in the magistrates Court of Victoria  
at Heidelberg, when it sought to claim AVERMENT for not having to produce any evidence, I  
(representing myself) submitted that the Commonwealth cannot override state provisions and  
must accept the state court as it is and hence it couldn't allow for AVERMENT. In the end the  
magistrate declared that the Commonwealth had to file and serve all evidence it sought to rely  
upon. Counsel for the Commonwealth then (albeit misleading the court) claimed this would take

truck loads. The magistrate made clear that was between the Commonwealth and the Defendant to sort out. Later a subsequent magistrate on 17 November 2005 convicted me ignoring the previous orders but on appeal on 19 July 2006 the County Court of Victoria at Melbourne upheld both appeals stating also the Commonwealth had not filed any evidence.

It should therefore be very clear that each time the ATO litigates against a person using AVERT (averment) is blatantly disregard and indeed violated the courts decision that the Commonwealth cannot rely upon averment.

In the (late) George Williams case I did notify the ATO about this but it nevertheless proceeds with AVERT.

And so what is the use to purportedly cause hardship upon ordinary citizens where the ATO, the politicians and others can continue their unconstitutional conduct without being held legally accountable?

**Hansard 31-3-1891 Constitution Convention Debates** (Official Record of the Debates of the National Australasian Convention)

**QUOTE Sir SAMUEL GRIFFITH:**

There must be some method, and we suggest that as a reasonable one. With respect to amendments of the constitution, it is proposed that a law to amend the constitution must be passed by an absolute majority of both the senate and the house of representatives; that, if that is done, the proposed amendment must be submitted for the opinion of the people of the states to be expressed in conventions elected for the purpose, and that then if the amendment is approved by a majority of the conventions in the states it shall become law, subject of course to the Queen's power of disallowance. **Otherwise the constitution might be amended, and by a few words the commonwealth turned into a republic, which is no part of the scheme proposed by this bill.**

**END QUOTE**

As such, no matter what federal legislation might eventuate is we all persist to enforce our constitutional rights then there is absolutely nothing the Government can do against us. After all you cannot be in violation of any laws for exercising your constitutional rights.

**Hansard 8-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates**

**QUOTE**

**Mr. GLYNN.-I think they would, because it is fixed in the Constitution. There is no special court, but the general courts would undoubtedly protect the states. What Mr. Isaacs seeks to do is to prevent the question of *ultra vires* arising after a law has been passed.**

**[start page 2004]**

**Mr. ISAACS.-No. If it is *ultra vires* of the Constitution it would, of course, be invalid.**

**END QUOTE**

**Hansard 23-3-1897 Constitution Convention Debates** (Official Record of the Debates of the National Australasian Convention)

**QUOTE Mr. BARTON:**

I believe that, with certain alterations in the financial provisions, that Bill is a measure under which the colonies could even now safely federate. Not that I say it is the best Bill that could be framed; but I do believe it is a well-devised and well-drawn Constitution, and **a Constitution [start page 11] under which a free people-making such amendments from time to time as necessity will require, and the powers given by the Constitution will allow-might live in perfect freedom and with perfect security.**

**END QUOTE**

**Hansard 9-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates** (Official Record of the Debates of the National Australasian Convention)

**QUOTE**

**Mr. DEAKIN** (Victoria).-The position of my honorable and learned friend (Mr. **[start page 2092]** Higgins) may be perfectly correct. It may be that without any special provision the practice of the High Court, when declaring an Act *ultra vires*, **would be that such a declaration applied only to the part which trespassed**



beyond the limits of the Constitution. If that were so, it would be a general principle applicable to the interpretation of the whole of the Constitution.

END QUOTE

Hansard 1-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates (Official Record of the Debates of the National Australasian Convention)

QUOTE

Mr. GORDON.-Well, I think not. I am sure that if the honorable member applies his mind to the subject he will see it is not abstruse. If a statute of either the Federal or the states Parliament be taken into court the court is bound to give an interpretation according to the strict hyper-refinements of the law. It may be a good law passed by "the sovereign will of the people," although that latter phrase is a common one which I do not care much about. The court may say-"It is a good law, but as it technically infringes on the Constitution we will have to wipe it out." As I have said, the proposal I support retains some remnant of parliamentary sovereignty, leaving it to the will of Parliament on either side to attack each other's laws.

END QUOTE

\* Well Section 115 clearly prevents the Federal government or even the State government to act against this.

\*\*\*\* If Parliamentarians spend less time playing games on their mobiles/computers when the Parliament is sitting and more time to consider the details of any Bill when they have to vote then we might all be better off.

Anyhow I will not reproduce our conversation of the 20190804 PRESS RELEASE:

QUOTE 20190804 PRESS RELEASE

ISSUE: 20190804- Re: ISSUE 63-Cash transactions

As a CONSTITUTIONALIST my concern is the true meaning and application of the constitution.

\* Gerrit, this Cash transaction restriction that is proposed do you have anything to say about that?

\*\*\*\* INSPECTOR-RIKATI®, I received an email which I will quote below before making further comments:

QUOTE EMAIL

**What issue is More Important?? =Urgent View Video - What a CASHLESS society will be like?**

3 Aug. at 12:00 pm

healthachievers - <healthachievers@hotmail.com>

I want to know how many people are reading through the proposed Currency (Restrictions of Cash Use) Bill 2019 and Explanatory Memorandum, ? How many people will call the Treasurer's Office and their Federal Member to extend the submissions from 12 August, 2019 to a reasonable due date? How many have noticed that the Division 2 on the proposed Bill is blank. Has the words "To be Inserted". How can we do a submission with an empty section? What I want to see are words of expression as to what they have read in the Proposed Bill, and direct me to issues that I am Not be aware of? In short, if people do not become proactive in writing submissions when this is critical to our welfare, Self Determination to control our money, being our property. What issue is more important at this moment? Hopefully, this video might spark the people who are lazy to do a submission and/or make contact their Federal Member:

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vcpznp1\\_s0](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vcpznp1_s0)

[https://www.treasury.gov.au/consultation/c2019-t395788?fbclid=IwAR2d8mWpVTauRrYfnCR8qNbEMb-ffoH-1hnpjOQZXNM89KXj0\\_tbvww-0](https://www.treasury.gov.au/consultation/c2019-t395788?fbclid=IwAR2d8mWpVTauRrYfnCR8qNbEMb-ffoH-1hnpjOQZXNM89KXj0_tbvww-0)

Treasury office on Direct. TEL.....No. 02/6277-7340

END QUOTE EMAIL

I did check out some details and noticed:

[https://www.treasury.gov.au/consultation/c2019-t395788?fbclid=IwAR2d8mWpVTauRxrYfnCR8qNbEMb-ffoH-1hnpkjOQZXNM89KXj0\\_tbvww-0](https://www.treasury.gov.au/consultation/c2019-t395788?fbclid=IwAR2d8mWpVTauRxrYfnCR8qNbEMb-ffoH-1hnpkjOQZXNM89KXj0_tbvww-0)

QUOTE

Currency (Restrictions on the Use of Cash) Bill 2019

9 days left to have your say

Date

26 July 2019 - 12 August 2019

Consultation Type

Draft Legislation

Email

[blackconomy@treasury.gov.au](mailto:blackconomy@treasury.gov.au)

END QUOTE

It appears to me absurd that the Government has been pondering about this issue for years and then the general community is given a mere few weeks to make submissions. What an absurdity. I also note that you can consider the comments made in a video:

**Red Alert\_ ScoMo Declares War On The Australian People**

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=770M2s6ZD8Y> and

**Lynette Zang And The "Great Reset"** [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vcpznpm1\\_s0](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vcpznpm1_s0)

I understand that the Commonwealth has made various limitations such as you can be denied to pay a bill in certain coins to a limit. To me this is unconstitutional, where it relates to currency usage within a state environment.

**\* Oh boy that is something people like to be aware off.**

\*\*\* Let us consider the provisions of the constitution:

*Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1900 (UK)*

QUOTE

(xii) currency, coinage, and legal tender;

END QUOTE

*Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1900 (UK)*

QUOTE

**115 States not to coin money**

A State shall not coin money, nor make anything but gold and

silver coin a legal tender in payment of debts.

END QUOTE

It is therefore very clear that within a State one can only be requested to pay a bill in silver and/or gold coins. If therefore the Commonwealth were to restrict payments say of \$2 coins by a mere 10 then it means that a State issuing a bills to a state resident for say \$460.00 can only get paid in silver and gold coins. With 5 cent being deemed a silver coin and so 10, 20 and 50 cents then effectively if there was a limit say of 10 such coins as well on the gold coins then the total maximum a person could legally pay would be:

10 x 5 cents = 50 cents

10 x 10 cents = \$1.00

10 x 20 cents = \$2.00

10 x 50 cents = \$5.00

10 x \$1.00 = \$10.00

$$10 \times \$2.00 = \$20.00$$

	-----
Total	\$38.50

Do you really think that a State government would settle for \$38.50 if the bill was \$460.00? What if the bill was in thousands of dollars? Because s115 is part of the constitution then the Commonwealth cannot legislate or otherwise use rules and regulations in any way that would undermine the States ability to collect monies in silver and gold coins to the amount it claims from any person/corporation.

Clearly any restriction by the Commonwealth would violate  
*Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1900 (UK)*

QUOTE

**115 States not to coin money**

A State shall not coin money, nor make anything but gold and silver coin a legal tender in payment of debts.

END QUOTE

In my view while the Commonwealth can regulate monies it cannot do so against Section 115 provision. And hence it cannot deny the States to collect monies such as taxes, etc.

Constitutionally any monies transfer by electronic system is in violation of Section 115!

Any state road that is tolled must have a provision to pay with gold and silver coins as otherwise one cannot be forced to pay. Hence, I never either used some kind of transponder for any vehicle because that would violate Section 115.

Actually so is Myki card for public transport, etc.

**\* Are you saying that any transaction limits in silver and gold coins is unconstitutional?**

\*\*\*\* That in my view is. We have a (federal) constitution and as the Framers of the Constitution made clear:

Hansard 17-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates

QUOTE Mr. BARTON.-

Providing, as this Constitution does, for a free people to elect a free Parliament-giving that people through their Parliament the power of the purse-laying at their mercy from day to day the existence of any Ministry which dares by corruption, or drifts through ignorance into, the commission of any act which is unfavorable to the people having this security, it must in its very essence be a free Constitution. Whatever any one may say to the contrary that is secured in the very way in which the freedom of the British Constitution is secured. It is secured by vesting in the people, through their representatives, the power of the purse, and I venture [start page 2477] to say there is no other way of securing absolute freedom to a people than that, unless you make a different kind of Executive than that which we contemplate, and then overload your Constitution with legislative provisions to protect the citizen from interference. Under this Constitution he is saved from every kind of interference. Under this Constitution he has his voice not only in the, daily government of the country, but in the daily determination of the question of whom is the Government to consist. There is the guarantee of freedom in this Constitution. There is the guarantee which none of us have sought to remove, but every one has sought to strengthen. How we or our work can be accused of not providing for the popular liberty is something which I hope the critics will now venture to explain, and I think I have made their work difficult for them. Having provided in that way for a free Constitution, we have provided for an Executive which is charged with the duty of maintaining the provisions of that Constitution; and, therefore, it can only act as the agents of the people. We have provided for a Judiciary, which will determine questions arising under this Constitution, and with all other questions which should be dealt with by a Federal Judiciary and it will also be a High Court of Appeal for all courts in the states that choose to resort to it. In doing these things, have we not provided, first, that our Constitution shall be free: next, that its government shall be by the will of the people, which is the just result of their freedom: thirdly, that the Constitution shall not, nor shall any of its provisions, be twisted or perverted, inasmuch as a court appointed by their own Executive, but acting independently, is to decide what is a perversion of its provisions? We can have every faith in the constitution of that tribunal. It is appointed as the arbiter of the Constitution. It is appointed not to be above the Constitution, for no citizen is above it, but under it; but

it is appointed for the purpose of saying that those who are the instruments of the Constitution-the Government and the Parliament of the day-shall not become the masters of those whom, as to the Constitution, they are bound to serve. What I mean is this: That if you, after making a Constitution of this kind, enable any Government or any Parliament to twist or infringe its provisions, then by slow degrees you may have that Constitution-if not altered in terms-so whittled away in operation that the guarantees of freedom which it gives your people will not be maintained; and so, in the highest sense, the court you are creating here, which is to be the final interpreter of that Constitution, will be such a tribunal as will preserve the popular liberty in all these regards, and will prevent, under any pretext of constitutional action, the Commonwealth from dominating the states, or the states from usurping the sphere of the Commonwealth. Having provided for all these things, I think this Convention has done well.

END QUOTE

\* Do you acknowledge that there are people who are avoiding taxation that they ought to pay on what they have as an income?

\*\*\*\* I in fact have been on this for a long time. Remember, Peter Costello when he was a treasurer. Well I wrote way back then that we have all those Sunday Markets where there is a lot of monies changing hands and a lot as I understand it tax avoidance. As I then indicated Kmart was selling a certain brand of toilet paper for a certain amount and at the Sunday Market the same toilet paper brand was sold for the same price as at Kmart. Just that Kmart had its overhead cost, etc, where as at the market (or garage/booth sales) they generally avoid taxes. As such, I held and then submitted that all vendors at Sunday Markets should be required to use transaction receipts that are issued by the tax office. There are trucks at the Sunday market where no doubt tens of thousands of dollars are collected by one vendor. Why should this be tax free when others like businesses in a shopping centre have to pay taxes, etc? Criminal gangs can sell at Sunday Markets their stolen goods and no paperwork to trace it back to them. I last year purchased at a computer market various program CD's. They looked genuine but afterwards discovered they were fraudulently made. What therefore is needed is a better system and using transaction records by cards isn't going to do it. Many stores show they will not accept a card payment under \$20.00.

\* Is there any exception that could allow the Commonwealth to place restrictions on usage of monies?

\*\*\*\* Section 115 deals with the States but obviously the Commonwealth can limit the transfer of monies out of the Commonwealth of Australia as that wouldn't fall within S115.

\* I get it State debts payments cannot be restricted by the Commonwealth how they are paid in silver and gold coins but overseas transfers can be.

\*\*\*\* That is correct. As such the Commonwealth can never seize the usage of silver and gold coins as a form of payment. Any business who collects monies for and on behalf of a State therefore also can only accept silver and coin payments. Neither can any State court demand other than silver and coin coins as a manner of payment. This as the courts are not above the constitution and cannot make an order in violation to the legal principles of the constitution.

\* What about the restriction upon ordinary persons to handle coins as a form of payment.

\*\*\*\* In my view this goes to the legal principles embedded in the constitution;

**RIGHTS and LIBERTIES** principles embedded in the Constitution;

**HANSARD 17-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates** (Official Record of the Debates of the National Australasian Convention)

QUOTE Mr. CLARK.-

the protection of certain fundamental rights and liberties which every individual citizen is entitled to

p12

5-8-2019

© G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B.

INSPECTOR-RIKATI® about the BLACK HOLE in the CONSTITUTION-DVD

A 1<sup>st</sup> edition limited special numbered book on Data DVD ISBN 978-0-9803712-6-0

Email: [admin@inspector-rikati.com](mailto:admin@inspector-rikati.com). For further details see also my blog at <http://www.scrib.com/InspectorRikati>

claim that the federal government shall take under its protection and secure to him.

END QUOTE

**HANSARD 17-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates** (Official Record of the Debates of the National Australasian Convention)

QUOTE Mr. DEAKIN.-

What a charter of liberty is embraced within this Bill-of political liberty and religious liberty-the liberty and the means to achieve all to which men in these days can reasonably aspire. A charter of liberty is enshrined in this Constitution, which is also a charter of peace-of peace, order, and good government for the whole of the peoples whom it will embrace and unite.

END QUOTE

And

**HANSARD 17-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates**

QUOTE

Mr. SYMON (South Australia).- We who are assembled in this Convention are about to commit to the people of Australia a new charter of union and liberty; we are about to commit this new Magna Charta for their acceptance and confirmation, and I can conceive of nothing of greater magnitude in the whole history of the peoples of the world than this question upon which we are about to invite the peoples of Australia to vote. The Great Charter was wrung by the barons of England from a reluctant king. This new charter is to be given by the people of Australia to themselves.

END QUOTE

The constitution doesn't belong to the courts or the politicians but is an agreement made between the people and the States/Commonwealth and only the people can amend the constitution.

**HANSARD 9-2-1898 Constitution Convention Debates**

QUOTE

Mr. HIGGINS.- No, because the Constitution is not passed by the Parliament.

END QUOTE

This applies to both State/Territory and Commonwealth Parliaments.

A Charter of Liberty is not that the State/Commonwealth can slowly erode those liberties and start tracking where you spend your monies, and perhaps then dictate what you can or cannot do.

I for one am a bargain hunter. I have done so for many decades and so walk up in a store and offer ridiculous low monies for items. For example, I wanted to build a patio from sleepers and the bolts were about \$4.75 each. So I went up to the manager and offered to pay a mere 5 cents each for all bolts of any size on the entire shelf. He agreed. I paid about \$90 in total. Had I purchased only the bolts I needed at \$4.75 each it would have cost me more than double. And this I have done in numerous stores.

\* So you like having the ability to have cash if needed?

\*\*\*\*\* How are you going to teach children the value of monies when they may never get it in their hands? How are people going to donate the charities their loose change when there is no coins in usage?

\*

But don't other countries already have restrictions on monies?

\*\*\*\*\* If one thing I am sick and tired about is people claiming about some other country which may not and likely do not have our kind of constitution. So, who cares what they can do, it doesn't mean we can have any State/Commonwealth violating our (federal) constitution. People in those countries may wish they had our constitutional restrictions upon politicians. My concern



is what our constitution stands for and that the true meaning and application of the constitution is observed by all.

**Hansard 1-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates**

QUOTE

**Mr. HIGGINS.**-Suppose the sentry is asleep, or is in the swim with the other power?

**Mr. GORDON.**-There will be more than one sentry. **In the case of a federal law, every member of a state Parliament will be a sentry, and, every constituent of a state Parliament will be a sentry.**

As regards a law passed by a state, every man in the Federal Parliament will be a sentry, and the whole constituency behind the Federal Parliament will be a sentry.

END QUOTE

**\* What about passing legislation with something left essentially blank to be filled in afterwards?**

\*\*\*\* I do not accept that this can be valid. It is to me utter and sheer nonsense to use regulations and rules not enshrined by the Parliament in legislation that can be altered upon the whims of anyone. Why indeed have a Parliament if any loose cannon can alter it against the interest of the general community? One thing you often hear from politicians caught in rorting that they didn't know. And that are our legislators? Come on. If you watch them using their mobiles during parliaments sessions times instead of properly considering what each speaker is stating about a proposed Bill then little wonder they are ignorant but as every person is deemed to know the law then politicians must accept this also. Hence don't use mobiles in parliament or for that laptops and other electronic devices that may distract the politicians from what is being presented to the Parliament and consider what is submitted as to avoid members of the general public having to fight court cases about some law that never should have been enacted if parliamentarians were more alert to the issues concerned.

The GST (Goods and Service Tax) in my view is unconstitutional as it deals with more than one items of taxation. It makes not one of iota difference that other countries can apply this kind of taxation system as they have different constitution., which may allow for it.

**Hansard 14-4-1897 Constitution Convention Debates**

QUOTE **Mr. HIGGINS:**

**Laws imposing taxation, except laws imposing duties Customs on imports, shall deal with one subject of taxation only.**

**What is meant by one subject of taxation?** Suppose a land tax is imposed, you tax posts and rails. That may be argued not to be a law dealing with one subject

END QUOTE

Consider how the Federal Government caused a huge financial burden upon the general community for activating a simcard and yet with Lawyer X (Nicola Gobbo) royal commission it shows she had 2 in false names. Just to show that it unduly burdens the general community.

The same with this cash restriction goal it will not dent any criminal activities as much as you do not dent criminals having access to guns, etc.

What is needed is a common sense approach that you could demand to reduce the flow of monies leaving the Commonwealth of Australia to avoid criminal purposes to be funded but then you need also to stop politicians to accept monies from criminals, etc. and well it seems to me that when it comes to politicians they accept bribes, etc.

So let it be clear, we are really having politicians to terrorize the general public while they can continue their merry go around with unlawful activities.

**\* Any other suggestions?**

\*\*\*\* Stop this unconstitutional not-for-profit exceptions. I have often written about it that it is unconstitutional.

#### Hansard 8-2-1898 Constitution Convention Debates

QUOTE Mr. BARTON.-

Under a Constitution like this, the withholding of a power from the Commonwealth is a prohibition against the exercise of such a power.

END QUOTE

#### Hansard 2-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates

QUOTE

Mr. HIGGINS.- The particular danger is this: That we do not want to give to the Commonwealth powers which ought to be left to the states. The point is that we are not going to make the Commonwealth a kind of social and religious power over us.

END QUOTE

#### HANSARD 1-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates

QUOTE Mr. GORDON.-

The court may say-"It is a good law, but as it technically infringes on the Constitution we will have to wipe it out."

END QUOTE

And

#### HANSARD 1-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates

QUOTE Mr. BARTON.-

The position with regard to this Constitution is that it has no legislative power, except that which is actually given to it in express terms or which is necessary or incidental to a power given.

END QUOTE

#### Hansard 16-2-1898 Constitution Convention Debates

QUOTE

start page 1020] I think that we ought to be satisfied on these points, and satisfied that if we leave the clause as it now stands there will, at any rate, be some proviso inserted which will safeguard the states in the carrying out of any of their state laws over which the states are to be supreme even under federation.

END QUOTE

#### Hansard 16-2-1898 Constitution Convention Debates (Official Record of the Debates of the National Australasian Convention)

QUOTE Mr. ISAACS (Victoria).-

In the next sub-section it is provided that all taxation shall be uniform throughout the Commonwealth. An income tax or a property tax raised under any federal law must be uniform "throughout the Commonwealth." That is, in every part of the Commonwealth.

END QUOTE

#### Hansard 19-4-1897 Constitution Convention Debates (Official Record of the Debates of the National Australasian Convention)

QUOTE

Mr. MCMILLAN: I think the reading of the sub-section is clear.

The reductions may be on a sliding scale, but they must always be uniform.

END QUOTE

And

#### Hansard 19-4-1897 Constitution Convention Debates (Official Record of the Debates of the National Australasian Convention)

QUOTE

**Sir GEORGE TURNER:** No. In imposing uniform duties of Customs it should not be necessary for the Federal Parliament to make them commence at a certain amount at once. We have pretty heavy duties in Victoria, and if the uniform tariff largely reduces them at once it may do serious injury to the colony. **The Federal Parliament will have power to fix the uniform tariff, and if any reductions made are on a sliding scale great injury will be avoided.**

END QUOTE

**Hansard 17-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates**

QUOTE **Mr. BARTON.-**

But it is a fair corollary to the provision for dealing with the revenue for the first five years after **the imposition of uniform duties of customs**, and further reflection has led me to the conclusion that, on the whole, it will be a useful and beneficial provision.

END QUOTE

It is absurd that some religious entity can collect billions of dollars without any taxation accountability how it was spend. Likewise major corporations earning billions can avoid paying a single cent tax and in fact are paid refunds for not paying taxes. A not-got-profit organization should be taxable like any other organization and like any other person must account for any deductions.

When you got large organizations collecting billions and claiming a not-for-profit tax exemption without any proper accountability then this violates the very legal principles of the constitution that taxation shall be uniform and on a sliding scale.

If I were to sell books I would be slugged taxation whereas some not-for-profit organization were to sell my books it would not have to pay any taxation. That I view is unconstitutional.

Take also where I understand there is this organization dealing with Italian seniors to build retirement kind of houses and I understand is headed by Gobbo..

**\* Are you meaning Nicola Gobbo?**

\*\*\*\* No her uncle who was a Supreme Court judge. Anyhow it seems to me from reports that never mind the millions provided not a single residence was build. Being a not-for-profit organization those in charge can as I understand it enrich themselves. We had once a local councilor who spend merely a fraction of what he collected for charity but I understand he used the rest up for himself, etc. that should be stopped. As Edmund Barton made clear:

**Hansard 2-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates**

QUOTE

**Mr. REID.-I suppose that money could not be paid to any church under this Constitution?**

**Mr. BARTON.-No; you have only two powers of spending money, and a church could not receive the funds of the Commonwealth under either of them.**

[start page 1773]

END QUOTE

**Hansard 2-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates**

QUOTE

**Mr. HIGGINS.-**That is the question-are those dangers non-existent?

**Mr. BARTON.-**I do not think the fact that we may be held by law to be a Christian community is any reason for us to anticipate that there will be any longer any fear of a reign of Christian persecution-any fear that there will be any remnant of the old ideas which have caused so much trouble in other ages. The whole of the advancement in English-speaking communities, under English laws and English institutions, has shown a less and less inclination to pass laws for imposing religious tests, or exacting religious observances, or to

maintain any religion. We have not done that in Australia. We have abolished state religion in all these colonies; we have wiped out every religious test, and we propose now to establish a Government and a Parliament which will be at least as enlightened as the Governments and Parliaments which prevail in various states; therefore, what is the practical fear against which we are fighting? That is the difficulty I have in relation to this proposed clause. If I thought there was any-the least-probability or possibility, taking into consideration the advancement of liberal and tolerant ideas that is constantly going on of any of these various communities utterly and entirely retracing its steps, I might be with the honorable member. If we, in these communities in which we live, have no right whatever to anticipate a return of methods which were practised under a different state or Constitution, under a less liberal measure of progress and advancement; if, as this progress goes on, the rights of citizenship are more respected; if the divorce between Church and State becomes more pronounced; if we have no fear of a recurrence of either the ideas or the methods of former days with respect to these colonies, then I do suggest that in framing a Constitution for the Commonwealth of Australia, which we expect to make at least as enlightened, and which we expect to be administered with as much intellectuality as any of the other Constitutions, we are not going to entertain fears in respect of the Commonwealth which we will not attempt to entertain with respect to any one of the states. Now, we have shown that we do not intend these words to apply to our states by striking out clause 109. That might be a provision that might be held to be too express in its terms, because there may be practices in various religions which are believed in by persons who may enter into the Commonwealth belonging to other races, which practices would be totally abhorrent to the ideas, not only to any Christian, but to any civilized community; and inasmuch as the Commonwealth is armed with the power of legislation in regard to immigration and emigration, and with regard to naturalization, and also with regard to the making of special laws for any race, except the aboriginal races belonging to any state-inasmuch as we have all these provisions under which it would be an advisable thing that the Commonwealth, under its regulative power, should prevent any practices from taking place which are abhorrent to the ideas of humanity and justice of the community; and inasmuch as it is a reasonable thing that these outrages on humanity and justice (if they ever occur) should be prohibited by the Commonwealth, it would be a dangerous thing, perhaps, to place in the Bill a provision which would take out [start page 1772] of their hands the power of preventing any such practices.

Mr. HIGGINS.-Do you think that the Commonwealth has that power under the existing Bill?

Mr. BARTON.-I am not sure that it has not. I am not sure that it has not power to prevent anything that may seem an inhuman practice by way of religious rite.

Mr. HIGGINS.-I want to leave such matters to the states.

#### END QUOTE

Yet, we had Peter Costello as treasurer providing thousands of dollars to the church. So much more to state but let the Commonwealth deal with those issues within constitutional context and we might be all better off. Just stay clear of interfering with the general communities right to its civil rights to use their monies as they deem fit and proper within the provisions of criminal law. We do not want to be set up for transactions tax either?

Let us not either ignore the unconstitutional bail-in laws.

*Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1900 (UK) Section 51 subsection:*

#### QUOTE

(xxxi) the acquisition of property on just terms from any State or person for any purpose in respect of which the Parliament has power to make laws;

#### END QUOTE

Therefore the Commonwealth cannot give away to the banks a persons property or entitlement/right to the value of property without just compensation. Again appropriate legislation to prevent any bank to gamble away monies is in my view a more appropriate way to deal with banks financial security. Where I receiving an age pension were to be denied by the bank of this monies then the Commonwealth must be held liable to replace any monies of my age pension wrongly taken by the banks. Obviously the question remains if the Commonwealth in the first place has the constitutional legislative power to enact bail-in laws. I do not think so!

**We need to return to the organics and legal principles embed in of our federal constitution!**

**This correspondence is not intended and neither must be perceived to state all issues/details.**

Awaiting your response, **G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B. (Gerrit)**

**MAY JUSTICE ALWAYS PREVAIL®** (*Our name is our motto!*)

END QUOTE 20190804 PRESS RELEASE

\* After all the above I think they should get the message but the question is will they, or are they simply going ahead no matter what?

\*\*\*\* that is what Premier Daniel Andrews did with the North East Link road. In 2017 we were asked to provide submissions to NELA (North East Link Authority) and afterwards I was provided in writing with a claim by NELA it didn't consider any submissions as the decision was already made in 2016. So much for the credibility of Premier Daniel Andrews. Who then could one trust considering the above stated?

This correspondence is not intended and neither must be perceived to state all issues/details.

Awaiting your response,  **G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B. (Gerrit)**

**MAY JUSTICE ALWAYS PREVAIL®** (*Our name is our motto!*)