PERMISSION TO BE LISTED ON CONSULATIONS RECEIVED AND MUST BE:

Re**: Consultation**: Currency (Restrictions on the Use of Cash) Bill 2019

Michael Andrew AO, (R.I.P.)   
Chair, **Black Economy Advisory Board**

Pete Calleja, Charles Cameron,CEO, Recruitment, Consulting  
Australian Tax Leader, PwC & Staffing Association;

Michael Croker, Rachel Mackenzie

Australian Tax Leader, Executive Director, Berries Australia Limited;  
 Chartered Accountants

Australia and New Zealand;

Peter Strong, Paul Grigson,  
CEO, Council of Small Business Deputy Secretary, Infrastructure, Transport, Organisations of Australia Security and Customs Group

Jeremy Hirschhorn, Maryanne Mrakovcic,  
Acting Second Commissioner, Deputy Secretary, Revenue Group, Treasury  
Australian Taxation Office;

**Government Advisors Patrick Boneham, Division Head, Black Economy Division, Treasury Deborah Jenkins, Deputy Commissioner, Small Business, ATO**

**Dear Personnel**, and my sincere sorry, to the family of Michael Andrew’s family.

Thank you, for the opportunity to voice my observations relating to the hastened and the perusal of “attempted” copious amount of documents in the unreasonable/insufficient time of less than two weeks’ notice to scrutinize abovementioned Exposure Draft.. The Board has a duty of care and the “capacity” to extend the consultation process in order for transparency and accuracy to the Commonwealth People of Australia. An **Estoppe**l must be imposed.. . The following points of questions but have more questions when the full scrutinization of “other matters” that are proposed in the Draft Exposure Bill:

(A)

The Draft Exposure: Currency (Restrictions on Use of Cash) Bill 2019. Why is Division 2 – blank – with words “To Be Inserted”? Does this not nullify the consultation process?

(B)

The sub-heading of this Exposure reads as:

“A Bill for an Act to restrict the use of cash in transactions, **and for related purposes**”.

Quote: “and for related purposes” – Do these words relate to the blank Division 2 and other “blanked” areas?

(C)

**Quote: Section (3) Object** of the Draft Exposure -

(1) The subject of this Act is to prevent the use of cash in economic activities in order to avoid the scrutiny of regulatory authorities: **Note:** Examples of illicit
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activitities that can be facilitated by large cash payments include money laundering, fraud, bribery, obtaining financial advantage by deception, fraud, bribery, obtaining financial advantage by deception and tax evasion.

**Unquote**

**(C (i**): Do we Not have Legislation Acts in place to counteract the above illicit examples and to this date have served the Commonwealth and the State/Territories with efficacy?

**(C (ii)** Was it Not the purpose of the Goods and Service Tax to trace and raise revenue and eradicate Tax Avoidance?

**(C) (iii)** Why “Derivatives” are Not included in the activities of “illicit activities?”

Is this one of the undisclosed reasons as to why inadvertently this Draft Exposure to

Currency Restrictions is to control our deposits as a guise to protect the banks from their demise due to their criminal “cartel” behaviour embroiled in “derivatives?”. Former Minister, Paul Keating sold The Commonwealth Bank of Australia to part there of to“foreign bankers” without a “referendum” which kept the private banks “honest.”

De-regulation and the quantity of “derivatives” have propelled.

What is the **quantit**y of “derivatives” that the main “part thereof of foreign banks” in Australia hold their “illusionary” digital futures?

Can the Board Members, please and **must include** – the **‘derivatives’** be included in the illicit and fraudulent category and “transfers” more than $10,000 in Derivatives be imposed for the **welfare** of our the People in the Commonwealth.

Please view he video for your Notice:.

Dangerous Derivatives and What the Banks are Hiding:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gBvF_DhOe6o&fbclid=IwAR3FZ7gk31MxrQ5D6ciT96KFlY5wvJZxJAF23-wamQa2NBkk2j5GjV9eqk0>

**(D)**

**Quote: Definition**:

Under “digital currency” – There is the Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terrorism Financing Act 2006 – Is this Not serving the Commonwealth with efficacy?

**(E)**

Part 1 Preliminary – Section 7, sub-section 7 – Meaning of cash payment limit

***For this Act, the cash payment limit is $10,000***

The fact is, that there is Legislation in place to prohibit currency laundering. This Draft Exposure Currency (Restrictions on Use of Cash) Bill 2019 is targeting the majority of the People in the Commonwealth – the fundamental right to use their money in their “private capacity as we deem fit” without the force of the elected representatives who are supposed to make laws to serve their Constituents.
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**(E (i)**

What evidence can the Black Economy Task Force produce as to the “quantity” of money being laundered of the “collective” “average” constituents, who are heavily house mortgaged; .

The pensioners whose “pension” has not kept up with the Consumer Price Index;

The perpetual increase of costs of electricity, gas, water, telecommunications since the “privatisation” of essential services without a referendum;

The fact that everyone pays the Goods and Services Tax ;.

The payment of excessive and increasing rates based on alleged Capital Improved Value on the principal home as a result of ongoing bank credit lending, negative gearing, developers, and overseas investors and “derivatives”.

New Start Allowance is $40 per day;

The average wage is $25 to $30 per hour of the average “constituent.” as some examples;

How much collective amount of $ value of the “average” constituent do you deem

is laundered based on the above facts?

How much “$” is needed for the “average” constituent to have the capacity to open banks in foreign countries?

How many “average” constituents are just coping with the ongoing tax burdens imposed by Government and will have superfluous “$” to launder in overseas banks or hidden Trusts which “specialised” accountants is required?

**(F (ii):**

For your convenience, I have copied and pasted of **evidence of laundering as per:**

Hansard Transcript on 25July 2019 – Parliament of Australia - House of Representatives - regarding Tax Invasion - Money Laundering to Cayman Islands:

**Quote**.....   
Dr LEIGH (Fenner) (13:57): Australians are rightly concerned about

multinational tax avoidance. They want a crackdown on tax havens and profit shifting. But what do they get instead? They get Senator Cormann, who received free flights from Helloworld, a company headed by Andrew Burnes, the former Liberal Party federal treasurer, and a company that received a contract to provide travel management services to the Commonwealth in 2015. They get the member for Hume, who co-founded a company located in the Cayman Islands, a notorious tax haven. It's called Eastern Australia Irrigation, and its headquarters is, to be fair, a long way east of Australia— 16,000 kilometres, to be exact. They get the member for Fadden, who organised for the firm Shac Communications to donate $112,000 to the LNP's Fadden Forum before the firm went bust owing $129,000 to the tax office. When he was asked why the LNP should get money before the ATO, the member replied,

'The Fadden Forum does not exist.' The Liberals were the party of the 1980s bottom-of-the-harbour schemes. Today, they're the party that fought a banking royal commission, tried to undermine the Future of
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Financial Advice reforms and wound back tax transparency. If only this government were as tough on tax havens as they are on welfare recipients, asylum seekers and pensioners! This mob aren't a meritocracy; they're a mate-ocracy. (*my opinion here: ​"Evidence how the SEAKER did Not thank or acknowledge or be of any concern”)* - The SPEAKER: It's not quite 2 o'clock. If anyone wants to make half a 90-second statement they're welcome to; otherwise, we'll just wait for people to take their seats—if members who are standing could take their seats as quickly as possible. In accordance with standing order 43, the time for members' statements has concluded. ....Unquote

**(F (iii)**

With respect and courtesy, scrutinize the video of Helen Edwards and

the evidence that she has in her possession of “money laundering” and that she sought help to certain regulatory authorities and elected representatives and even the former Governor General, whereby she had requested for him for a Royal Commission on “money laundering”. She is now waiting for feedback from the new Governor General of which she has re-lodged the “actual” evidence. Please view:

“Helen Edwards: Australia is a Money Laundering Washing Machines, 30 July, 2019”

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UiCILt343UY&fbclid=IwAR37VIPcA6Zx2yOIWiP0L17gUq2T2TICw1o7pYNxTuCGFOX6AeBDYh0OCD8>

**(G**) Part 2 – Offences: Division 2; 10 Offence – Cash payments in excess of cash payment limit (**“strict liability”**)

If this Draft Exposure succeeds? – By what “lawful instrument” is **“strict liability” is consistent with** , the “Commonwealth Act?” Do we not have the Rule of Law, and Due Process that we apply the **indictment** under Section 80 of the; **Quote:**

**COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA CONSTITUTION ACT - SECT 80. Trial by jury. The**

**trial on indictment of any offence against any law of the Commonwealth .. Unquote (?)**

**(G (i)** Reference is made to the undefined - : **Quote**: **“series payments” ..Unquote.** What is the definition of “**series payments**?” For example, one day, one week, one month, 6 months, one year?

**(G (ii)** Will the elected representatives enact an ultra vires law on constituents to “monitor” their private property being their money, in their private capacity as they deem fit to which they have paid tax?

**(G (iii**) Will the Board Members,and elected representatives guarantee to abide of said proposed Bill? Do we not have evidence as per the abovementioned Hansard Transcript? My saying: He who earns “heaps” has the capacity to “hide.”.

(**G (iv)** May I remind the People who will read this “consultation paper response” that: We, as the People **did receive our wages in cash**, nicely folded in a brown envelope, prior to mid the 70’s by our employer. It is evident that; We, the Constituents have been “conned” to having our wages transferred directly to a bank account. Breach of Trust is applicable**. and,**
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**and** to add salt to the wound, incurred fee charges for bank’s privilege and ***benefit***. . Also, if the Currency Restrictions Bill is enacted will be the icing to the “assault”.

**(H) Fiduciary responsibility to view video: “Bombshell – Denise Brailey blows apart the mortgage “FRAUD” cover up that “threatens” All Australians:**

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=1&v=VStwO-KoOK0>

**(I) Fiduciary responsibility to read:** [**Restricting or Abolishing Cash: An Effective Instrument for Fighting the Shadow Economy, Crime and Terrorism?\*) by Friedrich Schneider\*\*)**htts://www.bundesbank.de/resource/blob/634950/803cf541deb87a4433533e7196c2cd96/mL/2017-04-24-schneider-data.pdf?fbclid=IwAR23wAOCVOVxn4485LLaNFg5Idm7HlT9RZAAmcsiXAl3umqqIl2cTKzK15E](https://www.bundesbank.de/resource/blob/634950/803cf541deb87a4433533e7196c2cd96/mL/2017-04-24-schneider-data.pdf?fbclid=IwAR23wAOCVOVxn4485LLaNFg5Idm7HlT9RZAAmcsiXAl3umqqIl2cTKzK15E)

**4 Conclusions: Cash and civil liberties by Friedrich Schneider**  
For liberal societies the importance of cash has much deeper aspects than “pure” economic  
ones. Cash reflects the fundamental relation between citizens or taxpayers and state  
authorities. Using cash means freedom, independence and personal fulfillment for a citizen  
who doesn’t want a state intervention when using cash. The “voices” calling for the limitation  
or abolishment of cash argue that tighter and more comprehensive state control over  
individuals’ financial flows and funds will effectively fight crime, shadow economy and  
terrorism. But in my opinion we have weak empirical evidence.

**For the record and for your NOTICE and consequence of this Draft Bill**:

Dear Board Members, Elected Representatives and His Honour, the Governor General. If, this Bill is anointed with the Royal Assent and Enacted:

Who will be responsible, if, any **“risk**” is bestowed upon me via the inability to use **“cash**” for immediate well being needs and the hindering and/ or the prohibition of purchasing goods and services that I may urgently require and/or due to a **series of payments** totalling $10,500 in cash will be deemed a **“strict liability criminality**?

Who will be responsible to pay for the **“risk**” if “banks’ electronics system breakdown resulting the inability to transfer digital currency and/or the inability to access cash due to unforeseen circumstances?

Would it be prudent for an answer, from the personnel, elected representatives in their Private Capacity of whom have contributed to the “formulation” of this Act can **“Guarantee**” that relying on electronic digital currency and/or the withdrawal of with of **$10,000 cash** will Not pose a **“risk**”, and that that they are **“complicit**” in unison with The Treasury Department of the Commonwealth of Australia for **“ incurred “damages?” Governor-General, when it is time, do not give Royal Assent.**

In good faith and pray that good faith is in you.

M. Smyrnis

**Note:** My cursor on my computer froze and has taken at least 2 hours to reactivate and it is 3.12am, 14Aug.2019. **Electronics and like the speculative Superannuation do Not Guarantee**..