**From:** jacqui cornwell <jacquic122@hotmail.com>   
**Sent:** Sunday, 4 August 2019 9:24 AM  
**To:** admin@inspector-rikati.com; RG - Black Economy <Blackeconomy@treasury.gov.au>  
**Subject:** Re: see attachment 20190804-PRESS RELEASE Mr G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B. ISSUE - Re ISSUE-63-Cash transactions

Hi  
  
It is my will that you do not breach my right to choose how I wish ro pay for any goods or services     
  
Banks have already proven their stupidity given the royal commssion findings.  Notwithstanding rhat there have been several failures of electronic methods of paument whereby people have been unable to access funds to pay for even basic food therefore is not a reliable method of payment.    
  
With the huge increase in fraud and identity theft this will open the floodgates and anyone who has suffered rhese 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 withno 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

F.Y.I.

Gerrit

**Our federal constitution dictates our embedded rights to civil, political and religious liberties and cash restrictions I view would undermine those legally embedded rights.**

This document can be downloaded from:

**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 Mememorundum, ? 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 amy 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? Hopefuly, 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=Vcpznpm1_s0>

<https://www.treasury.gov.au/consultation/c2019-t395788?fbclid=IwAR2d8mWpVTauRxrYfnCR8qNbEMb-ffoH-1hnkpjOQZXNM89KXj0_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-1hnkpjOQZXNM89KXj0_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

[blackeconomy@treasury.gov.au](mailto:blackeconomy@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>

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 x $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 then 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**

**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 bolds 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 wimps of anyone. Why indeed have a Parliament if any lose 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 theCommonwealth 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 tothe Commonwealth powers which ought to be left to the states. The point is thatwe are not going to make the Commonwealth a kind of social and religious powerover 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 onthe Constitution we will have to wipe it out."**END QUOTEAnd**HANSARD 1-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates**QUOTE **Mr. BARTON.-The position with regard to this Constitution is that it has no legislativepower, except that which is actually given to it in express terms or which isnecessary 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!)

##### 

---

**Mr G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B**.

**MAY JUSTICE ALWAYS PREVAIL®**

107 Graham Road

Viewbank 3084, Victoria, Australia

Author of **INSPECTOR-RIKATI**® books on certain constitutional and other legal issues.
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see attachment 20190804-PRESS RELEASE Mr G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B. ISSUE - Re ISSUE-63-Cash transactions

**Our federal constitution dictates our embedded rights to civil, political and religious liberties and cash restrictions I view would undermine those legally embedded rights.**

This document can be downloaded from:

**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 Mememorundum, ? 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 amy 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? Hopefuly, 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=Vcpznpm1_s0>

<https://www.treasury.gov.au/consultation/c2019-t395788?fbclid=IwAR2d8mWpVTauRxrYfnCR8qNbEMb-ffoH-1hnkpjOQZXNM89KXj0_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-1hnkpjOQZXNM89KXj0_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

[blackeconomy@treasury.gov.au](mailto:blackeconomy@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>

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 x $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 then 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**

**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 bolds 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 wimps of anyone. Why indeed have a Parliament if any lose 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 theCommonwealth 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 tothe Commonwealth powers which ought to be left to the states. The point is thatwe are not going to make the Commonwealth a kind of social and religious powerover 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 onthe Constitution we will have to wipe it out."**END QUOTEAnd**HANSARD 1-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates**QUOTE **Mr. BARTON.-The position with regard to this Constitution is that it has no legislativepower, except that which is actually given to it in express terms or which isnecessary 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)
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