

Flora News



Flora #28

Nov 2015

Constitutional Law V Administrative Law

For many years people have been battling a legal system that appears to be ignoring the constitutional and common law system of justice. What that legal system is, the administration known as the Australian Government, was explained in FLORA #27. Presented here is a simplified explanation of the administration, how it contracts with us and how it controls the court system.

1. The first thing to understand is Public Law.

- *Public Law* governs relationships between individuals and government. Matters which are of direct concern to the society.
- Public Law covers Constitutional Law, Administrative Law, Tax Law, Criminal Law and Procedural Law in that governance.

So what is...

- *Constitutional Law* – the body of law that governs the relationships between the judiciary, the legislature and the executive with the bodies under its authority, in their exercise of power.
- *Administrative Law* – the body of law that governs the activities of administrative agencies of government.
- *Tax Law* – the body of law dealing with all legal matters relevant to taxation.
- *Criminal Law* - the body of law that deals with crime and the legal punishment of criminal offenses.
- *Procedural Law* - the set of rules that govern the proceedings of the court in criminal lawsuits, civil and administrative proceedings

Therefore, a Public Law court is a court that has the Jurisdictional power to hear and determine legal disputes that arise under the relevant areas of public law. In Australia these are Ch III courts, as defined in Ch III of the Constitution.

The High Court have stated that this Constitution is a common law contract.

So it is easy to understand that –

1. you and I, as subjects of the Crown in the Commonwealth of Australia, are governed under the Rule of Law, which is the Constitution. A public common law contract between the people and the Constitutional Monarch.
2. All those Public bodies are also answerable to the Constitution.
3. Therefore, any action you and I are involved in with reference to those bodies SHOULD be a constitutional common law-bound contract/agreement.
4. And any dispute should be resolved in a constitutional common law-bound court.

2. What are the key elements of a Common Law Contract?

1. Agreement (Offer & Acceptance)
2. Consideration – what each side gives to the other
3. Capacity – you're legally able to contract in free will
4. Intentions – is the intent within the law?
5. Formality – signed or verbal
6. Certainty – no hidden details

Example.

- You are offered a contract, you agree to the actual contract, but not to all the terms.
- Therefore this is not an acceptance.
- This is a counteroffer and is actually a rejection of the first offer.
- The offer is re-negotiated until all the terms are mutually acceptable.

- When mutual acceptance is achieved, the agreement is finalized and made real with a signature and becomes a legally-binding document.
- A contract then, is a ‘law’ between the parties, which can acquire force only by consent.

Note: Any duress, false statements, undue influence or unconscionable dealings could make a contract illegal and void.

Therefore, considering that our interaction with the tiers of the Commonwealth governance should be governed by and under common law structures, why, as many readers will have experienced, do the courts of the Australian Govt appear not to accept common law / constitutional defences or claims?

In fact, many people have had a judge respond to a constitutional statement by saying “get that rubbish out of my court” or words to that effect!

It appears that while we should have the protections of common law provided by the Rule of Law in our country, somewhere along the way, those protections have been removed for us to use as defence in the Australian courts. Why & how??

3. Maxims of Law

A Maxim of law is a Law Principle that a court normally does not dispute. They are derived from plain truths and “*Plain truths need not be proved.*” (*Perspicua vera non sunt probanda*)

As “*Consent makes the law.*” (*Consensus facit legem*) – it appears logical to assume that somehow, we have consented to the removal of those protections.

So let’s examine more very relevant contract maxims.

- ***The stipulations of parties constitute the law of the contract. Agreements give the law to the contract.*** (*Pacta dant legem contractui*)
- ***By agreement (or contract) something is permitted that, without agreement, is not allowed.*** (*Pacto aliquid licitum est quod sine pacto non admittitur*).
- ***The express agreement of parties overcomes [prevails against] the law.*** (*Conventio vincit legem*).
- ***Laws are abrogated by the same means [authority] by which they are made.*** (*Jura Eodem modo destituuntur quo constituuntur*)
- ***That which is ours cannot be transferred to another without our act (consent).*** (*Id quod nostrum est sine facto nostro ad alium transferri non potes*)

Wow!! To use plain English –

- Only we can give away what is ours.
- Including things the other person could not get in

any other lawful way

- Our agreement makes it law
- Such an agreement stands up in law

Aristotle wrote “Law should govern.” And our agreement makes the law. So our agreement governs in the matter of contracts. Clearly we have not been agreeing wisely.

That begins to answer some of our questions. But raises a new one – what contracts are we creating and with whom, to cause this situation? For that answer we we need to think differently.

Given that WE are the ones with the common law protections, and WE are the ones that are losing them, where and to whom are losing them?

And that would be to the Aust, State and Local Govt. Because govt are clearly the only body removing what what we *believe* are our rights on a daily basis.

4. The second thing to understand is Private Law.

Private law is YOU using your personal free will choice to enter a contract of any kind.

As a Cth society we have the Public law. As an individual we have other choices. If we were in a foreign country, we could enter a contract under republican or communist law. That choice uses Private Private Law. It does not remove our Cth Public law in in total, just our access to Public law in that specific Private Law contract.

But you must remember that you cannot use your Public Law protections in that republican or communist communist contract. It is irrelevant and the law of a “foreign” jurisdiction to the contract, so the communist communist or republican court has no ability to respect respect your constitutional/common law points, unless they are mutually accepted as part of the contract.

5. The third thing to understand is that Administrative Law answers to Common Law but does NOT operate IN Common Law.

Now that sounds crazy, but think about it. We know that the Public Law of the Constitution holds ultimate governance authority over Administrative Law – but that only tells us that Common Law is superior *over* Admin Law, not that Admin Law operates *in* Common Common Law. WE made that assumption and it has suited govt to allow us to remain thinking that.

In reality, admin law is “foreign” to common law.

What is Administrative Law?

Administrative Law is the body of law that governs the the activities of administrative agencies of government agencies of government through codes, regulations and and procedures – none of which require royal enactment.

What is an administrative agency?

All the responsibilities of a Parliament operating in peace, order and good government, listed in Part V, s51 of the Constitution are now operated by admin agencies. These bodies, created by the Executive are operating not just in administration relevant to those sections, but in ever-increasing administration over every private element of our lives.

What then is the activity of an administrative agency?

To *regulate* the social, economic and political spheres of human interaction.

So who are these agencies? You would be better to ask what bodies are NOT an agency. For the Federal list - <http://www.directory.gov.au/staticContent.shtml?page=departmentAB>
For the State lists - <http://www.australia.gov.au/about-government/states-territories-and-local-government>
NSW for eg, has 10 Departments and 140 agencies (among which is Local Government.)

Where we once dealt with Public Servants in that capacity, we now know that we deal with the employees of private corporations *contracted* into the role of an administrative agency.

6. Back to the confusion of the Contracts.

Have a think about all the dealings you have with these administrative agencies of the Australian Government.

They are ALL contractual and all registered.

Let's use a Driver's Licence as the simple example. (Please refer back to the list of contract details).

Your State Agency RMA

- offers to sell you a driver's licence.
- You agree you want one.
- In exchange for money from you, you will receive permission to drive a vehicle in public.
- You are of a legal age to drive and can enter that contract.
- The contract to drive is legislated so is legitimate.
- You examine the contract and agree to all the visible clauses by filling it out and signing it.
- You assume there are no hidden details – but don't ask.

You have now entered into an Administrative Law contract and have voluntarily given up any constitutional / common law protections specific & relevant to that contract.

This is why using common law enactments in a driving offence dispute does not stand up.

Why do we have to have contracts with these administrative agencies anyway?

You and I have a contract with the Commonwealth of Australia through the Constitution. We do not have a separate contract with the Executive (now known as the Australian Government) of that Parliament, so why are we having to enter individual contracts with the agencies of that Executive just because they operate the administration branches for the Executive?? Executive??

That's easy.

These agencies, are

- created by the *de jure* Parliament,
- but are NOT a *de jure* govt body
- they cannot use the original contract over us
- Parliament cannot legislate to give them that contractual authority
- they do not have any contract with us when they commence
- they are just another corporate body touting for our trade.

So over several decades, the Executive have created a structure where every element of interaction between the Federal and State governments and you and I, is through a regulated agency whose only authority lies in in you and I entering an individual agreement with them, using Private Law.

Because IF the Parliament did that – they would breach the terms of the common law Constitutional contract and it would become null and void – and they can not do that without the axe falling on their neck.

In simple words – the Parliament, Executive and agencies can not use Public Law to do what they want, so we must give them our 'permission' using Private Law.

What is the benefit to the Cth in doing this?

1. By delegating that responsibility, the Parliament is protected from the public response, with the contracted corporation holding the responsibility, answerable essentially to no-one except the toothless regulatory bodies, which simply make recommendations for new and expanded administrative legislation.
2. These agencies are being used to administer legislation that is often not constitutional
3. They can be used to allow the Parliament to implement international treaties, conventions and codes, that would not be accepted by the voters.
4. They can abrogate common law rights which are major impediments to the actions of govt.
5. Because WE have agreed individually rather than the necessity of a majority vote – the enforcement enforcement can be individual.
6. Without the responsibility of the Crown in common law investigating crimes, we are required

required to carry our own costs in most litigation.

7. The Cth can appear to be reducing govt by out-sourcing these responsibilities.
 - a. In fact, they are expanding through the regulatory bodies necessary to oversee the agencies – and the massive growth of required regulations.
8. It allows the Cth to implement a structure of its own planning, rather than that agreed to by the people.

7. So how can they remove Common Law from court when we have a dispute?

This is where it gets tricky to understand, so bear with me.

Public Law is

- bound to the Law of the Land – Common Law.
- deals with harm living men and women

Administrative Law is

- bound to Admiralty jurisdiction- the Law of the Sea.
- deals with commercial damage to things

The Parliament & Executive are common law bodies.

- Planning for this appears to have gone back many years prior to this actually commencing.
- Using the Submerged Seas & Lands Act 1973 the Parliament created a statutory “country”.
- They then created the Australian Government to govern that statutory “country”.
- Which then brought UN admiralty jurisdiction into the Aust Govt statutory courts.

But you and I had nothing to do with that statutory “country”, we still walked and talked on the physical landmass. It was foreign to you and I and our normal commercial interactions.

- The commercial currency supported by the UN was brought into our financial structure in 1966.
- The commercial zones called Postcodes were implemented in 1967.
- During the later 70’s all roads were given a name and all houses were given a number.

Consequently when you enter a contract with the Aust Govt or one of its agencies, you do so using very certain specifics.

1. Your legal name
2. Your legal address and postcode.
3. Your signature

This established that you were commercially active in a foreign jurisdiction – that of the Aust Govt.

Under UN arbitrational rules – brought into Australia by the Aust Govt in 1974 – the court you are taken to in the event of a dispute between persons of jurisdictions foreign to each other, takes place where

the Centre of Main Interest COMI (meaning commercial interest) is based. And that is found from the legal address used in the contracts – the address given you by the Aust Govt.

Uh oh – are you starting to get it now? You might walk and talk on the physical landmass, but you are commercially active on the Statutory “country” administered by the Aust Govt. And all your contracts with them are on that “country”.

Recap:

So you enter a contract with a body acting in administration.

- That contract meant you gave up your constitutional/common law protections.

You use the address they gave you on the contract.

- Which means you agreed to trade in their foreign jurisdiction.

You signed it with a wet ink signature.

- Which means you reached a mutual consent.

And if there is a dispute in that contract, such as a fine for speeding – not one single common law act has any relevance. Only and solely the codes, rules & legislation of the registered agreement YOU entered in their foreign jurisdiction, are relevant.

And we will talk about registration shortly.

But, isn’t it still answerable to the Constitution? Surely that means common law is still available?

Yes, it is. You can take an admin law case through the Administrative Law appeal system, BUT – it appears you can not dispute the details of the case. Only whether or not the judge breached the procedural rules.

You can also appeal the case to a common law jurisdiction on the grounds of a breach of Natural Justice.

But as you have “entered” the case, perhaps contracted to the solicitor, etc – it is deemed you agreed to the process. You and the court might know full well that you had no idea what system you were involved in – but YOU have to prove that.

And, even that avenue could be denied you on costs alone, as the Australian Government plan to massively increase the fees for the higher courts until they are basically out of reach of most people.

You: You didn’t tell me I was giving up my constitutional protections to enter this contract.

Aust Govt: Did you read s. 956, 1027 and 1 of the Blah-Blah Act?

You: No, but...

AG: and how about s 80 para 5 – 105 of the Hee-Haw Act?

You: No, but...

AG: Silly you.

Get it? Hidden in plain sight among the vast multitude of daily legislation – that even the parliamentarians who vote it in have never read.

8. How does Registering the Contract fit in?

In today's Australia, you and I are expected by the Aust Govt to have a registration for every commercial activity we enter. We are registered to go to school, get social services, have a trade, drive, travel, have medical care, get a tax refund, vote, go to court, buy land, have a child, etc. And every day a new registration process crops up.

Now you all understand the trap inherent in the contracts we are all coerced to enter.

But those contracts are specifically between you and the relevant agency, not the Aust Govt and not their courts which are another corporate agency.

And they demand to be involved!

Every contract you hold with these agencies is registered into the Aust Govt files. After all, they are charged with the oversight of these various agencies .

When you register something, you give to that body permission to be involved. For example, when you register your marriage, you involve the State as the third party in the marriage. You give them an "interest" – which is a legal word meaning they have a "say" in what goes on. And it appears, their "say" is superior to yours in administrative contracts dealing with land.

So in effect, for each commercial contract, you are entering 2 contracts with 2 separate bodies.

1. The initial contract with the relevant administrative agency
2. The registration of that initial contract with the Aust Govt.

9. Let's discuss how the Aust Govt courts operate.

In the Commonwealth and under the common law Constitution, our courts offer and operate under common law.

Clearly, when we have a dispute in one of these Aust Govt / agency contracts, their courts are not operating under common law.

As they are courts contracted to administer disputes in admin law, then they operate in admiralty and the various kinds of law in admiralty. And arbitration is in admiralty.

But if you got told you were being taken to an arbitration court you would clearly know something is not quite right. So the Aust Govt have come up with a soft name for arbitration – Australian Dispute Resolution.

And an ADR court can mimic a common law court so you wouldn't know anything different, except that most of the back & forth dispute is done by paperwork paperwork before a court hearing is necessary.

The Judges

Just as there is a difference between the court process, process, there is also a difference between the judge in in the 2 systems.

A common law judge holds a Commission under Seal giving him constitutional authority to make a binding ruling in the matter, which he signs.

An ADR judge is only a judge in name. These days he he is referred to as a decision-maker or a coram. He holds a contract with the Aust Govt and has no constitutional authority to make a binding ruling. Nor Nor does he sign anything.

How does the ADR court operate then?

You start an action.

1. You contract to a lawyer
2. The lawyer does the court paperwork
3. It is registered
4. The lawyer and you do the dispute paperwork.
5. It goes back and forth and the dispute is resolved
 - a. That dispute agreement is registered OR
6. It goes back and forth and no dispute is resolved.
 - a. It then moves to court
7. The decision-maker decides who has the best case, in his opinion.
8. The ruling is not signed by the decision-maker.
9. The ruling is registered

Notice the registration all the way through, starting (unknown to you) with any other relevant commercial commercial contract registration that may be involved. involved.

So say the final registered ruling goes pear-shaped and and you end up back in court. The next decision hinges on all those registered agreements. It does NOT NOT go back over the case, just the agreements.

And that also applies to an appeal in the ADR process. process. The appeal from that court can only be based based on whether or not the decision-maker followed procedures – that is called procedural fairness.

Now if you continue to appeal and take the matter to the High Court, you have to understand that the HC can NOT deal with your case if you try and bring constitutional/common law appeals into an ADR case. case.

I have read many appeal docs now, and that is the primary reason they have not been successful – not that that you get told that. You just get refused.

Because the HC looks at your request, notes that you entered into contracts, hired a lawyer, ran a case, etc -

and it is deemed that unless you protested wherever and whenever you could – you agreed to be in that ADR process.

“An error which is not resisted or opposed is approved.” (*Error qui non resistitur approbatur*)

“He who does not deny, admits.” (*Qui non negat fatetur*).

“But then they don’t have any authority to push the ruling on me do they”, you might cry!

And you would be right & wrong.

- No, they do not have any judicial authority.
- The ruling is simply an opinion with no force of law

Let’s look at how a case runs in the Local Court when you are defending.

1. Defendant is called to the bar by his legal name (which is attached to his registered legal address and postcode in commercial registered contracts – so the COMI is established for the purpose of the admiralty jurisdiction)
2. He or she has been caught speeding – breach of registered commercial contract
3. If the defendant is represented by a solicitor (contract), the decision-maker speaks only to the solicitor.
4. If the defendant is un-represented, the decision-maker then asks him or her to agree that they are the legal name (contract established) and speaks to them.
5. The decision-maker reads all the docs, talks to the prosecutor and the solicitor, then after all this weighty business – talks directly to the defendant.
6. The decision-maker announces his decision, a fine or whatever, then says to the defendant....
7. “I want you to go around to the registry. The registrar will have some paperwork for you to fill out. I want you to fill it out and sign it.”
8. That paperwork is then the registered, with the ‘offer’ of the decision accepted and signed by the defendant into law.

Who then authorizes the ruling?

- The defendant using his Private Law rights.

Who then legitimizes the punishment?

- The defendant by signing the registered decision.

Get it? The Aust Govt and its agencies do not need constitutional / common law authority to bring down a judgement and enforce it – you do that for them. !

So, let’s take it a step further. Say the decision is going to cost you an awful lot of money, you do not believe you have received justice in any capacity, you have lost the appeals basically because you didn’t know what you were dealing with – and you refuse to accept the contract and pay the money.

How does the Aust Govt deal with that protest?

Simple. It’s not their problem. It is the problem of the the person that “won” the case. THEY have to start a new action and take it back into the court process.

Can’t you see the dollars mounting up for the Aust Govt registered legal persons? Another case – more dollars – yippee!!

So the first case ends. You get decided against and are supposed to pay up. You don’t do it. You keep disagreeing. You get lots of warnings and you write back asking for some detail or other, but that is now irrelevant – all that matters is an outstanding debt claim.

The other side’s solicitors (contracted) follow the debt claim process, then when you do not pay, they register a debt claim in the Supreme Court Costs Assessment dept. Another administration agency.

BUT – this is where it gets really dirty in my opinion.

The state Supreme Court has Ch III judicial authority. It is a constitutional body. So the other side’s solicitors, lodge this debt claim. It is assessed and rendered as valid. And that validation is – you guessed it – registered.

Your protest is irrelevant it appears. Now it’s just about a bill. The Supreme Court with Ch III judicial authority is now chasing you for an unpaid bill. Doesn’t matter how it happened, it is just an unpaid bill.

You stand your ground – where is my justice? Justice has not been given me. That is now totally irrelevant – you had your turn at seeking justice.

A new process now starts in the Ch III Supreme Court to enforce you into paying the bill – which you are still disputing with no favourable results. The court steams ahead and starts seizing your property or – as is so very common now – they declare you bankrupt and take it all.

The end result is that our constitutional / common law Ch III courts are used by the administration to remove your wealth, because the admin system can’t.

You haven’t had a clue what you were dealing with in the first matter, you have no idea what you are dealing with now. All you know is that justice has the face of a dollar bill and she isn’t smiling at you.

10. Commonwealth & ??

- We men and women still have a Commonwealth Constitution.
 - It is alive and well
- But it appears persons in the Cth Parliaments in times past were able to work out a loophole
 - That loophole was used to create a whole new government

- One that did not have to answer to you and I
 - Although we get to contract to vote for that whole new government and that contract is registered too, so it *appears* we have a say – remember, he who does not resist, approves.
- We do everything this new govt tells us to do
 - We are offered punishment if we do not and our lawful constitutional structure enforces that punishment.
- We complain loud and long into that lawful constitutional structure but our complaints hit the wall of the Procedural Law
 - Which is administered by the Aust Govt.

Come on – that’s hardly fair. No natural justice in that!

You will often hear politicians complain about “unelected Judges” making the law.

And in common law, they do to a great degree. Because they interpret each case individually and clarify the contracts (the Law) in each case. So the contract does make the law for each person, based on and under the constitutional protections.

But that isn’t the reason the politicians are complaining. Their complaint is because the High Court Justices have refused to judicially rubber stamp ALL the administrative codes and regulations for the Aust Govt.

It is clear that those High Court Justices are protecting the Constitution. They know that it is our only source of protection against this system with no disclosed name.

A system

- we the people have never had openly, clearly, with full disclosure discussed in multiple public forums,
- have NEVER therefore knowingly agreed to be governed under Publicly OR Privately
- and wherein we LOSE our constitutional/common law protections.
- And this system gets to use OUR contracted structure of Public law to harm us.

And we are supposed to think that is ok???

Does the Commonwealth Parliament *not* recall that a the majority of the people in a majority of States refused to dissolve our Commonwealth in 2 referendums?

Wherein that did they then think “oh but it will be alright to trick them into just giving parts of it up.”

Because folks – I do not think it is all right. I think it stinks and is the most filthy display of chicanery, fraud and self-serving deception I have ever encountered.

I will not condemn my children to this system – it is almost at a slavery level. Only a few more registered contracts to go I think.

I DO NOT AGREE. DO YOU?????

How does this information affect our Private land ownership, which is the largest contract we all hold?

House & Land

- You buy land and a house, using a conveyancer solicitor (who hold Aust Govt contracts to practice).
- You agree to a contract with them wherein they all the ‘nuts and bolts’ work. You never ask what that includes.
- The conveyancer or solicitor registers the purchase contract into the Aust Govt system.
- It appears the Land Dept then give the details of the new registration to the Local Govt who then begin to issue rating notices.

Notice: Legal notification required by law or agreements as a result of some fact (such as the recording of an instrument [contract])

- In common law, the new land owner must hold a Deed.
- In the admin law system, the new land owner holds a Certificate.
- All Deeds are kept and stored by the Cth and/or the Aust. Govt..

You want to make changes to the house.

- In common law, you just make the changes as long as they do not interfere with someone else’s land.
- In the admin law system, you must ask from the Local Govt body.
- Your plans must comply with all codes and regulations as established by the Aust Govt statutory legislation.
- You must pay for that privilege.
- You must not do any work without that permission
- If you receive “consent” you must not change the agreed plans.
- If you do not receive “consent” you may take the matter to an Administrative Land Tribunal at your cost.

Eg. A person inherited land along a beachfront. That person did not intend to build but the Local Govt issued notices that required people to apply to build or lose the opportunity. So they applied.

9 years later they were refused as the moratorium had run out. The person took the matter to the Land Tribunal and were given permission.

The Local Govt then informed the person that the road verges belonged to Local Govt and the person could not cross them without permission.

Q: Does that person go back to court, at their own cost OR concede defeat and never be able to build on that land?

You are a farmer and your land is being targeted

for mining and coal-gas wells.

- You only hold a Certificate of Title on your land
- The Cth and/or the Aust Govt holds the Deeds because the land was registered to them
- They give the mining company contractual permission to enter your property
- They give the mining company contractual permission to mine your property.
- Along with the mining company, you must deal Dept officers from the Aust Govt who enter your property as they wish, mapping and investigating and fining you for carrying out the “unlawful” enterprise of using your land as you see fit.
- When the mining company representatives wish to move onto your property, the police protect them against you.

Who then really owns the land? It appears, not us.

Who then is the Parliament – charged with the responsibility of *making laws for peace, order and good government of the Commonwealth* - making those laws for? It appears, not us.

How does Administrative Law enter our private lives in our homes, when it deals with commercial contracts?

Say you are growing your own marijuana. You never sell it, it never leaves the property, you never smoke it in public – everything is done in the privacy of your home.

Yet you get busted and arrested.

The sale of marijuana, despite being illegal, is a commercial activity that impacts on the contract holders registered with the Aust Govt. in various capacities.

If you use marijuana but do not buy it, you are part of that impact in a negative capacity, so you are harming commercial contract holders and need to be ‘disciplined’.

Now that might seem totally ridiculous to you, but it is from an actual case.

Not a far stretch to see how that sort of action could be applied to growing your own vegetable & herbs, making your own medicinal treatments, cosmetics, etc.

Oh – they are already doing that! Or haven’t you heard of the Codex Alimentari??

In previous Newsletters I mentioned that we had reverted the Interest in our Assets back to the Commonwealth as did some other people we knew.

That appears to have made a huge difference in some of their dealings with the Aust Govt. and in our case, it took us into a court case that referenced the Cross Borders Insolvency Act 2008.

That act was about 1 person from 1 foreign jurisdiction being made bankrupt by another person from another foreign jurisdiction.

That opened the door to the information in this newsletter. After all, how could we be involved in an action between persons of foreign jurisdictions – when the whole matter was in this country?

We realized that

- IF we were of a foreign jurisdiction to the Aust Govt and
- IF we were Commonwealth people then
- The Aust Govt was not of the Commonwealth.
- That meant that we had to have some kind of contract with the Aust Govt which was outside of the Constitutional contract.

Remember that quote? “*Plain truths need not be proved.*” (*Perspicua vera non sunt probanda*)

Not knowing how or what, we found out how to revert all contracts back to the Commonwealth, did so and have been very comfortable with the result.

If people wish to know the details and how we did this, I am prepared to put together another Newsletter.

It is not complicated, but it is. You need to understand what it means and what you are doing.

You might have a problem with the Monarchy or the Constitutional system. But you should have more of a problem with the Admin system which has entrapped you into an enforced control that is growing daily and offers YOU not one human rights protection.

That is for you to work through. If it is not something you wish to do – then stay in the Admin system, but do not use the Constitutional protections as your defence. They do not belong to you in bits and pieces – only in a whole body of law.

If people want that to be documents, please email me on flora@reachnet.com.au

Thank you all for reading, what you do is now up to you.

Sue