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Freedom of Speech | Question 2–1

If freedom of speach is a true right then their can be no intervention of that freedom even if its damaging to government but if it insights violence towards poeple or the australian way of life then their should be some intervention.

Question 2–2

I Cant Comment I Do Not Know Commonwealth Law Too Well.

Freedom of Religion | Question 3–1

As Stated Above, If A Freedom Of Speach Is Used To Promote Violence Against The People Of This Nation Then Their Should Be Some Intervention.

Question 3–2

I Dont Know Of Any Law That Interferes With Religion, That Is Protected By The Constitution Section 116 But If A Religion Tries To Insite Violence Or Change The Australian Way Of Life Their Should Be Intervention.

Freedom of Association | Question 4–1

If a group of people are known to be anti australian and wish to force a set of principals that are un australian, that group should be banned.

Question 4–2

I Dont Know Of Any Commonwealth Laws That Do This, The Constitution Protects Our Freedom Of Association And Travel Amongst The States, Section 92.

Freedom of Movement | Question 5–1

If A Group Or An Individual Is Known To Be Of A Violent Or Criminal Nature Then Their Movement Should Be Monitors Or Restricted Unless Permission Is Granted By An Appropriate Authority.

Question 5–2

I Dont Know Of Any Commonwealth Laws.

Property Rights | Question 6–1

Their Should Be No Law To Interfere With Property Rights, Fee Simple Is An Enrtenched Law Of England And Is Absolute, To Remove The Right Of Fee Simple Is To Make Property Worthless And Is An Infringement Of The Highest Caliber. To Remove Such Rights Takes Away An Unalianble Right Of Common Law.

Question 6–2

To My Knowlege Their Are No Commonwealth Laws Removing Fee Simple Property Rights, To Do So Would Require A Referendum To Remove An Entrenched Law That Australia Federated Under And Then Seek Permission From The UK Parlimant, Hence The Preamble,

WHEREAS the people of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Queensland, and Tasmania, humbly relying on the blessing of Almighty God, have agreed to unite in **one indissoluble**Federal Commonwealth **under the Crown of the United Kingdom**of Great Britain and Ireland, and under the Constitution hereby established:

Retrospective Laws | Question 7–1

No Law Should Have The Ability To Remove Legal Rights And Obligations.

Question 7–2

I Dont Know Of Any Commonwealth Law Due To My Lack Of Knowlege.

Fair Trial | Question 8–1

Their Should Be No Law Removing The Right To A Fair Trial.

Question 8–2

I Dont Know If Its Commonwealth Law But The Removal Of Grand Jury Should Not Have Happend And The Removal Of Trial By Jury In The Lower Courts Should Not Have Happend As This Allowed For The Re Establishment Of The Star Chamber Type Court That Was Abolished In The 1600's. In My Opinion The Magistrates Court As Is Stands Today Is A Star Chamber Court And Is Not A Fair System Of Justice And Should Be Abolished And Replaced With A Proper System. I Think The Magistrates Court Is A UNIDROIT Court And Does Not Reflect The Common Law Principles This Country Was Set Up Under And Is Illegal As The Magistrated Have Not Sworn An Oath To Our Head Of State Queen Elizabeth II, They Have Recieved An Appointment From The De Facto Queen Of Australia Who Is A Creation Of Statute.

Burden of Proof | Question 9–1

It Is A Well Established Principle Of Law That The Burden Of Proof Lies With The Applicant, Anything Else Is Criminal And Should Never Be Entertained.

Question 9–2

Dont Know Of Any Commonwealth Laws That Do This Due To My Lack Of Knowlege Except For The UNIDROIT Treaty That Was Signed In 1973 That Appears To Have Alterd Our Protection That The Constitution Gives Us And Has Brought In A Foreign Power In Breach Of Section 44 Of The Constitution And These Laws Are Unjustified As They Bring In A Roman Code Of Law That Should Not Be In This Country. The Bringing In Of Implied And Absolute Liability Takes Away A Persons Right Of Fair Trial And This Roman Code Was Derived From The BOOK OF SUSAN Which The Vatican Removed From The Old Testiment In The Early 1200th Century So As The Layman Could Not Referance This Act Back To The Bible.

Privilege against Self-incrimination | Question 10–1

Privilage Against Self Incrimination Is An Inherant Right, If The Aplicant Cannot Prove Beyond A Reasonable Doubt That You Are Guilty Of An Offence Then The Prossecution Is Not Doing Their Job Properly Or, You Are Innocent.

Question 10–2

I Dont Know Of Any Due To Lack Of Knowlege But Their Should Not Be Any, In My Opinion.

Client Legal Privilege | Question 11–1

If A Person Openly And Unhinderd And Of Free Will Admits To Murder Or Rape Or Child Sex Crimes The Client Lawyer Privilage Should Be Waved.

Question 11–2

I Dont Know Of Any That Exist

Strict and Absolute Liability | Question 12–1

It Is Not Justified, It Is Against A Persons Rights And Is A UNIDROIT Principle Of Law And Should Be Outlawed In This Country.

Question 12–2

Due ToLack Of Knowlage I Cant Comment.

Appeal from Acquittal | Question 13–1

If That Law Breaches A Persons Rights, Wheather It Be A Human Right Or An Inherant Right.

Question 13–2

I Cant Comment Due To Lack Of Knowlage

Procedural Fairness | Question 14–1

If A Law Removes Or Alters A Persons Common Law Right Or A Human Right Or An Unalianable Inherant Right It Should Be Removed.

Question 14–2

I Cant Comment Due To Lack Of Knowlage.

Delegating Legislative Power | Question 15–1

The Constitution Forbids Legislative Power Be Vested With The Executive, Their Is A Process That Must Be Followed, Any Deviation From This Is TREASON.

Question 15–2

Im Not Sure How Many But Their Will Be A Few Im Sure, The Constitution Sets A Process That Must Be Followed In The Law Making Process, The Framers Of The Constitution Made Sure This Process Was Clearly Spelled Out, Any Altering Of This Process Renders The Law Repugnant.

Authorising what would otherwise be a Tort | Question 16–1

No Torts Are Justified In My Opinion.

Question 16–2

I Dont Know Of Commonwealth Law, But Their Are A Great Number Of State Laws That Are In Conflict With The Constitution Via Section 109.

Executive Immunities | Question 17–1

No One Should Be Immune From The Law.

Question 17–2

Due To Lack Of Knowlage I Cant Comment.

Judicial Review | Question 18–1

No Law Should Restrict Access To The Judicial Review Process.

Question 18–2

I Cant Comment Due To Lack Of Knowlage.

Others Rights, Freedoms and Privilege | Question 19–1

The New Anti Terror Laws Breach All Rights But We As A People Need Some Laws To Enable Authorities To Protect The Poeple Of The Commonwealth.

Other comments?

In My Opinion The Parlimant Has Drifted Away From Many Of The Principals That The Constitution Has Laid Out. The People Are Sovereign And It Seams The Government Think They Are. There Are Many Rights That The Consitiution Has Laid Before The People And The State Governments Have Slowley Removed Or Hidden Those Rights And For The People To Win Those Rights Back In The Court System Is An Expensive Road That Many Cannot Afford To Travel. The Introduction Of The UNIDROIT Law System In My Opinion Is Unlawfull And Against The Constitution But The Federal Government Refuses To Do Anything About It. Local Government Was Established Against The Will Of The People Via The 1988 Referendum And Yet The Federal Government Refuses To Do Anything About It. I Would Like To See The Governance Of This Country Return To Its Proper Form Under The Constitution Of The Commonwealth Of Australia, As Anything Else Is Not Acceptable.
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