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Freedom of Speech | Question 2–1

Question 2–2

Freedom of Religion | Question 3–1

Question 3–2

Freedom of Association | Question 4–1

Question 4–2

Freedom of Movement | Question 5–1

A law that interferes with freedom of movement is hardly justifiable if you have done nothing wrong to prevent your freedom of movement. This is such a fundamental aspect of being a human, to be able to move freely in the community, but because of the proliferation of radiofrequency signals from digital and wireless transmitters, many sensitive individuals can no longer move freely around the community. They have done nothing wrong to deserve this situation.

Question 5–2

The Radiocommunications Act sets maximum limits under the Human Exposure Standard for the radiofrequency electromagnetic radiation emissions from wireless devices such as wi-fi routers and mobile phone towers. These maximum limits have been set at such a level that they do not protect children or people who are particularly sensitive to these emissions. As a result, people who suffer this sensitivity are having to live their lives avoiding public places and even schools and hospitals, and are losing their ability to work, in an attempt to remove themselves from these signals. There is established scientific evidence internationally that these signals cause many different adverse health effects and are particularly damaging for sensitive people.

Property Rights | Question 6–1

Question 6–2

The Radiocommunications Act, by setting maximum radiofrequency electromagnetic radiation exposure limits that do not protect people's biological health (but only protect from acute thermal risks) is ruining people's lives and even their ability to enjoy their own properties. By setting the maximum limits in the Radiocommunications Human Exposure Standard at such a high level with no regard for biological effects on adults or especially children, and no regard for sensitive individuals, this law is completely eliminating people's ability to enjoy their property rights. People have had to move houses multiple times, and even move interstate to try to reduce their exposure to this radiofrequency radiation which has been particularly severe in Victoria with the smart meter grid electrosmog.

Similarly, the Telecommunications Act, which allows telco companies to situation mobile phone antennas and base stations anywhere they choose has forced people to move out of their homes entirely, to avoid the radiation that these towers emit. This radiation goes through walls, doors, and glass. Simply closing the front door does not block them out. As a result, they argubaly breach nuisance laws by emanating unwelcome into people's homes all day and night, leading to the destruction of people's health.

Retrospective Laws | Question 7–1

Question 7–2

Fair Trial | Question 8–1

Question 8–2

Burden of Proof | Question 9–1

Question 9–2

The Radiocommunications Act and ARPANSA RPS 3 unfairly shift the burden of proof to electromagnetic hypersensitivity syndrome sufferers to prove that wireless technology is harmful to their health, when the technology industry and telecommunications companies, and ARPANSA itself, should be required to show how wi-fi and such technology is safe, particularly for children.

Privilege against Self-incrimination | Question 10–1

Question 10–2

Client Legal Privilege | Question 11–1

Question 11–2

Strict and Absolute Liability | Question 12–1

Question 12–2

Appeal from Acquittal | Question 13–1

Question 13–2

Procedural Fairness | Question 14–1

Question 14–2

Delegating Legislative Power | Question 15–1

Question 15–2

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

Question 16–2

The Radiocommunications Act, under the standard making power, authorises ARPANSA to institute maximum non ionising radiation exposure limits that are ruining people's health. ARPANSA refuses to acknowledge the significant range of adverse biological effects that are resulting at levels well below its maximum limits. This is by any definition a state sponsored tort. As the health and safety adviser to the government, ARPANSA has a duty of care to all Australians, particularly children. Its inaction on dropping the maximum limits despite the scientific evidence, which is allowing the proliferation of radiofrequency microwaves across society, has now lead to a situation where wi-fi radiation is on all day in most schools around Australia. This is a tort against our children.

Executive Immunities | Question 17–1

Question 17–2

Judicial Review | Question 18–1

Question 18–2

Others Rights, Freedoms and Privilege | Question 19–1

The common law doctrine of the body inviolate is being breached on a daily basis. ARPANSA's lax maximum limits are allowing radiofrequency microwaves to enter into children's bodies every day and all day in schools around Australia. This is a breach of the bodily integrity of children in the care of education departments who are relying on ARPANSA's standards under the Radiocommunications Act, and who have not sought the consent of parents to this radiation emission around children.
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