

Dear All,
FYI.

Dictatorship by stealth and DECEIT.

Read and weep.
Regards
Col

The Queensland Constitution 2001 and the Removal of all Ownership Rights in Queensland

In order to bring about the structure now known as the State of QLD/Brigalow Corporation a long process of legal manipulation was instituted. As the aim was to remove QLD from the Commonwealth Federation, it was necessary to remove it back to the original *QLD Constitution 1867*, prior to Federation and make sure that Constitution was able to carry the intended results.

Consequently, this Constitution was reprinted but withheld for a date to be fixed, with 114 Changes, 131 Additions and 116 Deletions. [I have the Document Comparison here.]

The most relevant change initially was the addition of over 14 sections regarding the expansion of the role of Parliamentary Secretary.

During the early 1990's all major laws were reprinted, but held over for a fixed date.

On approx the 29 January 1998, the leader of the National Party placed on the table in Parliament, a document seeking to move the Governor of the State of QLD, into the *Constitution Act 1867* as a parliamentary secretary and a public official. This was done under the *Imperial Acts Application Act 1954 section 15DA*. This document was not challenged by any member of any party or any independent member of the QLD Parliament, and therefore became official on 29 January 1999. See *Constitution (Parliamentary Secretaries) Act ©The State of QLD 1996*.

On the same day the *QLD Constitution 1867* reprint was proclaimed, thus verifying the position of Parliamentary Secretary under its Constitution. From this day on, the Governor of the State of QLD was no longer a sworn representative of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, but was now inside the 1867 Constitution, conducting the daily business of the government and allocating "laws" applicable to each government department.

He was removed from his "no party allegiance" and had become, effectively, a part of the QLD government and under the Premier's control. On 9 November 2001, the Premier of the State of QLD, the Honourable Peter Beattie presented to Parliament the new *Constitution of Queensland 2001 Bill*. The elected Members for the people of QLD, the Members of the Legislative Assembly, passed the Bill, said only to 'modernise' the Constitution of QLD..

This constitution was assented to by the Governor on 3rd December 2001 and upon assent, under section 95 of the new Constitution, Acts subject to the *Constitution Act 1867* were repealed. Section 92 immediately came into force which repealed parts of the *Constitution Act Amendment Act 1922*. This allowed the Parliament to move back prior to the removal of the Legislative Council at referendum in 1922 and 'recreate' the positions of that former Legislative Council. QLD then became, at

the completion of these matters, without the assent of any of the laws by the Crown or Her Representative, an **independent sovereign State** and **fractured the common law and the separation of powers in that state.**

Although the **Governor** was clearly now a public servant under the current QLD State Government, he **still held the Public Seal of the State**, and **sealed all documents signed under the Hand of the Sovereign with the Public Seal of the State**, therefore **rendering void, any contracts, Acts, Laws, etc under the Hand of the Sovereign.**

In fact, on that day, 3 December 2001, the Governor of QLD with the authority of the Entrenched Provisions contained in the *Constitution Act 1867 (Reprint No 1)*, and the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act* which in their manner and form hold the entrenched provision of "The Governor of QLD", and exercising the delegated authority of "The Crown", did unilaterally 'Assent' to the '*Constitution of Queensland Parliament of Queensland Bill*' **without the consent of the People's of QLD** through the ultimate and absolute authority gained **through a vote of 'Referenda'**. And in doing so, this **Constitution of Queensland 2001** became the '**Fundamental Law of QLD.**'

Brigalow Corporation The Brigalow Corporation (of the State of Qld) originated in the old Qld Crowns Lands Act and came about through the Qld Government borrowing from the Federal Government funds to develop what was termed the "Brigalow Belt" (about 4 mil acres) out from Rockhampton during the 1960's. The old Crowns Lands Act (Qld) has now been converted to the "*Land Act 1994 (Qld)*" and this is where **you can find the "Brigalow Corporation"** today.

In essence the government of Qld has moved all the crowns land **AND)all crown land that was sold (fee simple)** into the Brigalow Corporation through the Land Act, Land Title Act, Property Law Act, etc, etc, etc. The "Brigalow Corporation" in **not Listed as a "Public" company** on the Stock Exchange, it is an "Exempt Public Authority" which is found by definition at *s9 and 5A* of the *Corporations Act 2001 (C'wth)* (in right of the crown), except there is no "Crown" in Qld just "the State".

The term "The State" or as written in most modern Qld statutes, "This Act binds **the state**". It is quite clear in the Second Reading Speech by Premier Beattie, that at the time the Legislative Assembly voted for the passing of the *Parliament of Queensland Bill 2001* and the *Constitution of Queensland 2001*, they were allowing the use of Acts which had been framed but had not been passed by the Legislative Assembly and were, in fact, adjourned **sine die** going back to 1991. Sine die meaning to be Adjourned without giving any future date of meeting or hearing.

Those Acts were proclaimed on 7 June 2002 and then reprinted as law of that Parliament. By the passing of these Acts by the Parliament of QLD, the subject citizens of Her Majesty have **suffered the loss of their judicial relief at common law and all those rights which are originally entrenched in the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act at sects 109, 107, 108, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, Chapter II, III, sects 75 & 76..**

The Corporations (Q) Act 1990 (Q) Reprint No 3, was reprinted as in force immediately before **15 July 2001** ©State of Q 2006. At this time, the State of **QLD became a Corporation Government.**

Under the definition of 'person' in the *Acts Interpretation Act 1901 (C'wth)*, section 22 (1)(a) **expressions used to denote persons include a body politic or corporate as well as an individual.** The *Acts Interpretation Act 1954 (Q)* defines a person as an 'individual and a corporation' and as such the once Sovereign People are now subject to the corporate government of the State of QLD and as such are '**chattels**' of the **State of QLD Corporation.**

I refer to the following Acts - the *Reprints Act 1992*, the *Statutory Instruments Act 1992*, the *Legislative Standards Act 1992*. These Acts were used in conjunction with the *Constitution of QLD 2001*, section 92 to create the corporation Government of the State and then further to repeal those Acts under section 95 of that Constitution. Those Acts moved back in time, one may say like the Tardis, reprinting, removing the Crown out of all Acts as far back as the Magna Carta then reprinting back to the *Australia Acts (Requests) Act 1985* and removing all the positions as cited in that Act.

The only part of the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act* which is recognized by QLD is the Commonwealth Constitution commencing at section 9. **The sections of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act which are not recognized includes the High Court and the Federal Court.**

By using the *Australia Acts (Request) Act 1985 section 12* in conjunction with the other three State Acts, the Acts reprinted QLD into a corporate State. In conjunction with the *Acts Interpretation Act 1954 section 15DA(2)* which allowed for the automatic commencement and assent of any Act that had been laying dormant for a period of twelve months, Acts which were framed to create the corporate State of QLD in 1992, 1993 and 1994 were reprinted by the *Reprints Act 1992* which is under the Department of the Premier.

The elected Members of the sovereign people of the State of QLD have, since 29th January 1999 taken it upon themselves, (contrary to the *Criminal Code Act 1995(C'wth)* to which they are all subject under **Chapter 7 - The proper administration of Government**), to create for themselves, under the *Constitution of QLD 2001*, a corporation Government in which the sovereign people of QLD and their property are mere chattels of the State.

This surely is a breach of the trust and faith which the electors of QLD placed in their elected members to uphold and respect the laws of the Commonwealth. The State of Queensland Australia is registered with the US Securities and Exchange Commissions under No. 0001244818.

The Queensland Treasury Corp is registered under No. 0000852555 I have copies of their Annual Report for Foreign Governments & Political Subdivisions including the Queensland Treasury Corporation's 2006-07 Indicative borrowing program Update. I also have the Queensland State Accounts December 2006 which carries gross private information.

Government Tiers All Government tiers, including Local councils are now inside the Parliament of QLD.

The Members of the Legislative Assembly are clearly individuals and members of the corporation as defined in the *Acts Interpretation Act 1954 sect 32 & 33*. Members of the Legislative Assembly are paid by the Parliament of QLD and are elected subject to the *Election Act (Q)* which is an Act enacted by the Parliament of QLD.

All elections held in QLD since 6th June 2002 are elections at common law but the *Election Act of QLD* is subject to the *Uniform Civil Procedures Rules 1999 of QLD*, therefore any vote given in any State, Federal or Council elections since that time are votes in name only.

The *Acts Interpretation (State Commercial Activities) Act 1994* amended the *Acts Interpretation Act 1954* to define "the State" to mean the Executive government of

the State of QLD. Under the provisions of this Act, "the State" may carry out commercial activities 'without further statutory authority' and 'without prior appropriation from the public accounts' {s47C.(3)} *Section 47C*. defines 'commercial activities to include 'commercial activities that are not within the ordinary functions of the State' and these functions may be delegated by a Minister to an officer of the State who may sub-delegate delegated powers to another officer of the State. An 'officer of the State means a chief executive, or employee of the public sector or an officer of the public service'.

The Second Reading Speech of the former Premier the Honourable Peter Beattie when he created the new Government of QLD, placed inside the Parliament himself as Premier (President), the Ministers, the Governor as a parliamentary secretary, the judges and justices of the Supreme and District Courts, the Supreme and District Court, the Local Government Councils.

The public officials are not public officials of "the Crown" but public officials of "the State" of QLD.

As all real property has now been taken back by the State and held under the State corporation, the Brigalow Corporation, the public officials are in fact now working for the owners of the land, the State Government of QLD. When the State of QLD removed the land and placed it under the ownership of the State, they did so without compensation or without a referendum.

Judicial Results Because this new Constitution was presented to and passed by the Parliament of Qld without respect of reference to the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act section 106*, to the *Queensland Constitution Act 1867* and without a referendum of the People as cited at *section 53*, this removed the Separation of Powers and recreated QLD as an independent, sovereign, corporation government outside of and not, therefore, subject to the laws of the Commonwealth or other States & Territories, in contradiction of the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act*.

The Common Law has been repealed from the *Supreme Court Act 1995 (Q)*, *Reprint No. 2*, reprinted as in force 2 March 2001 © State of Q 2001, by the omission of *Part 9 – Division Heading 4 Common Law & Jurisdiction; Division Heading 5 Equitable Jurisdiction; Division Heading 6 Criminal Jurisdiction - Section 199 Laws of England to be applied in the administration of Justice; Section 200 Common Law and General Jurisdiction of the Court, Jurisdiction at common Law; Section 2001 Equitable Jurisdiction; Section 202 Criminal Jurisdiction*. Courtesy of the *Constitution of Queensland 2001 Chapter 4 – Courts – section 58 – Supreme Courts* – the Supreme Court's jurisdiction is now of the State.

QLD is now outside the Commonwealth of Australia as an independent sovereign State without common law, and the people are subject to civil and statute law only.

The 'common law and general jurisdiction'; the 'Laws of England to be applied in the administration of justice' and 'equitable jurisdiction' have been removed under the *Supreme Court Act 1995(Qld) Reprint number 2A* dated 2nd March, 2001 under Schedule 2 of the *Constitution of Queensland 2001*.

All private equity and inheritance in the State is the property of "the State", see *Corporations (Q) Act 1990 (Q)*, *Reprint No 3*, reprinted as in force immediately before 15 July 2001 ©State of Q 2006. All courts, including the Magistrates Courts, are inside the Parliament of QLD.

The jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of QLD is found in the *Constitution of Queensland 2001*, Part 5 - Powers of the State. Therefore it is assumed that the

Judges of the Supreme and District Courts of QLD must protect the 'assets' of the State of QLD and find only in favour of the State, not in favour of the registered owners of private land who have lost, under the statute laws of QLD, the rights to use their fee simple land as they see fit.

*The Constitution of Queensland 2001 Chapter 3, Sections 51 & 27 are **ultra vires** to the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act at s109, s106, s107, s51 & s52 of the Referendum (Machinery Provisions) Act 1984 (C'wth). Ultra vires meaning Without authority. An act which is beyond the powers or authority of the person or organization which took it. The common law and references to the Crown have been removed out of the Supreme Court Act 1995(Qld). Civil law and statute law have a very different requirement for the committing of any offence, whether an indictable offence, a summary offence, a simple offence or an absolute offence such as a traffic offence where a guilty mind is not required to commit that offence.*

Under the civil law system, which is now subject to the Uniform Civil Procedures Rules of the Supreme Court Act 1991(Qld), every person is guilty until they prove their innocence.

The Supreme and District Court, other courts and the Judges and Justices of those Courts are now inside the corporation of the Government, and not sworn representatives of the Crown.

Under the *Constitution of Queensland 2001*, all documents are issued or signed under the Public Seal of the State. This would be any document appointing a politician, a Judge or any person who should swear an oath of allegiance to the Sovereign. The Governor now seals that document in accordance with the *Constitution of Queensland 2001* section 37 with the Public Seal of the State therefore voiding the appointment of any of those people by the Sovereign but making those people in effect 'officers of the State' and subject to the 'Powers of the State' as cited in Part 5 of the *Constitution of Queensland 2001*.

Sovereign People We are all subjects of Her Majesty under section 117 of the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act* The Parliament of QLD does not recognize the rights of the sovereign people inside the State of QLD. What now happens to people who have been prosecuted, fined, imprisoned etc. under the civil law of QLD, which does not exist elsewhere in the Commonwealth of Australia.

The people of QLD are still, under section 117 of the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act*, subjects of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and protected by Her laws as there has been no referendum under section 128 of the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act* to allow the separation of QLD from the Commonwealth of Australia.

Those of you who hold a Deed of Grant in fee simple in QLD, now only hold a statutory title, and that title is upheld by the civil laws of the Supreme and District Courts of the corporate Government of QLD and the Judges of the Supreme and District Courts who are inside the Government. Your common law estate in fee simple is now held by the corporate Government of the Sovereign State of QLD.

Under the definitions in the *Acts Interpretation 1954(Qld)*, section 36, the definition of 'property' and 'land', **the State of QLD now owns all your property, which includes money, real and personal property from the past and any future property which includes your will.**

I refer to the definition of 'land' under section 22 - Meaning of certain words (aa) 'individual' and (c) 'land' of the *Acts Interpretation Act 1901(C'wth)* and the definition of 'property' in section 130.1 of the *Criminal Code Act 1995(C'wth)* The

Acts Interpretation Act 1954(Qld) is *ultra vires* to the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act*, *Criminal Code Act 1995*(C'wth), Chapter 7 - The proper administration of Government; the *Acts Interpretation Act 1901*(C'wth).

The *Acts Interpretation Act 1954*(Q) defines property both present and future, owned by you as an 'individual and a corporation' as subject to a statutory instrument only and that statutory instrument is not only applicable to your land, but all property that you, as a person in QLD now own, as opposed to the previous common law indefeasible deed of grant in fee simple. All land, including private land held previously in the common law estate of inheritance in fee simple by private individuals, is now held by the corporation of the State of QLD known as the Brigalow Corporation.

The only tenure that any financial institutions hold in land in QLD today, even though they may believe they hold an estate in fee simple, is in fact held by the corporation of the State, the Brigalow Corporation and is now the full property of the State. The lending institutions now only hold a statutory title and an interest only in the land by virtue of the *Statutory Instruments Act 1992* under which the rules of the Supreme and District Courts are found under section 12 of that Act.

The owners of that property taken by the corporation can only hope that the corporation has not used your real property as an asset to borrow funds for the corporation for whatever purpose. If the independent State corporation fails or borrowing is too extensive, it will again be the sovereign people who will bear the financial consequences.

Your Deed of Grant in fee simple is now a statutory title only, and that title is upheld by the civil laws of the Supreme and District Courts of the corporate Government of QLD and the Judges of the Supreme and District Courts who are inside the Government Your land is now held by the Government of QLD in the Brigalow Corporation with no compensation paid to you for that acquisition. For "*Even though the King may not enter*" (*Plenty v. Dillon* [1991] HCA 5; 171 CLR 635 F.C. 91/004 (7 March 1991) the QLD Government and the delegated authorities thereof can, without fine or legal interference.

To have QLD become an independent Sovereign State and to remove the common law, set up statutory civil law and have Queensland not recognize the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act but only that Act from section 9 onwards, a full referendum would have been required of the people of the Commonwealth of Australia to enact, validly, that QLD, from 29th January 1999 was now independent of the Commonwealth of Australia and a State in its own right. **That did not happen.**

In the Second Reading Speech for the Constitution the Premier stated that the Constitution would be 'broadly accessible' to the people of QLD. Considering that this Act has effectively removed all common law property rights from the people of QLD it should, one would reasonably assume, have been put to a referendum of the people.

The sovereign people of the Commonwealth of Australia have never been required at a referendum by virtue of section 128 of the *Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia* to vote to allow "the State" of QLD to fracture the Commonwealth and become an independent sovereign state.

Assets of the Corporation As the corporation of QLD, when it was formed, had no assets, it had to acquire assets if they wished to borrow. Under the *Queensland Government (Land Holding) Amendment Act 1992*, they immediately took all the Crown land and estates in fee simple registered under the *Property Law*

Act 1974 as equity for the corporation without compensation to the registered owners of the property whether they live in QLD or anywhere else and converted that property for their own use, contrary to Chapter 7 of the *Criminal Code Act 1995(C'wth)* - *The proper administration of Government*.

The QLD Government *Land Holding Amendment Act 1992* was reprinted into law through the *Parliament of Queensland Act 2001*, whereupon all Crown land, assets and infrastructure on that land including schools, hospitals, roads, etc became subject to and responsible to the Ministers of the State of QLD as cited at *Chapter III of the Queensland Constitution 2001*.

The *Acts Interpretation (State Commercial Activities) Act 1994* amended the *Acts Interpretation Act 1954* to define "the State" to mean the Executive government of the State of QLD. Under the provisions of this Act, "the State" may carry out commercial activities 'without further statutory authority' and 'without prior appropriation from the public accounts' {s47C.(3)} Section 47C. defines 'commercial activities to include 'commercial activities that are not within the ordinary functions of the State' and these functions may be delegated by a Minister to an officer of the State who may sub-delegate delegated powers to another officer of the State. An 'officer of the State means a chief executive, or employee of the public sector or an officer of the public service'. Under the *Lands Legislation Amendment Act No. 64 of 1992* © The State of QLD and further now in the corporation of the State known as the Brigalow Corporation and further by amendment of the *Constitution Act 1867 Reprint 2A* which clearly defines that any estate or interest in the land to be acquired from any other person, the definition of land clearly does not include any estate, therefore the only land held has been transferred from the *Real Property Acts of 1861; 1877; 1952 and 1956* into the *Land Title Act 1994(Qld) Reprint 7* ©State of QLD 2003 and you hold your land in a statutory title only, without any further element of tenure of the Crown and the Courts are inside the Government and subject to the rules of the Court as found in the *Statutory Instruments Act 1992*© The State of QLD. Recent newspaper articles have shown the next steps in this "legal land theft".

The QLD Government plans to determine Land valuation via the Improved Capital Value, which would **allow their asset base to rise extraordinarily**, as well as **increase the amount of rates to the land owners**.

A second article states regarding the QLD Urban Land Development "Both the authority and a developer will be able to write their own by-laws, open and close roads, levy their own rates, enter buildings without a warrant and cut councils out of the planning process in designated areas, all without being elected."

What is Behind This It is quite clear that those who have been put in power by the sovereign people of the State have, since 1992 when the original Acts were being framed, had a full intention in time, to bring about their own personal agendas, regardless of the wishes of the sovereign people who have, in good and open faith and intention, by secret ballot at elections, voted these people into positions of power and of trust and who must swear or affirm an oath of allegiance to Her Majesty that they will uphold Her laws for the benefit of the people of the State of QLD.

That power has turned from the power granted by the people to the Legislative Assembly to make laws for 'peace **welfare** and good government' on behalf of the sovereign people of QLD using funds from taxes paid by the citizens of QLD and all of Australia, into a totalitarian system of Government, whereby we the people are subject to the corporation Government of the State.

The ramifications caused by these actions carried out over a long period of time by the Members of the body politic dating back as far as 1992 are so vast and wide spread it will take a long time to remedy and repair the whole system of government in QLD.

The Parliament can make any laws they wish but I do not believe that under a democratic system of Government they are elected to Parliament to make draconian laws which remove the rights of the sovereign people to their use of their land without fair and just compensation.

Under the *Constitution of Queensland 2001*, by the removal of common law in the State of QLD, the public officials of this State can acquire an interest in private registered land without compensation, for the benefit of the State Government corporation. This also includes the property owned now and in the future as the sovereign people are in fact " an individual and a corporation" and therefore subject to the corporation Government of the State of QLD..

It is very clear from the time line of events that this was a well-planned manoeuvre to remove QLD from the Federation of Australia and through that action from the protection of the Australian Constitution and Common Law & Equity.

The former Premier said in the Second Reading Speech for the constitution, 'we all look forward to the day when we are a republic'. The people of the Commonwealth of Australia at referendum in 1999 voted against a republic but wished to retain the present system of Government with a clear separation of powers under common law and for the Commonwealth of Australia to remain exactly the same with a combined Federation of States as was created in 1901. Mr Beattie also stated – "But this Act is much more it is the fundamental law of QLD that underpins our system of government. The entities it provides for include this Parliament, the Supreme and District Courts of this State and the system of local government that we know in QLD. The office holders under this Act include the Governor of QLD, the Ministers of the Crown and the judges of the Supreme and District Courts. This law is of supreme importance." Further in the speech, the Premier stated "Our entity as a Sovereign State, the democratic ideals on which our State is built, rest on our Constitution".

Is it Legal

May I first say – that as this matter covered almost 30 years, there can be **no doubt that every major QLD politician must have been aware of this plan**, including Mr Kevin Rudd.

There is also no doubt that every major Federal politician should have been aware of the plan including both John Howard and Kim Beasley. And finally there can be no doubt that the Governor-General of Australia was complicit in this plan.

Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act. Chapter II. The Executive Government. Section 61. The executive power of the Commonwealth is vested in the Queen and is exercisable by the Governor-General, as the Queen's representative and extends, to the execution and maintenance of this Constitution and of the laws of the Commonwealth. The primary fact that all these changes and manoeuvres were done without a referendum of the People clearly shows that the politicians involved knew they would not succeed if the people were asked for their approval. There in lies the major area of **illegality**.

McHugh J in *Kable v Director of Public Prosecutions (NSW)*, stated "That there is a common law of Australia as opposed to a common law of individual States is clear". *Lipohar v R* [1999] HCA 65; 200 CLR 485; 168 ALR 8; 74 ALJR 282 (9 December 1999) At 53. If the common law were fragmented, it would be necessary to spell out of the Australian constitutional structure principles to resolve conflicts or variances between, in particular, "federal common law" and that of the particular State in which the executive government of the Commonwealth conducted its activities..... *Lipohar v the Queen* is still law and subject to the section 77M of the *Judiciary Act 1903 (Cth)* . It is only the High Court of Australia who can remove the common law from the State of QLD, not the elected members of the Legislative Assembly.

Is this happening in other states? Yes. New South Wales removed the Governor in 1987 under the *Consolidated Amendment Act 1987*. WA is almost in the same situation as QLD. The State Govt, the World Wildlife Fund and the Real Estate Institute of WA have combined to sell Bush Blocks. All Governor's of each state now obey the Premier's in each state. See their websites.

Examples Several cases from QLD & NSW for your information

1 QLD fellow - prosecuted by an officer of the State for cutting native tea tree to feed his starving livestock in this time of severe drought. The Warrant to Enter executed by the public officials of this State was not for his property but was for a property approximately 17 kilometres away. The District court Judge stated that the fellow had purchased the property in the 1980's, in fact he had never owned that property. Cost of remediation - \$350,000.

1 QLD fellow - prosecuted by an officer of the State for repairing severe erosion on a watercourse on his property by filling the degraded areas in with dead and dying black wattle and other vegetation and weeds which were of no value to the livestock as a food source. He then covered the vegetation with soil and replanted the areas with pasture grass. Fine - \$27,559.25

1 QLD couple in their 60's - long-term Lychee farmers, using regulation low-voltage electricity structures to deter common fruit bats. Obeying all necessary legislation.

A University lecturer, with a fondness for bats, complains to the Environmental Defenders Office EDO, who institute legal proceedings. The farm was raided by police, who went through every cupboard and drawer in the house, including the families underwear drawers, ostensibly searching for paperwork and dead bats.

The bat protection was removed, destroyed and within 1 week the entire orchard and farming enterprise had been destroyed by bats. The couple have had no income for 4 years are unable to access govt financial support while the case is ongoing.

1 QLD fellow who dug a huge dam on his property with the view of supplying water free to a nearby retirement village in exchange for future accommodation.

Department of Lands Q have refused him the right to fill the dam, and are pumping the water out when necessary.

1 QLD lady in her late 60's - Mrs Burns - who wanted to develop 23 acres and sell it off in order to build a home for her retirement. All land around her had been developed with the exception of a parcel that had a restricted animal order over it - for the Mahogany Sugar Glider. Her land had been checked previously and was not included. At this time, she was refused the right to develop in case the animals wanted to visit her land. Judge White of the Planning and Environment Court in Cairns stated - : *I just find this astounding. Soviet Russia would be proud of these laws.*" Yet he upheld them. 1 Warwick couple - applied for permission to extend decking and received it. They notified council who did not come to check it. 12

months later, council contacted them wanting to know who gave them permission to build. Demanded it be pulled down. The couple protested, police came with a warrant, the owner was arrested, now faces \$125,000 fine and/or 5 years in jail. After high level complaints about the police treatment, the couple have had their computers bugged, they have been followed and returned home to find an attempt had been made to destroy the decking, with drill holes, piers knocked askew and etc. They received 3 different copies of the same court transcript none of which matched their witnesses versions.

1 QLD lady – bought 18 acres and received council permission to move a house to the land, providing she put a veranda around it. She moved the house, lodged a DA for the veranda. Since Christmas 2006, she has alternately been refused the DA and yet is received threats from the council re not having the veranda finished. Her land is adjacent to a large development in which her local council has an involvement, she finds gates left open, tyre shredding devices in her driveway etc. She believes she is being forced off her land.

1 72 year old QLD gentleman who entered a contract with a major telecommunication company for a connection. Ongoing problems – he spoke to staff in the office asking for compensation for his travelling costs and was arrested. Upon being asked whether he was guilty or not guilty, he replied guilty with mitigating circumstances. The judge replied she was not interested in his defence. A NSW farming family cleared land adjacent to the protected Gwydir Wetlands. Their land was not protected and they had all necessary departmental permission. The Wilderness Society flew over the land taking photos and the EDO began legal proceedings. Both that farm and a property they owned in QLD were raided and all farming operations on both properties were forcibly closed down. This story is still being used by the media and the Wilderness Society to point the finger at farmers re land clearing, even though the government themselves agreed this family had been given permission. Yet that family are now having to legally battle this issue, trying to recover their rights to farm. Please note, the aerial photographs were digital, which is illegal to use in court.

A NSW family retired on a small holding in 2 portions, being environmentally conscious and prepared to keep the land natural because of eagle eyries. Minerals were found on the property, right at the access between both properties and the owner was expected allow ongoing truck access through his main acreage, and to forego his right to enter the second property. Local council passed the miner's DA before any financial negotiations had begun, and the owners were told to agree or the Warden's Court would decide for them. The Warden's Court is specifically for mining issues. We have a portion of creek through our property, where a rock bar has become exposed and is spearing the water into soft soil on our boundary, causing very considerable erosion. We discussed blowing a small channel through the rock bar in order to return the creek to its original path and were told by the Lachlan Catchment Management officials that the *"creek had the right to do whatever it wanted."* These were the same men, from the same government organization, who entered into a scheme with our opposite neighbour to fence off the creek to a distance of 40 metres from the watercourse, on our land without any discussion with us whatsoever.

Needless to say, these gentlemen were informed of the rules of trespass. Peter Spencer, a Cooma NSW farmer. Environmentally sensitive land, he spent many years developing a plan for it, and was refused. Began a fish farm with eco-tourism in mind, the rules were changed and he lost that business. Began farming sheep in conjunction with the University of New England, the disastrous alpine bushfires and wild dogs destroyed that enterprise. He was then told he could not access federal drought funding as he was not viable. He is now suing the Federal Government for \$10.5billion in carbon credit income.

What can we do?

Ladies and Gentlemen, the most dangerous thing we can do is remain ignorant.

Government at all levels and in all states and territories are committed to removing our rights, our ownership and our futures.

We have the protection we need in both our constitutional laws and in our ability to call these elected public servants to task.

We need to do just that. Emails and phone calls do not work. I personally contacted over 850 parliamentarians before the Federal elections with a package of information on this matter and received 3 replies including one abusive reply from Selwyn Hughes, who I thought was on the side of the people.

I personally contacted every major media station and programme with absolutely no response.

We must take pen in hand, know our facts, remain calm and clear and write to these people, demanding they honour their oaths both to the Crown and to the Sovereign People the Crown purports to serve and protect. This information is available from the author.

Ray Smyth raysmyth@burcom.com.au