

Thomas Jefferson's Warning

John

Few Australians realise how stark raving mad judges, appointed by the major parties can get. Fewer can cope with the reality that these B...s will undermine all of our inherited laws.

I concur with your comments below and I have attached (after your comments) an example of recent judicial madness here in Australia.

PLEASE SEND THIS AUSTRALIA WIDE - Tony

The fellow who wrote the American Declaration of Independence and was their 3rd President, Thomas Jefferson, issued the following warning in 1821 in regard to the Judges:-

"The germ of destruction of our nation is in the power of the judiciary, an irresponsible body - working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall render powerless the checks of one branch over the other and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated."

That warning applies equally here in Australia. We are now in a situation where, unless ordinary People wake up to the reality of how the Judiciary have usurped and corrupted the Administration of Justice, the power of this treacherous body will be absolute and Democracy irrecoverable.

Australian Judges regard themselves as above the Law. Constitutional Laws, such as the "Charters of Liberty" (ie: *Magna Carta*, etc.), are ignored and violated by this body. They have terminated our Right to Trial by Jury and now oppressively control our Courts. Whereas *Magna Carta* guaranteed, "**for ever**", that Feemen will have the Right to defend themselves and to seek redress and remedy before other Freeman (***parium suorum*** = gathering of equals), now, even when Judges choose to have a Jury, they won't allow the Jurors to judge the Justice of the Law, nor vote for a verdict according to their conscience, nor give their Judgment (***legale iudicium*** = lawful judgment). Instead, the Judges have taken it upon themselves to make Judgments (ie: to pass sentence, make awards, etc.) and, what is equally abhorant, set aside a Jury's decision. Absolute power has corrupted absolutely.

The *Bill of Rights 1688* describes these actions as those of "***evil counsellors, judges and ministers***".

Wake up, Australia!
Yours sincerely
John Wilson.

Senator

I am greatly concerned that the Courts, the Police and even Parliamentarians are not fully aware of the laws in place to protect the Australian people. I enclose the following details of a vital court case. The actual excerpts from the transcript of **Essenberg v/s the Queen 22/6/00** are shown below are in the **ARIAL Font**.

The legal opinions are derived from fact and written law and not from wish lists, precedents, conventions, interpretations, lies or other forms of fairy stories. In all cases the extracts are unaltered and are from our statutes. They may be quoted by A. R. (Tony) Pitt but they are the words of our greatest legislators. These are in TIMES New Roman Font.

McHUGH J: but Parliament ... can, in effect do what it likes. As it is said, some authorities could legislate to have every blue-eyed baby killed if it wanted to....

This is not true. No federal or state parliament in Australia has ANY LEGISLATIVE POWER AT ALL. They can't legislate to even set a road speed let alone legislate to put anyone to death. Our system of law evolved from the dim past when kings were mad dictators and the politicians had desires for more mad power than that held by kings. Our politicians can write what they like. If the House of Representatives writes legislation and passes the legislation unanimously, and passes that legislation to the Senate which also passes the legislation unanimously, that legislation is no more powerful than a second-hand bus ticket. **All legislation requires ROYAL ASSENT before it can be of any effect.**

McHUGH J: No, it is not a question of an error; it is a question as to what was the power.

That is the point that neither the Magna Carta nor the Bill of Rights were ever intended to be anything more than a declaration of political principle, which it was expected Parliaments would observe, it is a matter for the constituents at the ballot box.

This is clearly wrong. Even failed history students would be aware that in 1215 King John was taken to Runnymede and given a choice to SIGN or DIE.

He signed the Magna Carta. The crux of the Magna Carta was a set of demands that King John had to agree to.

The most significant was in the preamble. It said: **"We have also granted to all free men of our kingdom, for ourselves and our heirs for ever, all the liberties written below, to be had and held by them and their heirs of us and our heirs."** That is not some airy fairy political principle that our forefathers "expected" might be "observed". It was one of the conditions which, if agreed to, would keep King John's head attached to his shoulders.

The Bill of Rights in 1688 put the will of the people even more clearly. IT stated, **"that all and singular the rights and liberties asserted and claimed in the said declaration are the true, ancient and indubitable rights and liberties of the people of this kingdom, and so shall be esteemed, allowed, adjudged, deemed and taken to be; and that all and every the particulars aforesaid shall be firmly and strictly holden and observed as they are expressed in the said declaration, and all officers and ministers whatsoever shall serve their Majesties and their successors according to the same in all times to come."**

These conditions were imposed on William and Mary as a precondition to sitting on the throne of England. King James II was able to keep his head attached to his shoulders by fleeing to France. The Bill of Rights was not an airy fairy wish list any more than was the Magna Carta. Both were deadly serious in their intent and execution. There are no let out clauses and Messrs. Gummow and McHugh should not be party to fabricating loop holes for crooks.

McHUGH J: Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights are not documents binding on Australian legislatures in the way that the Constitution is binding on them. Any legislature acting with the powers allotted to it by the Constitution can legislate in disregard of the Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights. At the highest, the two documents express a political idea, but they do not legally bind the legislature of this country or for that matter, the United Kingdom. Nor do they limit the powers of the legislatures of Australia or the United Kingdom. That being so, an appeal would have no prospect of success. For that reason, special leave to appeal is refused.

This is gross error. The Australian Constitution is clear. Para 61 states, **"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."** Elizabeth II had to agree to uphold the statutes in her Coronation Oath. That is a legal and binding contract. Elizabeth can't give Royal Assent to anything that contravenes Her Coronation Oath and nor can She delegate power to the

Governor General to contravene that oath by giving Royal Assent to abhorrent legislation.

As shown above the **"legislatures of Australia" HAVE NO POWERS.** If they had powers, there would be no need for them to seek Royal Assent to every piece of legislation of which they have voted in favour. It is a complex system. We used the Bill of Rights to strip the monarch of the powers to make laws but we left the monarch with the power to block legislation which was in conflict with the Statutes of The Realme. The Clause used was, **"That the pretended power of suspending of laws or the execution of laws by regal authority without consent of Parliament is illegal".**

NOTE: Messrs. Gummow and McHugh should read the Magna Carta which WAS reaffirmed by the Bill of Rights. It says, **"[45] We will not make justices, constables, sheriffs or bailiffs save of such as know the law of the kingdom and mean to observe it well."** The judiciary was made independent of parliament so the politicians could not pervert the course of justice by evading existing law. Messrs. Gummow and McHugh should **learn the laws and observe them well.** When we allowed the politicians to appoint the judiciary we were giving the fox the keys to the chook house. All Judges should ensure that our politicians and bureaucrats **learn the laws and observe them well** by severe penalties of those who infringe on the ordinary Australian's right to live free of government harassment.

The laws are **entrenched** so no parliament can repeal or amend them by the sunset clause **"all officers and ministers whatsoever shall serve their Majesties and their successors according to the same in all times to come."** A Bill of Rights is a prohibition order imposed on government. It would be powerless to protect the people if oppressors could alter the content at will. The **all times to come** sunset clause hasn't expired.

Please take action to ensure that ALL OFFICERS AND MINISTERS WHATSOEVER are fully aware of their duties and responsibilities under our inherited and entrenched laws.

Yours Sincerely

A. R. (Tony) Pitt, 79 Ferry St, Maryborough Qld 4650

THE IDEA OF ARRESTING MESSRS GUMMOW AND McHUGH HAS GREAT MERIT. WE MUST NEVER ALLOW THE JUDICIARY TO COMMIT TREACHERY BY UNDERMINING THE LAWS THEY WERE PUT THERE TO UPHOLD.

. THEY WERE GIVEN COMPLETE INDEPENDENCE AND AUTONOMY TO MAINTAIN OUR LAWS FOR THE PEOPLE. THEY WERE NOT PUT THERE TO PUCKER UP AND BROWN NOSE PARLIAMENTARY TRAITORS>

TP