


 MAY JUSTICE ALWAYS PREVAIL [®] 			
<small>ABN 97144820620</small>			
From: Mr G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B. 107 Graham Road, Viewbank 3084 Victoria, Australia			
<small>Website: www.schorel-hlavka.com</small>	<small>Email: admin@inspector-rikati.com</small>	<small>Fax: 03 8692 2727</small>	<small>LH-130117-01</small>
THE MORALS OF A SOCIETY CAN BE MEASURED AS TO HOW IT LOOKS AFTER THE DISABLED			
<small>Our website shows details as to how to order magnetic and other car door signs, to alert other motorist about the need to keep clear to enable the loading of a wheelchair bound person into the vehicle.</small>			
<small>Constitutionalist & Paralegal</small>	INSPECTOR-RIKATI [®]	<small>Series of books on certain constitutional and other legal issues</small>	
<small>Independent Consultant & Author</small>			

The Executive Director, Australian Law Reform Commission

21-9-2015

GPO Box 3708, SYDNEY NSW 2001

Phone: (02) 8238 6333 Fax: (02) 8238 6363, E-mail: info@alrc.gov.au

Ref: 20150921-G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B. to Australian Law Reform Commission-SUBMISSION-etc

Sir/madam,

as a **CONSTITUTIONALIST** I have written various books about constitutional issues including the rights of Australians. Just that often when making submissions to committees I find they are not published, and so basically become a sheer waste of my time. Often those in committees simply do not understand/comprehend what the true meaning and application of the constitution is about and so cannot understand/comprehend what my writings are about.

I in 2001 challenged the validity of the 2001 federal election. And obviously was getting nowhere. But I never gave up and in the process of 5 years litigation on constitutional issues in the end the County Court of Victoria (invoking federal jurisdiction) faced with numerous constitutional issues, including that compulsory voting is unconstitutional upheld both appeals on 19 July 2006. As such while all kinds of committees ignored my writings, at least that is how it came across to me, I diligently worked in the courts to succeed. Shame on those committee who blatantly disregard my past writings.

To me it is not relevant which politicians of whatever, if any, political party/parties are in government as all I seek is that they all act to the true meaning and application of the constitution, but when I am seeking to get the ear of those who are so to say brainwashed then well it is a never ending problem. I will give below a preview of my next PRESS RELEASE:

QUOTE 22-9-2015 PRESS RELEASE

 PRESS RELEASE 			
From: Mr G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B. 107 Graham Road, Viewbank 3084 Victoria, Australia			
<small>Website: www.schorel-hlavka.com</small>	<small>Email: admin@inspector-rikati.com</small>	<small>Fax: 03 8692 2727</small>	<small>LH-20150917-01</small>

ISSUE: Does Malcolm Turnbull as a lawyer really understand what citizenship is about?

Malcolm Turnbull is the prime minister and supposed to be the first minister as a “**constitutional advisor**” to the Governor-General, but despite his past reported claims he is a “constitutional lawyer” reality is, as I view it, he is crap, as he doesn’t even seem to understand/comprehend the meaning of the word “citizen” as stated in s44 of the ***Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1900*** (UK). It simply has nothing to do with nationality. It has to do with when a person resides in a foreign country, other than Embassy/High Commission staff residing at the Embassy/High Commission, where they are deemed to be a “citizen” in another country. “This Constitution may be cited as the Constitution of the Republic of Singapore.” **QUOTE Commonwealth citizenship. 139.** (1) In accordance with the position of Singapore within the Commonwealth, every person who is a citizen of Singapore enjoys by virtue of that citizenship the status of a Commonwealth citizen in common with the citizens of other Commonwealth countries. **END QUOTE** To the Framers of the Constitution “citizenship” had absolutely no meaning as to



nationality, as all people were automatically “**Subjects of the British Crown**”, and despite the judgment of the High Court of Australia in *Sue v Hill* **no judicial powers existed** to somehow alter the nationality of a person born in the Commonwealth of Australian or one who had naturalized to be somehow without their own input to do so. Indeed, if the High Court of Australia could have such a judicial power then what would stop the High Court of Australia to declare that Australians are now citizens of Saudi Arabia, Japan, or what else? We have a constitution and it be utterly worthless if any court could without input of those affected make a unilateral absurd without jurisdiction decision merely because it may suit some unelected judges. It would be amounting to **tyranny** from the bench. When I naturalized on 28 March 1994 I did so to become a “**Subject of the British Crown**”, and it would be absurd that the High Court of Australia afterwards somehow alters this without my knowledge and consent, nor bothered to allow me any input. And the same for others persons affected by this utter and sheer nonsense. Gaudron J (Wakim, HCA27\99) QUOTE... The starting point for a principled interpretation of the Constitution is the search for the intention of its makers END QUOTE Re Wakim; Ex parte McNally; Re Wakim; Ex parte Darvall; Re Brown; Ex parte Amann; Spi [1999] HCA 27 QUOTE For constitutional purposes, they are a nullity. No doctrine of res judicata or issue estoppel can prevail against the Constitution. Mr Gould is entitled to disregard the orders made in Gould v Brown. No doubt, as Latham CJ said of invalid legislation, "he will feel safer if he has a decision of a court in his favour". That is because those relying on the earlier decision may seek to enforce it against Mr Gould. END QUOTE Hence, I disregard the unconstitutional decision in *Sue v Hill*, this as no such country as Commonwealth of Australia exist, as it is a political union, so how can there be a nationality one has to ask! To call oneself a “constitutional lawyer” (**an oxymoron**) and not even understanding what “nationality” versus “citizenship” is about nor that the High Court of Australia lacked the judicial powers to turn a “**political union**” into some country removing effectively out constitutional setup, to me, is ought to indicate Turnbull’s competence as a “**constitutional advisor**” is to be in question! There is no such thing as a Minister being employed by the Commonwealth of Australia, as the constitution requires to pay the salaries to the Crown, the employer! We must reclaim our constitutional and other legal rights, and a “Prime Minister” who has other ideas (such as a republic) not only doesn’t belong in the job, but I view is a traitor! This as a Minister must honour his employer the Monarch and not undermine what is constitutionally applicable, including not undermining a fellow Minister (then Tony Abbott). I wonder how can anyone trust a traitor, and what honour does such a person deserve, if any? Will others betray him eventually by his own example? Surely we deserve better, one who is a “**constitutional advisor**” in reality and act as such, not a pretend one!

This correspondence is not intended and neither must be perceived to state all issues/details.
Awaiting your response, G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B. (Gerrit)

MAY JUSTICE ALWAYS PREVAIL®

(Our name is our motto!)

END QUOTE 22-9-2015 PRESS RELEASE

Hansard 2-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates

QUOTE

Mr. SYMON (South Australia).-

In the preamble honorable members will find that what we desire to do is to unite in one indissoluble Federal Commonwealth -that is the political Union-"**under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland** , and under the Constitution hereby established." Honorable members will therefore see that the application of the word Commonwealth is to the political Union which is sought to be established. It is not intended there to have any relation whatever to the name of the country or nation which we are going to create under that Union . The second part of the preamble goes on to say that it is expedient to make provision for the admission of other colonies into the Commonwealth. **That is, for admission into this political Union, which is not a republic, which is not to be called a dominion, kingdom, or empire, but is to be a Union by the name of "Commonwealth," and I do not propose to interfere with that in the slightest degree.**

END QUOTE

HANSARD 17-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates

QUOTE Mr. DEAKIN.-

What a charter of liberty is embraced within this Bill-of political liberty and religious liberty-the liberty and the means to achieve all to which men in these days can reasonably aspire. A charter of liberty is enshrined in this Constitution, which is also a charter of peace-of peace, order, and good government for the whole of the peoples whom it will embrace and unite.

END QUOTE

HANSARD 17-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates

QUOTE

5 **Mr. SYMON** (South Australia).- We who are assembled in this Convention are about to commit to the people of Australia a new charter of union and liberty; we are about to commit this new Magna Charta for their acceptance and confirmation, and I can conceive of nothing of greater magnitude in the whole history of the peoples of the world than this question upon which we are about to invite the peoples of Australia to vote. The Great Charter was wrung by the barons of England from a reluctant king. This new charter is to be given by the people of Australia to themselves.

END QUOTE

HANSARD 17-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates (Official Record of the Debates of the National Australasian Convention)

QUOTE Mr. CLARK-

15 **the protection of certain fundamental rights and liberties which every individual citizen is entitled to claim that the federal government shall take under its protection and secure to him.**

END QUOTE

Hansard 1-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates

QUOTE

20 **Mr. HIGGINS.**-Suppose the sentry is asleep, or is in the swim with the other power?

Mr. GORDON.-There will be more than one sentry. **In the case of a federal law, every member of a state Parliament will be a sentry, and, every constituent of a state Parliament will be a sentry.**

25 As regards a law passed by a state, every man in the Federal Parliament will be a sentry, and the whole constituency behind the Federal Parliament will be a sentry.

END QUOTE

30 The above is merely so to say the tip of the iceberg but forget about me going to write it down again, more than likely to have it all ignored.

If you desire to interview me to give oral explanations then well you can always set this up for a meeting in Melbourne. If you are interested in people's rights, not just pretend doing so, then you may also like to download my documentation of my blog at www.scribd.com/inspectorrikati where I have also published my rights in an ongoing court litigation, and how this applies also to others.

40 We have on average 7 people a day committing suicide and many of them so because they lost faith in the legal system because of it being so corrupt. My **ADDRESS TO THE COURT** (A format I designed in 1985 and since used in all levels of courts, including the High Court of Australia) makes it clear where the blame lies.

I have represented also legal practitioners, including one who was for more than 2 decades a Queen Counsel, even so I am not a lawyer/legal practitioner but a **CONSTITUTIONALIST** and Professional Advocate (now retired). A law degree doesn't give intelligence! The title "constitutional lawyer", used by many lawyers, is an **oxymoron!**

45 Consider my publications at my blog www.scribd.com/inspectorrikati as part of this submission.

I look forwards to your positive reply!

50 **This document is not intended and neither must be perceived to refer to all details/issues.**

MAY JUSTICE ALWAYS PREVAIL®

(Our name is our motto!)

Awaiting your response,  Signature

G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O. W. B. (Friends call me Gerrit)