

Touched by a Butterfly



Kissed by an Angel

David J. Walter

Post Office Box 578
Herberton,
Queensland 4887
Australia

Tel: (07) 4096 3009
Fax: (07) 4096 2641

*Where there is no vision the people perish: but he that keepeth the law, happy is he' -
Proverbs Ch.29 v.18*

The Facts:

I make reference to Blackstones: Commentaries on the Law of England.
- The Laws Of Nature And Nature's God.

Sir William Blackstone, Commentaries on the Law of England in Four Books, Vol. 1[1753]

[Extract]

OF CORPORATIONS :-

The general *duties* of all bodies politic, considered in their corporate capacity, may, like those of natural persons, be reduced to this single one, that of acting up to the end or design, whatever it be, for which they were created by their founder.

I know it is generally said, that civil corporations are subject to no visitation, but merely to the common law of the land; and this shall be presently explained. But first, as I have laid it down as a rule that the founder, his heirs or assigns, are the visitors of all lay corporations, let us inquire what is meant by the founder. The founder of all corporations, in the strictest and original sense, is the king alone, for he only can incorporate a society; and in civil incorporations, such as a mayor and commonalty, &c., where there are no possessions or endowments given to the body, there is no other founder but the king;

.....

The king being thus constituted by law visitor of all civil corporations, the law has also appointed the place wherein he shall exercise this jurisdiction: which is the court of King's Bench; where, and where only, all misbehaviours of this kind of corporations are inquired into and redressed, and all their controversies decided. And this is what I understand to be the meaning of our lawyers when they say that these civil corporations are liable to no visitation; that is, that the law having by immemorial usage appointed them to be visited and inspected by the king their founder, in his majesty's court of King's Bench, according to the rules of the common law, they ought not to be visited elsewhere, or by any other authority

Each and every living thing on this planet is conceived by nature, born of nature, live of nature and die of nature.

We as people are all conceived in exactly the same way to nature. By nature we are male or female. We are born, and throughout our lifetime, under our constitutional Sovereign in the Commonwealth of Australia, we create our commercial property, our assets.

Those assets are held by ourselves as individual natural persons and a corporation sole. All of your property, including your civil and political rights and liberties and even your own life is protected under the laws of Her Majesty to canon and common law.

No other person or party, be they members of a body politic, a political party, another individual natural person, or a corporation, registered under the laws of the highest authority, Her Majesty, the holder of the executive power under the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901* as Proclaimed, in the Preamble, Clauses 1 – 9, - **British Law** at section 61, 109, 117 and 128, can interfere with or in any way denigrate our lawful binding commercial contracts.

The entities inside the corporate ‘AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT’ under their statutory civil laws have the power, as does everyone else, of an individual only.

If a corporation, a body politic or an individual person wish to take over your assets and your real and personal property, there must be a signed and sealed commercial agreement between both parties. The agreement is only effective when it is sealed with the corporate seal of the corporation and it then becomes lawful and binding on all parties, signed and sealed in front of each other at the same time.

Who are we?

Mr John CITIZEN:- ‘Mr’ defines that you are an adult male person.

‘John’ is your given or Christian name, you as the natural, individual person.

‘CITIZEN’ is your surname as a corporation sole. Your signature is your private, individual commercial seal.

OF CORPORATION LAW – all shown in block or capital letters.

Example: THE PARLIAMENT OF AUSTRALIA – All persons inside that PARLIAMENT have the power of an individual only – any contract or law signed with the PARLIAMENT OF AUSTRALIA – or one of their individual employees must be signed, sealed and witnessed to make that commercial contract binding at law. This applies for any corporation made to the laws of the PARLIAMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA whose laws are signed and sealed with Her Majesty’s appointed representative of the Commonwealth of Australia - the Governor-General and for the States, the Governors.

All your assets and your liabilities are held in your *inter vivos* trust, testamentary trust, your will and testament for your “estate”. When drawing up that document, to make it legally binding, you will have obtained the signatures of two independent witnesses to bind the contract which must be signed sealed in front of all parties at the same time with no threat, promise or inducement made upon the person making his/her will and testament for their heirs and assigns to common cannon law only.

No other individual, that is the body politic of a government, holding the power of an individual only, any other natural individual person and a corporation sole or a corporation under the laws of the Parliament, can interfere with or in any way denigrate your *inter vivos* trust, your will and testament bequeathed to your heirs and assigns.

Her Majesty the Queen, also a natural person, an individual and a corporation sole, is the largest land holder in the world and we, the natural people in the Commonwealth of Australia, live on the lands of Her Majesty in the Commonwealth of Australia.

Her Majesty The Queen allows those lands to be sold and if you hold a commercial contract with Her Majesty for that land, that contract is a binding commercial contract which cannot be taken over by any other corporation, body politic or natural individual person without compensation or a voluntary commercial agreement between the parties.

Her Majesty is the holder of the land in the six States of the Commonwealth of Australia, under each of the Constitutions of the States, all of which are under the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901* as Proclaimed.

If you look at your Health Care Cards, your credit cards, drivers licence etc. you will note that your name is in full block or capital letters.

You are therefore, under the law of the corporate entity of the corporate AUSTRALIAN SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT, since the 19th October 1973.

Note the word Prime Minister and the name in capital letters - E.G. WHITLAM and the future Prime Ministers of AUSTRALIA to date. The Prime Minister is the title of the corporate head or the Chief Executive Officer of the AUSTRALIAN SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT under the *Corporations Act 2001(Cth)* – and the name in capital letters denotes a corporate entity with the power of an individual only inside THE SYSTEM OF AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT.

In this system of Government the Sovereign The Queen of Australia is ‘inherited’.

Under the corporate structures of the AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT in the PARLIAMENT OF AUSTRALIA and the PARLIAMENTS of each of the former Colonies, now the six States and two Territories, inside those corporate structures is also the Queen of Australia, the Governor-General, the Governors, the Ministers and members of those Parliaments, the judiciary, the Police services and the public servants all of whom are inside the corporation as ‘artificial persons’ or corporate entities.

For us, as the natural individual people of the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901*, as Proclaimed, to be under or bound to that corporate AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTION, not yet Proclaimed, we must have a commercial contract, signed and sealed between both parties. When you sign that contract you hand your real and personal property, your assets and your civil and political rights and liberties – in fact your life – over to that corporation and its statutory laws and become a thing, as defined in the *Corporations Act 2001*(Cth) at section 9 – Dictionary – ‘Act includes thing.’

To more fully explain the progression of events which have resulted in the supreme power of the Prime Minister of the AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT in the PARLIAMENT OF AUSTRALIA, as opposed to Her Majesty Elizabeth the Second, By the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and of Her Other Realms and Territories Queen, Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith as the holder of the executive power to Preamble, Clauses 1-9, (**British Law**), sections 61,109,117, 128, of the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901* as Proclaimed in the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, I cite the Royal Style and Titles Act used to create this power.

In 1953 in an agreement between the ‘Prime Ministers and other representatives of Her Majesty’s Governments’ in the ‘British Commonwealth of Nations in relation to one another’ it was decided that there was a need for a ‘new form which would, in particular, “reflect the special position of the Sovereign as Head of the Commonwealth” ‘.

As a result of this there was enacted the *Royal Style and Titles Act 1953*, No. [32] of 1953, creating The Royal Style and Titles of:

“Elizabeth the Second, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom, Australia and Her other Realms and Territories Queen, Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith”.

In the Preamble of this Act it shows the Act was enacted in the manner and form of:-

“BE it therefore enacted by the Queen’s Most Excellent Majesty, the Senate, and the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Australia, as follows:-“

Please note “**of the Commonwealth...**”

This Act was ‘adopted, as the Royal Style and Titles to be used in relation to the Commonwealth of Australia and its Territories,’

In 1973, the then Prime Minister E.G. WHITLAM, of the Government for Australia, being (AUSTRALIA), proposed “a change in the form of the Royal Style and Titles to be used in relation to Australia and its Territories:”

In the *Royal Style and Titles Act 1973*, No. [114] of 1973, it states in the Preamble that:-

“AND WHEREAS the proposed new Style and Titles, being the Style and Titles set for in the Schedule to this Act, retains the common element referred to in the preamble to the *Royal Style and Titles Act 1953*:

BE IT THEREFORE enacted by the Queen, the Senate and the House of Representatives of Australia, as follows:-“

Please Note the omission of: “**of the Commonwealth**”...which was the correct wording in the Preamble in the *Royal Style and Titles Act 1953*.

At the Schedule, section 2 of the *Royal Style and Titles Act 1973* it shows the new Royal Style and Titles of:-

Elizabeth the Second, by the Grace of God Queen of Australia and Her other Realms and Territories, Head of the Commonwealth.”

Note the omission of “**Defender of the Faith**”

Many people have complained that Her Majesty The Queen will not intervene on behalf of Her subjects in the Commonwealth of Australia when they have realized that they have lost Her protection, granted to us under the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901* as Proclaimed and under the Constitutions, sealed with Her Majesty’s Seal, in each of the six States.

HER MAJESTY – THE QUEEN, cannot intervene as she has signed a commercial contract, on 19th October 1973, to be known under the Royal Style and Titles of THE QUEEN OF AUSTRALIA for AUSTRALIA and its TERRITORIES.

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN granted to the Prime Minister of AUSTRALIA - E.G. WHITLAM the *Royal Style and Titles Act 1973*, Act No. [114] of 1973 which created that specific title for AUSTRALIA and its TERRITORIES, no more no less, not for the Commonwealth of Australia under our *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901* as Proclaimed.

I again refer to:-

**Sir William Blackstone,
Commentaries on the Law of England
in Four Books, Vol. 1[1753]**

[Extract]

OF CORPORATIONS -

To have a common seal. For a corporation, being an invisible body, cannot manifest its intentions by any personal act or oral discourse: it therefore acts and speaks only by its common seal. For, though the particular members may express their private consent to any acts, by words, or signing their names, yet this does not bind the corporation: it is the fixing of the seal, and that only, which unites the several assents of the individuals who compose the community, and makes one joint assent of the whole.^{(b)7} 5. To make by-laws or private statutes for the better government of the corporation; which are binding upon themselves, unless contrary to the laws of the land, and then they are void.⁸ This is also included by law

in the very act of incorporation: (c) for, as natural reason is given to the natural body for the governing it, so by-laws or statutes are a sort of political reason to govern the body politic. And this right of making by-laws for their own government, not contrary to the law of the land, was allowed by the law of the twelve tables at Rome. (d) But no trading company is with us allowed to make by-laws which may affect the king's prerogative, or the common profit of the people, under penalty of 40l., unless they be approved by the chancellor, treasurer, and chief justices, or the judges of assize in their circuits; and, even though they be so approved, still, if contrary to law, they are void. (e)

The *Royal Style and Titles Act 1973* carries no corporate Seal of any Australian Government and the Act is awaiting Her Majesty's Pleasure. In other words it has not received royal assent therefore has no common seal, as it required the consent at referendum of the people to bring it into force and has never been passed to the provisions of the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901* as Proclaimed.

Her Majesty, Elizabeth the Second, By the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and of Her Other Realms and Territories Queen, Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith is the owner of the land and seas in and about the Commonwealth of Australia and the holder of the executive power as cited at Preamble Clauses 1-9 (**British Law**) section 61; 109; 117 and 128 of the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901* as Proclaimed.

The AUSTRALIAN SYSTEM GOVERNMENT – COAG - holds no land therefore no laws can be made over us, the natural people, as Her Majesty The Queen, the holder of the land holds Her laws– the canon and common law, to that land

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN as the QUEEN OF AUSTRALIA, is inside the corporate AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT as an inherited Sovereign, with no executive authority.

The subsequent political parties in power since 1973 have used the *Royal Style and Titles Act 1973* to take over AUSTRALIA for the political parties inside their own corporate AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT.

Using an evolutionary process and making the United Kingdom, its Parliament and Her Majesty The Queen as part of a '**foreign power**' as cited in the High Court Decision *Sue v Hill* [1999] HCA 30 (23 June 1999) without the benefit of referendums of the people of the Commonwealth of Australia, the corporate AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT have created a form of government contrary to our *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901* as Proclaimed and removed, using the simple process of subtle changes to the wording of legislation and the change to our laws from the canon common law of Her Majesty The Queen to their statutory civil laws, without our consent or knowledge.

The *Statute Law Revision Act 1973*, Act No. 216 of 1973 was amended by the *Statute Law Revision Act 1974*, both of which came into operation on 31 December 1973, and these Acts removed from the current legislation of the Commonwealth of Australia, all references to the words 'of the Commonwealth'.

By using the words 'Prime Minister' and 'Premier', we were given to believe our political leaders were chosen as the 'first among equals'. They are not. They are corporate entities

inside their own corporations with HER MAJESTY, THE QUEEN at the direction of the Prime Minister of AUSTRALIA - the chief executive officer of the AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT as are the Premiers of the States of AUSTRALIA – for example, the Premier of QUEENSLAND and the Chief Ministers of the TERRITORIES. The Northern Territory is still a part of South Australia and the Australian Capital Territory is the Seat of Government of the Commonwealth, not an individual territory with its own Government.

As I stated to Her Majesty in my correspondence, we vote our elected representatives into what we believed were Parliaments of the Commonwealth of Australia for the people, by the people and of the people, in good faith and trust.

Her Majesty granted the royal style and title to the Prime Minister of the Australian Government for Australia and its Territories - in good faith.

To create a new system of government for a republic, there should have been referendums presented to us, the people, with all of the agendas and philosophies of the political parties fully explained to us, to enable us to make a fully informed decision on how we were to be governed and if in fact we wished to have that change imposed on us.

This was not done. A new system of corporate government – the AUSTRALIAN SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT was implemented without our consent or knowledge for the corporate benefit of the political parties only.

Her Majesty did not in any way betray Her subjects in the Commonwealth of Australia, or grant any authority to any person outside of Her laws and our *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901* as Proclaimed.

As the executive power of Her Majesty and authority had already been decimated, Her Majesty could do nothing unless, I believe, specifically requested to do so by Her subjects.

Every natural individual person in the Commonwealth of Australia has been affected by this new political agenda.

The aboriginal people of the Commonwealth of Australia were given an ‘apology’. This apology was meaningless ‘Government speak’ as their lands and their rights had already been incorporated into the AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT.

We now have no recourse but to request of Her Majesty to grant us Her Royal Prerogative to have these matters heard and determined before Her Majesty in Council as there are no governments in AUSTRALIA, who recognize us as natural individual people and corporation sole to the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901*, as Proclaimed, to the Preamble, Clauses 1-9 (**British Law**), sections 61, 109, 117 and 128.

The judiciary inside the corporate courts of the AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT do not hold the Royal Commission of the Crown, that is the lawful Crown of our constitutional Sovereign - the Defender of the Faith. They no longer sign their judicial decisions. That is done by a corporate entity of the public service inside the AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT.

We no longer have the laws and protection of our constitutional Sovereign from the civil laws of the AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT over our real and personal property and our civil and political rights and liberties.

There have been no laws which have received royal assent to the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901* as Proclaimed, since 16th March 1973 even though that new royal style and title was not granted until 19th October 1973.

The Commonwealth of Australia was effectively dissolved by members of the political parties inside their own Parliament with HER MAJESTY at their direction from those dates.

The Members of Parliament, in their own corporate headquarters – the ‘new’ Parliament House, in which the Prime Minister holds the full executive power may, if they so wish, take no note of any concerns Her Majesty may voice as they are inside their own corporation, the AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT which is not a part of the Commonwealth of Australia under the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901* as Proclaimed.

The Prime Minister, E.G. WHITLAM, applied to HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN, for a Government for Australia and its Territories, under which was then created the Governments of the States and Territories to COAG – the Council of Australian Governments.

Reference:-

Industry Research and Development Act 1986

Act No. 89 of 1986 as amended

An Act to encourage certain research and development

This Act, the *Industry Research and Development Act 1986* is not enacted to the Queen’s Most Excellent Majesty.

This Act is not a law to the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901* as Proclaimed.

As cited in section 19A of the Act, the AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT - COAG are not to use any Real Money or currency of the Commonwealth of Australia. The currency used in Australia is, since 1974 ‘Australian money’ as the word ‘Commonwealth’ was removed from our legal tender in that year without our knowledge or consent.

Australian money is a derivative of corporate AUSTRALIA, or a promissory note with which they pay their corporate entities and employees, all of whom are bound to the commercial laws of the corporation.

The AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT system cites ‘The Constitution’ as its Constitution - that is the “The Constitution” in Force 9th September 1900, not yet proclaimed.

The *Acts Interpretation Act 1901*(Cth) – section 17

Constitutional and official definitions [see Note 2]

Defines at:-

17(c) **The Constitution** shall mean the Constitution of the Commonwealth

17(d) **The Constitution Act** shall mean the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act

Reference:

Quick and Garran's

[Extracts]

Annotations of the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act*

CHAPTER VIII – ALTERATION OF THE CONSTITUTION

[Extract]

§481 –“Alteration.”

“The disability of a Federal Legislature to alter the Federal Constitution is one of the organic features and a prominent characteristic of every federal system. If, the Federal Legislature could change the Constitution it might transform itself from a subordinate law-making body into an organ of sovereignty; it might destroy the federal system altogether, and substitute a consolidated form of government. A Federal Legislature is a mere creature of the Federal Constitution; it is a mere instrument or servant of a federal community; it is an agent not a master. The Constitution is the master of the legislature, and the community itself is the author of the Constitution.

In the Constitution of the Commonwealth of course there is no absolute sovereignty, but a *quasi*-sovereignty which resides in the people of the Commonwealth, who may express their will on constitutional questions through a majority of the electors voting and a majority of the States. No amendment of the Constitution can be made without the concurrence of that double majority – a majority within a majority.”.....These safeguards have been provided, not in order to prevent or indefinitely resist change in any direction, but in order to prevent change being made in haste or by stealth,.....”

“If therefore the Commonwealth were a sovereign and independent State, no amendment, duly passed in the prescribed form, would beyond its powers; the amending power would have no limits. But the Commonwealth is only *quasi*-sovereign, and the amending power,; though above the State Governments and above the Federal Government, is below the Imperial Parliament. The Commonwealth is a dependency of the Empire; and the amending power- the highest legislature of the commonwealth – is a colonial legislature. “

“In particular, no law can be passed by the amending power which is repugnant to the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act – consisting of the preamble and the covering clauses to which the Constitution itself is annexed. The amending power can amend the Constitution, but the Constitution Act is above its reach. How far the scope of the amending power may be limited by the scope and intention of the Constitution Act, as gathered from the preamble, it is impossible to say; but it is certain that, if amendments were passed, which were inconsistent with such words as

“indissoluble,” “Federal Commonwealth” or “under the Crown,” strong arguments would be available against their constitutionality. (See Notes on “Preamble,” *supra*.)

If a Referendum based change is to be brought in with the consent of the majority of the natural people and it revolves around the commercial sale of property, which is land held by the people, those lawful commercial contracts the people hold with Her Majesty would remain in place. I refer to the Louisiana Purchase Treaty.

We have never been presented with a Referendum to alter the Constitution Act, subject to section 117 to 128 of The Constitution. Therefore the status quo – our system of government for the ‘indissoluble Federal Commonwealth’, remains the same, albeit well hidden and not currently available to the natural people of the Commonwealth.

On the face of it all appears to be well in our Commonwealth of Australia – however we rejected the idea of a republic at a referendum of the natural people of Australia in November of 1999. Despite that we now have the following, all of which have been created or have occurred without our consent at referendum or our knowledge:-

Our constitutional Sovereign is Elizabeth the Second, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom, Australia and Her other Realms and Territories Queen, Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith” to the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901* PROCLAIMED 1st July 1901 to the Preamble, Clauses 1-9 (**British law**), holding the cannon law/common law - as the landowner. If a government holds no land they hold no law.

Elizabeth the Second, by the Grace of God Queen of Australia and Her other Realms and Territories, Head of the Commonwealth.” is a titular appointment to THE AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTION - THE CONSTITUTION Reprinted as in force on 1st June 2003 – For commercial, or admiralty law for the AUSTRALIAN SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT. This AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTION is not yet PROCLAIMED.

The title ‘Defender of the Faith’ has been omitted from Her Majesty’s Royal Style and Titles– without our consent.

Our real and personal property is held in our wills and testaments, our *inter vivos* trusts for our heirs and assigns. Her Majesty’s canon/common law under the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901*, as Proclaimed, in the Preamble and Clauses 1 – 9 (**British law**) holds our civil and political rights and liberties, ours wills and estates.

Our *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901*, as Proclaimed is still in evidence in Australia however the AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT shows its constitution as being ‘The Constitution’ which is the Constitution of the Commonwealth not yet Proclaimed.

We have become AUSTRALIA – with ‘of the Commonwealth’ of Australia omitted – without our consent.

We are governed by a corporate AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT – without our consent.

Our laws are statutory civil law and we no longer have recourse to the common/canon laws of Her Majesty.

The Federal Parliament is the PARLIAMENT OF AUSTRALIA, no longer the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia.

The PARLIAMENT'S of the AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT have created under their corporate system, civil or commercial law held to the INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT ACT 2002, (The Parliament of Australia enacts), to the International Criminal Court in Rome to the International Monetary Fund, for the international borrowing in Australia money - the Australian dollar – by Australia to be used as promissory notes by the AUSTRALIAN SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT.

This systematic destruction of the system of government framed by our forefathers under the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901* as Proclaimed and the removal of the canon/common laws of Her Majesty, The Queen as our constitutional Sovereign has taken nearly 40 years to do, without the knowledge or consent of us the people.

Our judiciary and our courts are corporate entities holding Australian Business Numbers inside the corporate AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT under the authority of the Prime Minister, the Chief Executive Officer of and for the PARLIAMENT OF AUSTRALIA - without our knowledge and consent

Our judicial members do not hold the Royal Commission of Her Majesty and they do not sign their judgments. Refer *Royal Commission Act 1902*(Cth).

We have Police Services, not Police Forces.

This brings up a major question. If we are, under this corporate AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT system, merely 'things' this leaves the major question:-

How are we, the natural people, defined as 'things' as defined in the *Corporations Act 2001*(Cth), section 9 – Definitions 'act includes thing' *inter alia* to the CORPORATIONS AGREEMENT 2002 AS AMENDED:-

1. Arrested and detained and deprived of our liberty by public officials of the AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENTS employed as members of a Police Service not as members of a Police Force holding her Majesty's Royal Commission under a sworn Oath of Allegiance to Her Majesty? Further
2. How are members of the judiciary in their corporate courts hearing criminal matters under their civil statutory laws – not the common law? Further
3. How does the judiciary hear civil matters pertaining to signed and sealed commercial contracts held between Her Majesty's subjects to her Majesty's common law and a corporation or other natural individual people when the judiciary hearing the matter has not sworn their oath to Her Majesty to the *Royal Commissions Act 1902* and are not acting under the provisions of the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act*

1901 as Proclaimed to the Preamble and Clauses 1 – 9 (**British law**) or to Her Majesty's canon/ common law and equity of the land held by Her Majesty? Further

4. How can a member of the judiciary, not holding the Royal Commission of Her Majesty to the *Royal Commission Act 1902* but a signed commercial contract with the AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT convict, sentence, fine or imprison a subject of Her Majesty under civil statutory law?

It must be noted that members of the judiciary do not sign and seal their judgments. It is the judiciary who make a judgment and that judgment should be signed and sealed by that member of the judiciary, not as it is at the present time where those judgments are signed and sealed by a public official – a public servant of the court.

5. A member of the legal profession cannot assist a subject of Her Majesty, as, holding their practicing certificates with the Supreme Court of their State and IN THE HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA under a signed commercial contract to practice the law of the AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, the members of the legal profession are committed under those commercial contracts to practice law for AUSTRALIA and to protect the commercial interests of the corporate AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT to civil and statutory law only.

Our current Prime Minister Julia GILLARD when sworn in as Prime Minister said the words - "I, Julia Eileen Gillard, do solemnly and sincerely affirm and declare that I will loyally serve the Commonwealth of Australia in the office of prime minister."_ i.e Commercial Australia (AUSTRALIA) only.

Our entire system of Government is based on the political philosophies, agendas and policies of political parties in the body politic, not common/cannon law or the will of the natural people.

It is all no more than a fallacy - the greatest betrayal of Her Majesty, and us, the natural people, in the history of the Commonwealth.

I have seen natural individual people lose their entire life's work under the statutory laws of "the State" of Queensland, ostensibly in the name of 'protecting the environment' and for the 'public benefit'. Most of these people were producing food for the national and international markets – that was helping the economy of our country Australia and providing food for us to survive on. These businesses were also employing many people in other businesses and from within their local communities which also helped our economy.

The importance of the protection of the environment and the biodiversity must never be underestimated. However, the protection of the environment has become a great tool for the body politic. Using the excuse that it is for 'environmental protection in the public benefit' it has become a way to take a third party interest in private property and to remove our lawful rights to our real property.

Her Majesty is the owner of the land and seas on and about the Commonwealth of Australia. She holds the land and the laws. The AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT holds no land

therefore it holds no laws – hence the need to acquire the land to benefit their corporate structure. If a Government holds no land it can make no laws over land.

The case in the corporate Queensland Supreme Court of Appeal *Bone v Mothershaw* [2002] QCA 120 is the original case which has removed the rights to private property in Australia. The following is an extract from that case.

[Extract]

McPherson JJA *Bone v Mothershaw*[2002] QCA 120

[23] This brings me to what is really Mr Bone’s fundamental complaint about the whole process of vegetation protection that has been imposed on his land under chapter 22. It is that, by the Council’s action in making the order, his land has been struck with sterility in relation to the uses he can now lawfully make of it. Except with Council approval, **there is practically nothing he can do with it except continue to grow vegetation and perhaps walk on it.....For this severe limitation on his rights as owner**, he has received and will receive no compensation, **although he continues to enjoy the privilege of paying the rates that the Council levies on his land.** The action taken by the Council was no doubt undertaken in the public interest, as it claims, of the citizens of Brisbane; but it is not they who will bear the financial disadvantages of the action taken in their interest.

[25] The present case is different. The Council has not taken any interest of Mr Bone’s, so as to attract the operation of the *Acquisition of Land Act 1967* or otherwise. He retains unimpaired, for what it is worth, his estate in fee simple absolute in the land. **He has been stripped of virtually all the powers which make ownership of land of any practical utility or value.....**But the law provides no remedy for this action or its consequences **when it is the result of legislation validly passed under law-making authority** that by its terms or nature authorises or permits such an outcome.

It is interesting to note that this decision was handed down in April 2002. The *Constitution of Queensland 2001* was tabled in the Parliament of Queensland on 9th November 2001 and came into force on 6th June 2002. This Act placed the Queen of Australia, the Ministers, the Governor of Queensland, the judiciary, the Police and the public servants inside the corporate Queensland Government as entities.

It is also interesting to note that being unable to do anything with the land or develop it in any way under the statutory laws of ‘the State’, Mr Bone sold it. It was immediately purchased by a developer, cleared and developed.

It is the natural individual people of our country Australia who produce, by our hard work and our ingenuity, the wealth of our Commonwealth of Australia. It was our rights to and our possession of our real property, free of government interference that gave us the incentive to work long hours to make a living from our land. However with the corporate governmental and bureaucratic control in the name of environmental protection over real property, the rights to our land belong to those corporate entities.

The Environment:

I in no way advocate not caring for our environment and our biodiversity – we must do so for our future generations. But as the following extract shows, there must be a balance.

[Extract]

Environmental Law in Australia
4th Edition

G M Bates

[1.16] Former Chief Justice of the High Court and past president of the Australian Conservation Foundation, Sir Garfield Barwick, 'Problems in Conservation' [1975] 1 UNSWLJ 317, put it this way:

“The problem, like so many with which humans are faced from time to time, involves an intelligent balance, achieved by the use of knowledge, reason and wisdom: that balance will be found in the use, which though affecting a not undue change and not more than an acceptable modification of the environment....”

[1.17] Professor Sandford Clark, 'Conservation and Government: Towards an Understanding of Roles' (1974) 5 Search 241, also pointed out “that the task of government was not to protect each conflicting interest from adversity, but to strike a balance between conflicting interests:

Compromise is inevitable. Not all objectives can be obtained. The credibility of the conservation movement in the eyes of government - and consequently, its effectiveness - is endangered by failure of some conservationists to acknowledge this reality. The utter intractability of some adherents to the movement immediately puts them out of sympathy with the politician to whom compromise is, necessarily, a way of life.

Today it is not necessary to have to make out a case for the promotion of sensible environmental protection and management policies.Most people today would accept the ethics and philosophy of environmental conservation and preservation. **The emphasis is more on development *and* conservation rather than development *or* conservation. The integrated nature of ecology and economy lies at the heart of the ethic of 'sustainable development’**

[1.19]

“The former Chief Justice of Australia, Sir Garfield Barwick, has also urged that each generation should feel a sense of trusteeship of the environment for future generations and manage its resources wisely and compassionately, but he also stressed **that this was not a task for the law or even governments alone - every individual should accept this responsibility:**”

It is imperative, now that we have the people who have been so adversely affected by the statutory civil laws of the AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, that we take a stand.

To not stand up and be counted is to play into the hands of the people who are systematically removing our civil and political rights and liberties and our rights to our real and personal property. Apathy on our part is greatly appreciated by our political leaders and their massive bureaucracies as they take that as our tacit consent to their actions.

The time for untruths, 'Government speak' smoke and mirrors and spin is passed.

I believe in showing respect for our political leaders but I also believe that the good faith and trust we show them by electing them should not be open to abuse for their own political agendas, we should be respected for being the reason they are where they are.

To take any action it must be done correctly and with integrity. Any action must be carried out with respect for our Australia, our constitutional Sovereign and Her common law and our Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1901 as Proclaimed.

There is an email address here for the Governor General of Australia and I would ask that you email the Governor General and request that the caveats be registered. That is the only way that you can protect your assets, your real and personal property and your civil and political rights and liberties. There are also email addresses for your Members of Parliament.

Sadly the old Aussie adage of: "She'll be right mate" simply does not apply any longer.

It will not 'be right' unless we make our feelings loudly and clearly known to our political leaders in no uncertain terms.

If another country, to which the corporate 'AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT' is indebted, places a caveat over the lands of Australia, we have lost everything that we have worked for and that we own through no fault or consent of ours but by the deceit and subterfuge of people in whom we have placed our trust, our good faith and our belief they would act on our behalf for the betterment and the good government of our Commonwealth of Australia.

OUR Commonwealth of Australia needs you:-

PLEASE - MAKE YOUR STAND NOW OR ALL MAY WELL BE LOST.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Walter', with a horizontal line underneath.

(David.J.WALTER)
12th April 2011.

Att: Sir William Blackstone, 'Commentaries on the Law of England'