



MAY JUSTICE ALWAYS PREVAIL ®	
From: Mr G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B.	
Blog: www.scribd.com/inspectorrikati	LH-20160921-06
THE MORALS OF A SOCIETY CAN BE MEASURED AS TO HOW IT LOOKS AFTER THE DISABLED	
Please note: <i>The opinion(s) expressed in this letter by the writer, are stated considering the limited information available to him and may not be the same where further information were made available to him, is not intended and neither must be perceived to be legal advice!</i>	
WARNING	
Constitutionalist & Paralegal Independent Consultant & Author	INSPECTOR-RIKATI ® Series of books on certain constitutional and other legal issues
PEOPLES POWER Reclaim our State and Federal constitutional and other legal rights, and hold politicians and judges accountable!	

Committee Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Committee Department of the Senate

14-10-2020

PO Box 6100 Parliament House

Canberra ACT 2600

Phone +61 2 62773535

Email fadt.sen@aph.gov.au

20201014-G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B. to Committee Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Committee Department of the Senate

Sir/Madam,

I understand that there is a Bill before the Parliament regarding possible foreign forces to enter the Commonwealth of Australia.

Defence Legislation Amendment (Enhancement of Defence Force Response to mergencies) Bill 2020

It may appear to be some innocent provisions to protect foreign forces coming to the aid of Australians, reality however may be totally different.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vCFjU3pkfsQ&feature=youtu.be&fbclid=IwAR3Bjj_5c0FJ5IYBSqC0M9SoVsNwYo2i8nwEmIYLJ8KCS_fEFfsfZDJ6akY

NWO AUSTRALIAN HEALTH MINISTER SLIPS UP AND SAYS NEW WORLD ORDER. THEY WANT TO GO IN YOUR HOME. _

This I understand was the NSW Minister for Health in presence of the Premier of NSW making clear that he is pursuing the **New World Order**, and they want to go into people's home.

Crimes Act 1914 (Cth)
QUOTE

80.6 Division not intended to exclude State or Territory law

It is the intention of the Parliament that this Division is not to apply to the exclusion of a law of a State or a Territory to the extent that the law is capable of operating concurrently with this Division.

Crimes Act 1914

30A Unlawful associations

(1) The following are hereby declared to be unlawful associations, namely:

(a) any body of persons, incorporated or unincorporated, which by its constitution or propaganda or otherwise advocates or encourages:

(i) the overthrow of the Constitution of the Commonwealth by revolution or sabotage;
(ii) the overthrow by force or violence of the established government of the Commonwealth or of a State or of any other civilized country or of organized government; or

p1

14-10-2020

© G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B.

INSPECTOR-RIKATI® about the BLACK HOLE in the CONSTITUTION-DVD

A 1st edition limited special numbered book on Data DVD ISBN 978-0-9803712-6-0

For further details see also my blog at [Http://www.scrib.com/InspectorRikati](http://www.scrib.com/InspectorRikati)

(iii) the destruction or injury of property of the Commonwealth or of property used in trade or commerce with other countries or among the States;

or which is, or purports to be, affiliated with any organization which advocates or encourages any of the doctrines or practices specified in this paragraph;

(b) any body of persons, incorporated or unincorporated, which by its constitution or propaganda or otherwise advocates or encourages the doing of any act having or purporting to have as an object the carrying out of a seditious intention (see subsection (3)). ...

(3) In this section:

seditious intention means an intention to use force or violence to effect any of the following purposes:

(a) to bring the Sovereign into hatred or contempt;

(b) to urge disaffection against the following:

(i) **the Constitution;**

(ii) the Government of the Commonwealth;

(iii) either House of the Parliament;

(c) to urge another person to attempt to procure a change, otherwise than by lawful means, to any matter established by law of the Commonwealth;

(d) to promote feelings of ill-will or hostility between different groups so as to threaten the peace, order and good government of the Commonwealth.

END QUOTE

In my view, promoting a **NEW WORLD ORDER** means the overthrow of our constitution and any Government operating within the constitutional provisions.

Where then we have a Minister of the Crown promoting the New World Order then I view this could be deemed **INSURRECTION** and/or **SEDITION**. And, the Premier of NSW as I understand it standing there quietly not intervening then this may be deemed to support this conduct of **INSURRECTION** and/or **SEDITION**.

And considering then in Victoria:

Legislative Council (Upper House) Omnibus (Emergency) Bill - Voted with 3 Readings in One Day!!

QUOTE 14-10-2020 email

Quote Part:

Expansion of power to detain

The new Part 13 also contains new a section 200A, which broadens the ability of authorised officers to exercise the emergency power to detain high-risk persons under the PHW Act. Specifically, new section 200A provides that a designated authorised officer may detain a person if:

- a direction has been given in the exercise of an emergency power under section 200(1)(a), (b), (c) or (d) of the PHW Act; and
- the designated authorised officer has a reasonable belief that a person required to comply with the direction is a high-risk person who is likely to refuse or fail to comply with the direction.

This amendment engages, but does not limit, the right not to be subject to arbitrary detention in section 21(2) of the Charter.

Section 21(2) of the Charter requires that a person must not be unlawfully or arbitrarily detained. Detention under 200(1)(a) is clearly a deprivation of liberty for the finite and regularly reviewed period of time. The amendments will satisfy the requirements of

90 lawfulness as they will constitute the relevant law. It is likely that any detention would be
considered arbitrary if it was disproportionately or unjust, or if it was not based on **any**
identifiable criterion and was therefore able to be exercised capriciously (although there
remains conflict in the Victorian jurisprudence about the meaning of the word ‘arbitrary’).

95 The amendments will allow a person to be detained under the existing emergency detention
power in the PHW Act on the basis of what designated authorised officer reasonably
believes a person is ‘likely’ to do, or refuse or fail to do. Although these terms do involve
an authorised officer making an assessment or prediction of future behaviour, I consider
that the criteria for that assessment are sufficient clear so as to avoid the power being
100 exercised arbitrarily. I also note that the courts have accepted the use of protective detention
powers in other circumstances where an assessment is required of future risk (such as
under the preventative detention regimes for serious sex offenders).

END QUOTE 14-10-2020 email

Ok let us put this a bit in layman’s terms.

105 .
I on 10 September 2020 lodged with the High Court of Australia via email my
“COMPLAINT” against the Victorian Government unconstitutional lockdowns, curfews,
mandatory wearing of mask, etc. Registrar Ben Wickham refuses to file the document on
the basis that it is not acceptable to do so via email.

110 .
I being restricted to a mere 5 kilometres radius am prevented to go to a printer (beyond
that distance) to print out documents. If I do I face an about \$5,000.00 fine. My
documentation as such set out the legal predicaments I am in to follow the Rules of the
Court and as such view that judge of the High Court of Australia could issue EX PARTE
115 INTERIM ORDERS to facilitate me to travel beyond 5 kilometres to complete matters as
required by the Rules of the Court. Obviously, my documentation sets out the grounds
why such EX PARTE INTERIM ORDERS ought to be justified also considering the
UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATE OF EMERGENCY/ STATE OF DISASTER declared
by the State of Victoria. As such, there are extra ordinary reasons for the Court to ensure
120 that access to the Court (so preparation of documentation according to the Rules of the
Court) is not obstructed.

On 11 October 2020 I lodged revised documentation to replace those of 10 September 2020.
Again Registrar Ben Wickham makes clear he refused the lodgement by email to be
accepted. My request for a judge of the court to determine the matter, as after all the
125 Registrar is **NOT** and Officer of the Court has been ignored. It is a well established legal
rule that Registrars cannot act independently from supervision by a judge

**The documents hereby provided may give an insight as to what I pursue before the
High Court of Australia.**

130 **This document is the 11-10-2020 Correspondence (cover letter)**
**20201011-G. H. Schorel-Hlavka O.W.B. Registrar Ben Wickham High Court of
Australia**

This document can be downloaded from:

135 [https://www.scribd.com/document/479564106/20201011-G-H-Schorel-Hlavka-O-W-B-
Registrar-Ben-Wickham-High-Court-of-Australia](https://www.scribd.com/document/479564106/20201011-G-H-Schorel-Hlavka-O-W-B-Registrar-Ben-Wickham-High-Court-of-Australia)

This document is the Order Nisi (correction)

This document can be downloaded from:

<https://www.scribd.com/document/479582130/20201011-Order-Nisi-Correction>

This document is the Affidavit

This document can be downloaded from:

<https://www.scribd.com/document/479564539/20201011-Affidavit>

In my view, the High Court of Australia would do better to direct that the Palmer, Gerner and my case are all heard together. After all the court doesn't want to hear the same arguments time and time again where that can be avoided.

This document can be downloaded from:

<https://www.scribd.com/document/479733711/20201013-G-H-Schorel-Hlavka-O-W-B-Registrar-Ben-Wickham-High-Court-of-Australia>

As we already had the Minister for Health NSW making known to implement the **New World Order** then the absurd conduct by Victoria to have reading in one day, meaning politicians have no time to even digest the details of the Bill, which one would consider to be very important for politicians to do, then this rush combined with the Federal government now pushing for foreign troops to be allowed to come in is precisely as to set up the **New World Order**.

Hansard 8-2-1898 Constitution Convention Debates (Official Record of the Debates of the National Australasian Convention)

QUOTE

Clause 112-The Commonwealth shall protect every state against invasion, and, on the application of the Executive Government of a state, against domestic violence.

Mr. GORDON (South Australia).-I beg to move-

That the word "invasion" (line 2) be struck out, and the word "attack" substituted.

Why should the protection of the Commonwealth be confined only to invasion? We are not likely ever to be invaded, but we are exceedingly likely to be attacked.

Mr. BARTON.-Any attack is an invasion in the sense in which the word is used in this clause.

Mr. GORDON.-The gunning by a cruiser standing off a city is not an invasion, but it is an attack.

Mr. BARTON.-It is an attack which is part of an invasion; if the attack succeeds invasion follows.

Mr. GORDON.-I think "attack" is very much better. Of course, if the word "invasion" covers the ground, well and good; but while "attack" covers "invasion," does "invasion" cover "attack"? Originally, the amendment I intended to move used both the words "attack" and "invasion."

Mr. REID.-You can repel an invasion 100 miles from the coast.

Mr. GORDON.-But how does the honorable member know that an invasion is intended?

[start page 692]

Mr. REID.-If there was a war between two countries, and a cruiser from the one country was approaching the other, you would know that it was not on a visit of brotherly love.

Mr. GORDON.-They may not intend to invade the chances are that they do not intend to invade, but to attack.

Mr. BARTON.-Do you think that the Commonwealth, if a hostile fleet appeared for the purpose of attacking, and not invading, would keep the batteries silent and the Australian fleet at anchor?

Mr. GORDON.-Something may turn upon this. By this clause the Commonwealth is only bound to protect every state against invasion. If the Commonwealth neglected its duty, and South Australia was invaded, South Australia would have a claim against the Commonwealth. But, it appears to me, that it should have an equal claim against the Commonwealth if it was simply attacked, and not invaded. However, if the leader of the Convention thinks that "invasion" covers "attack," I am willing to leave the matter to the Drafting Committee, but I have some doubt on the point.

Mr. BARTON (New South Wales).-I am perfectly satisfied that when the guns are booming there will be no discussion about the meaning of the two words.

Mr. GORDON.-Ought the construction of this Act to be left until the guns are booming? I thought the object was to prevent the guns booming at all.

Mr. HOLDER (South Australia).-I think there is something in the point raised by my honorable friend (Mr. Gordon). We have previously used separately the terms "naval" and "military." Now, an attack would be naval, while an invasion would be military.

The CHAIRMAN.-Does the honorable member (Mr. Gordon) press his amendment?

Mr. GORDON.-No. If the leader of the Convention relies on his booming guns I am content.

The amendment was withdrawn.

END QUOTE

Well, the State and the Commonwealth are setting up legislation so that there is no need for any enemy foreign power to do the "booming" because they can peacefully under protection of the Rules of law enter Australia, such as on request of Chairman Dan (Premier Daniel Andrews) and take over the state under the excuse of fighting and protecting against this (Scott Morrison) "invisible enemy". From now on it no longer is relevant if there is a real danger as you can simply pretend there is an "invisible enemy" and no one knows the better and foreign enemy troops can be authorised to be a "designated officer" to lock up whomever and use any excuse to make arbitrary decisions excluding the judicature.

I might be an obvious target seeking to litigate the constitutional validity of the matters, this despite I have still a 4 December 2002 NOTICE OF CONSTITUTIONAL MATTER outstanding for the High Court of Australia to hear and determine.

I am one of those people referred to as a "GRANNY KILLER" for not wearing a face mask, and have been ejected by the Victorian Police as well as physically assaulted by another shopper for this. Never mind I have a medical exemption certificate for medical grounds. And, never mind my wife is a 87 year old heart patient who suffers other underlying medical condition and last October was in ICU for this. She is so scared that she rather put on a face mask no matter it could kill her as the fear to not to do so and be physically attacked by the constitutional terrorist called police leaves her no other choice. We are great grandparents but somehow referred to as "GRANNY KILLERS" for daring to exercise our constitutional, human, common law, and other legal rights.

And more than likely if COVID-19 can justify the lockdowns, curfews, etc, then with the flu we might expect even more draconic directives.

And, this appears to be all designed to implement the New World Order.

Just that I spend too much time researching constitutional issues and I am not prepared to let crooked politicians rob me of my constitutional rights, and I view neither should anyone else allow for this.

The following will also make clear that the Framers of the Constitution intended to have **CIVIL RIGHTS** and **LIBERTIES** principles embedded in the Constitution;

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

QUOTE Mr. CLARK.-

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

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.

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

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

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

And

HANSARD 17-3-1898 Constitution Convention Debates

QUOTE

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

Where are the politicians demanding the High Court of Australia accepts my “**COMPLAINT**” and hear and determines it upon legal basis?

The silence is deafening

At paragraph **164** of the Affidavit I stated;

QUOTE

Hansard 24-2-1898 Constitution Convention Debates (Official Record of the Debates of the National Australasian Convention)

QUOTE

Mr. BARTON.-The High Court cannot act unless complaint is made, but the Parliament can act whenever it likes.

Sir EDWARD BRADDON.-Only on motion.

END QUOTE

Well obviously the Framers of the Constitution never expected to have a High Court of Australia which will deny a person making a complaint of having the complaint heard and determined. The complaint doesn't rest with if a Registrar accept the filing of the complaint but rest by the person presenting the complaint to the court. The Registrar so to say is a mere so to say office person who has no legal rights within our constitutional framework as to rob any person of their right to lodge a complaint with any court. Hence, a judge must consider any such refusal to accept a complaint and

well my 18 March 2003 application that I at the time left with the Registrar was never subject to a court order, this because the judge on 19 March 2003 simply referred again to the 18 February 2003 Application that was then refused to be accepted. When judges of the High Court of Australia cannot even manage their own registry and ignore a valid challenge to the purported Cross Vesting Act and ignore to comply with a 4 December 2002 order of the magistrates Court of Victoria then what hope does an ordinary citizen have to have what I consider such “vague and aloof” court where the rule of law as governed by the Constitution is trampled upon.

END QUOTE

The Framers of the Constitution referred to “**COMPLAINT**” and not to a “filed” case, and even using email facilities in the circumstances prevailing I did lodge a “**COMPLAINT**”.

Let us be clear about it that the Governor-General on 18 March 2020 declared a STATE OF EMERGENCY and by this the **Biosecurity Act 2015** (Cth) is the governing legislation throughout the Commonwealth of Australia and the Federal Minister for health Greg Hunt is not permitted to delegate his powers. As such whatever eventuated in Victoria or elsewhere in violation of the legal provisions of the **Biosecurity Act 2015** (Cth) cannot and never must be accepted.

As my documentation also sets out that “concurrent” legislative powers regarding QUARANTINE issues no longer existed since the Commonwealth legislated its then **Biosecurity Act 1908** (Cth).

Paragraph 67 of the Affidavit
QUOTE

There is however more to this. The Commonwealth as I understand it commenced to legislate the **Biosecurity Act 1908** regarding “**man-kind**” diseases. This then from then on excluded the States to legislate in regard of this subject matter. While there was this 1910 Spanish Flu where the State closed borders, etc, reality is that they had no such legislative powers when it came to “**mad-kind**” diseases. With then another disease coming around called COVID-19 the States and Territories simply took it upon themselves to close of the borders to some extent. In the State of Victoria Premier Daniel Andrews implemented, also through the Chief Health Officer, draconic provisions as a totalitarian totally disregarding the legal embedded principles of the **Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1900** (UK).

The *Biosecurity (Consequential Amendments and Transitional Provisions) Act 2015*, brings 3 Acts into 1 Act, which is now called the Biosecurity Act 2015. Under Australian Law it is correct that to delete an old Act, it is repealed. However, in doing this, they needed to bring in this *Biosecurity (Consequential Amendments and Transitional Provisions) Act 2015*, thus linking the *Quarantine Act 1908* and *Quarantine Charges (Collection) Act 2014*, into one Act.

The **Biosecurity Act 2015** Act No. 61 of 2015 Start date 20 September 2017.
The Commonwealth in its wisdom previously had updated the **Biosecurity Act 1908** (Cth) to become the **Biosecurity Act 2015** (Cth). Hence, Neither the States and/or the Territories (Quasi States) could therefore legislate as to “man-kind” diseases.

Hansard 7-2-1898 Constitution Convention Debates

QUOTE Mr. BARTON (New South Wales).-

I do not think the word quarantine, for instance, which is used in the sub-section of the 52nd clause, is intended to give the Commonwealth power to legislate with regard to any quarantine. That simply applies to quarantine as referring to diseases among man-kind.

END QUOTE

345 Considering Section 117 of the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1900*
(UK) that no state can discriminate against citizens of another State then the border
closures clearly are violating this provision. We have that for example the State of
Queensland allow some 400 AFL people entering the State upon different conditions
350 then other citizens. We have some who can enter a particular State without needing
to be staying at a wrong named “quarantine hotel” while others may simply go home
to self isolate. Others are forced into a “quarantine hotel”. As such there is
discrimination.

END QUOTE

355 It appears to me to be very clear that Registrar Ben Wickham seeks to deliberately prevent my
lodged documents to be considered by a judge of the High Court of Australia and this to me is
treasonous.

360 My computer is having numerous problems, including various keys not working properly and it
tends to close down unintendedly and it caused me to struggle to prepare my case but with the 5
kilometres radius limit to travel I am prevented to get it repaired, etc.

365 My wife at 87 years now has been cooked up for months at home this because she is not even
allowed to travel with me to a supermarket, but she is allowed to go by taxi, as the limit is one
designated person per household. So, in her fragile state to be left with some stranger hardly
makes sense. This is the absurdity that is going on.

We need to consider also the following:

keep in mind QUALIFIED IMMUNITY

370 *CAMPBELL v CHRIS FLORIAN; DAVID TATARSKY and Ors*
<https://www.ca4.uscourts.gov/opinions/196417.P.pdf>

375 **Do we really desire “foreign troops” to enter the Commonwealth of Australia under a
pretext of fighting some “invisible enemy” and then take over the place and having then
QUALIFIED IMMUNITY no one can hold them liable for any crimes they may commit.**

380 In my view, Sections 114 and 119 do not allow foreign troops to operate within the
Commonwealth of Australia to act as “authorised officers” with freedom to commit any crime,
even to take over the country without any legal liability. Section 114 limits the Commonwealth
to under certain circumstances permit a State to raise and/or maintain a naval or military force,
but there is no provision for the Commonwealth to permit foreign forces to do so within the
Commonwealth of Australia, let alone to be free from liability if committing a crime.

385 **114 States may not raise forces. Taxation of property of
Commonwealth or State**

A State shall not, without the consent of the Parliament of the Commonwealth, raise or maintain
any naval or military force, or impose any tax on property of any kind belonging to the
Commonwealth, nor shall the Commonwealth impose any tax on property of any kind belonging to
a State.

390 **119 Protection of States from invasion and violence**

The Commonwealth shall protect every State against invasion and, on the application of the
Executive Government of the State, against domestic violence.

395 **One never knows when one friends becomes one enemy, and one should never tell a friend
secrets one doesn't desire to tell and enemy.**

Likewise one would not trust some "friendly country" who then might turn to become the
"enemy" once landed and able to take over the country.

400 It is already bad enough that ports were leased out to foreign entities as this in my view
undermines NATIONAL SECURITY.

It is absurd that when a person make an FOI application often parts if not all is deemed not to be
released because of NATIONAL SECURITY but somehow inviting foreigners to control our
405 ports and so use this to invade the country as well as having foreign troops entering the
Commonwealth of Australia somehow to fight some "INVISIBLE ENEMY" is not endangering
national security?

When one look at that a lot of deaths eventuated in nursing homes even after 270 days or more
410 even so it is claimed that isolation of 14 days is more than sufficient then one has to ask is it
reasonable to assume these are COVID-19 deaths or perhaps are deaths not at all related to
COVID-19 but blamed on it as to push through the NEW WORLD ORDER?

While there were reportedly disagreements between PM Scott Morrison and Premier Daniel
415 Andrews, somehow at no time did PM Scott Morrison and/or Federal Minister for health Greg
Hunt take Premier Daniel Andrews to the High Court of Australia for violating the legal
provisions of the *Biosecurity Act 2015 (Cth)*. One then has to ask are they just playing a political
game not at all interested in NATIONAL SECURITY but in fact using this so-called
420 "INVISIBLE ENEMY" as to get foreign troops into Australia to take over in violation of our
constitutional rights, etc?

Let us stop the fear mongering "INVISIBLE ENEMY" and demand that PM Scott Morrison
proves his "INVISIBLE ENEMY" does exist at all. Whatever he means by it.

For sure, we have COVID-19 as a disease, but I understand that the death rate relating to it is far
lower than that of influenza, etc. We had panic stricken people in leadership who simply didn't
425 know how to be a leader. And, those knee-jerking panicking leaders then desire to call in foreign
troops blinded to see reality and using common sense?

In my view, only utter fools who are led by the nose would vote for such absurdity.

Let us all be sentries, and ensure that the constitutional rights we were provided for will be
430 guarded by each and every Australian who is worthy to be a "sentry".

We need to return to the organics and legal principles embed in of our federal constitution!

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. (Friends call me Gerrit)

MAY JUSTICE ALWAYS PREVAIL®

(Our name is our motto!)