

Dear [REDACTED] ,

I am writing to thank the Chairman, Mr Andrew Wallace MP, as well as members of the Committee for the invitation to representatives of Australians for Constitutional Monarchy to attend the hearing yesterday.

I would like to confirm our view that the Yes/No booklet is too important not to be sent to each voter by post, unless the voter has indicated a preference for an alternative form of delivery.

This is the normal approach these days with important documents, for example, those from banks.

In other words, we are proposing that the individually addressed booklet be the default position which any citizen may vary.

We also affirm our view that the Yes case in the booklet continue to be authorised by the MPs and senators approving the relevant bill and the No case also continue to be authorised by the MPs and senators opposing that bill.

We believe that it would be wrong on principle to hand this task to some unelected body.

Although our proposal for a significant change in the question and thus the long title of the Bill was rejected in 1999, we nevertheless believe the question should, for consistency, refer to the long title of the relevant bill as adopted by Parliament (or the House which approves the bill) under section 128 of the Constitution.

As to conventions consisting of delegates elected by the Australian people, something ACM has been proposing for many years, these should be reserved for general reviews or when a major change is being proposed to the very essence of the Constitution, as in 1999.

There has not been a general review by such a convention since federation.

For reasons which we believe are self-evident, it would be unwise to do this too often. These should be special events in the life of the nation.

Instead, the people and the states should be empowered to initiate referendums on specific changes, something we have proposed in our submission.

In this regard, the Swiss experience provides a valuable precedent, as it did to the Founders in relation to the adoption of the constitution as well as ultimately, to its amendment.

As to education on constitutional matters, it might be helpful to raise this with the non-partisan Constitutional Education Fund ( <http://cefa.org.au/> ) which I understand is involved in the Australian Constitution Centre located at the High Court. (Some years ago, I was on the board of CEFA but am no longer.)

Sincerely,  
David Flint