

Joint	Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters
Sub	Submission No. 6
Date	Date Received 16 Oct 2000
Sec	Secretary



10-10-2000

The Secretary,
 Joint Statutory Committee on Electoral Matters.
 Parliament House,
 Canberra ACT 2600

Re: ***Inquiry into ELECTORAL FUNDING and DISCLOSURE***

(Advertised in 'The Age' Saturday 09-09-2000)

Government Authority and Elections

Australia is no longer a dependent and subordinate 'Colony' or 'Dominion' subject to the control or direction of any 'Foreign Nation, 'Power', or 'Crown', it is an Independent Sovereign Nation.

Since Australia gained Independence the UK Parliament and Monarch have had no 'authority' in relation to Australian affairs, and no 'Australian Government' has sought or obtained from the 'Australian' people it purports to represent any 'authority' to 'govern', enter into any Treaty or International Agreement, or to dispose of any land assets or other property of the Australian people.

As an 'Independent Sovereign Nation', the **only** source of any 'authority' for 'Government' in Australia resides in and may be derived from the 'Australian' people. **No such authority has been given by the now independent 'Australian' people to any 'group' to act as an Australian 'Government', or to engage in any other actions effecting the sovereignty and assets of the Australian people.**

Logic decrees that Australia now has no valid or legitimate Constitution, Government, Judiciary, or Legislation.

The now defunct 'foreign' UK (1900) 'Australian Federation Constitution' gave the Australian Government limited power, subject to assent or otherwise by the UK Parliament and 'Sovereign', in relation to a specific limited number of functions; it was not given 'authority' to delegate, give away, 'privatise' or sell any of those responsibilities assets infrastructure public utilities etc, for which 'Governments' accepted responsibility, to any 'foreign or private enterprise', or to subject itself to any 'foreign' or other external control law or 'conditions'.

As the Independent Sovereign Nation of Australia has no valid and legitimate Constitution, any action by current groups calling themselves 'Governments' are invalid and illegitimate. Any 'agreement' made by these bodies in the name of the 'Australian' people is therefore null and void, and constitutes a deception.

Current Australian 'Governments' without constitutions, or 'contracts with the people', are operating under 'rules' of their own choice or making, and utilising the assets of the Australian people for their own purposes, a situation somewhat like foxes in charge of the chicken coop.

Election as a 'representative of the people' does not constitute a valid 'Government', nor does it eliminate the need for a valid Constitution to legitimise a 'Government'.

The 'Australian' people own the Australian land and assets, not the 'Government' or the 'Crown'.

Elections

'Government' claims that the current electoral process is controlled by **the Australian Electoral Commission, another body not 'authorised' by the 'Australian' people**, are not legitimate or valid. The principles and criteria from which rules and regulations controlling these events have been drawn up have not been given the informed consent of the 'Australian' people, or created under a legitimate constitution.

Electoral Funding

Democratic electoral funding should ensure that each 'candidate' is on an equal footing, none having any financial or other material advantage over any of the others, and strict limits should be imposed on Electoral expenses and the burden on funds owned by the 'Australian' people.

The nature, quantity, and source of any funding or other material assistance to any electoral candidates, and 'political parties', must be the subject of public disclosure in a legitimate open democratic system of Government.

No individual, or member of any group, should have any financial or funding advantage of any nature over any other individual contesting an election. Funding for all such candidates should therefore be equal, as should be the costs of publicity and advertising, including media exposure.

The acceptance and/or soliciting of 'donated' funds by candidates should be prohibited. The current practice of significant funding by donations from corporate, business, or wealthy private sources, both local and foreign, can only create the impression that they seek 'something' in return for that expenditure, and at the very least leaves the recipient open to the suggestion of non-impartiality in decision making. Politicians are elected by the people, to represent the people, not to represent business entities which exist only to generate profit, which have no right to vote, or to influence elections in any manner whatsoever.

Funding from business interests to the two current major political parties leaves other candidates at varying degrees of significant disadvantage, particularly in relation to advertising and publicity, as well as with staff, facilities, research and logistics. Good candidates and policies are marginalised and defeated by the funding support available to the major parties, to the detriment of the interests of the 'Australian' people.

Vote Counting

There is no valid legal or moral foundation to the current practice of vote counting on a 'two party' preferred basis, it has become a device by which the people are deprived of representation by their preference of independent or smaller 'party' candidates over those of the two major parties. It is a system by which intentional votes of the people are rendered valueless and improperly converted to active votes for candidates least wanted, or possibly totally unwanted.

It is illegitimate, and a corruption of a voter's will, to force a voter to mark a ballot paper for an unwanted candidate, even as last preference, then utilise that document to add to the unwanted candidate's vote count while ignoring the voter's higher preferences. Such a system simply supports either one or other of the two major parties, to the detriment of the 'Australian' people, and the candidates preferred by those voters.

Political Parties

Any 'Political Party' candidate who agrees to act in accord with the 'will of that party' if elected, willingly and deliberately abdicates his/her role as a representative of the people, and the right to stand as a legitimate candidate in the election. Candidates are elected to represent those people who vote, not an un-elected and un-accountable 'Political Party'. Electoral candidates in a democracy offer themselves for election as representatives of, and accountable to the people of their electorate, not as representatives of, or accountable to and subject to obedience to the directions of a 'political party'; a situation of conflict of interest, where the will of the people is generally ignored or disregarded, and 'party policy' implemented to the detriment of the people.

Successive Australian 'Governments' have deliberately chosen to disregard the will of the people they are elected to represent, as do many 'non-democratic Governments'.

It is far more than a serious abrogation of responsibilities and a dereliction of duty by 'elected representatives of the people' for an 'Australian Government' to act against the interests and against the will of the 'Australian' people, it is an act of tyranny.

A 'Government' without the informed consent, and valid 'authority' from the 'Australian' people, cannot legitimately create legislation or indulge in other acts in the name of the people, nor can it simply create 'authority' for its representatives, delegates, or subordinates to do so.

Actions of Successive Australian 'Governments', without the knowledge or consent of the 'Australian' people are detrimental to the 'Australian' people and erode their rights and sovereignty, and/or contain 'provisions' that provide for significant economic financial and other losses to the 'Australian' people.

Australian Sovereignty and Independence

The Australian 'Government' has no 'Constitutional' or any other 'authority' from the people to indulge in any actions that are detrimental to the 'Australian' people. It has no 'authority' to exercise 'sovereignty' on behalf of the Australian people; elected representatives are limited to representing the will of the people of their electorate and acting in their interest.

The 'Government' has no 'authority' to render the Australian people subject to foreign control or influence of any type. Any such actions are totally unacceptable, they are an attack against Australian independence and sovereignty.

Australians should be subject only to valid and legitimate 'Australian' law in Australia, not 'foreign' or 'private' law, rules, or any other externally imposed conditions or restrictions, and certainly not the 'rules' of any international 'business organisation'.

It would be appropriate and proper for the Australian people to **totally reject any and all 'elected representatives' who are prepared to support any such unauthorised, invalid, and illegitimate 'Contracts', 'Agreements' or 'Treaties' and their obnoxious conditions, as well as those 'representatives' who belong to any 'political party' that supports those policies against the will and to the detriment of the people they were elected to represent. For a 'Party' to demand precedence over the people is tyranny, a role reversal from people's representative to party policy 'sales people' and a corruption of democracy.**

Any 'Government' proposition in any way effecting Australian Sovereignty demands a referendum.

The sacrifices of our forbears during WWI & II and other conflicts in the pursuit of freedom from tyranny, and the efforts of William Hughes PM in 1919, cannot now simply be ignored forgotten wasted or illegitimately surrendered by 'Government' to the interests of 'private organisations' or 'foreign interests'. Australia's sovereignty is under attack from within.

Privatised Elections, Universal Postal Voting, Computer processing, & Media desire for Quick Results ?

I may only be entitled to one vote, but I have every right to expect that vote to have its full value, and that any vote counting process for any election is open, with transparent integrity, capable of being effectively scrutinised and validated, and is an honest and accurate representation of the will of the people.

Several requests from Victorian Local Councils for 'Tenders for provision of Election Services' advertised in 'The Age' (Sat 07-08-99 and 21-08-99 and others) indicate that a number of local councils have abdicated their responsibility, and a fundamental 'democratic process' has been sold off to private enterprise

Some of these advertisements indicate that 'Universal Postal Voting' is the method to be used for elections.

Australian history shows that 'Postal Voting' is by far the method most open to electoral fraud, and is incapable of having adequate security, scrutiny and integrity. (That was before computer processing !)

The 'Australian Electoral Commission' well knows that their 'Electoral Roll' is far from 100% accurate, and is well aware of the enormous capacity for fraud inherent in the postal voting system, certainly more than enough to change an 'honest' result, fraudulent votes are almost impossible to challenge and 'prove', in the 'Court of

Disputed Returns', and the Court is prohibited from interrogating the 'electoral rolls'. (Voting roll errors apparently number in hundreds of thousands – An unjustifiable and unacceptable situation.)

Many elections are won and lost on the basis of less than 200 votes. The "Postal Voting" provisions, under what had been the normal and customary method of personal attendance at a local polling booth, allowed corruption and manipulation to flourish, how much more so with 'Universal Postal Voting'. Even the 'dead' appear to vote, as do 'non-residents and non-people'.

'Voting Machines' (mechanical devices) have been tried before (US), and they failed to provide adequate security and integrity. The prospect of computer based 'vote processing', which eliminates processing scrutiny, and readily provides the unscrupulous with the capacity for manipulation, corruption, and fraud on a previously unparalleled scale, is diabolical. It seems that George Bush (Snr) won an un-winnable US election in 1975, where vote counting was 'aided' by computer processing. It is not impossible that such improbable results could be gained anywhere thanks to whoever controls the computer program. It has been claimed that; 'whoever controls the vote counting controls the election result, not the voters')

The 1984 AEC computer data feed to the 'tally room' fiasco should have sent an adequate warning to anyone contemplating the use of computers as a significant part of voting result processing. **Integrity, accuracy, and validity of the voting process are paramount.**

Valid elections are not 'media events', they are a fundamental democratic process. The desire of the media for quick access to electoral results is totally irrelevant to the electoral process, and not a valid reason for the use of 'private organisation computer programs' (Not available for inspection or subject to scrutiny) to 'speed up' the process for the benefit of the media or others.

Every 'fraudulent' vote counted diminishes the value of each legitimate vote. 'Universal postal voting' will encourage fraud, corruption, and distortion of electoral results and 'the will of the people'. 'Computer processing' will remove transparency and accountability from the electoral process and result in the loss of 'integrity', and 'Democracy'.

'Privatisation' of the electoral process is illegitimate, invalid, and a corruption of democracy. In a 'democracy' the total process of elections, including eligibility of voters, belongs to the people and must be remain open to thorough scrutiny by the people, there must be no possibility of results being manipulated.

References:

'**The Frauding of Votes ?**' Dr Amy McGrath; Tower House Publications. Box 737 P O Kensington NSW 2033. ISBN 0 9591879 9 5

'**Fine Print 2**' Brian Wiltshire, Distributed by Simon & Schuster Australia. 20 Barcoo St East Roseville NSW 2069. ISBN 0 646 14404 9 (See Chapter 13, 'Votescam' pp.116-124)

'**The Stealing of America**' James M Collier, Kenneth E Collier, Victoria House Press 67 Wall St New York, 1992. ISBN 0 96 34165 0 8 (Australia unfortunately tends to follow many US Trends)

(Also see various **Royal Commissions and enquiries into electoral fraud.**)

Public Debate

An 'advertisement' buried in a large daily newspaper 'allowing the submission of comments' is not an adequate or appropriate method of conducting 'public debate' on any issue effecting the whole population. Decision making on this basis is no more valid than decision making processes based on selective 'opinion polling', or demands of lobbyists, etc. The number of 'responses' should clearly indicate that conclusion.

Yours sincerely,



G. Lloyd-Smith,
1 Jenola Pde, Wantirna Sth. 3152.