

**RECEIVED**  
14 NOV 1997  
LEGAL, CONSTITUTIONAL AND  
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW  
COMMITTEE

12.11.97

THE RESEARCH DIRECTOR,  
LEGAL, CONSTITUTIONAL &  
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE,  
PARLIAMENT HOUSE,  
BRISBANE, QLD 4000.

DEAR SIR,

THE INGHAM INFORMATION GROUP, CONSISTING OF THIRTY MEMBERS, MEET REGULARLY TO DISCUSS & DISSEMINATE ISSUES OF IMPORTANCE TO OUR COMMUNITY. WE OFFER YOU OUR OPINIONS ON "THE PRESERVATION & ENHANCEMENT OF INDIVIDUALS' RIGHTS & FREEDOMS: SHOULD QUEENSLAND ADOPT A BILL OF RIGHTS?" ISSUES PAPER 3. SEPTEMBER 1997.

IT IS OUR STRONGLY HELD OPINION THAT QUEENSLAND ALREADY HAS THE PROTECTION OF A BILL OF RIGHTS. THAT PROTECTION COMES TO US THROUGH THE CORONATION OATH, SWORN BY THE QUEEN, TO PRESERVE & PROTECT OUR RIGHTS AS THEY ARE HELD TO BE. THOSE RIGHTS ARE ENTRENCHED IN QUEENSLAND LEGISLATION IN THE IMPERIAL ACTS APPLICATIONS ACT. WE BELIEVE OUR LEGAL STRUCTURE SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE FIRMLY BASED ON GODS LAW.

WE FEEL THAT IT IS FAR MORE IMPORTANT THAT QUEENSLAND REESTABLISH AN UPPER HOUSE IN THE QUEENSLAND PARLIAMENTARY SYSTEM. THIS WOULD BE A BETTER CHECK & BALANCE THAN FURTHER DEFINING OUR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS.

WE BELIEVE THAT OUR EDUCATION SYSTEM IS SADLY LACKING IN THAT IT DOES NOT TEACH THE FACT THAT WE DO HAVE A BILL OF RIGHTS & THE EXTENT OF THOSE RIGHTS.

IF ALL CITIZENS WERE FAMILIAR WITH THEIR RIGHTS IT WOULD BE FAR MORE DIFFICULT FOR THE PARLIAMENT OR THE COURTS TO INFRINGE THOSE RIGHTS,

WE ACCEPT THAT THERE MAY BE ADDITIONAL RIGHTS WHICH THE COMMUNITY SEE AS APPROPRIATE TO PRESERVE. WE FEEL THAT THESE RIGHTS SHOULD BE WRITTEN INTO LEGISLATION SUPPLEMENTARY TO OUR EXISTING RIGHTS AS THEY ARE HELD TO BE.

REFERRING SPECIFICALLY TO TABLE 2. THE RIGHTS CONTAINED IN EARC'S BILL OF RIGHTS....WE HAVE NO ARGUMENT WITH THE MAJORITY OF THE CONTENTS OF THIS TABLE BUT SPECIFICALLY THE PARAGRAPH • TO PROTECTION AGAINST ARBITRARY INTERFERENCE....WE FEEL STRONGLY THAT THIS PROTECTION SHOULD BE GUARANTEED BY THE REQUIREMENT OF A WARRANT FROM A COURT OF THE APPROPRIATE JURISDICTION. THE FOLLOWING • NOT TO BE INVESTIGATED FOR AN OFFENCE IN A WAY PREJUDICIAL TO THE FAIRNESS OF A PERSON'S TRIAL.... SHOULD STOP THERE. WE BELIEVE A PERSONS PRIVATE RIGHTS ARE SUPERIOR TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

THE SECTION COMMENCING.... IF IN CUSTODY TO BE TREATED HUMANELY....THE SECOND DOT POINT SHOULD BE STRUCK OUT. WE BELIEVE THAT THE RIGHT TO FOOD, MEDICAL TREATMENT & REASONABLE ACCESS TO FAMILY & ANY PERSON NECESSARY TO EXERCISE A PERSONS RIGHTS IS PARAMOUNT & SHOULD NOT BE LIMITED.

IN THE SECTION BEGINING....IF CHARGED WITH AN OFFENCE....• NOT TO BE FOUND GUILTY....THIS ALREADY EXISTS IN OUR PRESENT PROTECTION. THE RIGHT OF SELF & SPOUCE TO REMAIN SILENT SHOULD BE REAFFIRMED

IN THE SECTION....IF FOUND GUILTY OF AN OFFENCE....• THE RIGHT TO BENEFIT OF A LESSER PENALTY....SHOULD BE EXCLUDED. ONE SHOULD BE TRIED UNDER THE LAWS & PENALTIES EXISTING AT THE TIME OF THE OFFENCE WHETHER THEY BE HARSHER OR MORE LENIENT.

IN THE SECTION..... TO FREEDOM FROM DISCRIMINATION....THE DOT POINT, SEXUALITY SHOULD BE EXCLUDED & THE DOT POINT, OTHER NATURAL CHARACTERISTICS SHOULD HAVE A RIDER EXCLUDING HOMOSEXUALITY. THE FINAL LINE. BUT STEPS TAKEN.... SHOULD BE EXCLUDED FOR THIS ALLOWS REVERSE DISCRIMINATION.

THE SECTION.... TO OWN PROPERTY....THE RIGHT TO OWN PROPERTY SHOULD BE FURTHER GUARANTEED BY SAYING "TO OWN PROPERTY INCLUDING CHATTELS IN TOTAL FREEDOM,OR IN FEE SIMPLE."

IN THE SECTION ECONOMIC & SOCIAL RIGHTS.... TO FREEDOM OF FAMILY STRUCTURE.... WE BELIEVE SHOULD BE GROUPED WITH CIVIL & POLITICAL RIGHTS BUT THE FINAL • THE RIGHT TO DECIDE FREELY ....SHOULD EXPRESSLY EXCLUDE ABORTION AS A MEANS OF ACHIEVING THIS RIGHT.

WE BELIEVE THAT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THIS SECTION SHOULD READ "A PERSON HAS THE FOLLOWING RIGHTS "TO THE PERSUIT OF."

THE SECTION HEADED.... COMMUNITY & CULTURAL RIGHTS....SHOULD ALSO HAVE THE WORDS "TO THE PERSUIT OF" ADDED AS THE ABOVE SECTION.

THE FOLLOWING ARE OUR OBSERVATIONS ON SECTION 6. AGREEMENT FOR & AGAINST A BILL OF RIGHT.

6.1.1 WE ARE IN TOTAL AGREEMENT WITH THIS PARAGRAPH.

.3 ANY TIME CONSTRAINTS ARE THE RESULT OF THE PARTY POLITICAL SYSTEM DRIVING PARLIAMENT, RATHER THAN THE PEOPLE BEING REPRESENTED.

.5 WE SHOULD NOT ACCEPT INTERNATIONAL LAW AS AN AUTHORITY IN OUR STATES COURTS.

.7 TO BE AVOIDED AT ALL COST.

6.2 .2 THE RIGHTS WE PRESENTLY HAVE, IF OBSERVED CORRECTLY, WOULD GIVE US THE GUIDANCE & PROTECTION THAT WE ARE SEEKING.

.3 WE AGREE STRONGLY THAT TO DEFINE HUMAN RIGHTS IS TO LIMIT THOSE RIGHTS. WE DO NOT AGREE THAT ENTRENCHED RIGHTS BECOME FOSSILISED.

.4 IGNORE THE FACT THAT THE CROWN IS PART OF OUR PARLIAMENTARY SYSTEM & NO ACT WHICH INFRINGES OUR RIGHTS SHOULD EVER BE SIGNED INTO LAW BY THE GOVERNOR. THE CROWN IS AN INTEGRAL PART OF OUR PARLIAMENTS SOVEREIGNTY & THEREFORE RIGHTS PROTECTED BY THE CROWN ARE NOT UNDEMOCRATIC.

LATER IN THIS SAME PARAGRAPH WE POINT OUT THAT JUDGES ARE APPOINTED TO INTERPERATE & ADMINISTER THE LAW & POLICY DECISIONS ARE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PARLIAMENT.

.5 A BILL OF RIGHTS WOULD ONLY FRUSTRATE GOVERNMENT, ACTING AGAINST THE PEOPLE.

7. OTHER METHODS OF ENHANCING....

.4 INTERNATIONALLY ADOPTED HUMAN RIGHTS NORMS SHOULD BE AVOIDED AT ALL COST, FOR WE BELIEVE THAT THESE COVERNANTS ARE MOST OFTEN VEHICLES TO DRIVE AN AGENDA (i.e. THE COVERNANT ON THE RIGHTS OF A CHILD.) TO DESTROY THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY UNIT.

9. ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION.

1. DOES THE COMMON LAW & SPECIFIC STATUTE LAW PROVIDE ADEQUATE PROTECTION? YES IT DOES. PROVIDING THE GOVERNOR OBSERVES GODS LAW & REFRAINS FROM GIVING ASSENT TO ANY BILL THAT CONTRAVENES OUR RIGHTS AS HANDED TO US IN THE BRITISH BILL OF RIFGTS, MAGNA CARTA & HABIUS CORPUS.

2. IF THERE ARE ANY OTHER RIGHTS THAT WE WISH TO PRESERVE FOR THE PEOPLE THEN THOSE RIGHTS SHOULD BE ENTRENCHED IN THE QUEENSLAND CONSTITUTION THROUGH SUPPLIMENTARY LEGISLATION, PROVIDING THAT SUCH