

2024-05-13 Graham and John speak with Australian constitutional experts...

Well, hi everybody and welcome to Club Grubbery and it's Monday the 13th of May. It's, uh, it's all happening. It really is all happening all around the world. There's so much stuff going on at the moment. I've noticed a whole lot of stuff coming out of America with Cuomo and, uh, you know, there's Debra Bricks and uh, they're all starting to say, yep, we did the wrong thing.

So anyhow, let's get straight into it. Johnny, welcome back to another week, mate. A very big week this week. Yeah, mate. It was great to, uh, go up to Gold Coast on the weekend and celebrate the 30, uh, year anniversary of, of the, uh, vaccine network. Uh, and, uh, we, we were very honored to attend that. It was a great weekend and, and boy, oh boy, it really opened our eyes.

They've been at this for 30 years, those people, and they've copped everything that could be possibly thrown at the citizens of this country by other citizens. And uh, we're really going to ramp up our efforts with the ABN because it's all about vaccines and protecting our kids and we've got to get into this and we will be.

And to help us understand all the legal ramifications around the things that have been going on the last four years. Johnny. We are blessed to have Professor Augusto Zimmerman from the Sheridan Institute in WA, Professor of Law. Welcome to the show, Augusto. Thanks. Go ahead. It's a pleasure to talk with you and if your colleagues as well.

Thank you very much, my friend. And Tim Dwyer, who's been on the program a couple of times, John, I love the backdrop. That's where our government should be housed at this moment. Instead of that dump up the hill, uh, Tim Dwyer, you, you, um, you astounded me, uh, at, uh, Gamaraka, I think it was when we shared a stage together and your knowledge is incredible.

And I'm really heartened to see that you're working with Professor Zimmerman. To bring about some changes and challenge the system a little bit. And we look forward to talking to you both tonight about that. Our pleasure. Gentlemen, the rule of law, um, what on earth has happened to the rule of law in this country in the last few years?

I mean, it is absolutely trashed. The Australian constitution of 1901 just doesn't seem to have any weight at all. Professor Zimmerman, please enlighten us. Well, this is a, uh, a difficult, uh, question to answer because of the many instances of, uh, Of disregard for the concept of the rule of law, uh, to the point that, uh, Professor Gabriel Moyes and I, a couple of, uh, probably two years ago published this book here, which is, um, which is entitled Emergency Powers, COVID 19 Restrictions and Mandatory Vaccination, a Rule of Law Perspective.

I guess that most, um, uh, of our members of the legal profession, uh, if they hadn't been my They might not even know what the rule of law actually means. And that's the main problem. They, um, probably what I would regard as a legal theorist, they are legal positivists by default, which it means that they just are there to apply the rules of an oppressive regime, and very faithfully so.

Uh, so the rule of law has not been being understood as something that is connected with a classical liberal tradition of protecting individual rights and freedoms, and more properly separating the powers of the state, so that we do not have the concentration of powers that, um, you know, causing most of the problem.

Another thing I have to say is that The lack of such separation, which is an important component of the doctrine of separation of powers and the rule of law as a result, leads to the fact that you have some people, especially in the executive branch of government, passing Regulations and executive decrease in a rather authoritarian manner.

So you saw these, especially during the lockdowns when chief health advisors could, um, enact a decrease, uh, closing borders and forcing people into certain things, including vaccination. So this is totally contrary to the idea of legal certainty and that the law must ultimately be a protector. Of individual rights and freedoms and not the agent by which the government undermines these rights and freedoms.

So we need to make sure that the idea of law is intrinsically connected with a common law tradition, where the ultimate purposes of having government and having laws. There is a law ultimately to achieve, uh, a fair society to achieve the common good and to protect these rights, as I have mentioned.

Professor Zimmerman, we shared a stage together at the Triple Conference in Albury and your lecture there was just outstanding. We, we, um, we understand that there's something like just under 50,000 laws and statutes in this country, which is, which means that there's not one person on the planet in this country, rather, who isn't breaking the law, because how can you know that many laws and former Prime Minister Julia Gillard passed 18,000 pieces of legislation.

In her time in office, I mean, how, how can the judiciary and the law enforcement agencies in this country keep up with that kind of legislation? Well, not only that, but these laws, if it was not bad enough that we have far too many of them. And, you know, if you have too many laws, that is also a complicating factor for the realization of the rule of law, because one of the assumptions within our tradition is that you know, uh, the existing laws so that you can more properly.

Abide to this loss. But if you do not have the capacity to know all this 40 50 or whatever thousands of thousands of laws, so it's going to be impossible for you to behave as a law abiding person, even if you try. And another thing I have to say is that law. In our tradition, as I mentioned before. This was associated with the idea of liberty, the idea of individual liberty.

And Saint Augustine used to say, and he said in the City of God and many other of his writings, that an unjust law is not law at all. And Saint Thomas Aquinas had a similar understanding of the matter to say that an unjust law is a defective law and it's not a law, shouldn't be considered a law at all.

Properly so called. So we have also, you know, um, legal tradition, something called natural law. And a part of these, uh, tradition that was so much important for the establishment of common law principles in, uh, especially England. Uh, these, um, principles contain an element of lawful rights to resist. So, uh, the Americans used The lawful right to resist tyranny as a principle when they decided to break ranks and to start the revolutionary process in America.

So if the law is used as an instrument of oppression, then the people have another legal right, which I would perhaps describe it as a lawful right to resist tyranny and to resist, um, uh, comments that, uh, Not directed at the common good and not directed to the protection of these rights, but they are ultimately aiming, uh, the concentration of powers, uh, in the hands of a few for the purposes of a more tyrannical or authoritarian exercise of power.

And certainly this is actually. Somehow being facilitated by the fact that the courts have authorized the executive to behave as a legislator, so further undermining as a result, uh, the doctrine of separation of powers because only the parliament should create laws and the Executive is supposed to be only enforcing them.

Another thing that I find disgraceful is the fact that we have now heads of state represented representing the king in theory, actually being more directly serving the government of the day, and being appointed for such a purpose. So you see, in Western Australia, the fact that The current, uh, governor was, uh, a very terrible police commissioner who behave in against style here in Western Australia.

And he was also a, uh, the recipient of a second title during that Covid Madness, which is the title of Vaccine Commander. He was a vaccine commander and, uh, and because of his good service to a very. Terribly oppressive regime. This regime has now appointed him as the governor of Western Australia.

Johnny. Well, what can you say? Uh, I'd like to get your thoughts on the World Economic Forum and the WHO and whether, whether under the constitution under section 44, 44. 1, whether your support of the WEF or the WHO. Effectively brings that, uh, section in the constitution under play adherence or, uh, to, to a foreign body.

In a certain sense, this should be also observed in conjunction with Section 5129. Obviously, no international agreement should be enforceable in Australia because we Thankfully, as a result of a good decision made by the founders decided that international law is not law in Australia and shouldn't be considered as such.

So if the High Court appeals to international law, they are actually acting against the Constitution, because the Constitution is very clear in stating that That, um, international law is no law in Australia. It can only become so if it is turned into domestic legislation via the use of the external affairs power.

So even the signing and ratification of an international treaty. Convention, it's not, it doesn't have the force of law until it is used as a, um, uh, as, as an instrument to increase the powers of the federal parliament. And therefore, uh, with the combination of this. The use of inconsistency, uh, render any state law or any existing law to the country as, um, legally invalid one.

But, um, international law must be also interpreted once it is turned into domestic law, into our, into something that it, that protects the, the, the rights and, and freedoms of the people. So what I have to say about this is very clear that, um. Any international law must not contradict constitutional law, so that even if an international treaty is introduced in the form of domestic legislation, this law cannot contain any element or any provision that contradicts the spirit and the latter.

Of the Australian constitution. Timmy, um, Tim, I know your wife won't mind me saying this. Corinne would, uh, would know this for a fact, but, um, you have a, you have a mistress and the mistress is the constitutional law of Australia. Um, you've spent, I don't know how much, probably most of your adult life studying it, looking into it and your presentation, the simplicity, the way you present it makes the every, every man understand where we're at.

Should borders have ever been closed under the constitution? No, the, once, once we were federated all, um, colonial borders. Disappeared. The only border we have is the water border, the, the 12 mile limit, um, within Australia, um, to close down those borders, which aren't borders. They are, they are

there for a, um, basically a political redistribution. So is that we can have States, but they are not a border that can be closed. So is it the policemen or the military as we found going through the Northern territory, um, would stand there and block the highway and demand your papers. It was like West Germany and East Germany.

It was, it was very interesting, but according to the constitution, we do not have internal borders. Is that right? Augusta. Look, there's a borders issue was one of the leading causes of the decision made by the framers to turn us into a federated Commonwealth, because prior to 1901, the colonies had had their own laws, of course, colonial colonial powers, and, and they were not united as a federation.

But the idea of unite. Uniting the continent into a federation was caused by the fact that there were borders who caused obstacles for the movement of peoples. and commerce. So one of the most important provisions in the constitution is derived from section 92 of the document explicitly stating that the movement of individuals and products should be and most must be absolutely free.

Absolutely free. But of course, the high court, uh, made a different view of the matter because it decided to say that the word up the term absolutely free now means that it can be really relativized as a result of a so called, uh, emergency. power. So Western Australia closed the borders. I must say that I spent about two years living in

this relatively comfortable concentration camp called Western Australia, not allowed even to go to my second job that I had in the past at Notre Dame in Sydney because the borders were closed.

So the use of emergency power here justified a cross violation. of the most important, perhaps in the mind, the minds of the framers, the most important provision to be founded the constitution because it's the whole reason as to how we got united in the first place to allow individuals and and products and and everything else to be freely Moved from one state into another.

So yes, I completely agree with you team that this is another evidence that constitutional constitutional framework is being completely destroyed or very remarkably ignored. Gentlemen, before we go any further, Professor. Zimmerman, can you tell us a bit more of your background prior to your professorship at Sheridan?

Because I think it's really important that we understand just how much knowledge you have in this. I could spend a couple of minutes now, but I'll try to think about what I should say. So I was vice president and vice president of the Liberal Party, one of the divisions here in Western Australia. But I'm not proud of this, perhaps I should not even have said so.

Another thing is that I was a law reform commissioner. serving Western Australia for five years. And I hope that I have prevented some bad things to have happened as a commissioner. I was an Associate Dean for Research at Murdoch University, Associate Dean for Research at the Murdoch Law School. I was for three years.

15 years constitutional law professor and unit coordinator of constitutional law and jurisprudence. I'm president of the Western Australian Theory Association. I'm editor in chief of the Western Australian Jurist Law Journal. And I'm a vice president, former vice president, president of the Australian Society of Legal Philosophy.

And better to stop by here. So that's some of my qualifications. Yeah. Thank you for that. We could have done a whole program on that, but I'm going to ask you a question. I, I understand if you don't want to answer it, but to, to most people watching this, Um, the law has really suffered badly in this country.

We have lost faith in the, in the, um, in the judicial system. Is it a, is it a bridge too far to say that the judicial system has become corrupted in this country? I think it has been, uh, Quite undesirable the behavior of, uh, of some of, uh, some members of the judicial elite. And I think this is caused by a state, the state of legal education in this country, uh, combined with the fact that judges are appointed by the government of the day.

So if it was not bad enough that the process by which judges are appointed in Australia. is utterly undesirable. We have this also in combination with the fact that most lawyers are not aware of jurisprudence. So they actually are not really true common lawyers, but they are just legal practitioners.

And they think that the role of the lawyer is to apply the law regardless of consequences. So if they actually were True common lawyers, they would understand that there are some protections that are derived from a tradition based on on common law tradition based on natural law and and also based on the rule of law principles or principles of the rule of law.

But you know, if you talk for about a second with a lawyer in Australia. Normally, you get the understanding very quickly that he knows nothing about common law, knows nothing about the rule of law, knows absolutely nothing about jurisprudence, but he knows something about the sovereignty of Parliament.

Meaning that the parliament can do whatever parliament wants. The only thing the parliament cannot do that was the saying the 19th century is to turn a woman into a man and the minute for a woman. But I guess that at this point, this, uh, small problem has been fixed by them. Good grief, Johnny. It'd be interesting to get, uh, your, your take on the national law and where that fits into the constitution.

Uh, perhaps. Uh, the organizations that have really been a real issue in this, uh, whole, uh, vaccine, uh, mandate debate have been APRA, the, the, the regulator of doctors. Uh, and now I'm being told off the record that, uh, a

number of senior doctors signed non disclosure agreements. Uh, with, with health, uh, officials, uh, and, and we're not vaccinated.

Uh, a number of them were given fake vaccine passports. Uh, we hear a lot about this national law. Nobody seems to know anything about it. Well, we you mean the, the law that, uh, forced, uh, this, uh, us to be vaccinated? Well, this national law is, is what the, the, the regulators rely on. Mm-Hmm. . Mm-Hmm. to, to, uh, essentially punish doctors and, yeah.

Well, the, the, the law, the law is unconstitutional. Uh, the cons, I am not, uh, into the specificities of. Stupid laws because I don't have time to be reading garbage. But but as a constitutional professor, it's very simple to answer the these laws mandating the inoculation of an experiment on people's bodies.

It's actually in gross violation. Of that section that I have mentioned so many times section 5123 a, um, you know, you have not only that clear provision saying that nobody must be subject to a medical or pharmaceutical treatment without his or her consent, but you know, ever since that amendment was introduced to the document into the document.

You have also. Decisions made by the high court, reinforcing the fact that nobody must be subject to coercive medical treatment. So I just don't understand, or I better say, perhaps I understand, but, uh, it's for a more sinister reason that, uh, these people are doing so, that they are in violation or, or they are preaching that, uh, provision that appears to be so clear to me.

So, uh, authoritarian regimes, they tend to find excuses to disobey the law. And they actually always claim an emergency. What, what makes the Australian people so naive and so stupidly naive is that they don't, they don't know anything about history. I mean, uh, out of Hitler, they didn't have to revoke or repeal the German constitution.

The German constitution was kept intact. But the vehicle, uh, by which authoritarian regimes established is always Always emergency power. So emergency power is always you. You don't have dictators telling us here. We are going to be terrible. We are going to oppress you. Now they're going to say we are going to protect you.

They are going to say that they are going to look after you. But of course, you have to exchange all your freedoms and rights for This false sense of security. And I think if I'm not wrong, it was Benjamin Franklin who said that those who exchange safety for freedom or freedom for safety end up having none of these two.

Because, uh, if you give, if you trust government too much to, to give you whatever you want, guess what? The government will be powerful enough to take away everything you have. Unbelievable. You know, there's a, um, uh, a concept called the color of law. Now the color of law in layman's terms, it looks like the law.

It sounds like the law it's spoken by those who you trust to know the law, but it is not the law. And Australia at the moment, in my opinion, is running a hundred percent under the color of law. Not the actual law. And unfortunately Augusto is correct, that so many Australian people don't know the truth.

Now the reason people don't even understand that we have a constitution, that it was taken out of the schools in 1973 or 74, and was not taught any longer in the education system. Now, it wasn't forbidden, it was just taken out of the curriculum. And the schools cannot teach that which is not in the curriculum.

And so people of my age and younger have no idea we even had a constitution until the referendum comes around. Oh yeah, we've got a, we've got a constitution. Don't know anything about it, but we got one. And yet it is possibly one of the most brilliant legal documents of the modern era for the protection of the people, except it's been withdrawn from their knowledge base and even here in South Australia, I was talking to a young lawyer.

And they don't get taught constitutional law that's any older than 25 years. Like that's still within the Whitlam range where everything was, you know, we had a bloodless coup d'etat, the country was stolen, not a shot fired. And when you talk to them about all the cases, it's like one of your Boeing 707s, just goes right over their head.

They've got no idea. And so the legal fraternity. As far as the law is, the actual law is concerned, uh, don't know. And those that do know will capitulate to whoever he's being paid by. Like I've had phone calls and phone calls these last couple of weeks from people in the federal court, in the Supreme court and in the high court being literally snowballed and given ridiculous responses.

And won't even allow the cases to be heard. And one guy went into court with two sack trucks full of documents to present his case. No, not allowed. And that was in, that was in the federal court. And he had the documents to prove that a certain bank had altered all his contracts and forged his signatures.

And he had other documents to prove that his first attempt at going into the federal court, the federal court had altered documents, photocopied it and altered his signature. And no, he's got no place to go because the, the, those that are the honorable are proving not to be so. So the people have no place of recourse that can be trusted.

Here lies our issue. And when, when, when good people are faced with bad laws, I think John Fitzgerald Kennedy sort of half got it right. If the people are denied a peaceful resolution, the end result will be a violent revolution and we don't want that. We want a peace resolution. We just want honesty, integrity.

And somebody to stand by the law. We have the law, the law is written. And yet we have nobody with the gumption, the backbone, the, the. Moral integrity in office to stand by. Where, where do we go from here then? Because clearly the legal system is collapsing. Like the medical system health has gone education, which is really the main cause of both those other institutions falling out of a let's face it, education, university educations now, nothing to write home about.

In fact, they're indoctrination. Everyone knows that it's all about money, money, money. But where do we go from here? You two are working together. I believe. Well, Augusto is throwing some good ideas at me when I ask him a question. Um, he gives me two answers, maybe three sometimes. And then I have to go and figure out which is going to work the best.

Yeah. Now look, uh, solution, talking about solution, when you're dealing with, um, with, uh, a government that they see, uh, action to undermine the rule of law, when you have a government that is so, uh, outrageously Authoritarian. Uh, we have to think about, uh, the the avenues, the mechanisms that, uh, that are still available for Action for changing things, and I am not necessarily the center of entirely positive news, but I don't think that the final answer that I could give is necessarily of a bad.

Or negative nature. I think what I have to see is people to be more realistic about this matter and understand that this is far more complicated than just going to the court and see if they can find. A nice judge who will, uh, treat them properly. I don't think this is so, uh, expectable given the reasons, uh, but due, due to the reasons I have exposed, uh, the fact that, uh, judges are part of the establishment.

They are part of the ruling classes. So I feel that the best way to go while we still have the channel not entirely closed. is the political avenue. I think the best way to go is to still, uh, have a good political strategy to renew, uh, the composition of the parliament and to perhaps entrench certain characteristics of the rule of law.

That perhaps not not just to be placed in theory. I think we need to make sure that there is a much better comprehension or understanding of the need of separating the branches of government and certainly making sure that judges are appointed properly. And these judges are going to be serving. Not the establishment, but rather the common good and upholding the rule of law accordingly.

There's been a lot of talk recently about a particular judgment, and you may be aware of it, involving Julian Gillespie. Yeah. And his crew with, uh, with Judge Helen Roth, um, who clearly has a conflict of interest if everything that we're seeing is to be believed and it looks that way. She represented Pfizer and Moderna, I believe.

Um, and she hasn't declared any of these conflicts of interest and she's handed, she's virtually kicked the case out of court based on a lack of standing. Yeah. When the, uh, lawyers arrived with truckloads of documents relating to the death. an injury of Australians who've been, who've been injured by the vaccine.

I mean, that's why I say that you have to be very careful because you are legitimizing. Very problematic system by appealing to those who are serving it. So I don't think the legal avenue is the best one at the moment. I believe that what you need to think is in terms of political gain and to make sure that the parliaments are entirely renewed.

And so, for instance, in terms of political strategy, it seems that in the last election. Labour got, around what, 33 percent of the votes, something like that. Even less than the Liberals. None of these two deserve to be in power. I'm just saying that the one that is in power even got less votes than the Liberals.

And in my list from 1 to 10, when I had to cast my vote, I placed the Liberals in number 10. And the reason I did so is because I absolutely abhorred what the Scott, Scott Morrison regime did to us. Because as a constitutional law academic, I knew that they could have done far more than they did. And rather than actually protecting us from the tyranny of these demented premiers, what Scott Morrison did was to support it.

was supported. And, and even before the vaccine became so compulsory, he was telling us that he would try to make it as mandatory as possible. So I really. detest this, this, this human being. I find him to be a despicable human being. And then I put the libros at the very bottom because of Scott Morrison. I even wrote a book in his honor called Deconstructing Squamo together with Rocco Locoyane.

It became a bestseller. Uh, I think it seems that, and of course that would have twice the number of pages now, because I got to know even more things about him that are not very, uh, Uh, complimentary. But, um, that that's that's the whole thing. We have to actually think about what happened to the other 33 percent of the votes that didn't actually resulted in at least us having more members in Parliament.

So why you have to do is to actually get these leaders of these small parties, including The likes of Clive Palmer or, and I would say Pauline Hanson and others just stop with this thing of, of, of personality cult and starting to get united and set up a block, a political block that can actually effectively win an election.

I mean, the vote, the votes of those who opposed the Lib Lab mafia. was almost the same of the votes that went to these two parties. So why on earth, the, the Labour Party is empowered, you know? So we have to think about better strategy on the political level, uh, to be making sure that this, uh, history doesn't repeat itself next time.

Do you think that, uh, what's happening now is a real wake up call? I mean, I look at the vaccines now and I'm concerned about the, all vaccines. I think we need to have a look at what they're doing and the COVID situation has really woken people up as to what's been going on previously. I mean, Have the courts always been this bad?

Is it just that the COVID stuff's, uh, accentuated just how rotten they are? Have they always been letting out pedophiles and murderers at the High Court or, or, or do we, uh, is this just something new? Well, the High Court in Australia has a tradition of never taking into consideration the intention of the constitutional drafter.

So the Constitution has been corrupted since, especially the 1920s, when a particular um, Uh, person who used to be or was better saying a member of the Constitutional Convention, um, was appointed, uh, to become one of the justices of the High Court. And his name is Isaac Isaacs. And Isaac Isaacs in the early 20s decided to explode Two doctrines that were used by the founders to protect the constitution.

One is called the implied immunity of instrumentality is basically to protect state state rights. And the other one is the state, uh, reserved powers. So saying that the states, the powers belonging to the state should never be taken away from the states as they currently are. Especially via the corporation's use of the corporation's power and, um, the external affairs power.

So, uh, basically the constitution has been, uh, corrupted and has been undermined for a hundred years at this point. And that was one of the causes of the attempt by the Western Australian to secede. Because they saw that the the original intent, uh, given to us by the framers had been completely, um, uh, completely disregarded by the high court.

This process ultimately led to further Concentration of powers and centralization of power in Canberra. So what we need to do perhaps is to reestablish the distribution of legislative powers in a more proper manner and make sure that the powers that shouldn't belong to the Commonwealth returned to the States.

And at the same time, make sure that ministers can be impeached by Parliament. And that perhaps could work better if the ministers were. chosen also by merit rather than just being members of parliament. Like, I find it outrageous that the health minister in Western Australia has a degree in journalism from one of our worst universities in Western Australia, ECU.

I mean, she is definitely not qualified to be holding a portfolio such as this. The only reason that she became, I should say, As to why she became the health minister is that she supports a pro death agenda. And it seems that labor associates health with killing babies and killing the elderly, because that's the only thing that she used to talk about, about selling us the vaccine to protect our lives.

So the pro death MP. Is selling us a vaccine, sending us the message that vaccine is safe and effective when the only thing she did before campaigning for this was to promote abortion and euthanasia. So can you actually, you need to be really stupid to believe that these people want to save lives, don't you think?

Yeah, well, look, the police minister in New South Wales, she was a librarian. Uh, you know, it just demonstrates just what a disgrace this whole parliamentary system is. Tim Dwyer, you, you, uh, you, you working constantly on where to from here. Tell us about what's, what's coming up for you guys at the moment.

Well, we've, we started off a couple of years ago and worked on it for a while. And we wanted to look at bringing a people's initiated referenda and to do that separate to any government entities whatsoever. And in doing that through a lot of different conversations, one of the things that was pointed out that we need to exhaust all other avenues of having our constitution literally reestablished to have the high court rule that yes, all those in parliament who have not sworn the law for life, according to the schedule and the note, Um, if they haven't done that, they're sitting in office unlawfully because there's no provision otherwise.

And therefore, they would be impersonating Commonwealth officials, which every time they do that, they're liable for possibly two years imprisonment per offense. And so we thought we would have a bit of a look down that path to start the process. Well, I started the process a couple of times and then it changed and then it changed again.

And of recent times, I think I'm on a fool's errand approaching the high court for these two cases, uh, to bring 226 politicians to the high court for not swearing their oath. When it appears that the high court, according to Uh, something I bumped into the other week is a part of the corporate commonwealth and not Of the commonwealth and the corporate commonwealth and the commonwealth are separate by law um, and so I thought well i'm literally taking a Taking a chicken into the house of wolves and um, I won't get any response in there I don't think now I still think what i'm going to do is i'm going to lodge the case So is that the high court can not hear the case?

You And in doing that, then I can wave that flag to the people and say, look, here's the evidence, you make up your mind and run a referendum on a couple of different issues. Um, and one of the issues that I would run the referendum on would be that the high court of Australia, Um, not have the power that it has and the constitution law, like the, uh, but people don't understand the constant, the, the, the government has to run under the constitution.

Now they're running under their own constitution, not our constitution. There's not a lot of difference, but there's enough to make a difference. And in doing this, we would have constitutional guardians. We would put the guardians in place. of people of high caliber or knowledge of the constitution and any law passed by the parliament would have to go via the guardians because clearly the high court have no interest in protecting the constitution or the people of this country.

And so, and that's by their demonstration more than anything, right? And so one of the things I'm, I'm now looking at, we've been ticking around the edges and we've, we've found a handful of very, very, very, very wealthy people. Who have indicated they would put up that stump up between them, uh, 68 million to help run the referendum.

And we have a, an app which is on the blockchain that people can, we can, everybody can download the app and we can put the constitutional referendum questions. To everybody in the country that's got a mobile phone and the people for no cost, no, no effort, just read the questions, pick their answers, vote in the referendum.

And this would give us a feel for where the people are actually at. So as I think then, um, Augusto was talking about setting, you know, making sure the political scene changed. I think we could then under, with that knowledge and, and that base, we could then turn around and say to a lot of people in minor parties, because right now I don't trust the political system one bit.

I don't trust the counting of the vote. Uh, I know what happened when I ran for the Senate. They were told the people that I spoke to afterwards were told to throw 50 percent of Fraser Enning's vote in the bin. Um, so, you know, I don't trust the voting process because it's as crooked as, as the rest of it.

But I think what we've got to do is perhaps hit it with such an overwhelming force if we're going to go that way, that it literally cannot be denied. You can't throw that amount of votes out. And one of the key things we have to stop is pre polling votes. You poll on the day, you do not, like, okay, there can be some postal votes if people are incapacitated or whatever, but you poll on the day.

You don't poll a week before, 10 days before. You don't do any of that because those votes can be mucked around with and clearly I believe that's what happens to a lot of the pre poll votes and so the polling would only be on the day. But we're going to still push forward for a people's referendum because I believe it's the people of this country that should really have the say in this country, not a bunch of people in the pocket of Klaus Schwab or the WHO or anybody else, the United Nations, the Australian people.

This is your country. And when was the last time anybody listening to this went to the bank and said, look, I'm sick of cash. Can you go digital, please get rid of all this paper and stuff. I'm sick of it. When was the last time anybody went to any politician in this country and said, look, please give me a digital ID and track me like a sheep and a cow, because I'm sick of being free.

I don't like my freedoms. I just want to be tracked and corralled and controlled. When was the last time anybody in this country went to their politicians and said any of that stuff? It's not coming from Australia. And so it should not be encumbered on Australians. And it's time that we, the Australian people literally, we can't all come together and work together in one block because we're all individuals.

Augusto's knowledge on the constitution is far superior to mine, but I know if I've got a real big question and I'm, I'm tricked up by it, I've only got to make one phone call and I get an answer or two, um, but. Your personalities here on Club Grubbery are different to somebody else's and everybody else.

But we as a people, we as a people, we are Australians, not by citizenship, but we are Australians by character. We are Australians. That love freedom. We are larrikins and we'll take the piss out of anybody we possibly can and have a laugh with them while we do it. We are not to be corralled by, oh you can't say that, oh you shouldn't say this.

We are Australians. We work hard. We dream big. Look at what we've built. We dream big but now we're being corralled down into being just minions going to and from work. And being paid little for it. Ladies and gentlemen of Australia, we are bigger than this. We are stronger than this. We are better than this and we should not let low life people control the high goals and minds, spirits, and the boldness that this country has.

We need to do really, really something big, something that will shake the core of this earth around the world. It'll be felt from Australia all over the world. So that's what I'm about. Wow. Um, yeah, more power to you for that, uh, Tim Augusto, uh, in Aubrey, I heard you finish off your presentation very passionately.

You virtually said that the constitution demands defense and you were going to plant your flag on the hill and you were going to defend it with everything. Do you still stand by that? I totally stand by that. And, um, you know, one of the reasons as to why most of the referenda. Which is the plural of referendum have been rejected.

It's that the oligarchs have proposed that we should give to them more power, and we have been wise enough to say no. But the High Court has in many, on many occasions, fixed the problem that they perceived. By allowing a method of constitutional interpretation to be used so as to nullify the decision made by the people in this previous referendum.

So what I have to say is that, um, uh, You know, a referendum should be the method or the primary means by which the people make a decision regarding constitutional law matters. And the High Court should be just upholding the document and and being faithful to the letter and the spirit of the document.

But unfortunately that's not what it's, uh, what is happening or what even happened, uh, in the past. But, um, Regarding, regarding, uh, people, uh, I was in Melbourne, uh, recently have just returned from Melbourne and I can see the Change in popular population of terms of the city. I just saw so many people speaking different languages and they do not some of them even properly speaking English.

And that I think it's a population replacement strategy. It's quite clear to me that when you talk about Australians being, uh, this sort of people who are self resilient and bold and independent. That's why they are killing people. That's why they have the vaccines and other things to reduce the population.

So we do not have actually realized. That's what we are envisaging at the moment is a population replacement. The borders are all be open hundreds of thousands of people coming to this country and the death rate. amongst Australians has jumped to around 20 percent increase. So, I mean, that's quite clear to me that what they want is to replace the native population with new e commerce who actually do not share a world view and do not come from, Cultures and traditions that, that, uh, have the same appreciation for individual rights and freedoms, and even knowledge of a common law history.

Do you think that's why they're fearful of a Royal commission Augusta? That they, they know they'll get caught out. Well, you know, I'm not so sure because I don't trust anything coming from or organized by the ruling classes. So I'm not so sure where the Royal Commission is the solution because I want to see who is going to be appointed to be members of the Royal Commission.

I think we still believe in a system that has been so corrupt that I don't think that anything can come from it. Well, I think there's two on the screen that we could appoint immediately. Absolutely. Absolutely. I second that one, Johnny. And, uh, we might even ask Augusta and Tim if they'd like to participate as well.

I'm only joking. I'm only joking. Um, we, we've got to wrap this one up sadly. And it's, it's been an eye opener and I think we need to do it again. And I, I hope that we can do this again in the near future. We want to keep updated on this. Um, there's so much going on in this country at the moment. People need to wake up for goodness sake.

If what Tim said, uh, just a few moments ago, hasn't stirred you, please share this stuff around. Make sure that people are hearing these, these issues that we're talking about, because we're not crazies. And, uh, and we got, we're just going to go for it. I mean, The weekend opened my eyes, uh, around vaccinations in general and, and the suffering that's gone on for 30 years at the hands of Big Pharma.

And, you know, John, I, I go back to, and it's all relevant to what we're talking about now, but I go back to, um, our interview with Pierre Chorey, who used to vaccinate people all the time and says he will never ever vaccinate anyone ever again with anything in his life because of the research he's done.

And so I think it beholds all of us now to understand what's going on in this country, to get behind those people who've been trodden on for 30 odd years. I'm talking about the AVN, the Australian Vaccine Network. Um, those people have really been out there educating and they've copped it from every angle.

And it's not only, not only these people, but there's so many other groups that are fighting to get some justice in this country, and we've all got to wake up and support them. So now is the time. It's not the time to sit back and watch My Kitchen Stinks. It's a time to get to know your constitution, understand it, because it is Augusto, am I right to say that the Australian constitution of 1901 is the highest law in the land?

It is the highest law of the land. It has been misinterpreted by the High Court and other alterations have taken place. But I can tell you one thing. It's better to beget it funnily wrong. Sorry, it's better to be finally right, then to be consistently wrong. So, um, the point with the, with the high court is that previous decisions are not to be taken to precedent if they actually are undermining the document.

So my, my understanding is quite clear. That the matters of constitutional law. What really matters is the text of the document is the constitution itself. It is the written constitution and not the opinion of judges who have distorts the meaning and even the spirit of the document. So be careful about people saying that they are following precedent because precedent can be a departure of the original intent of the constitutional frame.

Just on that. One of the things is that this is my second annotated version. The first one fell apart because it got a bit of use. This one's not much better. But, um, if anybody, um, I'm just going to throw this in and I haven't asked what he, so I do apologize if I've stepped the mark here, but if anybody's looking for a copy, an annotated version, and it's a reprint of the original, um, 1901, We, we do, we get them printed.

Um, we get them printed in Western Australia and, uh, shipped over here to South Australia and people can purchase it through us if they want a copy of it. There are 185 hard, it's hard bound, but, um, don't buy it as a book. You want to stick on the shelf and look all pretty. It's a workbook. It's there for you to gain some knowledge.

and have something firm to stand on. Our constitution is the, uh, there's two books, is our constitution and the Holy Bible. They're the only two things you can rely on. Yeah. And talking about Quick and Garin, these were the two of the most active members of the convention that, um, uh, drafted the document.

And, uh, the book was published a few, uh, Years after the decisions were made by the two, two of the most important, uh, contributors to the process that ultimately leading to the final draft. So if you really want to know the intention. Of the legislature behind each of the existing sections, you definitely need to read quick and get it.

And there is no such excuse to not follow the spirit in the letter of the document. Since two of the greatest contributors published a book explaining exactly what they meant section by section. Absolutely. And crazy, uh, situation in the public libraries, there'll be 20 copies of how to have a six change, uh, but not one.

Version of that. Yeah. There you go. In the South. In the South Australian State Library, they have one copy. You can book a time to go and read it. It sits, put on, you've got to put white gloves on and there's a camera above you and a camera in front of you watching what you're reading and who's reading it, but you can't take it home, but you can take home a copy of the Communist Manifesto.

Johnny, you've often been heard to say. You just couldn't make this stuff up, Fanny. You couldn't make this stuff up. Look, gentlemen, we're out of time, really sadly. But I'm going to pester you again, because I want to get you back on, most definitely. We're all four men of God on this screen, and Tim, you did agree before we recorded that you would pray us out, and we'd really love you to do that, if you would please.

My pleasure. Dear heavenly father, we come before you for men of strong minds, strong hearts, and pure intention. Heavenly father, we ask that you would bless this country. You would pour your spirit all over it. You would open the eyes of the people who've been blinded. You would open the ears of those who've been deafened and you would cleanse the mind of those who've been confused.

Heavenly father, only you can pull this country through what it's got to do and only us. Can do it. We, the people as your instruments, as the people of God, as the people of spirit, as the people of hope and heavenly father, as we go out different ways after this call, may you send your spirit before us, bless our paths, keep our minds clear and keep us all safe and bless the people of this country.

I love this country. And by that, I mean, I love the people of this country as you do father and Lord. In all of your ways, hold up Australia. Let us be the beacon that the world needs to see Holy spirit. Amen. Amen. I mean, thank you so much, gentlemen. Uh, Johnny side again. You just couldn't make this stuff up.

You couldn't make this stuff up. Stay out of the trees, everybody. Don't forget what you did yesterday got you to today. Guys, just do this one day at a time. We're, we're, we're a great country. We're filled with wonderful people. And we all have different views on a whole raft of issues, but we are Australian and we love our country and we're going to defend it as best we can.

And so keep loving each other. Remember, if you love somebody and you haven't told them, please give them a call. You may just save their life. Professor Augusto Zimmerman, thank you so much for your time, sir. It's a real pleasure. Thank you so much. It's a pleasure to be engaged in such an enlightening conversation.

It was enlightening for us. I can assure you. And Tim Dwyer, always a pleasure, mate. Um, you've really got a way of stirring the passions of the people in this country and more power to your brother. Thank you very much, Graham. Thanks, John. All right, gentlemen. Well, thank you so much. Watch Clubber at Grubbery again.

We have, uh, Ramesh Thakkar and we have David Bell coming onto the program in the next, uh, I think that's next week, we're lining them both up for the same program. That will be an absolute cracker, John. Yeah. Well, on the eve of this WHO nonsense, uh, no better time to talk to people that know what's really going on.

And we're going to be bringing you all the best that we can bring you. Believe me, we're going to keep it legitimate. We're going to keep it reasonable, respectful, and we're going to keep it lawful. And that's the way we play the game. We're getting there. We are getting there, everybody. So get behind the people you need to and get behind your country.

God bless you. And bye for now from Club Grubbery. God bless you.