

**Subject:** Telecommunications (Interception and Access) Amendment (Data Retention) Bill 2014  
**Date:** Sunday, 7 December 2014 7:38:30 PM  
**Importance:** High

---

I am sending this e-mail in opposition to the proposed data retention bill since my Member of Parliament does not express any interest in doing so, even on behalf of his electorate despite being a member of the government and also having knowledge in this area through his studies in engineering and computers.

As governments can never be trusted and given the power of retrospective legislation which is immoral, the additional security legislation introduced in 2014 has already been excessive, especially concerning additional ASIO powers that can be accessed by way of a single warrant, from a single individual, without review. While such new powers might suit those in government well, they are concerning to regular Australians, who can easily feel as though the new powers can be used for the purposes of the exploitation of the public rather than in their defense. The government can never guarantee anything, just compare any government's pre-election promises and post election actions. The Telecommunication (Interception and Access) Amendment (Data Retention) Bill 2014 will solidify these powers if passed, hence my opposition to it. Additionally, the additional costs imposed on telecommunications companies are likely to be passed down to consumers at least in part, which could not come at a worse time. Already, low and middle income earners are struggling with increasing frequency in the midst of a declining economy. This bill, in combination with the ASIO amendment passed on the 25th September 2014, is both socially and economically irresponsible. We don't want to be a defacto communist style country hidden under the skirt of democracy. Finally, research and data from other nations where similar measures have been passed questions, keenly, the effectiveness of data retention. Data retention measures have been found to be ineffective in preventing terrorism and preventing more domestic crime.

As a result, I find no reason to support any aspect of the upcoming amendment and the speed with which this has gone through without proper and informed public debate.