



Submission No 44

Inquiry into potential reforms of National Security Legislation

Name Withheld

From: No Thanks
Sent: Wednesday, 8 August 2012 12:35 AM
To: Committee, PJCIS (REPS)
Subject: Submission for Inquiry into potential reforms of National Security Legislation and discussion paper

This writing, is my submission for a Inquiry into potential reforms of National Security Legislation and discussion paper with a title and the word of 'Australia' in it. The submission is written in non-complaint format with that of the requested because the submission is based from documents supplied by the Federal Australian Government which are designed to for-go proper discussion and debate (*must be fun to get paid for sitting on a commission after an election with a hung Parliament - then produce a document that fails to note in point form any proposed changes in a manner that is easy to read and accessible*).

I take exception that the AG propose allowing anyone the right to carry weapons and use them when confronted with a scene that would first require a police negotiator, a fire truck, and perhaps other emergency services here in Australia, and in another country or within another legal boundary that may not be able to provide a service to an acceptable Australian standard (or from where the request to perform an action is made); And this is while considering that the authority of the Australian Federal Police (and other law enforcement) as it currently stands (inclusive of all Australian law enforcement) also fails to give proper notice with backing of service provisions to other emergency services/departments, and even fail to send other emergency services to the locations in advance where any officer who is trained to hold a weapon can use such a weapon.

The subject of 'weapon' could relate to just about anything from the army I would assume - and unless it is noted then the discussion paper is worthless waste of time. The paper fails to note weapon platforms and systems which could also be in use to 'tap' phones such as UAV's and the like.

In light of the issue comes the fact that emergency departments are not notified, or given an allowance of an action by ASIO or ASIS that could result in the use of emergency departments and services such as the fire department and ambulance service. Also there is no consideration given to current operational status of any emergency department until after or even during an operation. Should a major 'terrorist' action occur then the services relied upon to perform under such emergencies would be forced to treat officers from ASIO/ASIS before any member of the public (perhaps to retrieve information from the ASIO/ASIS officers). Such actions, as this paper would allow amount to neglect of the issues at large.

It is also apparent that the writers of this paper had clear intent of using it to obscure the facts under the wrapping of terrorism when it is just a money making exercise for the people who police and sometimes enforce regulation/law.

The law as it currently stands is used to shut people up - and prevent lawful actions by an aggrieved party against the all powerful who reside in places of power such as the Australian Government, Local Governments, and their public services. Never has the information from such as a 'tap' or data collection on a person who commits the act of suicide ever been seen in a coroners court, or any other for that matter - apart from the conviction of the person under suspicion (even without informing the person of conviction or investigation/s).

As of the above I allege that such has already occurred and the office charged with performing a duty which must include safety is clearly lacking any kind of correct review or audit (its described as public safety to remove the rights of the person under a wire-tap for those who can, do, and have acted in such ways as to cause the person under wire-tap to commit self harm).

Australian business has lost millions of dollars for the commercial reasons of some major ISP being able to sell anti-virus software in a country where it is illegal to transmit any kind of virus over the wire.

The current paper as it stands is a work of art - perhaps fiction in some of its statements; The submission guide referred by the committee fails to denote if they would accept encrypted or even digital signed submissions / along with what standards and protocols are supported (apart from html/text email I will assume).

Last, the document called the discussion paper is incorrectly linked on the governments web page redirect; I assert this is to delay a reply, or provide a barrier for those who do not know better; For some web browsers/user/s the document downloads without a PDF file extension (which works on an Apple OS/X operating system without the 8.3 file extension of PDF).

Another area of concern is the use of a never ending pot of gold to feed ISP's money; By using 1meg worth of images in CSS files is just one example - where the images are never shown but are for most part downloaded by unsuspecting users, search engines, and other forms of technologies. Such actions of funding is an act of terrorism considering the same ISP's who would profit from this action are also sometimes the suppliers of the Governments own internet services, and that of the unsuspecting users of such services that visits the Governments service (online, website).

The above issue extends over our boarder onto others where users of such content need to be informed they are downloading data and information which will never be seen - a few Kb is ok but when your having 1Meg of images then this is an issue. Another is offering translation services which fail to translate correctly, and their use not been correctly obtained. A further point is that of text to voice technology where some Government web sites would download a feature that is never required by the end user.