



Submission No 164

Inquiry into potential reforms of National Security Legislation

Organisation: Professor Jo Wainer

Sent: Monday, 20 August 2012 9:44 AM
To: Committee, PJCIS (REPS)
Subject: RE: Inquiry into potential reforms of National Security Legislation

Dear Mr Secretary,

The proposed changes to the National Security Legislation will result in a substantial and unacceptable reversal of the relationship between government and the governed. This Orwellian proposal, to allow unlimited intrusion into the private lives of citizens, is completely unacceptable and wrong headed. I understand the felt need to monitor threats and respond appropriately. However this proposed legislative extension of surveillance powers is achieving through our democratic process the goals of those who seek to undermine our free society. that goal is the imposition of state control over citizens, to suit the purpose of the governing elite. We, the governed, have not consented to this.

When this type of proposal was first mooted, with the suggested introduction of the Australia card, the population revolted and the idea was withdrawn. Since then the powers of surveillance have expanded enormously and we are all now filmed, scanned, photographed, tracked and monitored until the sense of intrusion has become overwhelming.

History is replete with examples of the tyranny that results when the State accumulates overweening power. We know that power corrupts. This is what the people of Libya and Syria are fighting against.

Just in case you have forgotten, in a democracy, government works for the people. We are citizens, not suspects. There has been no public discussion, no debate, and no consent. You do not have my consent to track my communications.

You do not have my consent to track me and i object strongly to the proposed expansion of surveillance powers. Privacy and freedom of expression are fundamental building blocks of citizenship. Without these the rest of the edifice crumbles.

This is a very serious issue. It must receive full and frank and lengthy public discussion, not a two week, unpublicised, and completely unsatisfactory review.

Sincerely,

Professor Jo Wainer AM