



Submission No 101

Inquiry into potential reforms of National Security Legislation

Organisation: Mr Nathan Hondros

20 August 2012

Joint Parliamentary Committee on Intelligence and Security
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

To the committee

INQUIRY INTO POTENTIAL REFORMS OF NATIONAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

This is a submission to the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Intelligence and Security's *Inquiry into potential reforms of National Security Legislation*.

While there are others who will no doubt eruditely cast their submissions in a well grounded understanding of the legal nature and effect of these proposals, I wish to merely add my voice in opposition to the ever escalating and self-propagating machinery of government that you are considering in order to creep over our freedoms and liberties. I have never in my lifetime seen a proposal from government that would reduce the power and influence of the state.

Yet, governments of both persuasions ceaselessly propose new laws and measures that undermine our personal and civil liberties and extend the insidious ability of the state to surveil and punish its people.

Of course, I object to the specific proposals contained in your Discussion Paper. That the government will retain its citizens' personal data for periods for up to 2 years is just odious. As is the punishment of imprisonment for people who refuse to unencrypt data on the direction of an agent of the state. And how can anyone meaningfully justify a legislative immunity from criminal prosecution for members of the security services?

Are we a society where the government is at war with its people?

Further, I wish to remind Labor members of this committee (Mssrs Byrne, Danby, and Rudd, and Senators Bishop, Faulkner and Stephens) that it was H. V. Evatt and the ALP who fought the *Communist Party Dissolution Act 1950* at their own political peril, but in doing so did more to reinforce the freedoms we enjoy today than any member of any major party before or since. Furthermore, I ask you to reflect whether these laws would even be possible if the Whitlam Government had the support in the Senate to pass Lionel Murphy's *Human Rights Bill 1973* (which would have been a precursor to constitutional change).

Rest assured that I am not the only one who is shocked at the proposals that are before you. Any attempt to introduce these measures will be resisted.

Yours sincerely

NATHAN HONDROS