

To whom it concerns,

I am deeply concerned about the new so-called "anti-terrorism" laws that the government is trying to pass.

They constitute a complete lack of respect for human and civil rights, as well as human dignity, and are not reflective of a supposedly "free and just" society, where people are innocent until proven guilty.

If Australia were to have a Bill of Rights, or to be bound to certain conventions/laws (as is the UK to laws which bind the European Union member states), these new laws MIGHT be safer as there would be a safeguard to prevent abuses. But Australia does not have such safeguards. I wholeheartedly protest to giving the Howard Government, or for that matter, the present Labour Government, such powers when they have proven numerous times that they will lie, deceive and bend the rules to suit their own political agendas. e.g. Iraq has WMD, Children overboard, Tampa, etc. The list goes on.

A couple of issues I would like to share as examples of my concern.  
Financing terrorism: From my understanding of what these laws will mean, they place an unreasonable and unworkable responsibility on someone, for instance, thinking about donating money to a charity. There is enough problems in the world, and far too many people not taking a caring attitude towards others in need. This kind of law will only invoke fear, and will cause a whole lot more people NOT to help already overstretched charitable organisations. Is there any backup plan being proposed that will counteract this affect to charitable and non-profit organisations? Is there a plan to encourage people NOT to be afraid to help others, to counteract the fear of donating?

Control orders and preventative detention orders. Phillip Ruddock is lately fond of quoting the Declaration of Human Rights (and mistquoting it by the way - replacing the word 'liberty' with 'safety'). I would very much like to hear how the Government reconciles the edicts in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, with arbitrary detention, lack of freedom of association, and the demand to be dishonest (i.e. not being able to inform anybody but family members that they are 'Safe, but uncontactable' (amongst other things)).

I sincerely and firmly deplore what the Government is doing, including trying to rush these kinds of changes to the laws through, without allowing adequate time for public review, discussion, debate, and protest.

Sincerely,  
Kim Wainwright