

FAX FROM:	ALAN SMITH C. O. T. (CASUALTIES OF TELSTRA formerly CASUALTIES OF TELECOM)	DATE:	9.8.95
FAX NO:	055 267 230		
PHONE NO:	008 816 522	NUMBER OF PAGES (including this page)	
FAX TO:	MR TED BENJAMIN CUSTOMER AFFAIRS TELSTRA EXHIBITION ST MELBOURNE 3000		
		By facsimile 03 9632 3225	

Dear Sir,

**RE YOUR LETTER DATED 3rd AUGUST, 1995  
TF200 TELEPHONE**

This TF200 telephone report, as I have previously explained to Telstra, was not provided to me before Telstra's defence of 12th December, 1994. You mention in your letter that even so, this report was provided pursuant to the arbitration process. This is incorrect. The Report itself was only forwarded to me after I had asked for relevant material which was associated with this Report.

Telstra's defence documents were the first time I had known of such a Report and it was at this point that I asked Dr Hughes to seek forensic material and copies of original photos through the arbitration process. Dr Hughes chose not to seek this information and it was then that a copy of the Report was delivered to my business.

I am now asking Telstra to supply this TF200 Telephone Report under the FOI Act. I am forwarding an additional \$30.00 for this request.

You also mention in your letter that I had not received a copy of the Report because this report was not finished until June 20th, 1994 and my FOI requests after that date were very specific as to which documentation I was seeking. Mr Benjamin, this statement demonstrates that Telstra is 'having two bobs each way'. Firstly Telstra has been quoted as saying that I (and other members of COT) are too broad in our FOI requests, and now you state that I am too specific. It appears by your own admission, in your letter dated 3rd August, 1995, that Telstra has only supplied various FOI documents in accordance with Telstra's own views regarding each particular application.

I find this late admission by Telstra of FOI documents most alarming, especially when I have been in a Settlement/Arbitration Procedure for some 15 months and documents have not been provided in accordance with the FOI Act. This state of affairs leaves little doubt as to why it has taken Telstra some 18 months to provide FOI documents - in some cases quite old documents. The concern now held by COT members is: what FOI documentation has not been supplied at all, due to Telstra's screening procedure?

Again it appears that Telstra has not been the model corporate citizen it would like the public to believe it is.

This TF200 Report contains statements that conflict with Telstra's own internal documentation, therefore I am now asking for ALL material, including raw working notes written to support the findings as included in this TF200 Report.

If there is still any democratic system in Australia then Telstra, without my knowledge, has allowed this Report to be processed with adverse findings.

DATE

TIME

CASUALTIES OF TERROR

PROPERTY AND LOSS OF LIFE

NUMBER OF PAGES (including cover)

NAME OF AUTHOR

NAME OF EDITOR

NAME OF PUBLISHER

NAME OF DISTRIBUTOR

BY YOUR LETTER DATED 10 AUGUST 1964

RE: TERRORISM

The first of the two reports which I have received from you is dated 10 August 1964. It contains information on the activities of the "Reds" in the United States. The second report is dated 11 August 1964 and contains information on the activities of the "Reds" in the United Kingdom.

The first of the two reports which I have received from you is dated 10 August 1964. It contains information on the activities of the "Reds" in the United States. The second report is dated 11 August 1964 and contains information on the activities of the "Reds" in the United Kingdom.

The first of the two reports which I have received from you is dated 10 August 1964. It contains information on the activities of the "Reds" in the United States. The second report is dated 11 August 1964 and contains information on the activities of the "Reds" in the United Kingdom.

The first of the two reports which I have received from you is dated 10 August 1964. It contains information on the activities of the "Reds" in the United States. The second report is dated 11 August 1964 and contains information on the activities of the "Reds" in the United Kingdom.

The first of the two reports which I have received from you is dated 10 August 1964. It contains information on the activities of the "Reds" in the United States. The second report is dated 11 August 1964 and contains information on the activities of the "Reds" in the United Kingdom.

The first of the two reports which I have received from you is dated 10 August 1964. It contains information on the activities of the "Reds" in the United States. The second report is dated 11 August 1964 and contains information on the activities of the "Reds" in the United Kingdom.

The first of the two reports which I have received from you is dated 10 August 1964. It contains information on the activities of the "Reds" in the United States. The second report is dated 11 August 1964 and contains information on the activities of the "Reds" in the United Kingdom.

I demand that Telstra provide all the documentation associated with this TF200 Report so as to allow me the chance to defend those allegations contained within the Report. I await your response with regard to this matter.

Also, further to your letter of August 3rd, 1995: I did not receive any raw tape data or ELMI monitoring information for the months of May to August, 1993. An ELMI monitoring device was connected to my 267 267 line at the RCM Cape Bridgewater during that period. If I had not found tapes in a briefcase inadvertently left by a Telstra technician during June, 1993, (where a tape for one 6 day period showed that 29 calls attempting to come to my business were not connected) I would not have been aware of this data at all. For your information, this data also showed incorrect charging.

It would appear, from your letter of August 3rd, 1994, that this reluctance to provide ELMI data is similar to Telstra's attitude to the FOI Act: they seem to think about only what is the very least they can supply, rather than what the Act states that they must supply.

I hope that the result of my request for the supply of original documentation related to the TF200 Report receives a different response from you than that received to my request for this ELMI data.

Sincerely,

Alar Smith

cc Mr John Wynack, Commonwealth Ombudsman's Office, Canberra, ACT.  
Mr John Pincock, Telecommunication Industry Ombudsman, Exhibition St, Melbourne.