So much of the discussion around scope creep with the original data retention bill was shot down by George Brandis when debating the original bill, because he repeatedly discussed that "civil wrongs" are not part of the data retention bill. For example, this exchange with Nick Xenophon on 2015-03-26:

Nick (http://www.openaustralia.org.au/senate/?gid=2015-03-26.17.5):

> Can the Attorney assure us that access to metadata under this regime
will not in any circumstances be used for the prosecution of citizens or, indeed, of others that may be downloading content that relates to breach of copyright?

George (http://www.openaustralia.org.au/senate/?gid=2015-03-26.18.1):

> I can give you that assurance, Senator, because what this bill is
concerned with is the enforcement of the criminal law... So we are dealing here with the enforcement of the criminal law...
> If the only reason they are retaining metadata is compliance with the
provisions of this act, they cannot be answerable in respect of that metadata to a subpoena or a notice for third party discovery in a civil action either, whether it be a breach of copyright claim or any other form of civil claim.

When such a clear and straight forward assertion is made, and made in defense of the bill - for the purpose of getting people to vote for the bill - then why are we having a discussion about broadening the possibility for people to access this private information? I've spent the past four years volunteering to build software to help people in countries where the government censors and monitors their citizens to a point where they are unable to function as a free society. I am very disappointing that a "liberal" government has taken so many steps to limit the liberties of Australians by participating in what amounts to mass surveillance (i.e. data retention). We should do everything possible to limit the scope of such projects so that we remain a free and liberal democracy.

Cheers,
Pete.