

In under no circumstances should the data retention laws be extended to include civil cases.

This is a clear and present example of law creep to slowly sap away personal privacy and enhance a surveillance state. Including the data retention in civil cases does nothing to combat terrorism, or child exploitation or abuse. It does nothing to stop drug manufacture or importation, it does nothing to stop violence or abuse.

I should not have to remind the Government when the laws it is proposing are in violation of it's pre-existing policies, but here I am. The proposed metadata retention changes are in violation of the Australian Privacy Principle, in particular principle #3 which states:

"the entity must not collect personal information (other than sensitive information) unless the information is reasonably necessary for one or more of the entity's functions or activities."

Where I have been, who I send my emails to etc is not needed for any of the telecommunication companies functions or activities. This proposed legislation is a violation of the right to privacy granted to all Australians, not to mention the specific rights to privacy granted to under 16 children in many State laws.

Attorney-General Brandis and Senator Fifield, I hope that you do not follow through with this proposed legislation. I suspect that you feel as if the Australian public does not care about this sort of thing, that they have more pressing concerns. I want to make it very clear to you that the Australian public **does** care about this and that if this is passed a vindictive and annoyed public **will** use it against you two, personally. You are not exempt from civil cases, you can be brought before the court just as any other member of the public may, and the court will be open and your metadata will be brought forward and very quickly passed around by news agencies looking for a quick and easy news story. Or do you believe that you are exempt from the laws that you create? If you followed the US election you would have seen how the leak, or the active suppression of a leak, of personal information can ruin a campaign. Hillary Clinton spent over a billion dollars on her election and **lost** to a TV personality with a fake tan, and a big contributor to that loss were the release of the Podesta Emails by Wikileaks. How do you think a leak like that of your metadata, through the courts, will affect you and your careers? Imagine that one of the thousands of houses you walked past in the previous two years belonged to a drug dealer (a very likely possibility), the metadata obtained by your ISP through the GPS tracking by your phone, and then brought to the public through a civil case would show that you were there. What would the headlines read? "Attorney-General Brandis visits known drug dealer" is one that I imagine would garner a lot of interest. But, you might say, that doesn't prove anything, it just shows that I was in the vicinity of his house, and you'd be right, but therefore showing that these proposed laws are ineffective in their purpose and should not be given any credible thought.

I'm not trying to threaten, or make you feel bad, or anything like that. What I'm trying to show you two, Attorney-General Brandis and Senator Fifield (and anyone else reading this) is the avenue of abuse that these laws open up, and the way in which they threaten the daily lives of every Australian person. I hope that if you see how these laws can threaten you personally, and your colleges, and your friends and your family you will realise how important it is that these changes are not made.

Thank you for your time.

Christopher White