

Dear Sir / Madam,

I believe this measure is very troubling and a dangerous misstep in the use of metadata. This scheme was sold to the Australian public as a method of managing terrorism threats. Extending this to civil proceedings is complete overreach by our Attorney General.

The same AG that insisted this is for criminal and terrorist investigations, is the same AG who is best buddies with Village Roadshow. This was predictable and should be stopped immediately. Selling our information to corporations for a political donation and a handshake is ethically wrong, but would be very easy to do, were this scheme to be extended.

This will severely degrade the effectiveness of law enforcement in terrorism and major crimes, paranoia of being wrongfully persecuted by corporations and litigious lawyers would motivate a lot more Australians to proliferate the use of VPNs as a common internet tool, where the effectiveness for it to predict, analyse and time-machine serious life-taking crimes mute, especially in the case of spontaneous or "crimes of passion"

If the corporation/individual has just cause to pursue meta-data, they should file criminal charges and let law enforcement access the meta-data, otherwise this is in direct violation of the original intent of the law and the privacy of individuals.

All someone need to do to get access to your internet history, is sue you and convince a judge they need it. One poorly written court order and they can get 2 years of internet history for the cost of a lawyer and a day in court, then they can use that to threaten / extort you to pay anything they want, and its not like corporations can keep anything secret, they cant even keep our credit cards secure.

If it is possible for an individual like me to see the many drawbacks to this scheme, then surely others can find even more disturbing missuses of these new rules, were they to be implemented.

Scared and Angry,

Troy Growden