

To whom it may concern -

The proposed legislation in giving these powers to ACMA to be the sole judge of what is misinformation or disinformation, it is not clear to me how this judgement is made and how the ACMA will ensure that there is no political influence in the decisions around that judgement.

Failing clarity in this space is a threat to our democracy and can very easily lead to abuse of power for the purposes of political gain, as have been evidenced in the last few years.

Please reconsider putting this level of power into a select group of individuals without providing clarity on how freedom of speech will not be influenced by political agendas.

While the intention is to prevent harm based on specific type of harm outlined, the definitions of these 'types' is broad enough to be open to interpretation that will lead to more division in our country rather than everyone working for the common good.

There is also a risk that one group within a specific harm 'group' would be given unfair consideration as apposed to others, for example transgender individuals are considered more important than women in the context of misinformation. Many men and women have worked very hard to ensure that biological women have equal rights and opportunities under the law, but this is being threatened by the unbalanced view of transgender rights vs womens rights and blocking information in the public sphere due to one group lobbying versus another is not right.

Another example of the above is the often unfair treatment of Christian religion in comparison to other religions.

In addition to this, the exemption of all levels of government from this legislation, means that we must ALWAYS trust what the government publishes and never question it, that this legislation has no powers for ACMA to question it or label any government content as misinformation, is this right?

*"excluded content for misinformation purposes means any of the following:*

...

*(c) content produced by or for an educational institution accredited by any of the following:*

- (i) the Commonwealth;*
- (ii) a State;*
- (iii) a Territory;*
- (iv) a body recognised by the Commonwealth, a State or a 22 Territory as an accreditor of educational institutions;*

...

*(e) content that is authorised by:*

- (i) the Commonwealth; or*
- (ii) a State; or*
- (iii) a Territory; or*
- (iv) a local government.*

...

”

If so, then it sounds to me like we are heading towards a massive attack on freedom of speech, resembling the control that some foreign governments have over their citizens in non-democratic systems, which is not what Australia is and is not what MANY immigrants chose when they left their countries of birth to start a new life here, including myself and my family.

Please reconsider legislating this, as I don't believe this is in the best interests of a democratic society where freedom of speech should be valued and holding governments to account for their actions should be openly allowed and encouraged, as the citizens of a country are the ones that are paying the government officials their salaries through our taxes.

Thanks for your time in advance.