

Please find below my objection, as an Australian citizen, to the proposed ACMA misinformation and disinformation bill.

- The bill is too broad and vague. It does not define what constitutes “misinformation” or “disinformation,” which leaves too much discretion to the government and the eSafety Commissioner. This could lead to the censorship of legitimate speech.
- The bill could stifle innovation in the online space. Platforms may be hesitant to develop new features or services if they fear that they could be penalised for violating the new rules. This could stifle innovation and make it more difficult for platforms to compete.
- The bill is not necessary. There are already a number of tools and resources available to help people identify and avoid misinformation. These include fact-checking websites, browser extensions, and social media literacy education. The government should focus on supporting these efforts rather than creating new regulations.

In addition to these arguments, there are also concerns that the bill could be used to silence political dissent or to censor minority viewpoints. The bill gives the government broad powers to regulate online content, and there is no guarantee that these powers will not be abused.

The government should focus on supporting existing efforts to combat misinformation rather than creating new regulations.