

The proposed bill suggests that ACMA will have no role in determining the truth of statements, but that it will "allow the ACMA to create and enforce an industry standard (a stronger form of regulation), should a code of practice be deemed ineffective in combatting misinformation and disinformation on digital platforms." I simply cannot see a way to reconcile these statements. Truth is fundamental to the definition of mis/dis-information (as is acknowledged in the bill). How could it possibly be determined that a code of practice has been ineffective in combatting mis/dis-information on a platform, without first determining the truth of one or more statements made on that platform?

This bill serves as evidence that the government views its citizens as children who require protection from their own ability to interpret the world they live in (as if such evidence was necessary). The guidance notice for the bill states that "the proposed powers seek to strike a balance between the public interest in combatting the serious harms that can arise from the propagation of misinformation and disinformation, with freedom of speech." The right balance is for the government to keep their arrogant, self-righteous hands out of public discourse. We do not need you to sanitise our conversations for us.