

## My Say on the current exposure draft of the Communications Legislation Amendment Bill 2023

Firstly I believe it is not Lawful under the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution 1901, which requires the Parliament to take such dramatic Legislation or Amendments, to a Referendum.

Secondly I believe the origin of this Legislation has come from a Foreign Power and not 'We the People' of Australia, your Electors. Therefore it is un-Democratic.

Where is the enumerated Head of Power, that grants Royal Crown Authority, to create such LegislationCM

Are the Staff of ACMA: Psychologists or Psychiatrists, qualified to assess what is harmful?

Who defines what is Dis and Mis-information? What are their qualifications? Are they Biased? Are they compromised? Do they have an invested interest? Are they fully transparent? Will decisions be made by staff opinions or personal interpretations?

Where do you derive your definition of integrity? Is it wide enough to apply to every aspect of human activity that could be posted online?

The Electors are adults, not children. To deprive people of a balanced view, of any issue or 'fact', is a form of Slavery. It is also Communism. It is also Tyranny. Who holds ACMA accountable?

Have you included all the clear definitions and parameters upfront so you can't change the rules to suit a new policy. Who has created those definitions? Are they transparent, qualified, unbiased, or have an invested interest?

Do those definitions come from a broad spectrum of the population?

This legislation can be used to Coerce parties to conform to the desires or hidden agendas of Government or foreign powers. (As shown by the 'Twitter Files')

It is a Human Right to have made available all sides of any view or argument or 'fact' Therefore the legislation is Discriminatory under the Australian Human Rights Commission.

This legislation will put the Fox in charge of the Hen-house? Who is in charge of over-seeing the decisions made and what Oversight safety mechanisms are in place to detect and correct wrong decisions made by ACMA in a timely fashion, and not be unfairly dragged out longer? (Much like Ombudsman decisions). What are the consequences if ACMA get a decision wrong?

You quote Hal Crawford as an independent reviewer of the platform. How can one entity cover what will be hundreds of thousands of posts in a year?

And who can insure his transparency, and assure they are not influenced by government or a foreign power?

This is the thin end of the wedge, what is to stop the government from making unfavourable changes of definitions in the future?

In the current environment of lack of Cyber security, you cannot ensure people's Privacy. What compensation will you give for any breaches?

A living example of dis and mis-information management is China's censorship programs. Have you asked the people of Australia if they want that? Have they given you their Consent?

The Federal Government has a history of lying to its population.

Examples include: Robodebt was said to be legal and it wasn't.

The Cov19 Vax was said to be safe and effective, and it wasn't. DEANS registered 138,000 adverse reactions including death.

The Governments said it would stop one from getting infected, it didn't.

We were told it would stop the spread. It was a lie.

Would all Australian Governments be held accountable under this same legislation?