

## Feedback on an exposure draft of the Communications Legislation Amendment (Combating Misinformation and Disinformation) Bill 2023.

If your submission is to be made public, please ensure you do not include any personal information that you don't want to be published

contact name anonymous

contact details, including telephone number, postal and email addresses anonymous

confirmation whether or not your submission can be made public—published—or kept confidential

### **Submission to be made public.**

Preamble:

This is the second submission I have made to the Australian Government, the former several years ago to an agency with the same activities but probably a different name, with the previous feedback the department went outside of the submission process engaged with "stakeholder" entities after the submission process had closed and screwed the Australian public. I found the behaviour of this/that Department deceiving and believe that this submission process as a smokescreen to what the government wants to achieve. Your bureaucrats have proven this with the previous submission process, we the people were not invited to make any further submissions to address the further "stakeholder" submission/discussions. Most likely this will occur again if not already discussed.

The previous three years have been very interesting, I am one of the 20% of the critical thinkers in our society.

After the start of the "pandemic" and the attack from media and the government on the critical thinkers type discussions, and yes I have a FOI with the Department of Home Affairs which is currently overdue by 30 days for a response regarding my facebook posts and comments. There is/was a narrative being pushed by the government and things outside of the narrative were squashed. ( some doctors and medical professional were also squashed)

In 2020 I came to a conclusion that in three or four years after the start of the "pandemic" the proof would come as death rate statics and at this point in time excess deaths are running at around 17% above the 5 year averages before 2019 however the Australian Government is completely silent regarding these excess deaths.

The so called conspiracy theorist's, Lab Leak, Ivermectin, hydroxychloroquine, Experimental vaccines (Vaccine injuries), man made virus, social exclusion issues, financial issues, unsafe and ineffective vaccines were all played down by the government even some Australian Government Politician's were censored on the advice of government bureaucrats.

Both authoritarian and democratic governments had made more legal changes on this front of Misinformation and Disinformation laws in 2020 than in 2019. And in

authoritarian states, pandemic-related misinformation has provided a new justification for repressive policies.

Is Australia democratically or Authoritarian governed? The shooting of mainly peaceful protesters with rubber bullets and beanbag projectiles (also at a Shrine), indiscriminate use of capsicum spray, being questioned why a person is taking a boat out onto a bay, the politicisation of the police force, people with anti government tendencies mysteriously end up with a bullet in their head. The right to protest removed, Human rights violations, the use of so called "LRAD" devices on peaceful protesters with the possibility of a microwave type device deployed, violations regarding incitement, incite to "protest", Incitement should be reserved for lets say more serious things such as incite to murder, but no not anymore you can be arrested for inciting people to attend a peaceful protest.

So where does that leave Australia democratically or Authoritarian governed, the past three years have shown us how quickly an Authoritarian system can be put in place in a so called democratically elected country like Australia.

under section 2 Definitions, of the exposure draft it is stated,

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

- (a) content produced in good faith for the purposes of entertainment, parody or satire;
- (b) professional news content;
- (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 Territory as an accreditor of educational institutions;
- (d) content produced by or for an educational institution accredited:
  - (i) by a foreign government or a body recognised by a foreign government as an accreditor of educational institutions; and
  - (ii) to substantially equivalent standards as a comparable Australian educational institution;
- (e) content that is authorised by:
  - (i) the Commonwealth; or
  - (ii) a State; or
  - (iii) a Territory; or
  - (iv) a local government

Why have the mainstream (professional) media been excluded from this Act at (b), and also the Crown and Local government at (e).

I have not given consideration to (c), (d).

For example during the past 3 years we were told by the Government, mainstream media and many other influential persons about the vaccines being safe and effective and would prevent you getting the virus and stop the transmission of the virus.

Another example, I have contacted both the Governor General and the Attorney General regarding the title of our sovereign, King of Australia. Queen of Australia was made by legislation, as the constitution has the title of the sovereign contained within. With the king being the new sovereign of Australia the wording for the proclamation was made by the Australia Government as advised by the GG, after contact with the office of the AG, I was advised that King of Australia is generally accepted as the title of the new sovereign. This must be some type of spin doctor rubbish because it is legislation that enabled the Sovereign to be call Queen of Australia, no such legislation exists for the King and our constitution provides the title of the new King.

I have made posts on Facebook regarding this which have been censored, by what means it is unknown maybe the FOI will shed some light on this matter, who knows??

It is as plain as the nose on my face is that our constitution must be honoured, however to take this matter to the high court is not within my financial means. It has huge ramifications if I am correct as the Judicial is sworn in to the King Of Australia our court system and our government systems are currently being compromised. The comment from the Principle Legal Officer, Office of Constitutional Law that stated " it is generally accepted " is very worrying, perhaps it is just the government narrative again.

And another example more recently regarding the Voice to Parliament, the Prime minister has been recorded as saying the Uluru Statement from the heart fits on an A4 page, Sky News has just provided information that the Uluru statement from the heart is 23 pages long. A quick search on the internet only reveals that the 1 page is available, why wouldn't the whole 23 pages be revealed since this is the basis of going to a referendum.

The government hasn't even set a date for the referendum yet, is the government waiting to get this legislation in place before setting a date then censoring the information available!!!!

What happens to the other 22 pages of information in the Uluru Statement from the heart would that be deemed mis/dis information???

Lets talk about safe and although the Government is very silent on the excess deaths currently occurring in Australia, this drug was novel, unproven, no empirical data and experimental but we are told that it is "safe" further more it is what I call a god drug, plays with DNA. we are now seeing an increase in heart related problems, turbo cancer, autoimmune issues and perhaps many more issues in the future.

Effective but does not stop you from getting or transmitting the virus. If this was a product for sale in Australia it would be returned due to not performing to the standard we were told it would.

Somehow a narrative was developed and information outside the narrative would be shutdown. We have already a glimpse into how the Government manages a narrative thru the Twitter files being released, and information from the Meta company, Basically the spy apparatus of the government on behalf of the health department and using a third party information gathering entity then contacts the social media organisation to review said content and if it doesn't need the necessary requirement it is restricted/removed/less views by the social media company. Somehow we are to believe that I also have the same ability to effect the same scrutiny, I don't think so, firstly I don't have an email address for any personnel working for social media companies. An individual can not exert the same influence as the Government when dealing with social media companies, it has also been noted that the USA government definitely exerted influence over the social media companies.

If this legislation is carried forward the crown must be subject to this legislation and including professional media outlets.

Who is the keeper of the truth? fact checking teams, will the Government deem certain things as Mis/Dis information, the past 3 years have shown us how a narrative was developed and enforced

Will freedom of speech be restricted? Yes even AMCA has stated this. Are we living in a democracy or under the veil of an Authoritarian system.

Stick this bill in the bin!!!!!!

End of submission