

This submission is in reference to the definitions in 'Section 2.1.2 Misinformation, disinformation and serious harm'.

In retrospect, experiences of these definitions during recent years concerning such issues as Pandemic and its management, climate crisis, globalism, and gender identity bring into question the agenda and integrity of those who control the respective narratives. This includes the comprising of non-elected senior bureaucrats in regulatory bodies and elected politicians. The bias of mainstream media in its selective reporting and propagandising in support of these narratives has caused widespread disenchantment with them and a mass migration to alternative media sources. It might be construed that this legislation is designed to control and stymie those avenues of information, shared ideas, and democratic opposition.

The elephant in the room here being who wears the jackboots and gets to define what information is; thereby making any revelation of contravening facts, or just some alternative opinion, 'misinformation'. Currently, there are agendas and narratives being pushed by state and federal governments, and hammered out on mainstream media, that a significant proportion of Australians have great disquiet about. This legislation to boot.

The draconian overreach of state premiers and health bureaucrats during the so-called pandemic was justified on what has since been revealed to be 'disinformation', and Australia has been seriously harmed in a multitude of ways. The stark fact being that the worst harm Australians have ever had done to them by 'disinformation' came by way of governance and mainstream media. The punitive censorship and suppression of anything non-compliant with that misinforming narrative was heavy handed.

Based on this evidence, I argue that current regulators of 'information' have clearly demonstrated they are unfit to make any decree as to what 'misinformation' is. This legislation is reasonably likely to cause harm to our democratic freedom.

In Part 1.2 Definitions of the Exposure Draft document (Pg6), **Harm** is cited as a list of actual outcomes; that is harm that has happened. However, Part 1.7 uses the term '*reasonably likely to cause or contribute to serious harm*'. This is about **potential** outcomes, not real harm that has happened. What is the reality here? There is no reality...only an opinion that there might be harm. This is nothing but thought policing and persecution. It is totally undemocratic and at odds with natural justice. What happens when the published material is a fact but regarded as 'reasonably likely to cause serious harm'? For instance, someone posting their documented autoimmune adverse reaction to a vaccine that could potentially make others reluctant to be treated. How many 'others' convinced otherwise would constitute 'serious' harm and what would that imaginary harm be? How is it proven that they could be influenced or that they would be impacted adversely if they were? In fact, no harm was ever done by the posted such information; and if people exercised their right to informed consent, then that is not harm. The narrative being pushed out should have to clarify its claims and answer the challenges rather than have anything contrary labeled as 'misinformation' and suppressed.

This proposed legislation is a trojan horse attack on democratic debate and freedom of speech in Australia and has more in common with the values of socialistic totalitarianism than of a liberal democracy. This legislation is one more slide down the slippery slope into a much darker future for Australians.