

exposure draft of the Communications Legislation Amendment (Combatting Misinformation and Disinformation) Bill 2023.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the exposure draft mentioned above. I request that my name not be published.

Even before reading the exposure draft, the true motivation for the draft bill is obvious and disturbing. Australia is blindly following in lockstep with the other 'five eyes' countries and the EU to implement a series of "dictates" pushed by the world economic forum (WEF), despite the damage this will do to our sovereignty, economy, and independence. Misinformation bills are only one of the suite of actions simultaneously being shoved down countries' throats - do these others in progress in the western world sound familiar?

- mass immigration which will displace existing residents;
- interest rate rises and inflation;
- rental/housing crises pushing homelessness to new levels;
- pushing more electrical usage while shutting down reliable power supply and replacing it with practically useless and destructive renewables;
- shutting down of manufacturing and small business;
- attacks on the food supply and farming;
- attempts to remove cash in conjunction with bank closures/failures; and
- threats of a social credit system/ESG

As an award-winning Australian for services to society, the behaviour I've observed of current politicians not fighting for Australians is obscene. Comments I've read from so many that "Australia has already been sold out to foreign interests" are very hard to ignore when you look at what is happening. Why are un-elected foreign actors being allowed to influence/dictate domestic affairs and policy? This has to STOP!!

After a quick read of the exposure draft, the following is apparent:

THIS BILL IS NOT EVEN ENFORCEABLE AS WRITTEN.

- x this bill places duty of care on those who cannot possibly uphold the terms of the bill (publishers especially)
- x this bill exerts authority over foreign citizens and companies operating within their own countries
- x this bill does not nominate under what standard of criteria information is to be judged
- x if this bill had already been passed, the government itself has already violated it repeatedly by deliberately producing and disseminating harmful disinformation and that track record demonstrates that the government is utterly incapable of implementing this bill without causing harm.

This bill places duty of care on those who cannot possibly uphold the terms of the bill (publishers especially)

The wording of this bill suggests that all publishers of information - be they social media, news outlets or websites - are expected to make a determination on every piece of information carried by their platform as potentially mis or dis information and police it themselves. The job of publishers

is to provide a platform for communication and free expression of ideas. An appropriate level of 'policing' would include removing posts where someone is threatening another; someone is engaged in deliberate defamation, violence or paedophilia; or pornography on all-ages platforms - things which are obviously universally offensive and people should be protected from - and this already happens in social media and the mainstream media. It is not appropriate for publishers to police and remove content which reflects an opinion or new knowledge which might just be correct but still widely unknown such as the upcoming solar micronova or grand solar minimum (as opposed to the "AGW"/net zero scam), or somebody's use of herbs or ivermectin to successfully treat covid (as opposed to deliberately poisoning (killing) someone with remdesivir which is shockingly an accepted protocol).

Wisdom comes from hearing many points of view, looking into them for yourself, and making a decision which bits resonate with your experience and which can be ignored. If you make the personal choice to ignore a particular piece of information, that is your personal freewill and that information should not be denied to someone else who might benefit from it in their own circumstance. The authorised reasons for 'word policing' that I mentioned in the previous paragraph are warranted but that is all.

This bill exerts authority over foreign citizens and companies operating within their own countries

Australia has no right to tell people in other countries what to do. If an international platform posts content from citizens in its base country or other countries outside Australia, the Australian government has no right to include those comments in its evaluations of whether those comments might be mis/dis information and no right to hold the publisher responsible. An example of such a situation is where someone in France has made a comment on facebook or a news site placing blame about the recent riots they had there. Whatever the background of the comment, it is outside the scope of the Australian government to determine its validity.

This bill does not nominate under what standard of criteria information is to be judged

The bill puts the onus on the platform (social media, news, websites) where the information appears and expects the publisher to examine every one of the millions of postings/content for accuracy which is impossible for any platform to do. Then the bill expects the publisher to keep documents of all the mis/dis information incidents which can be provided to ACMA when they turn their 'enforcement eye' on that platform. This is well beyond reasonable or even conceivable.

If the ACMA is going to look over the shoulders of all information providers, what criterion will it use to determine if the publisher complied? Who makes the determination what pieces of information are allowed? This bill rekindles the memory of another black time in human history known as WW2 - nobody was allowed to question "the party" either (and you know which party I mean).

If a publisher doesn't remove anything from their platform, does that mean they have violated this law or have they simply allowed freedom of speech? Or put another way, does this law cancel freedom of speech and make it a violation, not just in Australia but worldwide? This bill smacks of two highly undesirable principles: dictatorship, and the rules-based world order, neither of which the people in Australia want.

If this bill had already existed, the government itself has already violated it repeatedly by deliberately producing and disseminating harmful disinformation

We have only to look at the past three years for sufficient evidence. The volume of disinformation by all levels of government in all states is blatantly obvious. Such a track record demonstrates that the government is utterly incapable of implementing this bill or of making any decisions about the quality of information. Just a few examples to illustrate:

- » when the government said the CV shot would prevent transmission (WRONG!!)
- » when the government said the CV shot was safe (VERY WRONG!)
- » when the government forced employees to get it or lose their jobs (coercion = violation of the Nuremberg Code)
- » when the government sent letters to GP's telling them they would lose their licence if they allowed informed consent of their patients (forcing GP's to violate the Hippocratic Oath and the Nuremberg Code as well as deliberately harming some of their patients who would normally have qualified for medical exemptions - that isn't just disinformation, that is assault with intent)
- » when the Qld government said on their website that those who already were incapacitated by the first CV shot still had to get additional shots; they also said that no medical exemptions were allowed unless you already had myocarditis (forcing people to get the shot even if it was going to kill them - what level of harm would you categorise that little piece of disinformation?)

These examples demonstrate that the government is totally incapable of making ANY judgements about what is mis/dis information. It also suggests their definition of "harm" is based on mere words and opinions and not on physical things that will actually cause damage to your body or kill you!

This bill would create 'imperial fact checkers' controlling an entire planet of information sharing which goes beyond the boundaries of any democratic government. This draft bill is a definite 'no go zone' and needs to be retracted.

Thank you for reading my humble opinion which has been gained by reading the many different thoughts of many diverse people from many different backgrounds in many different countries.