I have several concerns about this bill.

Firstly, anyone granted the power to police the expression of public (let alone private) opinion is always walking a very thin line. Who, ultimately, gets to decide what is mis- or dis-information? Who removes public expression, on what topics? Who makes an assumption about the intent of a post, of a message, of a word, of a thought? Who then acts on that? With what consequences? Harm to others is something we would all like to minimise. But by what means? And to what effect?

By attempting to minimise harm by limiting certain types of information, you are making several grand assumptions:

1. There is a correct, measurable way to think.
2. You can stop people thinking incorrect things.
3. You should stop people thinking incorrect things.
4. That a public stance on allowable good and correct knowledge (and the suppression of all else) is an achievable or even desirable thing.
5. That supposedly stopping some types of information outweighs the benefits of a free expression of and exchange of information.

I and most other Australians do believe in the existence of things that are, by nature, morally or ethically wrong- even though we may disagree on which exact things. We have laws that govern many of these things, including various forms of harm unto others. Do we really need more laws that tell people what they can and can't say, and therefore ultimately, can or can't think?

Scientific and ideological discourse and expression are qualities more evident in some societies than others. There exists a place in a healthy, 'free' society, for valid expression of opinion, and also for enquiry, discourse and exchange of information. Both in private and in public, if that distinction will remain.

People will always have opinions. Misguided, misinformed or not. And information- correct, incorrect or somewhere in between- always exists. You cannot create a vacuum of information, insert one black and white view and then expect any other to just blink out of existence. Nor should you want to.

Political, religious, philosophical, academic and scientific viewpoints have more variety and points of contradiction than they do people that hold them. To legislate which are correct and publicly allowable is not only impossible, but harmful in itself. A healthy society encourages some form of debate. Growth, whether personal or societal, does not ultimately come from suppression.

Perhaps my concerns are not valid. Are incorrect.

Maybe a telco will increase their profits. Perhaps some more people will get vaccinated. Perhaps not.

Perhaps we will decide that we like living in an Orwellian nightmare and we will gladly choose Communist China as our holiday destination (as long as our travel passes are approved, Comrade). Perhaps not.

Perhaps everyone who decides that they do or don't like fossil fuel production or nuclear power or wind power or the colour orange or the state government will one day find they have harmful opinions that must be stopped. (While you're at it, you might want medical practitioners to do away with informed consent. I'm sure there's more than a few who'd be happy to be rid of that annoyance).

I don't want to live in an idiocracy, or for our species to kill ourselves off, but we all pretty much don't want to live in a dictatorship either. (Nor a dictatorship full of idiots, for that matter).

But, why not limit public debate and the exchange of ideas. By all means, silence that voice of dissent. It's been done before plenty of times.

Your intent may not be malicious. Perhaps you really are well-informed yourselves. In any case, please learn from history and think about whose interests, if anybody's, are ultimately going to be protected here. And at what cost.