

## Mis/ disinformation controls are not appropriate.

I believe that passing this Bill violates Australian's democratic and constitutional rights to freedom of speech which is the lifeblood of our democracy, as it is aimed at controlling communications and imposing penalties for information it does not approve through ACMA. This Bill intends to remove the Voice of every Australian, including Aborigines.

As I am against this censorship, I believe that no penalties should be even considered or imposed on social media platforms for noncompliance.

As an alternative, why not just publicly refute anything that the Government considers "Misinformation" or "Disinformation" instead? It is widely accepted in liberal democratic societies that it is better to fight information with information.

Some of the many problems with the Bill include the following:

- The statutory definition of 'misinformation' is over-broad and unworkable
- ACMA is not necessarily qualified to judge what is 'misinformation' and what is not. It is not clear what justifies the statutory presupposition that ACMA will have the expertise and intellectual resources to identify and distinguish 'misinformation' from other forms of online content.'
- Will ACMA be deplatformed for adhering to the government's views if they are later found to be false or flawed?
- It creates an unlevel playing field between governments and other speakers.
- It considers that any view authorised by the government is, by statutory definition, not 'misinformation', however false or misleading it might be.'
- Governments and political parties are exempted from the Combating Misinformation and Disinformation bill.

- It blames the informer for the behaviour of the recipient by claiming that 'misinformation'/'disinformation' can cause people to do inappropriate things.
- It can be used to censor any information on any issue that government does not approve of now and in the future.
- It does not recognize that it is the free flow of information and ideas that inform political debate
- It puts the development of a code of practice in the hands of the industry, leaving the general public out of the loop.
- No one government or agency has a monopoly on truth. Our perception of truth evolves over time with experience, an example of which was validated during the Parliamentary questioning by Senator Roberts of Mr Pezullo from the Department of Home Affairs Covid Censorship Team where Senator Roberts pointed out that some of the 4000 censored posts turned out to be neither Misinformation nor Disinformation as Pfizer has amended its statement regarding the efficiency of its product.
- It will silence dissenting experts.
- It will lead to us becoming a totalitarian society

Following are questions that still need to be answered about the Bill:

1. Who decides what constitutes 'misinformation'/'disinformation'? (Their qualifications, experience, ties with industry)
2. To whom and what products will it apply? (unhealthy foods/cosmetics?)
3. How (by what process) will the government determine what constitutes 'misinformation'/'disinformation'?
4. How will it monitor the developments in that area to update its understanding of information/disinformation in the future?
5. How will the government communicate to all Australians (of all ages, ethnicities, education levels and abilities) what they can and can't say in the future?