

Communications Legislation Amendment (Combatting Misinformation and Disinformation) Bill 2023

As part of the bill proposal, how is the following going to be considered and questions answered?

This bill has nothing to do with balancing free speech and expression. This bill is about silencing and censoring decent voices of inconvenient truth, through media and tech companies, that the government and many other organisations don't want the public to hear and make up their own mind on. Hence I have a better suggestion for a name of this Bill, "Combatting, censoring and silencing decent voices of inconvenient truth, we don't want the public to be exposed to and make up their own mind on" Bill 2023.

Under the definition of "misinformation" and "disinformation", what serious harm is being referred to? Who decides what is harmful, what is serious and how? What is opposite of "misinformation" and "disinformation"? Is it truth? How does anyone have right or power to decide what is truth? Truth just is and reveals itself naturally without any interference from powers to be.

Under definition of disinformation point (e) states: "dissemination of content using a digital service is disinformation on the digital service if: the person disseminating, or causing the dissemination of, the content intends that the content deceive another person. Isn't disinformation what politicians do routinely at elections. They make promises to deceive masses, lately and more increasingly online and through media, and rarely deliver on them. How are they going to be held to account?"

What if ACMA classified "misinformation" and "disinformation" and content it contains, claimed to be false, misleading and deceptive is can be backed up and hence proven as truth hence no longer "misinformation" and "disinformation"? Who and how ACMA be held to account?

What happens if the "misinformation" and "disinformation" ends up being true, just like lots has after the pandemic?

When will ACMA change its name to Ministry of Truth?

What is this country turning into? Is this a free democratic country or a country of censorship where everyone is brought into line arbitrarily by a supposed power? Is this not a reflection of communism? Firstly, we are told this is a multi-cultural country yet we will not be allowed to express our views and present data and information for a debate. How is this a reflection of a free and democratic country?

It is unclear how "misinformation" and "disinformation" poses a threat to the safety and wellbeing of Australians, and democracy. Censorship and silencing of voices is a greater threat to democracy than any misinformation and disinformation. If misinformation and disinformation is proven to be truth, wouldn't censoring of this information also be equally dangerous?

How is any information dangerous to democracy? Isn't democracy quite the opposite? Isn't democracy about debate, exploration and freedom of speech?

What happens when government gains full control of information and through this control generates propagandas and launches misinformation and disinformation itself? Who will hold government and ACMA accountable?

Does government, and individual members of government, believe they are accountable to anyone? If so, who does the government, and individual members of government, believe they are accountable to?

Who is ACMA accountable to? What if ACMA gets it wrong, how will ACMA be held to account?

Does government believe that Australians are not capable and smart enough to judge for themselves between truth and lies, and it believes it needs to interfere? Why does government believe it can give itself power to judge and declare truth and lies? Is the government intending to insult intelligence of Australians by centralising power to declare truth and lies, because that's certainly what it feels like?

In the free society and democracy, how can any organisation or body be an arbitrary judge of truth and lies without hearing all sides of the story and citing all evidence? Isn't this what the court and judicial system is for?

How is ACMA independent when government gives it powers to judge and declare truth and lies?

Who decides how freedom of speech is balanced? Why is ACMA and individuals within ACMA any better than any other Australian citizen and judging and balancing freedom of speech? Shouldn't we be able to have a civilised debate?

How can you talk about transparency and censorship of information in the same sentence?

Quite contrary to what this bill claims to be, this bill is one of, if not the most, dangerous pieces of legislation for free market, freedom of speech and expression and ultimately for democracy.