The Government lists the key premise for the need for the proposed Communications Legislation Amendment (Combatting Misinformation and Disinformation) as being that:

> *"Misinformation and disinformation pose a threat to the safety and wellbeing of Australians, as well as our democracy, society and economy."*

The premise for this new legislation is fundamentally flawed and represents a great danger to Australia's modern western democratic system of government on the following basis:

1. The Government seeks to introduce new legislation that will be based on their determination of what is "misinformation" and "disinformation".

    a) The legislation equates the terms "misinformation" and "disinformation" with falsehood, misleading information, or deception. This legislation seeks to give the Government the power to determine what is the opposite i.e. the power to determine what is truth, and to do so on an ongoing basis in perpetuity, (yet also issuing the Government of the day with the power to define "truth" on a day by day basis changeable to their vagaries and party priorities of the day, or the zietgiest of the society of the day).

    > *"The Bill defines misinformation and disinformation as follows:*
    >
    > - *Misinformation is online content that is false, misleading or deceptive, that is shared or created without an intent to deceive but can cause and contribute to serious harm.*
    > - *Disinformation is misinformation that is intentionally disseminated with the intent to deceive or cause serious harm."*

    b) In doing so, the legislation is in effect seeking to criminalise certain thought and speech, and create legislation that outlaws thought crime and prevent free expression or free speech. It does so by seeking to determine the intention by which certain information is expressed or disseminated.

        i) Criminalising certain thought and speech, would give the government of the day and government bureaucracies (at first via social media corporations), the power to determine a person's intentions by what thoughts they are thinking and what they communicate to others via social media (with the potential for this to be expanded to all forms of communication) if the principles of outlawing the communication of "misinformation" and "disinformation", and handing the power to determine what is "misinformation" and "disinformation" (and therefore the determination of what is "truth") to government are accepted if this legislation were to pass.

        ii) While the government is not proposing in this legislation to allow criminal penalty for members of the public for communicating their thoughts if they criticise the government or fall foul of the narrative of the day, the legislation does allow for them to be silenced (having social media posts and expressions taken down) and potentially identified to government by social media platforms and telecommunication carriers. And if the thought or speech is treated as wrong "think" or wrong "speech" as decreed by the government of the day via

this legislation, it is only a matter of time before its communication will be treated as wrong on all levels, and the potential blacklisting of those members of the population who have expressed "wrong think" becoming a reality (including via a social credit scoring system as is currently in place in communist China). In fact, if this legislation were to pass, I believe it would be unlikely that an open public consultation on any contentious legislation such as this would even be allowed in the future, and it would be very unlikely that expression of thought that went against the government narrative in a public submission as this would be published – as this would be the "dissemination" of thought and speech that is considered "wrong" by the government, and would go against these new proposed government powers to "combat mis and disinformation".

iii) Allowing government powers to stray into the domain of thought crime by allowing the government or bureaucracies of the day the power (whether via social media corporations or directly) to determine and classify what is going on in the minds of the population based on how they are communicating via social media or otherwise, for the purposes of having them controlled through silencing them, (and potentially identified, and in the future even blacklisted by governments and/or corporations) is unacceptable territory that the government in Australia should never stray into. A free and open society and democratic country such as Australia that has historically fought against authoritarian governments around the world (most notably during the world wars of the 20th Century), and a country that has opened its doors and rescued victims of authoritarian rule, allowing refugees to settle here to experience and become a part of our free and great democracy, must never be allowed to travel down this proposed road of potential authoritarianism where freedom of speech is effectively outlawed. Australia's history of democratic rule must continue to always stand in stark contrast to the following dictatorships and authoritarian governments (to name but a few):

- The Communist China Party rule over China as a "people's democratic dictatorship";
- Marxist soviet union under Stalin;
- 1930s-1942 Nazi Germany totalitarian dictatorship;
- The socialist republic of East Germany from 1949 when they began to institute a government based on the government of the Soviet Union during the Stalin era;
- Medieval societies prior to the separation of church and state, where truth was determined by the church and enforced as the law of the land.

iv) Freedom of speech is the most important of the four freedoms that must be present for a society to be a free and open western democratic country where individual rights are not sacrificed for the rights of the commune. If the population in a society is not allowed to express themselves freely and is in fear of being silenced or blacklisted if they criticise the government or fall foul of the narrative or group think of the day, then they do not have any other individual rights. In the absence of freedom of speech, a population does not have the right to freedom of association, freedom of religion, freedom to own property, and without freedom of speech a society cannot be a functional democracy that develops through the merit of the contest of ideas – which is the main way that

a country and its population are able to propel itself forward based on true innovation and ingenuity and principles that support the values of a free and open society. In a free and open capitalist society, the population must have the ability to participate in and determine the government of the day, the system of government used, including the type of economy. The very definition of a democracy is that the majority of its population is able to have control in these matters, rather than the individuals that they have elected to govern. While it may be understandable that the government of a growing population is going to try to find ways to be able to maintain control over a population, (and it is through this legislation that the federal government is indeed seeking to control the population through silencing sections of the population, including those who oppose them even in the parliament from expressing views or opinions contrary to their own, who disagree with or criticise their policies and narratives of the day either on social media or otherwise), Australia must never go down the path of other authoritarian governments to do so. If they do, they risk re-creating the history of those governments in less fortunate countries plagued by dictatorship and war, and they risk doing so in one of the greatest western democratic countries on earth that the diggers of the World War 1 and 2 put their very lives on the line to uphold and protect. The societies who lived through the world wars would tell you that to allow governments to hinder full open and fierce debate by classifying this as so-called hate or harmful speech is a one way ticket to authoritarian rule. Please let us not repeat the authoritarian history of certain governments during the 20th Century, especially not so soon afterwards, simply because of a lack of basic understanding of history or of the principles that our country has already sent its people to fight and die for in foreign lands to save those populations and the world from tyranny.

2. The Government has not put forward a case that the expression or "dissemination" "misinformation and disinformation" pose a threat to the safety and wellbeing of Australia by providing any data or evidence to support this assertion, (let alone any widely accepted date or evidence), or any evidence that the majority of Australians feel that their safety or the safety and wellbeing of others is threatened as a result of the expression of "misinformation" or "disinformation" – as defined by the government of the day.

    a) There was much talk of the new in vogue terms "misinformation" and "disinformation" during the pandemic. The terms have the effect of maligning any information that goes anywhere near certain topics that are not considered by the ruling elite sections of society or government, to be acceptable for discussion by or conjecture of the general population. These terms malign the expression of opinion or fact or even just questioning in relation to these topics by the general population (unless in support of the educated elite of the day), to the extent that the topics themselves are so heavily controlled that they are cast into the category of too controversial to discuss; therefore classifying them as third rail. These terms nullify the desire to think critically, and especially to express these thoughts publicaly (on social media, or eventually otherwise)
    b) These terms being as such, there has been no attempt made by government to prove that what they consider as "misinformation" or "disinformation" has caused harm to the Australian population. There have been many talking heads

on the media during the pandemic, and many government officials standing daily at press conferences hammering into the community what the policy positions inherent in their health orders of the day, but there was never proper peer reviewed accepted evidence that people questioning their views or policy positions caused harm to any section of the community. There was the very questionable assertion that the mandatory vaccinations were safe and effective, assertions that have been proven irrefutably false by the huge number of catastrophic and deadly responses to the vaccines that were developed and rushed out at "warp speed". The vaccines cannot be safe and effective if they have been found to have killed even one person, of which they have been found to have done by coroners across the world. Informed consent requires the population to have this information, and the fact is none of it was provided and is even still refuted today by talking head virologists and scientists, even though it is starting to emerge that there are hundreds of thousands, even millions of cases of death and catastrophic injuries from the vaccines, that we know about and that have been reported at this point in time. There was some assertions that the vaccines prevented serious illness, but I never saw any medical or scientific evidence presented to support this – just more narrative and assertion.

c) This proposed legislation will not be applied to the views, opinions, policy positions of the government of the day, or the supporting media talking heads or their narratives, and along with this there will be no attempt to measure or determine whether their thoughts/narratives/information that they may be presenting are causing harm to the population. When clearly they were the only groups causing mass harm to the population, whether via support for lock downs of the population (worse than even in war time with curfews in at least one state of Australia), masking of children and adults (causing damage to the IQ of children as proven in respected peer reviewed scientific research where a 20 point drop was noticed as a result of these pandemic policy measures), support for vaccine mandates that caused catastrophic injuries, death or financially and emotionally crippling those who withstood the mandates and did not cave into the psychological operation waged on the public to fold and take the vaccine. The harm caused to the economy by the government of the day's policies, which has now resulted in the highest inflation we have seen in more than 30 years, the destruction of small businesses and the early retirement of many who may have chosen to protect their bodies and refuse forced vaccination with an experimental and unknown substance.
d) Although promising a royal commission into the pandemic response, we were never provided with one, denying the population and the current government with any ability to accurately measure the effect of these policies on the population, or any evidence or data to test the narratives of the day during the pandemic about what was "disinformation" and "misinformation". And without a royal commission there can be no claims by government that there is any evidence to support that the dominant and some would argue forced narrative of the day was accurate, nothing to support that what out of what was being said on television on an hourly basis was accurate and could be held up to data and statistics? Without a fair, openly and properly conducted royal commission there can be no assessment of just how harmful these narratives and policies were on the public. Many suspect this is the very reason we do not have a royal

commission today, and may never have a royal commission. Too many are complicit from both sides of politics, as they spoke in one voice "safe and effective" and that anyone who questioned this and wanted to protect theirs or their families bodies by refraining from taking the vaccine until more was known, was a "grub" or a "murderer" and were not worthy or medical attention or a hospital bed themselves if they became sick, or were even told by some (even in the media) that it was hoped that they died. Yes this is what happened, and many of us who suffered through it, we still have the online footage of these disgraceful attempts by government and media talking heads to smear us and make us subject to the lateral violence of everyone from our neighbours to our local GP to our employer, to our own families. Many of these voices are a little quiet now, given the humanitarian level crisis that was created by these policies and mandatory vaccinations, but we the population have not forgotten what we were subjected to, and will very quickly electorally punish any government who seeks to legislate this kind of abusive environment that we were subject to through public health orders and mainstream media and corporations working in unison with government, similar to the start of what occurred in 1930s Nazi Germany where these organisations spoke with one voice, a desperately diabolical narrative.

e) Given that the Australian population was never given the chance to voice our opinions on the pandemic measures that were being taken by government, when any social media posts that were contrary to the government and media narratives being taken down on masse, under the direction of western defence departments and agencies around the world, and given no actual legislation was ever put to parliament, and in fact parliament itself had been suspended for much of the pandemic due to the creation of emergency powers by the classification of the pandemic as an emergency the Australian public has never been asked to either via legislation or a referendum if we consented to the response of the government during the pandemic. This and the lack of a royal commission into the measures taken by both state and federal governments really underlies the fact that there was no democratic basis for any of the measures undertaken during the pandemic – during which time the terms "misinformation" and "disinformation" were deployed to prevent discussion of the measures being taken. There was no democratic basis, and there was no evidential basis for the policy measures taken. So there is certainly no evidential basis to support the notion of this proposed communications legislation that seeks to curb free speech and critical thinking in relation to what is "disinformation" or "misinformation"

How the outlawing of any information deemed "misinformation" and "disinformation" that occurred during the pandemic (that essentially was any opinion or statement of fact that went against the public health orders of the state and federal governments, and was taken down by social media corporations) and how the silencing of people occurred and the effect this had.

Please note that describing even person stories of suffering as a result of the vaccine mandates or the vaccines are still currently outlawed, as they are still the kind of information taken down by social media corporations, because they fly in the face of the still current narrative that the vaccines and policies taken by government were nothing but good for us, safe and effective.

My Story

How anyone's story can be considered "misinformation" or "disinformation" is beyond me, but that is most certainly still what is currently considered by the policies of many social media corporations.

I did not want to take the vaccine (for the reasons that I outline in section below), and just as I was threatened would occur by the state Premiers in their daily press conference: *"I would only go backwards"*. I promise you they weren't kidding. However I just wish they had shared the full plan. The plan to bankrupt and make homeless those who were fundamentally opposed to being made guinea pig to the big government, big pharamaceutical medical and financial experiment of the covid vaccine.

Although I was the granddaughter of a world war 2 veteran, whose grandfather had his life put on the line to fight for western freedoms (including the freedom that is protected in the Australian constitution to not be subject to a medical procedure (or experiment) against their will), I was still stripped of my working rights in this country. As a result I was sent into 30 thousand dollars of debt, debt I had never experienced in my whole life and was forced to go to St Vincent De Pauls for meals and meal vouchers. Despite having almost 2 university degrees, and a 20 year corporate career, not one person would help me by providing me with a job. Not in my field or industry, not as a call centre officer, not as a cleaner, not as kitchenhand or delivery driver. I applied for everything and was turned away sometimes with the amusement and great disrespect of those with the power to employ. I tried to start my own cleaning business, but seemed to primarily get propositioned by those wishing to turn my cleaning business into a prostitution business. I would rather be homeless then to be forced into prostitution by the governments decision to erase me because I wanted to spare my body from the ravages of the vaccine.

I got down to the point where I had $200 of access to credit left, facing bankruptcy and not enough money to even move my things into storage and would have simply had to put my things out on the nature strip and go and live in my car. Family and friends were not in a position to help a by this stage quite ill person with the help I needed. I turned to God and that was the only way I started to climb out of this death pit the government had dug for me.

I became one of many people cast out onto the conspiracy theorist, unvaccinated (unclean), purveyor of "disinformation" hitlist which eventually became a dumping pit. I was continually told but no the vaccine mandates have ended and even though it was a year or more after this narrative or "disinformation" was being forced down our throats on TV and social media, I had to try and explain one more time that I had literally tried everything and every place I could and was still told I could not apply or be considered for a job without a vaccine, (or I was considered overqualified for the very tiny number of jobs I found out about that were just starting to accept those without a vaccine – this was even by early 2023.

While it might be a little easier today to gain employment, there are many sectors where it is still the case where those from those industries can not work because of the vaccine mandates. That is because the only way to counter what the government did is to include discrimination based on vaccination or other medical status as illegal. As we all know finding a good or stable and safe job these days is not easy. So try multiplying that by about 10 for many of us who are unvaccinated, especially those who are also ageing or from very specific industries that do not translate easily into other industries. Then add to all of this very high inflation and cost of living. Its too much.

But every time I tried to explain my story on social media I was silenced and had my posts erased/taken down, I felt so alone and that no one would help me, and that not many people cared

enough to actually help, and not many people understood what the government had done to me. I stopped talking about it, and just suffered pretty much alone (spare a few good friends also in the unvaccinated boat) and in silence. By this stage I was very physically ill, and found it very difficult to get proper medical care, experiencing serious discrimination and really a denial of universal health care when I went to hospital to try and get care…..*da ta da taaa, becaaaause* I was "not vaccinated". Essentially I was suffering the personal experiences of very random lateral violence that I had been set up for by the government.

In fact, this submission is the first time I am really able to describe what happened to me publicaly, because I believe (perhaps erroneously – we will see) that this will be published, and my request for anonymity will be respected. Finally a chance to help people understand what someone who was unvaccinated actually experienced as a result of being posited as some sort of social and medical leper for desiring to maintain control over my body.

As for others who are unvaccinated, I have heard of people who lost their homes, their marriages, their mental health, their careers (or were given new careers as cleaners), or were able to work but at lower levels then previously for reduced pay. Is there really anyone in Australia who honestly thinks this is fair, especially when we look at the catastrophic injuries being faced by many who were vaccinated? The suffering of the unvaccinated was also catastrophic, and we share a bond because of what we experienced.

Today I am still very unwell from not being able to care for myself properly during the pandemic, get care, and because I was squashed under the terrible debt that I was forced to pick up. I still struggle with large debt that determines and limits a lot of my decision today. I lost so much of my superannuation, as I had to live on this to try and survive this experiment on me by the government, and feel sad knowing my retirement funds will be at least $100 – up to potentially even $200K less because I was forced to raid these during the pandemic.

However, it is through God and the prayers of my church and my friends who understand what happened to me that I am able to cope with the constant terrible legacy of the government's pandemic policies, or rather what I refer to as their attempted hit job on me. It was the first time that I started to understand what it might be like to be an immigrant in Australia without working rights and without the support of family. This is even though I go back many generations of Australians with most of my ancestors having worked hard over generations to help build Australia to the Country it is today.

<u>The reason I refused the vaccine:</u>

I refused to take the experimental vaccine because I have had previous health issues where I have lost much faith in the integrity and usefulness of the mainstream health industry and pharmaceutical companies. I have read so many legal cases of women who had developed cancer or terrible injuries from products developed by certain pharmaceutical companies, I had personal experience of receiving no help or treatment for my own debilitating chronic health condition and had to scurry away to wherever I could to try and receive assistance to get through this and eventually without an acknowledgement by medical professionals that I was even suffering, eventually finding myself in alternative health care which actually cured my illnesses through natural techniques and supplements.

It was during this time I saw how broken the system was and I was not going to trust my health to the very same system that put me through so much distress through neglect and dereliction of its duty to properly research and provide care to all patients, because it had come up with a very

rapidly produced vaccine that I was expected to take and form part of the experimental group. I knew that I could easily recover from a very bad flu, as I had done so and learnt how to activate my immune system, something they did not tell me how to do when I had a chronic respiratory related condition 10 years earlier. I also read reputable scientifically peer reviewed research that indicated that there was a chance that taking the vaccine would reintroduce this previous condition that I had fought so hard to get rid of, and introduce some other related women's health conditions. I was not willing to gamble my health on the advice of medical professionals who had abandoned me at least 10-12 years earlier.

I am also a sexual assault victim, and I experience trauma at the idea of being forced to relinquish control over my body and institutional coercion to do something I do not want to do with my body.

However I have still suffered medically terribly since the vaccine rollout, as I live in a capital city and am surrounded by people who have had 2 or 3 jabs, that I experience similar menstrual dysregulation that many women who have been vaccinated experience. This is because I inhale the exhalation of those who have been vaccinated and I also touch them or rather touch surfaces that they have touched, and just as Pfizer outlined in the documents related to their trials (that they were ordered to release by a US court), those who inhale the exhalation of those who have been vaccinated (which can occur in airconditioned environments) or touch them (or who have unprotected sex with a vaccinated male) are considered to have been exposed to the vaccine.

Also, as womens' menstrual cycles tend to synchronise (a well known and indisputable medical fact), this has meant for me that I also suffer from the same enslaught of exposure to the vaccine and the same sterilising effect of those vaccinated women who have had their cycle terribly disrupted in that they bleed non stop (and without a regular cycle it is very difficult for a woman to maintain control over her reproductive health). The sterilising impact of the vaccines has been borne out by the dramatic reduction in reproductive rates in Australia and many other countries – some who have seen up to 20% or more drop from directly after the vaccination roll outs. I have been told hysterectomy is the answer.

Other stories of catastrophic injuries from the vaccines.

I have not addressed those who were injured, disabled or killed by the vaccine in this submission, but I know of some devastating stories, some that broke through the code of silence in the media about those suffering because they followed the mainstream narrative to get vaccinated and do their part, or loose their jobs, their livelihoods (and in effect for some parents the custody of their children if they could no longer provide a roof over their head). If there had been full and frank discussion in the media about the true cost benefit analysis of taking the vaccine, and how wrong mandating it was, there could have been informed consent. Informed consent was trampled on during the vaccine rollout, with I argue no-one able to provide informed consent, subject to being forced participants in a global rapid medical experiment, unable to access information about what was in the vaccines, the dosage, and the research.

How is it that we sign forms just before surgery to state that we understand the risks and have had these explained to us, and have to make decisions about our own health day in and day out, but when it came to this incredibly profitable vaccine – (profitable for the companies, and anyone who had shares in them), we were told we were just not capable of deciding whether we should or should not have the vaccine, because we were not medical doctors or scientists and virologists. Or we could but we were terribly coerced and told we would just "go backwards", loose our jobs, homes etc etc if we did not comply…its just hideous how the population was treated, and there must

and will be a reckoning of what occurred. It is happening now, people are living out the results. Many governments changed as they were voted out after those experiment, and they will change rapidly again if this legislation is forced on us against the will of the people again.

I know of a young man who had a promising football career and who had an apprenticeship, who is now permanently blind in both eyes from taking the vaccine and who is also essentially homeless (or couch surfing) – because the government refused to pay out his claim for the vaccine injury. I know of others who had to replace part of their heart system because they took the vaccine, or others who experience debilitating pain every day. I have seen countless images of people and athletes dropping dead mid field after taking the vaccine. I have heard of babies, kids and teenagers dying after being vaccinated, or suffering terribly. Not many of these stories are allowed in the mainstream media, and not many are reported, because of the threats of loss of licence and even criminal prosecution that so many doctors received all throughout the pandemic to not report adverse events and to recommend vaccination even against their own medical advice. So many of our doctors in Australia are also on temporary visas, and are in an even more precarious position should they dare to stand up and speak, in that their own livelihoods and ability to live in the country they call home is threatened if they do.

Proposed legislation not compliant with the constitution or other commonwealth legislation.

Lastly, this legislation is not compliant with the constitution and other pieces of federal legislation, in that free speech and the personal expressions of opinions, personal stories, facts by the pubic, freedom of association, freedom of religion and a range of other freedoms including the freedom to not be subjected to is protected in other commonwealth legislation, and in the constitution. If people are unable to speak freely about vaccines or protest these, and are forced to take a medical procedure, this is against provisions it the constitution protecting against such.

Thank you for considering my submission. I ask that you do not censor my submission and treat the people as adults, let them read it and decide what is fair and reasonable, and make up their own minds if they want to legislate this kind of censorship and mind control proposed in the legislation.