

## **I would like to state my strong objection to the proposed Communications Legislation Amendment (Combating Misinformation and Disinformation) Bill 2023.**

Vanessa Moss

Submission can be made public

This “proposed” bill is another ‘power grab’ and a ‘fundamental threat to our democracy. This bill is an extraordinary example of government overreach and, if this bill goes through, public health safety, electoral integrity, social cohesion and ultimately democracy will be at risk. It will allow the government to manage Australians like little children. It will enable them to hide their mistakes, incompetence, criminality and corruption. We know just how ineffective the government is at providing factual information. For example information relating to COVID-19 and their vaccines. The COVID-19 pandemic taught us not to trust the government, our medical practitioners (thanks to AHPRA’s statement to their members), or our media, as misinformation/ disinformation provided by the government about COVID treatments led to serious consequences (the public were not fully informed of the possible adverse events which meant that the government violated voluntary informed consent). We are now experiencing unprecedented excess death rates (16-20% above the 5 year average) which are being ignored by the government and the media. These government officials who can’t use spell check or safety test dangerously rushed gene-vaccines want to control everything we can see, hear or say online. That many claims made by politicians and health authorities turned out to be false would seem to be a problem. For example, Australians were told in 2021 that they were confronting a uniquely deadly virus that required an extreme response. The Australian Bureau of Statistics, however, recorded that 2021 was the second lowest level of respiratory deaths since records have been kept (the lowest was 2020). They also said they won’t block political speech but a politician’s maiden speech to parliament was banned from YouTube in June, 2023 - Liberal Democrats MLC John Ruddick – who called into question the risky experimental gene-based vaccines. A first in Australian history! (It has since been reinstated.)

This bill will give ACMA (Australian Communications & Media Authority) extraordinary powers and have a chilling effect on, and would suppress legitimate, free speech. In classic double speak Michelle Rowland said ACMA will be given its new information gathering and record-keeping powers “while balancing the right to freedom of expression so fundamental to democracy” – they will be stopping freedom of expression to protect freedom of expression! They will outsource censorship to the digital platforms so the government can dishonestly pretend that it is not the one ordering the censoring. It’s decentralised censorship. Also, the Australian public will not be able to vote ACMA in or out, so they will not care if we like it or not.

After reading through the bill there are huge problems:

- It will stifle political debate – the definition of ‘misinformation’ is too broad.
- Nothing a government official, an ‘approved’ academic or news media representative says can be misinformation/disinformation, but criticisms or statements by somebody disagreeing with government official, an ‘approved’ academic or news media representative can be deemed misinformation/disinformation.
- It will allow all levels of government to become a ‘ministry of truth’ censor of social media companies.
- Professional news content – who defines this?

- Content that is authorised by the Commonwealth or the State – a backdoor so Canberra can lie to the Australian people without consequences.
- How do you establish a person's intent from a post, and, how will ACMA know how the reader will respond?

Why exclude the government and government entities, government approved media and online news media content and government approved accredited educational providers? Research has shown that the government, news media and educational institutions can also be a source of harmful misinformation and disinformation (such as the 2019 election reports about the 'death tax'). The fact that the bill explicitly exempts any government communication, or any level of government, from being considered misinformation or disinformation, shows how Orwellian this law will be.

This bill will be a direct violation of Section 16 of the Human Rights Act 2004 which states that:

1. Everyone has the right to hold opinions without interference.
2. Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right includes the freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of borders, whether orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or any other way chosen by him or her.

and in direct violation of the UN General Assembly's 'International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights' (ICCPR) on 16 December 1966:

ICCPR Article 19 states –

1. Everyone shall have the right to hold opinions without interference.
2. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice.

General Comment 34 emphasises that freedom of expression and opinion are the foundation stone of a free and democratic society and a necessary condition for the promotion and protection of human rights.

The government are already using "misinformation" to threaten journalists right now. The Department of Health accused Alison Bevege of false and misleading information when she stated that the COVID products were gene vaccines. It's obvious and factual: both the mRNA products (Pfizer and Moderna), and the DNA products (Astra Zeneca...quietly withdrawn from the market 12 months after UK withdrew it due to the high number of adverse events), insert a genetic sequence into your cells instructing them to express an uncontrollable amount of non-human spike protein from the COVID-19 virus. These products are nothing like traditional vaccines which are simple doses of weakened or killed virus injected to provoke an immune response. The government named these products "vaccines" to confuse the public because people would readily accept them without fuss, thus helping the government achieve their policy goal. The government was completely wrong about the COVID-19 "vaccines". They did not reduce transmission. They were not safe; they injured people.

Australia is one of the few common law countries to not have a Constitutional Charter or Bill of Rights. However, the High Court has held that an implied freedom of political communication exists as an indispensable part of the system of representative and responsible government created by the Constitution. It operates as a freedom from government restraint, rather than a right conferred directly on individuals. It is my belief that the recently appointed [REDACTED] who has just been appointed the [REDACTED]

