

## **Communications Legislation Amendment (Combatting Misinformation and Disinformation) Bill 2023 Comments on the Exposure Draft Bill**

Pursuant to this legislation, ACMA will judge whether relevant content contains information that is false, misleading, or deceptive and whether it is serious after considering several criteria.

That judgement in this legislation will, to a large degree, rely on the character of the 'independent' ACMA members, which the government tends to control since ACMA members are appointed by the Governor General (in all probability as recommended by the Commonwealth Government, who also appoints the Governor General) and the Commonwealth Government itself. Instead of the tradition of relying on the wider community to debate and expose false, misleading or deceptive information, this legislation will put the power to judge 'the truth' into the hands of a few government appointed individuals. That power will include forcing the appearance of individuals (paragraphs 18(3)(d) and 19(3)(d) without travel compensation, except for copying documents in paragraph 20) and issuing huge fines.

There are many recent examples of content that has been judged by government and/or mainstream media which has later turned out to be the opposite.

If ACMA would rule against the State and Commonwealth Governments and their agencies that their adoption of emission targets for a non-existent 'climate crisis' resulting in the destruction of Australia's energy market and competitive advantage leading to seriously harmful energy poverty and serious commercial and private economic harm, then the legislation might be considered fair. Governments are unfairly exempt from this legislation and are entitled to lie and deceive. However, even if not exempt, I expect that rather than listening to geophysicists like myself<sup>1</sup> and 2022 Nobel Physics Laureate Dr. John Clauser<sup>2</sup>, ACMA would favor the ideological opinion of an uneducated Swedish teenager and unelected European communist/socialist leaders when determining the 'truth' for the purpose of this legislation.

If ACMA would rule against the Prime Minister and his Government for attempting to deceive and seriously harm the Australian public by making false statements that the 'Uluru Statement From The Heart' is only one page long, that treaty-making will be left to state governments and that no work will commence on Makarrata until after the referendum, then the legislation might be considered fair. Governments are unfairly exempt from this legislation and are entitled to lie and deceive. However, even if not exempt, I expect that rather than reading the twenty-six page Uluru Statement From The Heart<sup>3</sup>, listening to speeches made by the Prime Minister that contradict each other, understanding that Makarrata is treaty negotiation process with the Commonwealth Government and examining actual Makarrata expenditures that have been made prior to the referendum, ACMA would still favor the government's political position.

If ACMA would rule against the State and Commonwealth Governments and their agencies that inflicted serious harm by banning the prescription of Ivermectin and other available drugs for treating Covid-19 in order to justify emergency approvals of an experimental mRNA vaccine compounded with forcing people to choose between keeping their jobs or taking those experimental vaccinations that have a relatively high risk of serious harmful side effects without the benefit of preventing transmission<sup>4</sup>, then the legislation might be considered fair. Governments are unfairly exempt from this legislation and are entitled to lie and deceive. However, even if not exempt, I expect that rather than looking at the evidence presented Dr. Robert Malone, inventor of the mRNA process, or evidence collected by former

Member of Australian Parliament Craig Kelly and current Australian Commonwealth Senators Matt Canavan and Malcolm Roberts, ACMA would still favor the government's ideological position.

Government deceit and lies cause serious harm to children (gender policies based on fiction and turning a blind eye to domestic violence in indigenous communities based on fictional 'stolen generations') and serious harm to real women (gender policies based on fiction) but are unfairly exempt from this legislation.

I could go on. It is politicians, governments and their agencies that need to be held accountable to the truth, but instead they are creating another instrument to control the speech of Australian citizens and residents. There are already too many laws and regulations curtailing free speech; Section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act is one example.

Democracy is not possible without free speech and this legislation represents an attack on democracy. Furthermore, this legislation together with a government agenda to move towards a digital currency will form a strong foundation to implement an anti-democracy 'social credit' scheme like the one imposed in communist China.

This legislation must be rejected in full to preserve free speech and democracy.

Sincerely,  
Wayne Karlen

██████████

1:30pm AEST, 6 August 2023

#### References:

- 1 <https://twitter.com/AlaMerQld/status/1422401800989151240>
- 2 <https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/world/nobel-prize-winner-who-doesnt-believe-climate-crisis-has-speech-canceled/ar-AA1eiNgg>; and <https://www.theepochtimes.com/us/exclusive-we-are-totally-awash-in-pseudoscience-nobel-prize-winning-physicist-on-climate-agenda-5430650>
- 3 <https://www.skynews.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/Credlin-Editorial-PDF-2.pdf>
- 4 <https://www.foxnews.com/us/new-york-supreme-court-reinstates-all-employees-fired-being-unvaccinated-orders-backpay>