

Submission: Communications Legislation Amendment (Combatting Misinformation and Disinformation) Bill 2023

19 August 2023

Re : Exposure Draft

Basic Argument Against this Proposal:

I believe there are so many examples of a lack of certainty in this current draft document that no contract could be agreed to under its current format.

Any enshrinement of this draft or similar into any Statutory or other Law would I believe be tantamount to Treason, or encourage those with an intent of Treason.

The timing of this draft document being offered to the people of Australia for submissions questions the integrity of those proposing it (unnamed), especially since silence does not legally create a contract, but only serves to increase the lack of certainty contained within it, that would require an inordinate amount of resources to be put forward in legal cases based on attempts to enforce such a contract.

This draft does not fully disclose the proposal and so is not ready for debate, and therefore leaves the proposers open to allegations of corruption. Given the current allegations of corruption against ASIC, and the current motions in parliament put to parliament by at least two Senators that propose to open up and force disclosure and cancellation of the no liability status of pharmaceutical companies, because of mounting evidence of actual 'harm' to the people of Australia, (which no doubt will also implicate employees of parliaments), this proposal may not only be ill timed, but itself be open to allegations of a means of further corruption activities and could implicate those proposing it.

The issue of Australia's sovereignty within International Law arguably must be addressed prior to any closing down of open debate. Especially given the not yet ratified, yet arguably ignored by government media dissemination to the public, existence of the Vienna Convention 1986 document, which, I believe, those proposing this document appear to be supporting, or could be accused of supporting, and maybe even pushing forward by eliminating the voices of Sovereign Australians.

Given the currently disputed efforts to change the Constitution, with so many Original peoples petitioning themselves against this, this draft, especially on the perceived by many people to be a 'censorship' Chinese styled draft is ill timed and may aggravate the Australian Sovereign People even further against those making such an ill-informed, and even 'silly' document when set against a benchmark of philosophical logical intelligence.

There are no names attached to this draft proposal. The international and national experiences of all people at least since 2020, and for many prior to this, seem to have ignited a very powerful sense of accountability by all of us. This document is not in line with the culture of the people of our geographical land. And therefore of great concern when considering what constitutes Treason.

The now widespread knowledge that Corporations and their Directors have done a great deal of harm to people in this geographical land of Australia (and I do cite the loss of lives arguably caused by, or at least arguably encouraged by, politicians and their subsidiary corporations who had

anything to do with the medical mandates, the WEF, WHO and others), means that if this document does not receive the proper debate in good faith, it will be viewed and ignored as simply a means of further deception under the guise of more wolves in sheep's clothing, to coin a Fabian term. Or yet another 'mandate', whose philosophical recognition of allowable information, is gathered solely from arguably those monopolists with invested interests in harming Australians and others. I am referring to Hopkins Medicine notably in connection with this one [of several] examples, which appeared, to my knowledge, to form the basis of all argument for a mandate and other perceived coercive tactics during what was called 'Covid', but is now being argued in legal courts worldwide as bio-weapons that did and continue to cause harm to people.

And, it must be stated that the terms under which this submission has been called for may themselves be termed disinformation or misinformation. I refer to the either/or option, which really isn't satisfactory of open public submissions, when a caveat of permission is assumed and stated for the proposers of the document or others to be able to edit the submissions by people.

To state someone else's words by using your own is to my knowledge still plagiarism. To do so, within the seriousness of a draft submission sought to become legally enshrined may be termed corruption in many quarters. Especially if these edits employ advertorial tactics of juxta-positioning, or other contextual placements that either distort any open healthy debate and oversight of such a nonsensical draft as the current one must be considered in its current format.

In order to ensure that my submission is available publicly without any edits a copy of this will be protected, witnessed and secured by me. So you have fair warning. No edits are consented to by me. Your options are not valid and certainly not cogent by the standards of any intelligent openly honest dialogue, to the true capacity of those who seek honesty.

I look forward to expanding upon this initial submission and debating your proposal when you have given it more serious thought and assigned people to its construction that may be more versed in philosophical argument and feasible contracts. If it appears silly to me then I have no doubt there are many others more highly skilled in philosophy who may be laughing and referring to the proposers in terms I would not repeat here. Unfortunately, this attempt to present such a document is far too serious to take this lightly.

Given the short notice to make this submission at all, (through what I believe may be a purposeful hiding of this document from the Public via a lack of media attention), I reserve my rights to add to the above as I see fit in good faith.

Mena Baines

All Rights Reserved.