Submission to not pass the bill related to regulating social media and the freedom of sharing alternate ideas, some may think of as mis-information and dis-information:

I oppose the restriction of information based on any groups' of any kind, definition of what is or isn't their idea of mis-information or dis-information.

I have many reasons, including.:

- I have at times thought myself right about something only to find out later, I was wrong.
- Historically the restriction of information has never indicated social improvement.
- Recently having researched a few 'facts' myself on varying topics and subject matter, I found information I believe to be factual, that differed greatly from what the so called 'fact checkers' said was true.
- I am aware of the book called 1984, and no part of me believes any semblance of a ministry of truth should ever be inflicted on a modern society.
- What I most value in life is the creativity and flexibility possible in approaches, disciplines and views, as by sharing thoughts and checking across disciplines and into other methodologies a lot can in fact be understood, that would not be so otherwise.
- I truly do not believe our representative government should think so highly of itself and dare suggest that they know what is best for everyone. I challenge that in a few ways as it is.
- Limiting speech and declaring what is and is not 'safe' to talk about is limiting expression, freedoms and is fundamentally and clearly contradicting the universal declaration of human rights.
- I do not in general consent to the many implied consents assumed already by our social structures, and I am fundamentally opposed to a reduction of my own capacity to freely seek and share alternative views and findings.
- Government is not my parent, I am an adult, and can decide very well for myself what I deem is true or not. This is part of how we define ourselves. Individual expression, even defiant thinking is part of what we are as people. Remember teenage angst?
- I have heard there exists a scientific paper that is peer reviewed addressing the subject of being able to find scientific papers supporting whatever view you want. By way of cherry picking the studies cited, and by the nature of scientists in fact needing funds to do research, which leads to only certain findings being searched for.
- It is in fact fundamentally so completely and ridiculously arrogant to think that any one group, esp government funded, could in fact know what is true, the disconnect between what prime ministers and media generally focus on and what matters, what conversations are being had in real life away from agendas and power hungry stakeholder interests is staggering in good times, it staggers me that some part of government actually thinks it knows best.
- A lot of good minds exist in the world. Limit their reach to your own, and everyone else's peril.

Do not allow this bill to pass. Regards

## Stephanie Cridland Australia