

## **Australia's regulatory approach to online services, systems and processes - consultation questions**

### **1. Are the current objects of the Act to improve and promote online safety for Australians sufficient or should they be expanded?**

These should NOT be expanded – if anything, they should be reduced. We are already witnessing and experiencing the over-reach by the e-safety commissioner/er over content that is not harmful to Australians. (Footage of an attack on Bishop Mar Mari being case in point – children's video games are even way more gorey and violent than this, perhaps the e-commissioner should focus her attention there.)

### **2. Does the Act capture and define the right sections of the online industry?**

No – it is impeaching into our right to freedom of speech and accurate knowledge of events occurring in our society.

### **3. Does the Act regulate things (such as tools or services) that do not need to be regulated, or fail to regulate things that should be regulated?**

It regulates things that DO NOT NEED to be regulated. Surprising as this might seem to the e-safety commissioner, most adults are capable of discernment. “Regulation” is over-stepping as it is becoming mere “censorship” which is abhorrent to a democratic society. The most dangerous source of misinformation/disinformation comes from Government itself as its platform has traditionally been one which was thought to be trustworthy. Freedom of speech during the Covid era was severely curtailed and evidence now proves that it was those who were curtailed, gagged, who were correct, not the Government. If anywhere needs regulation it should be the Government – their lies over “safe and effective” for an experimental gene therapy injection is another case in point, and has caused much harm amongst the community.

### **4. Should the Act have strengthened and enforceable Basic Online Safety Expectations?**

Strengthened? .... No. But made more competent (as opposed to stronger) in its restriction of pornography and other sexualized viewing for under-aged children would be commended. This is however what the Internet Safety Act was purposed for in the first place, not for censorship of adults.

### **5. Should the Act provide greater flexibility around industry codes, including who can draft codes and the harms that can be addressed? How can the code drafting process be improved?**

We do not want more and more investment to people, departments and industries to only hold power over us as to what we can say or see.

**6. To what extent should online safety be managed through a service provider's terms of use?**

Using "X" as an example, their current self-policing set-up appears quite adequate. Use of "community notes" is very helpful. Unappreciated, unwanted viewing can be blocked at the user's choice, and abhorrent content can be reported with reasonable outcomes. Unlike FB, who censors heavily, at X different and opposing viewpoints are more easily accessible and it is from this that we can learn and grow. X's "spaces" are also proving to be very informative and good places to be – these are self-policed by those hosting them. If the host does not conduct the 'room' adequately (and that does not mean 'censor', but to keep conversation respectful), the host is very quickly notified either on the spot and or by a loss of audience.

STOP dictating to us on what we can or cannot say, how it should be said, what we can view. It is stifling, unproductive, deleterious to learning understanding and compassion and is quite simply UN-DEMOCRATIC.

**7. Should regulatory obligations depend on a service provider's risk or reach?**

Who are you suggesting is to be appointed the arbiter of what we see, say and hear? The service provider? The Government? The e-safety commissioner (unelected)?

We the People are the arbiters of what we see, say and hear. Removing free speech (which includes viewing) from society is UN-DEMOCRATIC and such a concept should be repelled. Powers which have been extended to "fact checkers" who themselves have proven themselves wrong, particularly over the past 4 years, is another case in point – and with zero right of rebuttal and zero accountability.