

Objection to censorship of information by classing it as misinformation.

Summary

The introduction of any piece of legislation that in any way tries to restrict the freedom of ideas, thoughts, in any format, institutes a totalitarian form of control over every area of life to human beings. We currently have laws that deal with certain areas of thought and actions that are deemed as illegal and against the moral judgement of the people. But to have a department that is specifically designed to silence what it may perceive as misinformation and that department is not controlled by a majority public view is only trouble. That will be because it will be controlled by a few people pushing their own agenda (as proven in the last 3 years).

It is not possible to list all the reason that this bill should not be enacted, and the pure fact that it even exists raises serious concerns over the leadership of the people who proposed it. Now do they have the right to propose it? The answer has to be yes. Do the majority of people have the right to say no and choose not to consent? The answer to this is also yes. Are the people who proposed this bill doing the right thing for their constituents, that they work for, is definitely in contention. Ironically this very bill is designed to stop people from raising that concern as it could be classed as disinformation.

History as so many examples of thoughts and ideas that were considered radical and crazy that over time proved to be a generally accepted truth. Things like the earth is round, Gravity, medical advancement and so on. With out the ability propose an idea you are restricting the ability of Free thought.

I ask this question, who gives you the power to tell the Australian people what is right or wrong about information that my be dispersed? The answer is the very people that you are trying to censor by threats of fines and punishment. If you can't, see the disastrous circular reference here then you are not service the very Australian that put you in that position.

Some reference that goes directly against this bill.

<https://www.ag.gov.au/rights-and-protections/human-rights-and-anti-discrimination/human-rights-scrutiny/public-sector-guidance-sheets/right-freedom-opinion-and-expression>

What is the right to freedom of opinion and expression?

The right to freedom of opinion is the right to hold opinions without interference, and cannot be subject to any exception or restriction.

The right to freedom of expression extends to any medium, including written and oral communications, the media, public protest, broadcasting, artistic works and commercial advertising. The right is not absolute. It carries with it special responsibilities, and may be restricted on several grounds. For example, restrictions could relate to filtering access to certain internet sites, the urging of violence or the classification of artistic material.

Multiple Court Cases Relating to this matter.

High Court in 1992 in *Australian Capital Television v Commonwealth* and *Nationwide News Ltd v Wills*.

In the 2019 cases of *Clubb v Edwards* and *Preston v Avery*

In *Lange v Australian Broadcasting Corporation*

I could spend multiple days finding heaps of reference of history and legislation. But to what avail if you cant see this as morally wrong then you should not be in the position you are in.

Summary

Generally it should be understood that this legislation is a bad idea at bests and a totalitarian concept at worst and I personally as a free person do not consent to this piece of legislation even if it is enacted.

Vince Pannell