

Committee Secretary  
Community Support and Services Committee  
Parliament House  
George Street  
Brisbane Qld 4000

SUBMISSION TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND OTHER LEGISLATION (EXTENSION OF EXPIRING PROVISIONS) AMENDMENT BILL 2022

THE PURPOSE OF THE BILL IS TO:

FURTHER EXTEND THE OPERATION OF ESSENTIAL PUBLIC HEALTH MEASURES IMPLEMENTED TO FACILITATE QUEENSLAND'S RESPONSE TO THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC  
EXTEND AMENDMENTS TO THE CORRECTIVE SERVICES ACT 2006, DISASTER MANAGEMENT ACT 2003 AND MENTAL HEALTH ACT 2016 TO SUPPORT THE PUBLIC HEALTH RESPONSE.

Dear Committee Secretary,

I am against the extension of the COVID-19 Pandemic.

In essence, these are my arguments:

- The existing restrictions are inconsistent and likely have little basis upon robust medical advice
- The existing restrictions change depending on political stances (such as different states vs. the federal government) as well as different countries.
- We are no longer in an emergency situation, we are two years in and are now in an endemic situation.
- The latest New Zealand High Court vaccination case showed just how little (in fact zero) data was used to justify vaccination mandates. It was solely based on 'I am an expert and this is what I have seen'. Meanwhile the other side of the argument provided extensive data to show otherwise.
- Governments should focus on core responsibilities such as emergency services and hospitals instead of simply removing citizens' human rights. This must be a last resort, be proportionate and time limited, not indefinite.
- The seasonal flu has in the past had certain deadly seasons resulting in hospitals becoming overburdened. Yet, nothing has been done then, and nothing has been done now to increase capacity. This is an 'emergency' made by the government by failing to prepare (and now failing to rectify).
- Public opinion has changed significantly, as outlined in the UK Public Comment Survey. 90% of respondents were for the removal of vaccine mandates for their health services.

I apologize for the below, I did not become aware of this public comment until the very day of the due date. The below is a slightly more in-depth take on the above arguments.

The existing restrictions and directions are inconsistent with the wider community and scientific knowledge. For instance, the Federal Government only sees a need for vaccination requirements in aged care facilities and high risk settings within a hospital. Queensland on the other hand, is of the belief that vaccination requirements are needed for all aspects of social life, such as a cafe/restaurant and many occupations. While the government may not set out requirements for vaccination for all businesses, the government's stance has emboldened private businesses to do so, even if it is not required/reasonable.

This is simply one decision that is inconsistent. Others include vaccination not being required for a food court (which is indoors and often crowded) whereas a restaurant with socially distanced outdoor dining and check-ins would be described as 'too dangerous' as this is not permitted.

Quite frankly, these rules are too inconsistent to actually be based on proper scientific reasoning and appear to mostly be done for administrative ease and/or to be seen to 'do the right thing' and be tough on unvaccinated persons.

As for it continuing to be a state of emergency, this is an absolute stretch. Other locations in the world have either completely removed their covid-19 restrictions or have reduced these to very few restrictions to be phased out in the very near future. These include the United Kingdom, Ireland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Tanzania, Nicaragua (never really had restrictions to begin with), Dominican Republic and Iceland. Certain states within Canada and the US have also abandoned their positions.

A large factor for the reduction/revocation of these restrictions is a change in science, namely the widespread nature of covid as well as the new strains of Delta and Omicron and the vaccines being ineffective at preventing transmission.

Of note is the New Zealand High Court case for mandatory vaccination of Police and Defense Force Staff. It should be noted that the Justice for this case was the same Justice who previously upheld mandatory vaccination in a previous case of airport workers.

What came of this case was appalling to say the least. When it came to evidence of vaccination preventing the spread of covid, the government health advisor was unable to produce any tangible evidence of such and instead stated that he has viewed many studies showing it to be effective at stopping transmission. Oddly, the government did provide evidence for the effectiveness of vaccination against mild and severe covid. Further, there were several letters of advice sent to the Police and Defence force which stated that vaccination prevents transmission, however again the government failed to provide any evidence on which this advice was based upon. We are two years into this pandemic (which supposedly is such a concerning emergency) and yet we have so little provided by the government other than 'I am an expert, trust me. This is appalling.

The government's job should be to provide a population with the tools to handle emergencies (such as providing emergency services, hospitals etc.). Only as a last resort should the

government impede upon human rights (and this should be proportional and time limited, not indefinite). We are two years into the pandemic and the government has barely changed anything when it comes to health care other than mandating vaccination and in fact canceling/suspending non-critical surgeries. In fact, viruses such as the flu have been issues many times in the past with some years being very deadly and hospitals becoming overwhelmed. Yet, nothing has been done other than strip peoples rights away and preventing them from seeing their dying loved ones.

I would like to conclude on a public comment by the UK Government on removing vaccination mandates for their health service. This shows the broad public support for revoking (at the very least) mandatory vaccination and can likely be extrapolated to other restrictions which adversely impact peoples lives with little scientific benefit.

90,020 respondents. Namely 55% were members of the public and 26% were those giving or requiring care.

87% stated "I feel strongly that the requirement should be revoked"

7% stated" I feel strongly that the requirement should not be revoked"

The public overwhelmingly supported revoking the requirement (96%); this was the highest level of support of any respondent type, ahead of patients or friends or family or carers of patients (92%). The largest opposition to revocation was by managers of health or social care services, 30% of whom said the requirement should not be revoked, followed by 22% of organisations providing health or social care services. Members of the health and care workforce were highly likely to support revocation (84%).

[https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/revoking-vaccination-as-a-condition-of-deployment-across-all-health-and-social-care/outcome/revoking-vaccination-as-a-condition-of-deployment-across-all-health-and-social-care-consultation-response?fbclid=IwAR0uNWKkr5MaLCAsoVbl5NFrEIQ\\_7RvVKTOZ8txAA4XCpQi12z7HpHPVEqw](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/revoking-vaccination-as-a-condition-of-deployment-across-all-health-and-social-care/outcome/revoking-vaccination-as-a-condition-of-deployment-across-all-health-and-social-care-consultation-response?fbclid=IwAR0uNWKkr5MaLCAsoVbl5NFrEIQ_7RvVKTOZ8txAA4XCpQi12z7HpHPVEqw)

Up until recently, any covid measure, no matter how supported or opposed by science and no matter how restrictive, was rubber stamped into existence. The rationale behind these decisions was never published other than verbal reassurances that 'the science is clear'. This science oddly changed depending on states and countries. The only reason there is now changes internationally is because some scientists are finally being emboldened to come forward without being entirely discredited.

This situation is endemic, is not an emergency, and can be dealt with under existing measures. The constant rubber stamping and perpetuation of a state of emergency must end. Current court cases will no doubt override public health policy if the amount of evidence is the same as was provided in New Zealand, which is basically non-existent. This would only further embarrass the government.

Kind regards,

Steven HENNLEIN

