

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Economics and Governance Committee](#)  
**Subject:** Rejection of Continuation of State of Emergency - Abuse of Power  
**Date:** Thursday, 1 July 2021 5:29:22 PM

---

Minister,

There is no statistical or scientific basis for an Emergency in any state of Australia. Why do we need a State of Emergency when Statistics in Australia show that 99.9% of people under the age of 65 survive the virus, 99.5% of 70 year olds (without the complication of other co-morbidities) survive the virus. The age group at risk is the over 80's?

Why do we need a State of Emergency when John Ioannidis of Stanford University – one of the ten most cited scientists in the world has ranked the mortality rate of COVID-19 caused by SARS-COV-2 in the range of that of influenza as early as March 2020? He demonstrated that the worldwide panic at the end of January 2020 regarding an alleged high mortality rate associated with SARS-Cov 2 infection was and is simply unfounded. His paper confirms that the majority of people 65 and under survive the Corona Virus. See: <http://bit.ly/3rvOVs4>

Why is there a need for a State of Emergency when the Statistics show there have been a small number of deaths in Australia (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2020 deaths from COVID are 909). This is the lowest average death rate in Australia from upper respiratory infections in the past 5 years and apparently last year influenza deaths completely disappeared, Prior to COVID, the Australian Bureau of Statistics show that nearly 3,000 people were dying from influenza?

Why is no data given to people in Queensland about how many of the alleged COVID "cases" were properly diagnosed by a doctor apart from having a PCR test since now the WHO are saying the PCR test should not be used as the sole diagnostic tool but merely an aid?

It has been alleged that there is an asymptomatic form of COVID19. Usually doctors cannot make a proper diagnosis unless a person is displaying symptoms. A study of nearly 10,000,000 people stated that out of the nearly 10 million people in the study, "300 asymptomatic cases" were found.

Contact tracing was then carried out and of those 300, no cases of COVID-19 were detected in any of them. "A total of 1,174 close contacts of the asymptomatic positive cases were traced, and they all tested negative for the COVID-19." See:

<https://bit.ly/30jhXiE>

The WHO has realised some of the problems with the PCR testing in that many false positives are produced and if the cycles of magnification are too high this test produces incorrect results. WHO has issued two notifications -- one on 14th December 2020 and one on 13th January 2021 providing a warning that caution needs to be exercised in using this test, as it is an aid to diagnosis and not the sole diagnostic tool. It is a known fact that the PCR test is not able to diagnose whether you have an infection from any virus. See:

Version 1 - 7 December 2020 - <http://bit.ly/3c7Eysk>

Version 2 - 13 January 2021 - <http://bit.ly/3qkP68c>

Why is the PCR test still being used as a basis that a person is infected with the Virus? Our

own Therapeutic Goods Administration on their website (for Health Practitioners only) says “The extent to which a positive PCR result correlates with the infectious state of an individual is still being determined” “There is limited evidence available to assess the accuracy and clinical utility of available COVID-19 tests”

You need to show where WHO has ever suggested that there should be lockdowns and arrests for non-compliance?

In summary a very serious event (the State of Emergency) has taken place that allows people enormous power and it is being abused. People have had their human rights taken away. This situation demands that the State of Emergency is fully justified with statistics that show a high death rate and that if you catch the virus you are likely to die. NEITHER OF THESE THINGS IS TRUE.

Decisions are being made without any reliable data and causing damage to people’s lives.

You would be wise to remember that the role of Parliament, in a liberal democracy, is to preserve freedoms.

True rights can only be suspended or limited by the right's holder. These are known as inalienable rights. God given which cannot be extinguished by the State, the Chief Health Officer or Premier.

Regards,  
Chris Hood

