

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Economics and Governance Committee](#)
Subject: disagreeing with Public Health and Other Legislation (Further Extension of Expiring Provisions) Amendment Bill 2021 to 30 April 2022
Date: Saturday, 3 July 2021 8:23:08 AM
Attachments: [PastedGraphic-1.png](#)
[PastedGraphic-2.png](#)

In response to the application to extend the [Public Health and Other Legislation \(Further Extension of Expiring Provisions\) Amendment Bill 2021 to 30 April 2022](#) .

I question this choice based on the following points.

1. There are many other 'health' issues that could be said to demand a draconian, liberty removal approach - such as banning all smoking across Australia, considering it kills up to 24,000 lives each year. Yet I note that cigarettes have not been banned. Thus I do not understand why a 'flu' which has killed a fraction of this amount of people warrants such a heavy handed approach to reducing freedoms. If the Govt was to ban smoking then the CoVid approach might make more sense and indicate consistency in a governmental approach.

2. Nor have we banned automobiles - which have killed more people this year than Coronavirus has. Once again, if the Govt was to ban cars then the CoVid approach to control movement in and out of our homes might make more sense and indicate consistency in the Government approach.

3. In the past, influenza has not resulted in the Government setting up lockdown situations.

If the government is going to be consistent in 'saving' Australians - then it would seem the government would be better placed to first focus on easy to control issues - rather than a rogue virus.



If the Government is truly committed to reducing deaths - then it would focus resources in to other areas more controllable.

Until a consistent approach is taken across ALL health aspects I do not agree or support this submission.

sincerely

Susan Kroening

[REDACTED]