
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 7 July 2021 2:48 PM
To: Economics and Governance Committee
Subject: submission in regard to the public health amendment bill

SUBMISSION IN REGARD TO THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION PUBLIC HEALTH AND OTHER LEGISLATION (FURTHER
EXTENSION OF EXPIRING PROVISIONS) AMENDMENT BILL 2021

I am making this submission as a private individual to assert that I am entirely opposed to this reckless and dangerous bill.

I am opposed to this bill on the following grounds:

It represents a serious assault on the liberties, freedoms and self-determination which all Australians, and all citizens of democratic societies, take for granted.

The danger of absolute power is proverbial and there are absolutely no meaningful constraints on the power of the CHO in the wording of this bill. The only necessary condition is that the CHO considers a particular action to be necessary to protect public health. This is an outrageous and unprecedented gift of power which no individual deserves to hold.

The bill is predicated on the assumption that with the gift of these extraordinary powers the CHO would act in a rational and medically defensible manner, which has clearly not been the case up to this point (for example her previous directive to people to block their respiratory passages with bacteria-laden rags while driving alone in their cars).

It grants to the Chief Health Officer a degree of coercive control over other people which infantilises and insults them, negating their own capacity for responsible decisions in the face of real or perceived threats.

The risk of coronavirus, with its percentage recovery rate in the high 90s for all age groups, is miniscule compared to the real massive psychological, emotional and financial damage and destruction to Queenslanders which would result from this bill.

The bill would allow the ongoing reckless waste of taxpayer funds on covid propaganda and related expenditure which has been evident over the course of the pandemic. Every wall is plastered with admonitions to wash our hands, every TV screen blares out messages of fear and coercion, and the terrorised taxpayer foots the bill.

The bill would allow for the further enrichment of those pharmaceutical, pathology and DNA storage companies who may have unpublicised financial and personal links with state politicians and public servants. Please note that the Big Pharma companies who have been trusted to provide vaccines for the population are literally corporate criminals, with Pfizer, for example, paying a record-breaking fine of USD2.3 billion in 2009 for their unethical and deceptive practices.

There is no genuine medical emergency. The bill is predicated on the existence of devastating consequences of coronavirus in other countries, which must not be allowed to occur here. This predicate can be seen to be false when examining the total death rates of countries in Europe in 2020 with death rates over the previous 50 years. In England and Wales, the overall 2020 death rate fits comfortably within average parameters of the preceding five decades. In other words, the physical, social and economic health of citizens has been destroyed not by coronavirus but by the punitive and irrational actions of governments. Given that no genuine condition of medical emergency exists, the bill is entirely redundant.

The bill represents an absurd and unbalanced response to one particular respiratory virus, while other medical conditions such as influenza in previous years attracted no such attention.

This bill is completely unacceptable both in principle and in detail and must not be permitted to pass. It does not deal adequately with its infringement on human rights and liberties, relying mainly on the assertion that its assault on these rights is justified in the view of those very people who have written the bill and would benefit from its passing! On p.17, for example, we read that 'Given the need to protect the health of the public, the limitations on the rights and liberties of individuals from the extension of the amendments regarding the duration of detention powers are considered appropriately justified.' Who considers those limitations justified? Why are those people being permitted to undo and dismantle the democratic structures of our society simply because in their subjective opinion it is justified?

Again I would like to affirm my entire opposition to this Bill and to the entire edifice of state interference and control on the spurious grounds of protection of public health.

Katherine Spadaro

