

July 7, 2021

To the Queensland Parliament Economics and Governance Committee,

I am utterly opposed to the bill tabled in parliament on June 16 by the Minister for Health, Yvette D'Ath. As a sovereign woman living in Queensland, I urge the Economics and Governance Committee and the Queensland Parliament to bring a halt to an extension of these unlawful measures. This submission is lengthy, however, given the high stakes on people's livelihoods and freedoms, it could be deemed as a gross oversight for the Committee to ignore this evidence.

According to the work of [G&B Lawyers](#) (italics indicate the words of others throughout):

... any state law that purports to restrict movement and freedoms through quarantine, or make it mandatory for a person to submit to a COVID-19 vaccination is invalid.

*In 1945, the then Chief Justice Latham held that quarantine laws "may be regarded in most, if not all, of its aspects as a form of public health legislation". The Commonwealth has the power under section 51(ix) of the Constitution to make laws with respect to 'quarantine'. **This is a power granted to the Commonwealth. Not the States.***

At [257] of the decision, Latham CJ held that the Commonwealth "could not pass a law requiring citizens of the States... to submit to vaccination or immunization". There are several important things that flow from this High Court decision.

- 1. Vaccinations and immunizations are matters that fall within the category of 'quarantine'.*
- 2. Only the Commonwealth has the power to make laws with respect to 'quarantine' under section 51(ix) of the Constitution.*
- 3. The Commonwealth is prohibited from passing laws requiring citizens to submit to vaccination or immunization (which are quarantine matters).*
- 4. The States have no power to make laws with respect to quarantine, including matters dealing with vaccinations and immunizations (as Latham CJ held that these things are 'quarantine' matters).*
- 5. The States are unable to do something that the Commonwealth is prohibited from doing under the exercise of the quarantine power.*
- 6. Therefore the States cannot pass any law that requires citizens to submit to vaccination or immunization.*

It stands to reason that the same applies for quarantine and tracking. Although not all of the above points are encompassed within the current Public Health Bill in question, **all are relevant for the committee's awareness in making questions about Queenslanders lives.** The proposed measures of the bill can be described as overreaching and even tyrannical in nature, creating fear and blind submission to **unlawful instructions.**

Under the guise of "public safety" based on dubious "scientific consensus" [currently being challenged](#) by thousands of lawyers and censored medical experts from around the world, this bill strips freedoms from our people. There's been almost 15,000 medical & public health scientists and over 43,000 medical

practitioners sign the [Great Barrington Declaration](#). They “have grave concerns about the damaging physical and mental health impacts of the prevailing COVID-19 policies and recommend an approach we call *Focused Protection*.” The Minister and other decision makers would be well advised to challenge the current failed health approach that strips people of their freedoms, and the unlawful justifications for this Bill.

Regarding interventions, I provide the Committee with “missed information” that the Minister fails to provide in the [Statement of Compatibility](#) for this proposed bill.

The following thorough advice is provided by PANDA (Pandemics Data and Analytics) - A group of multi-disciplinary professionals, who perceived the global reaction to Covid, and lockdown in particular, as overwrought and damaging to the point of causing a great tear in the fabric of society, established PANDA (Pandemics Data & Analytics) in April 2020. As a politically and economically independent organisation, PANDA seeks to develop science-based explanations and test them against international data. Policy recommendations for governments and other institutions can be developed from these. PANDA stands for open science and rational debate, for replacing flawed science with good science and for retrieving liberty and prosperity from the clutches of a dystopian “new normal”. [Protocol for Reopening Society](#). PANDA states:

There is no evidence that lockdowns have reduced mortality from Covid-19 and research is now revealing the devastation that lockdowns are causing, particularly in the developing world. In these draconian lockdown policies, we have also seen the biggest infringement on civil liberties in democratic countries during peacetime.

PANDA believes that, at this juncture, the science is quite clear on what key policy responses should be—or should have been. The cure should not be worse than the disease. It is critically important that societies are reopened, whilst protecting those who may be vulnerable to serious illness from SARS-CoV-2. Human agency must be upheld, and individuals should be empowered to make their own choices.

[PANDA’s Protocol for Reopening Society](#) is a ‘blueprint’ for governments to move forward from the paralysing cycle of lockdowns. Concerned with the ongoing damage of the response to COVID-19, PANDA applies the principles of ‘focused protection’ to safeguard the most vulnerable, as articulated by the [Great Barrington Declaration](#). PANDA’s aim is to offer an evidence-based pathway for policy makers and citizens by returning to long-established public health principles that uphold fundamental human rights.

I urge our Queensland parliamentarians to review the depth of insight provided in PANDA’s two reports [PANDA’s Protocol for Reopening Society](#) (December 2020) and [Responding to COVID-19: Public Health or Public Harm](#) (June 2021). The advice offered in these documents completely obliterates Minister for Health, Yvette D’Ath’s rationale for the [Statement of Compatibility](#) and spells out how the Minister’s approach is a violation of our fundamental sovereign rights.

[In regards to lockdowns](#), PANDA cites THE SIRACUSA PRINCIPLES (page 4).

No state party shall, even in time of emergency threatening the life of the nation, derogate from the Covenant's guarantees of the right to life; freedom from torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, and from medical or scientific experimentation without free consent...

...the right to recognition as a person before the law; and freedom of thought, conscience and religion. These rights are not derogable under any conditions even for the asserted purpose of preserving the life of the asserted purpose of preserving the life of the nation.

The current bill in question violates these principles.

Page 6:

The widespread shutting down of whole societies to suppress a respiratory virus has little scientific foundation and does not form part of pandemic plans in democratic countries. Lockdowns are an experimental exercise never attempted before ... In fact, previous research explicitly cautioned against such drastic measures because the negative consequences outweigh any theoretical benefit.

And again on page 6, citing the World Health Organisation:

...these [lockdown] measures can impose significant burdens on individual rights (e.g. autonomy, privacy, and liberty) and economic and social welfare (e.g. trade, tourism, and business).

Citing WHO on page 11:

There is currently no evidence that wearing a mask (whether medical or other types) by healthy persons in the wider community setting, including universal community masking, can protect them from infection with respiratory viruses, including COVID-19.

Page 12 and 13:

Once a disease is widespread in many countries, it is impossible to permanently eliminate a highly transmissible respiratory virus such as SARS-CoV-2 through contact tracing and testing. It is recognised that these measures are a waste of valuable resources, as they will not detect a significant proportion of cases. Consequently, contact tracing was not recommended in WHO guidelines.

Nevertheless, there has been widespread adoption of these policies in response to COVID-19, diverting huge health resources and creating economic gain for several biotechnology companies.

The contact tracing employed for SARS-CoV-2 raises serious ethical concerns. These are noted in the literature; apart from privacy issues associated with the tracking of an individual's movement by mobile phones or other technology, contact tracing is frequently combined with mandatory quarantine.

Quarantining of exposed individuals is also not recommended in WHO guidelines, and previous research found that large scale quarantine measures should be 'eliminated from serious consideration' because the negative consequences are so extreme.

PANDA goes on to explain that there is evidence to suggest PCR tests exhibit concerning flaws and were never designed for mass screening of asymptomatic people. *Millions of people globally are being forced to quarantine whether they are infectious or not, having a catastrophic impact on individuals and communities. Contact tracing and testing for SARS-CoV-2 also has serious ethical implications for privacy and the fundamental right to refuse medical intervention. Forcibly testing citizens is a violation of bodily integrity.*

For most people, the risk of death from COVID-19 is very low. COVID-19 mortality has a steep age gradient and the lockdown impacts on children are extensive—the world's children and young people will bear the broader economic impact of 'lockdowns' in the years ahead.

It is on this basis that [PANDA lays out a blueprint for reopening society](#) where "Human dignity should be respected above all."

PANDA General Recommendations state that ***Lockdowns, PPE and social distancing have never been shown to benefit the course of an epidemic, yet they can have devastating effects on society. Such diktats should be rendered unlawful.***

1. Reassert freedom of speech, opinion and choice.
2. Restore open scientific debate.
3. Promote personal responsibility and accountability and the protection of basic human liberties
4. Promote mutual respect with regards to feelings of fear and personal health choices.
5. End quarantining of asymptomatic individuals.
6. Eliminate forced isolation of symptomatic individuals. Recommend resting at home when experiencing flu-like symptoms for up to eight days from the onset of symptoms and until the absence of fever for 24 hours.
7. Develop a public health awareness campaign to promote hand hygiene and a healthy lifestyle consisting of healthy eating, exercise and adequate exposure to the sun (or vitamin D supplements).

PANDA Healthcare Recommendations go on to say:

1. Restore all health services back to normal, including free access for visitors. Without this patients will continue to die at home.
2. Give access to early outpatient treatment for high-risk individuals with Covid-19.
3. End mass testing, testing of asymptomatic individuals and contact-tracing (including contact-tracing apps). Hospital testing should be limited to patients with a characteristic clinical picture, on a case by case basis and at the discretion of the attending physician. Differential diagnostic testing is called for only if the treatment plan thereafter would be different.
4. Set the PCR cycle threshold to not exceed 30 cycles and require the detection of multiple primers. Alternative tests with high specificity may be used to confirm the results. The Ct value of the test must be transparent to the doctor and patient.
5. Define cases using clinical symptoms confirmed by a positive test result.
6. Define a Covid death as death of a patient who is an active Covid-19 clinical case.
7. Ensure public transparency of all efficacy and safety data for vaccines. Vaccination must be fully voluntary with informed consent and without any form of coercion or restriction. Mandatory vaccination is unethical and unlawful. It undermines trust in the medical profession and in vaccination programmes.

PANDA recommendations also include advice for protection of vulnerable individuals and keeping schools and educational institutions open. Relating to **business, travel and leisure**, PANDA advises:

1. *Open for business: end all restrictions on businesses.*
2. *Open borders: end all travel restrictions.*
3. *Resume all individual sports as well as group sports with no restrictions.*
4. *Resume all cultural and artistic activities with no restrictions.*
5. *Denounce medical ostracization by opposing immunity passports and ending PCR testing requirements for work and travel. Eliminate temperature screening checkpoints - it is a useless measure.*

There has been zero consultation with the people of Queensland about the restrictive measures implemented since the commencement of the Covid-19 arrival—and as clearly laid out, these restrictive measures undoubtedly infringe on our sovereign rights.

The proposed bill is a violation of Section 28 of the Federal Crimes Act (1914): *“Any person who, by violence or by threats or intimidation of any kind, hinders or interferes with the free exercise or performance, by any other person, of any political right or duty, shall be guilty of an offence. Penalty: Imprisonment for three years.”*

Section 109 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia states that *“When a law of a State is inconsistent with a law of the Commonwealth, the latter shall prevail, and the form shall, to the extent of the inconsistency, be invalid.”*

To date, the actions carried out by the Minister and her Department surrounding the management of COVID cases are unlawful and fly in the face of the robust and well-researched recommendations of PANDA. *It is critically important that societies be reopened and those vulnerable to serious illness from SARS-CoV-2 be protected in a sensible, dignified manner. Human agency must be upheld and individuals should be informed about risks and mitigation so that they can make personal choices.*

[REDACTED]

Yours Sincerely,



Liz Walker

[REDACTED]