ATTACHMENT 4

Lockdown Data and Questions

<u>Index – Attachment 4</u>

Lockdown Data and Questions		. 38
	Lockdowns are Not Effective	
	Lockdowns are Extremely Costly	
	Cruel, Heartless Implementation	
	Inconsistencies, Contradictions	
	Legality	
	Mismanagement	
7.	Fear	48
Q	Freedom	10

1. Lockdowns are Not Effective

- Emergency Declarations enable governments to invoke and enforce lockdowns.
- Nothing makes it moral or respectful to invoke and enforce lockdowns the way some states have.
 The federal government's support for lockdowns have extended imprudently beyond the initial stages early in 2020.
- No state or federal government has provided the scientific medical data and evidence justifying lockdowns.
- Even the incompetent, dishonest, corrupt UN WHO now admits that lockdowns are a blunt
 instrument only for use initially to get control of a virus. Every lockdown since mid-2020 is an
 admission that the state government is not in control. Every lockdown confirms that instead of
 the governments mastering the virus, the virus is master of the states.
- In Victoria COVID-19 cases are high despite the Premier invoking "fast and hard" lockdown and despite high 'vaccine' injection rates.
- Experience across the USA's 50 states reveals lockdowns have no advantage with COVID-19 and many disadvantages to the people including loss of jobs and livelihoods, adverse mental health effects, separations and family dislocations.
- Early in Florida's experience with COVID-19 Governor Ron DeSantis declared a lockdown. He
 called it off early and apologised to the people of Florida. Despite having a high proportion of
 retirees and elderly, Florida has had better results with COVID-19 than California which had been
 in perpetual lockdown and restrictions.
- There's increasing broad consideration that Sweden was correct in never locking down. The Swedish death rate is now reverting to the mean together with the added advantage that Sweden now has herd immunity.
- While quarantine restricts the movement of sick or vulnerable people, lockdowns are not quarantine. Lockdowns, like tyranny, restrict the movement of healthy people.
- The universal human need to belong is fundamental to human society and civilisation. Depriving people of social connection is inhuman.
- Where is the empirical scientific medical data as evidence for the basis of lockdowns? Where is the economic data showing the short-term and long-term cost of lockdowns? Where is the empirical data showing the social and mental health impacts of lockdowns? In addition to governments being responsible for providing an environment in which people can take responsibility for individual personal physical health and mental health, the government is responsible for economic health that determines people's future physical and mental health.
- There is no difference in safety pushing hundreds of people into one centralised location like a large supermarket where the risk of mass transmission is high versus allowing small shops to be open.

2. Lockdowns are Extremely Costly

Cost of lockdowns

Are the following devastating impacts of lockdowns factored into the costing of lockdowns?

- Lockdowns kill people
- Lockdowns kill jobs and the economy

In Victoria

Any just, moral, competent, compassionate government would solemnly reflect on:

- More than 340 teenagers suffering mental health emergencies admitted weekly to hospitals, a 162% increase attributed largely to lockdowns.
- 156 teenagers a week rushed to hospital for attempting suicide or self-harm, 37 needing emergency treatment or surgery; an 88% increase.
- 90% increase in children with eating disorders.

This is the ultimate transgression, neglect and abandonment of people at a vulnerable age.

In NSW

- Daily, more than 40 children and teenagers are rushed to hospital for self-harm; up 31%.
- Acute mental health admissions for children and young people up 43%.

In Queensland

- At Gold Coast Hospital, a 212% spike in eating disorders from 2019 2020.
- Queensland's Butterfly Foundation says:
 - o calls for help increased 34% for eating disorders from Jan 20 to Jan 21.
 - o 85% were first time callers for the Help line.

Other

- In August, Lifeline's National Suicide Prevention had its busiest days in its 57-year history.
- Children now may wait 6 9 months before seeing a psychiatrist.
- Children suffering with depression, eating disorders or suicidal thoughts, may not be able to wait 9 months.
- As a result of government lockdowns, parents who must work from home now have to educate children and are now front-line mental health workers.
- In lockdowns people defer health diagnoses and treatments leading to future increased health burdens after lockdowns end.
- Economic impacts of people losing their job adds stress affecting people's future health. Debt levels rise adding to stress.
- Lockdowns harm disabled people and the vulnerable.

• Economic effects and impact:

- Reputable, perceptive economists have raised the irresponsibility and lack of accountability rife in government approach relying on lockdowns.
- O During the first COVID outbreak (April-May 2020) the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) arbitrarily decided to reduce the size of the Australian labour force by around 656,000 people. That positively yet wrongly affected the public perception regarding the lockdown's effects on unemployment. Australians were forced to lockdown and to be out of the labour force or not be available for work. The government cooked the books to show a better subsequent recovery.
- An unemployment rate based on a linear projection of the labour force shows that in 2020 the unemployment rate could have reached 11.7% which is double the official data of 5.7%.
 This is seen as a biased manipulation to hide reality in order to manage people's negative perceptions of lockdowns. (Additionally, it increases unmeasured underemployment.)
- The unemployed population could have reached 1.5 million people, about double the official data of 837,000 that the ABS presented. This simple analysis could have changed the public perceptions of the lockdowns, of actual unemployment, and of the effectiveness of the JobSeeker and JobKeeper programs.
- Official ABS data claims that during the period March 2020 to May 2020 unemployment grew by only 89,000 people, yet based on linear projections of the labour force unemployment grew possibly by 1,069,000 people.
- Current unemployment is comparable only to the negative period 1991-1992 when the global financial crisis affected our country. The negative effects on unemployment of that period lasted 7-10 years. Should we expect the same for the current lockdown measures?
- Was any economic modelling done? Has any analysis been conducted since? If so, governments need to make these public so that cost-effectiveness can be assessed. Without such a review, governments and the people will not be awake and prepared for future challenges

The problem we are facing now is not only the economic and social cost of lockdowns it is additional indirect costs associated with the types of enforcement because sadly, some humans, including parliamentarians and senior public servants, have wielded power brutally and without care for others.

- Politicians capriciously invoking lockdowns and brutally or heartlessly withdrawing basic human rights and freedoms enforcing lockdowns destroying people's trust in government, parliament and fundamentals of society, including law and order.
- Making businesses responsible for COVID outbreaks is unprecedented and irresponsible of the government.
- Creating businesses injection hubs is a violation of the separation between health and corporate.
- When government breaks our laws and the Constitution it leads to the community losing respect for the law.

- When police are sacrificed in the name of suppressing honest citizens simply voicing dissent in an
 overwhelmingly peaceful protest against government economic and mental brutality, it erodes
 community trust in the police.
- Capricious or brutal lockdowns undermine truth; the basis of civil society.
- When trust is smashed it often leads to oppression and cruel inhuman control as in Victoria. Extreme emergency measures lead to control, bullying and violence.
- Capricious or brutal lockdowns undermine human rights, freedom, economic security, military security, health, immune systems.
- Governments are disrespecting the people and undermining our citizens respect for vital institutions and our states and country.
- States enforcing unsupported dictates and brutality are harming and trashing Australia's international reputation.
- Governance has been undermined and further tarnished. What did the Prime Minister do to stop this and to enforce our national constitution?
- The sad reality is that the omission and contradiction of the basic data prevented the security of the most vulnerable and jeopardised the future health of people across the community and nation.
- Was economic modelling conducted before each lockdown? Were the underlying assumptions revised based on lessons from each lockdown? Was data gathered? Will it be the basis of future policy?

These are some of the reasons why it is known that after lockdowns end, overall mortality increases.

What is the total direct cost to taxpayers of the lockdowns and the total indirect cost in terms of lives, livelihoods, impact on our economy, health and business failures? At a time when Queensland's debt position is disgraceful as a result of Labor policies and decisions for all but three of the last 23 years.

These staggering costs and callous ignoring of the many human costs lead into the bastardry and inhumanity characterising lockdowns in Victoria and Queensland.

As Sweden's death rate reverts to the mean, is anyone in government evaluating its strategy as an option?

A constituent says - "I was doing OK until they stopped me from working, earning a living because of the mandated vax."

Lockdowns kill people. Locking down healthy people makes healthy people sick.

The use of lockdowns 19 months after the virus arrived in Australia proves politicians lack understanding of what is happening, of what is needed and of what is a proper comprehensive response.

3. Cruel, Heartless Implementation

- Personal impacts of government lockdowns have often been cruel and heartless:
 - A pregnant mother in northern NSW was denied entry to Queensland for emergency care and instead of a two-hour dash to Brisbane hospitals had to endure a 16-hour odyssey to Sydney. Despite receiving federal funding for hospitalisation of northern NSW people in Brisbane, the Queensland government abandoned this mother and her twins resulting in one dying.
 - o People were prevented from saying goodbye to dying parents who died alone.
 - Children undergoing cancer treatment were alone without their parents who were prevented from entering Queensland.
 - While the town of Mungindi straddles the Queensland-NSW border the hospital is a few hundred metres inside Queensland and the Queensland government prevented Mungindi residents in NSW from going to the hospital.
- Hospitals were never overburdened. Why were these capricious and inhuman edicts not revised? Why were they implemented? Why did governments drive needless stress, hurt, anguish and damage coupled with a double dose of stress from mandating injections?
- Is people's health being considered when a twin dies because of the lockdown? When children in cancer treatment cannot have their parents at bedside? When people cannot farewell their parent? What does it mean to be human?
- Alcohol was confiscated after being paid for, showing an abuse of fundamental property rights.
- People's lives have been devastated staying for weeks in tents near borders.
- Lockdowns and restrictions are costing individuals thousands of dollars and great anguish, especially with people losing their jobs and livelihoods, and the ability to feed their children.

People are feeling hurt, devastated, upset and angry because they need fairness, consistency, sense, practicality, understanding, transparency, honesty, truth, respect, surety, confidence, consideration, social interaction.

In my experience basing decisions on solid data and transparently communicating that data gives people confidence. Why do governments so rarely make decisions based on solid, data and allow scrutiny?

This confirms how easy it is for politicians who feel the uncertainty and then sense their vulnerability to ditch common sense, decency, truth, morality and any semblance of care and humanity.

Always beneath control there is fear.

When applications for exemptions for border entry ballooned into ridiculous waiting times of many weeks, why was the basis for capricious lockdowns not revised? Why were lockdowns not removed and proven treatments like Ivermectin implemented?

4. Inconsistencies, Contradictions

- Contradictions and inconsistencies abound and are a giveaway to the lack of objective empirical data as the basis for policy and decisions.
- Inconsistent and arbitrary health orders absurdly call coffee shops 'safe' and shoe stores 'dangerous'. Reportedly, a health official said that alcohol shops are as "dangerous" as retail but they 'didn't feel they could close them politically".
- There is still no working definition between 'essential' and 'non-essential', yet this arbitrary categorisation was used to pummel the small business sector that is already overloaded with bureaucracy, restrictions and tax administration compared with large multinationals.
- After the Rugby League Grand Final on 3 October people are rightly ridiculing the limit of 43,000 for Suncorp Stadium compared with 20 for dancing at weddings.
- When questioned after the grand-final, the Queensland Deputy Premier was adamant that the stadium audience was wearing masks, yet photos abound that show his statement to be false. It seems that any statement is made to justify every latest capricious, unfathomable declaration and order.

Shifting targets, contradictions, lies, falsehoods, nonsensical and absurd claims.

What does it say about health? Especially with contradictions?

5. Legality

What is the statutory basis of emergency powers and health directives?

Steve Andrew MP submitted the only Dissenting Report to the Public Health and Other Legislation (Extension of Expiring Provisions Amendment Bill 2020) committee in February 2021. The report states:

• Domestic and international jurisprudence contain principles for law making during a public health emergency.

These are that emergency laws should be limited, time-bounded and proportionate to the nature of the emergency.

This makes emergency laws separate and distinct from ordinary laws, and reduces the chances of them being used for periods and purposes beyond their initial remit.

Specific structural techniques to do this are: to use sunset clauses, to use a single legislative vehicle for emergency laws, to use non-textual amendments, to expressly state their temporary nature, to specifically limit their use to the emergency and to give them a title which indicates their emergency nature.

I am concerned at the lack of Transparency we are getting from the Government, that no cost/benefit or risk assessment was carried out at the outset of the crisis as is regarded as 'best practice' for crisis management, and even today, over a year later, we are given no roadmap for removing these powers.

In fact, Dr Young leaves the question of an 'exit date' as very much up in the air. On page 14 of the Report, Dr Young States:

"in response to the question of how long the extraordinary powers would be needed, Queensland Health states "it is difficult to determine with absolute certainty how long these emergency response measures will be required."

Like a lot of other submitters to this Inquiry, I am starting to have real concerns regarding not only the impact of emergency provisions on our democratic freedoms and civil liberties, but also the potential of emergency powers to become normalised and eventually permanent.

And: CONCLUSION

All over the media and official outlets, we are hearing about how efficient the new way of governing is, at both the National and State level.

Normally, when parliamentary committees conduct inquiries they will select individuals and representatives of organisations from amongst those who have submitted written submissions to the Committee are invited to appear before the committee and answer questions the committee may have.

According to the Australian Parliamentary website, "these hearings enable witnesses to clarify and expand on their written submissions and allow the committee to seek additional information".

There is a common delusion that authoritarian government is efficient. It does not waste time in argument or debate or parliamentary scrutiny.

This concentration of power in a small number of hands and the absence of wider deliberation and scrutiny enables governments to make major decisions on an ad hoc basis, without proper forethought, transparency, scrutiny or accountability.

The use of political power as an instrument of mass coercion is corrosive. It divides and it embitters.

The unequal impact of the government's measures is also eroding any sense of community or national solidarity.

The repeated, unexplained, unjustified extension of emergency declarations contradicts the spirit and intent if not the actual wording of the requirements bounding declarations.

Emergency legislation created a parallel legal system immune to scrutiny and politics.

6. Mismanagement

Why has there been so much politicking and why have there been so many contradictions within individual governments over time, between state governments and with the federal government? What has the PM done to stop this? His is a failure of leadership and teamwork. People's lives have been lost due to lockdowns.

If the virus was as serious as it has been made out to be, there would have been unity.

The failure reveals that either the virus is not as serious as politicians' exaggerations and fearmongering suggest or politicians just do not care.

Political point scoring has rendered the so-called national "cabinet" pointless and damaging. This is hardly surprising as there is clearly no agreement among the Premiers and Prime Minister, and that indicates that objective data is not being followed and instead politics is the driver.

The failure of quarantine occurred in two aspects: firstly, breaches of quarantine such as the Ruby Princess fiasco and the Victorian aged care fiasco with no one held accountable.

Secondly, the government is responsible for destroying tens of thousands of businesses. Are governments able to provide data on how many businesses closed and on the drop in staff numbers since many small businesses apparently went from 20 staff to 1 or 2, which has a huge impact on the overall market?

Did the government deliberately prioritise big business over small business in the mismanaging the virus?

What was the cost of health orders on small business?

Removing the right to protest is a political, not health measure.

Limitation or prevention on travel between states breaches our Constitution. One of the core responsibilities of a federal government is to ensure free trade between states. Do governments not understand that trade incorporates small businesses and individuals?

The lack of unity and the politicking have been due to lack of data that has enabled political games to be played.

This may be one reason why it has been said that after lockdowns end, overall mortality increases.

In February 2020 after the bushfire season the Prime Minister was floundering electorally and in Queensland the Premier was set to lose the state election, despite an uninspiring opposition. Fear worked for both.

That is, it worked until recently because people can now see that the fear went too long and the data and circumstances exposed governments' strategies as unfounded, wasteful, expensive, dishonest, unfounded, cruel and heartless.

A cornerstone to the governments' fear campaigns was the omission of relevant data. That omission enabled the campaign to mislead the people and heighten fear.

From the Australian Department of Health's "plan" entitled Australian Health Sector Emergency Response Plan for Coronavirus (COVID-19):-

Dept of Health's initial plan:

"During the novel coronavirus outbreak, the health sector will aim to minimise the outbreak's impact on the health of Australians and our health systems. This, the COVID-19 Plan, is the Australian national health sector plan for the outbreak of novel coronavirus 2019/20, and contributes to these aims by:

- Clarifying the roles and responsibilities within the health sector of the Australian Government and state and territory governments.
- Identifying areas where national guidance and coordination will be provided, and how this will be achieved; and
- Supporting decision makers to respond in a manner that is flexible, informed and proportionate to the circumstances at the time.

Initially the government's "plan" seemed to aim at minimising impact on the health system. While that initial aim is understandable, the "plan" never moved off that aim after data revealed the virus to be far less severe for most people.

As a result of the so-called "National Cabinet", the virus quickly became politicised. That indicates that those in the national cabinet never considered the virus to be a serious threat.

A real leader would be able to lead us without exceeding what is moral and without stealing basic human rights and freedoms and without coercion and bullying.

Real leaders use data while inspiring and drawing people forward to take responsibility and needed action. Bullying though is based on coercion and intimidation. The state and federal governments handling of the COVID-19 virus reeks of bullying and is devoid of leadership.

Instead of inspiration there is intimidation.

In totalitarian dictatorships, the people fear the government.

In true democracies, governments fear the people.

Although voters vote, the government does not fear the voters because in the current two-party system, allied media and statutes are used to control people under the guise of protecting the people.

7. Fear

Fear may be causing the current reported explosion in mental health issues. Nonetheless, political leaders have fomented, promoted, deepened fear to harvest the opportunity to control people.

Given the accompanying data, why are Premiers and the Prime Minister fomenting so much fear? Is it deliberate for political advantage or because politicians are ignorant of the data or themselves afraid of the virus or afraid of being exposed for exaggerating the virus threat?

If the virus was being responsibly managed there would be no need for politicians to be afraid. Given that the virus is being woefully mismanaged it is not surprising that politicians would be in fear of being found out.

In an apparent attempt to grab the crown of incumbent during a perceived external threat the Queensland Premier whipped Queenslanders into a state of deep, pervasive fear and then made the most of it electorally. She succeeded in that her government's poor election prospects when COVID-19 arrived in Australia were expertly transformed into an increased majority at the cost of all other political parties.

Nineteen months later the deep fear of the virus has mutated into fear of government orders and prosecutions and into fear of coercion to be injected.

In attending a nurses' forum in Brisbane many nurses were afraid of being on film in case their employer, the Queensland Department of Health, saw their presence. Some were upset, a few crying.

It is clear from recent experience in Victoria and to a lesser yet real extent in NSW and Queensland that the people fear the government. This fear is not only fear of physical harm in Victoria and NSW and to a lesser extent in Queensland, it is fear of being vilified and financially devastated. It is a fear of being unable to provide for one's family. It is a deep yearning for security as a result of carefully choreographed government deprivation of people's fundamental human rights and freedoms.

It is calculated true deprivation bluntly spurring coercion.

It's noted that in a totalitarian dictatorship, the people are afraid of the government. In a true democracy, governments fear the people.

In a true democracy the governing receives consent to govern from those being governed.

That is no longer the case in Australia where governments make up controls without reference to parliament, debate, data or the common good.

8. Freedom

Increased freedom in Britain, Europe and America during the nineteenth century led to the developed world blossoming scientifically, medically, technically, materially, socially and economically.

This led to unprecedented increases in material standards of living, health, longevity, ease, comfort, choice, movement and economic interaction. These further increased people's freedom across many additional dimensions of human life.

Human progress and development depend on freedom. Future health technology and affordability of care depend on freedom.

During the last 19 months freedom has been severely and, at times, savagely constrained. The cost has been in many dimensions including lower levels of current and future mental health, physical health, economic activity, social cohesion and community interaction, and reduced respect for and confidence in the fundamentals of modern democracy and its institutions including the police, health care, and especially parliament.

As has been noted overseas, "Australia is returning full circle back to being a penal colony."

On the bright side, lockdowns have given people time to research and to learn why they're locked down and being coerced into injections. This awakening to the reality of shoddy government and mismanagement in Australia will hopefully lead to greater responsibility to elect representatives who serve the people and not the political parties.

Lockdowns must end now. Where are governments' detailed plans for managing the virus?

Remember, quarantine restricts the movement of sick or vulnerable people. Tyranny restricts the movement of healthy people.

The virus and especially the mismanagement of the virus have made governance the core issue in Australia.