

My main issue is that the various costs associated with the anti-Covid measures, which were predictable, were not considered in the cost/benefit analysis of imposing the conditions Australians were virtually & even actually forced to endure.

* Socially & psychologically. We are humans, not disease-prone organisms. I have been very involved in inviting people home for meals, etc, & have noticed a marked decrease in people's desire to do it, post-pandemic. We are social creatures by nature but we are now significantly more isolated by habit alone, following an extended period of being forced/trained to do so. The psychological consequences are easy to anticipate, have already begun, will be ongoing & were always inevitable.

* Educationally. It became clear early on that children & young adults would be virtually untouched by the disease yet they were still locked out of education, which has set them back to a significant degree from what their lives would otherwise have become.

* Financially.

* The resultant inflation, which any one could have predicted would result from huge govt spending for no productivity outcomes, was also not factored in. We are still paying the cost of that overreaction. Pandemics, wars, GFC's & the like will always exact a cost, so there is no point working towards zero effect; early the law of diminishing returns kicked in, causing the cure to eventually become worse than the disease.

* Many small businesses had to shut their doors through overzealous lockdowns, never to open again, & small business is the backbone of Australian productivity, which has suffered as a result.

* Medically.

* People's right to choose their own disease treatment regime was utterly ignored, with suspensions & even sackings from work, demands for jabs for social & religious gatherings, doctors forbidden to explain the pros & cons of the jab, etc.

* [REDACTED] that medical protocol for covid patients in at least Tennessee is now that they all receive Ivermectin, vitamins D & C & zinc, the very treatments that were forbidden during the pandemic.

However, there is another issue: exempting Federal & State from the terms of the reference of the enquiry when they were the policy-setters of the very issue the enquiry is set to consider is utter nonsense. I presume it is set up to review policy so as to modify it as needed, but how will this be possible?