

My name is [REDACTED] and would like to make the following statement to the panel. I don't represent anyone but myself. As a result of the covid response in Victoria I lost my job and have suffered both personally and financially.

I think that governments both state and federal, aided by the media, first response to the pandemic was to whip up a climate of fear and hysteria. I understand that it was a new disease and what its effects would be was unknown. Once the fear factor had been ramped up there was no way it could be moderated without a loss of face so on it went. Perhaps a more measured approach was needed.

My biggest concern during the whole episode was not getting covid but in the Government's ability to override our most basic of human rights.

Under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights [ICCPR] certain rights are described as being non-derogable. It's said in the ICCPR that "Certain rights, however, are non-derogable, that is, they cannot be suspended even in a state of emergency". Article 4(2) of the ICCPR provides that no derogation is permitted for:

Article 7 No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. In particular, no one shall be subjected without his free consent to medical or scientific experimentation.

The then Australian federal government Health Minister Greg Hunt said in an interview on the ABC Insiders "The world is engaged in the largest clinical trial, the largest global vaccination trial ever". These two statements alone would imply they're still part of a 'scientific experimentation' and therefore should not have been mandated by any level of Australian Government.

We were told that the Australian Government's policy is that COVID-19 vaccinations are voluntary; its aim is to have as many people as possible choose to be vaccinated.

The Australian Immunisation Handbook states that

Criteria for valid consent

For consent to be legally valid, the following elements must be present:

1. *It must be given by a person with legal capacity, and of sufficient intellectual capacity to understand the implications of receiving a vaccine.*
2. *It must be given voluntarily in the absence of undue pressure, coercion or manipulation.*

A common theme though out all these treaties is free consent, in the absence of undue pressure, coercion or manipulation.

The Fair Work Commission defines coercion as;

A person coerces another to act in a particular way if the first person brings about that act by force or compulsion. Coercion will cause a person to act in a way that is non-voluntary.

Coercion is distinguished from other concepts including influence, persuasion and inducement. Coercion implies a high degree of compulsion and not some lesser form of pressure where a person is left with a realistic choice as to whether or not to comply

The Australian Building and Construction Commission describes it as

Coercion is the act of organising or taking action, or threatening to organise or take action against someone with the intent to influence that person or another person to do something. Coercion interferes with a person's freedom of choice.

If mandatory vaccination directions aren't coercive I don't know what is. They certainly interfere with a person's freedom of choice and imply a high degree of compulsion to undertake to be part of a medical or scientific experiment if they want to be able to go to work or participate in society as a whole. I can't see how they'd be compatible with our non-derogable right not to be subject medical or scientific experimentation even if we are in a state of emergency. When there's a risk there must be freedom of choice. All medical treatments, including vaccinations, have risk. There is no long term safety data on the current covid vaccines and short term adverse effects are being recorded in Australia, Europe and America in fact all over the world. Only an assumption can be made on what the longer term consequences will be.

The mandating of the vaccine denied me my right to work. On the Australian Human rights commission website it states

ICESCR Article 6 states:

The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right to work, which includes the right of everyone to the opportunity to gain his living by work which he freely chooses or accepts, and will take appropriate steps to safeguard this right

You may ask why not take the 'jab' and be done with it. Aside from the risks of being part a scientific experiment I have a conscientious, religious and moral objection to having any of the vaccines so far available. My dilemma is as far as I've been able to find out is that they all have used somewhere in there development cell lines taken from the [REDACTED]. Whilst it's said that the cell lines used now are now so remote from the original cell line as no longer the same, in my mind they're still tainted by their origins. In Exodus 20 – 13 we see one of Gods Ten Commandments "You shall not kill." This is a command against the premeditated killing of another human being. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] It's been said that people taking a vaccine created with [REDACTED] cell lines are not committing a moral evil because they are not directly participating in the act of [REDACTED] that led to the creation of these cell lines. The moral wrong was already committed by the [REDACTED] while the pharmaceutical companies engage in an ongoing [REDACTED] for medical research, testing and manufacture. I would say that the moral wrong extends to anyone accepting of a product of moral evil. How the organs needed are removed from the [REDACTED] is grotesque, a crime that should be prosecuted, the link details what they allegedly do ¹.

The AMA has a policy on conscience objections. It says that "It is acceptable for a doctor to refuse to provide or to participate in certain medical treatments or procedures based on a conscientious objection" A Doctor therefore can refuse to treat a patient, but in this case the patient can't refuse

the treatment if they need to go to work to earn a living. Am I not entitled to a clear conscience too?

It just doesn't seem right that the Governments, state and federal can override their own laws and international treaties and trample over our, that is the Australian publics, rights and freedoms. In times of crisis or emergency is exactly when human rights need to be upheld, if not then when? What crimes of the past could have been swept away with the phrase 'it was for the greater good'?

Thank you for allowing me to have my say.

[REDACTED]

1. <https://americasfrontlinedoctors.org/2/frontlinenews/aborted-fetal-cells-and-vaccines-a-scandal-much-bigger-than-pfizers-whistleblower-ever-imagined/>