

First examine the most recent global health crisis. I have many questions as I don't have access to raw data. Please review the following, before making any future plans?

- How is it, that an organisation, not voted for by the Australian electors, has the right to dictate enforceable individual or collective health programs on the Australian people? The WHO admits to errors in the last 3 years. Considering human health is their area of expertise how would you rate their performance?
- Are you willing to ask the Australian public with open questions and publish the raw answers? And are you willing to publish the Australian public's evaluation of their own Commonwealth and State or Territory's response / performance of the last 3 years?
- Is it true that National Cabinet is not Federal Government as per the Australian Constitution 1901, and as such may discuss, but cannot make, applicable decisions?
- Do you agree that police enforcing the wearing of masks in public, indoors, but especially outdoors, is government over-reach? Are you willing to hear the answers from the Australian public? Do you think it is likely that the use of police in this manner contributed to creating the police shortage as the good hearted police left the force?
- Any person who has attended a CPR course will know that air is foremost in sustaining life. Masks deprive people of proper gas exchange, oxygen in and often overlooked, expulsion of human respiratory waste build-up of carbon dioxide. Do you agree that to demand that healthy people obfuscate their breathing organs, with the added risk of inhaling mask fibers, is counter-intuitive to health?
- Is it not true that in Italy, during the lockdown and mask wearing period of March/April/May 2020, in the general population, there was a three fold increase of stillbirths compared to the same time in 2019? Please compare and consider this to Sweden, which had no mask mandates, and no increase in stillbirths?
- Is it not true that the disposable masks that were handed out, ignoring the gaps at the sides, have too coarse a weave, to stop anything of viral size,? Is it not true that the disposable mask is designed to catch spittle, and is only effective temporarily, until it's no longer dry?
- Can you show proof anywhere in the world where the Coronavirus Sars-2 has been isolated, in the true sense of the word, without any other biologic material?
- Is Australia a signatory to the principles of permissible medical experiments of The Nuremberg Code (1947) and therefore obliged to abide by those "moral, ethical and legal concepts"?
- "The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential" ... "so situated as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, overreaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion"(Principle 1). How many Australians truly and freely chose to receive an experimental injectable?
- "...and should have sufficient knowledge and comprehensionas to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision."(Principle 1). Is it true that the anti-coronavirus injections were approved by the TGA while still in the experimental phase, where trials were incomplete and so safety and efficacy data was incomplete and unavailable?
- "The duty and responsibility for ascertaining the quality of the consent rests upon each individual who initiates, directs or engages in the experiment. It is a personal duty and responsibility which may not be delegated to another with impunity." (Principle 1)

How many Australians had the required 1:1 free discussion and understanding with their doctor and felt they could choose?

- “Proper preparations should be made ... to protect the experimental subject against even remote possibilities of injury, disability or death.” (Principle 7). Was that truly the case?
- “During the course of the experiment the human subjects should be at liberty to bring the experiment to an end ... where continuation of the experiment seems to him to be impossible” (Principle 9). Was anyone allowed to opt out, at any time, without consequences?
- “During the course of the experiment the scientist in charge must be prepared to terminate the experiment at any stage ... of the experiment is likely to result in injury, disability, or death to the experimental subject.” (Principle 10). Who is Australia’s chief scientist? Does he / she not have any doubts or concerns?
- Do you remember how, tried and true, early measures of healthful fresh air, exposure to sunlight (for vitamin D), Vitamin C, minerals such as zinc, improved diet, were never promoted. Also exercise had to be at the expense of usual enjoyment of company, rest periods, engaging with other people? Have you ever wondered how the Irish dancing style came to being?
- Is it true that health ministers, and never before publicly heard of, chief health officers, were dictating mass treatment protocols and even placed fines, \$1,300, on doctors should they prescribe alternative treatments such as forms of quinine? And that anti-parasitic medications such as Ivermectin, were outlawed and not to be tried?
- Is it true, pharmaceutical companies, such as [REDACTED] have a history of lying and cover-up.
- Is it true, that increasing adverse events, such as anaphylaxis, thrombosis, myocarditis, pericarditis, neurological damage, strokes, paralyses and convulsions have been reported post injectible application? With well over a hundred thousand recorded deaths worldwide?
- Is it true that deaths have been linked to the injectibles designed to combat coronavirus than to Coronavirus itself?
- Is it true, evaluation of clinical trial risk reduction reveals the true effectiveness of the injectible anti-coronavirus to be negligible (~1%), and that they do not prevent or reduce viral transmission? If so, the so called vaccines therefore, fail to meet the basic performance criteria required of vaccines and are incapable of managing the spread of Coronavirus.
- Is it true, that the injectible manufacturers and medical staff inoculating people are fully indemnified, but it remains unclear if insurance companies would adequately compensate individuals for potential life-threatening injuries?
- Isn’t it true, that individuals and groups of people were coerced into accepting these injections to keep their livelihood. ‘No jab, no job’. If so, this goes against the official Australian *Immunisation Handbook*, which states that for consent to be legally valid, “It must be given voluntarily in the absence of undue pressure, coercion or manipulation.” (s.2.1.3).
- Did doctors and companies receive financial incentives or bonuses, for pushing the injectible program, eg Bunnings with their sausage sizzle injecting clinics?
- Was there financial incentive of continued funding or bonuses for compliance, eg government funded nursing homes?

- Do you have the ability to review all finances involved in Australia's health programs especially with injectibles of the last 3 years, with an aim to reveal unethical financial behaviour?
- Is it true, that other groups of people eg politicians, employees of pharmaceutical companies, had blanket exemptions?
- Is it not true, that some labour shortages were created by 'authorities' decree causing staff to be sacked for exercising their moral and possibly legal right to have the final say in what enters, or does not enter their own body, eg nurses, police.
- The UNESCO *Statement on Bioethics and Human Rights*, which states "Any preventative diagnostic and therapeutic medical intervention is only to be carried out with the prior free and informed consent of the person concerned, based on adequate information. The consent should, where appropriate, be express and may be withdrawn by the person concerned at any time and for any reason, without disadvantage and without prejudice" (Art.6).
- Before Coronavirus took hold in Australia Nursing homes locked their doors. Isolation was advised. Residents could not enjoy the embrace of their loved ones and friends, by government decree? Is it not true that this one action created more heart ache and many of our elderly souls, who had lived through WW2 died during Lockdowns?

Considering the number and seriousness of questions just one person has, don't you think a full, wide and open reporting from a royal commission be done into all of the areas above for the 4 years?