

14/12/2023

Submission to: **Members of the Independent Panel**
Regarding: **COVID-19 Response Inquiry**

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission to the COVID-19 Response Inquiry.

It is prudent to review how the Federal Government handled the COVID pandemic so that lessons can be learned. It would have been more prudent to include a review of how the State Governments responded to the pandemic as all Australians were affected by the response of the State Governments. It is unfortunate that this aspect has not been included in the terms of reference. In fact, I ask that this inquiry recommend a Royal Commission into every aspect of the pandemic response as only a Royal Commission has the powers needed to access all the evidence required for a proper review.

Here are some of the issues I found concerning about the Federal Government's response to the COVID-19 pandemic that deserve to be reviewed:

- the use of media, especially tv and radio, to desensitize the population to their loss of freedoms, to lead them to expect mask-wearing and lockdowns, and to set the public up to actually call for mask-wearing and lockdowns
- the stifling of any voices or opinions that differed from the government's approach no matter how credentialed those people were, including cancelling or rescinding their prior academic qualifications and professional standing; the role of the government to "other", shame, cancel, belittle and name-call those whose perspectives and opinions differed from the government narrative including the unvaccinated and freedom protestors.
- the Federal Government appointing itself as the only official source of accurate information
- how frequently the Government and health advice changed and the fact that none of it worked anyway. The fact that we had to keep extending the emergency response period was evidence of this.
- why the Federal Government and public health officials ignored evidence from elsewhere eg Sweden had no worse outcomes and yet were not locked down; ivermectin was proving effective in India and Latin America yet was pre-emptively banned in Australia. If the pandemic was as bad as the government said then any signs of effective ways to manage it should have been explored rather than suppressed.
- the fact that democracy was used to get rid of democracy – parliament passed laws that removed the democratic process and put all power into one person's hands for indefinite periods of time
- the amount of public money wasted – how much has been spent on the pandemic response in total; why has there been no transparency, accountability or presentation of a cost-benefit analysis; please now correct that and publicly release the cost-benefit analyses the government used to determine its response; please release the government's post-pandemic review into how effective its spending was in stopping the pandemic ie did the money do what it was supposed to do?
- why so much money was wasted on useless things such as tables and chairs for kids to do their school work at home, and air purifiers in every class room
- the use of force and military weapons by our police and defence forces against their own un-armed citizens including those who were complying with all COVID restrictions should never have happened
- how ATAGI, TGA, APHRA etc were able to review all the vaccine trial data so quickly that they could confidently declare that the vaccines were safe and effective; remember that [REDACTED] itself told the courts it could not release the documentation to the public in less than 75 years because there was so much of it
- why the new genetic vaccines were the only ones given Emergency Use Authorisation and more traditional vaccines were suppressed, and why development of more traditional vaccines was denied funding
- why the government was only focused on vaccinating healthy people and put very few resources into helping

those with COVID recover

- the Federal Government and public health officials abused the public's good will and took advantage of people's concern for their neighbour
- why the Opposition (Labor), who are now the Government, did not do their job holding the then-Government to account
- I ask for the ethics studies on the genetic vaccines to be released; have they been done or was the pandemic response and emergency use authorisation a convenient way to by-pass ethics studies?; is the act of changing how healthy human cells work in order to perform an arbitrary function (producing the spike protein) even ethical?
- why it was forbidden for unvaccinated Australians to leave the country. Surely if another country did not want to accept unvaccinated travellers they could make their own policy. This move was reminiscent of communist Russia and China who would not let their citizens leave the country.
- Why the Government continues to vote down any legislation that will rectify some of these problems or investigate some of these concerns
- why vaccine injuries are not properly investigated, if at all; why the government continues to “other” the vaccine-injured; why the Government and health authorities are permitted to get away with this negligence
- why the Government abandoned its own pandemic preparedness plans
- why our parliamentary Members of the House of Representatives and Senators disabled all forms of communication by which their constituents could usually reach them - their phone lines, fax lines, contact forms and email addresses - during the pandemic; how can they represent us when we cannot even contact them to tell them our concerns? With only a very few exceptions, why did no member of the parliament, government or health authorities reply to any queries from concerned experts?
- the use of public and private institutions and celebrities as mouthpieces for the government's narrative. Such institutions included schools and churches. Health matters are not issues these institutions or celebrities are qualified or competent to speak about.
- why private medicare data was allowed to be used to enforce a two-tiered state – the vaccinated could access services, the unvaccinated could not; this was the case even though the public health officials had advised that the vaccines neither stopped transmission nor infection; is this consistent with human rights and democracy?
- why it was necessary to form the National Cabinet and why our existing democratic systems were not sufficient; why state premiers were able to use the National Cabinet to push their ideas on the whole country – well beyond their own jurisdictions
- whether it is right that unvaccinated Australians were not permitted to receive health care eg they could not go to the doctor, dentist or hospital, even though health authorities had declared that the vaccines did not stop transmission or infection and even though medical professionals were vaccinated (due to vaccine mandates)
- why lock-down conditions were stricter than house arrest; is it consistent with human rights and a free society to lock healthy people inside their homes if they haven't committed a crime?
- why there is secrecy surrounding the vaccine contracts and vaccine manufacturer indemnities given that they were paid for by public money and a very large proportion of the population received the vaccines into their bodies; please release the vaccine contracts and vaccine manufacturer indemnities; please rescind the indemnities and make this retrospective
- why the pandemic response was allowed to go on for two years when a State of Emergency is supposed to be a short-lived
- why vaccine mandates were needed by so many industries, even by those workers who work outdoors by

themselves

- the disgraceful treatment of Novak Djokovic; the Government made up its own rules about immigration which Djokovic duly followed, but the Government did not like it so the Minister changed the rules for Djokovic because the government wanted to be in control and, according to their own statements, they wanted to make an example of him
- why genetic vaccines were authorised for children when children were at next to no risk from COVID and there was no long-term safety data for the vaccines, nor was there any trial data; how did ATAGI, TGA etc reach the conclusion that the genetic vaccines were safe for children?
- why vaccines were authorised and encouraged for pregnant women when there weren't even any trials done on pregnant women; since this was the case, why were pregnant women told the vaccines were safe and effective and not told the truth about lack of trial data. Surely this must be considered medical negligence at best, if not criminal behaviour.
- why the government could require employers to sack unvaccinated workers rather than allow employers to come to their own arrangement with staff eg allowing staff to take leave
- due to lockdowns and lock-outs, my [REDACTED] could not return home for 6 months; my [REDACTED] was home alone for 6 months; why travel and freedom of movement were restricted since everyone was locked down anyway so the restrictions were not providing any benefit
- why the power invested in one person was used to shut down everybody else's freedoms instead of being used to open up freedoms eg it could have been used to over-ride ATAGI, TGA, APHRA to allow doctors to treat COVID however they see fit within their professional competence; why government and health authorities (ATAGI, APHRA) pursued only one avenue for dealing with the pandemic (vaccines) rather than letting health professionals try a variety of approaches
- given we still have a lot of COVID in the community it seems absolutely none of the COVID-19 pandemic response was effective or beneficial. It was a complete waste of years of our lives and money. It was an absolute trampling on our freedoms with no scruples. We need to find how our freedoms, our liberty, our democratic processes, as well as principles and good practice in fields such as medicine, ethics, journalism and policy-making are never again abandoned so readily and so swiftly.
- why some professions are still subject to vaccine mandates given all we now know about the disease, the vaccines and since the pandemic has been declared to be over
- The short-term and long-term cost on businesses, mental health, suicides, student learning, vaccine-induced illnesses, intergenerational debt, trust in government and public authorities. It would be prudent to have a follow up review in 5 – 10 years time as some of the repercussions of the pandemic response are still playing out and therefore it is not possible to fully understand their impact.

It is important that our freedom, our liberty, our democratic processes, as well as principles and good practice in fields such as medicine, ethics, journalism and policy-making are never again abandoned so readily and so swiftly. It is even more damning that this state should have continued for more than 2 years. This must never be allowed to happen again.

I reiterate my call for this inquiry to recommend a Royal Commission into every aspect of the pandemic response as only a Royal Commission has the powers needed to access all the evidence required for a proper review.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a submission to the COVID-19 Response Inquiry.