

- What couldn't we see the data? Why is it hidden and why can't we have experts from outside public health debate the data so all Australians know what is happening?
- Why do we have 50,000 excess deaths since April 2021, which was when the Covid-19 vaccine was rolled out? It is not from Covid, so what is it, and why did the Senate vote 30-29 against a formal investigation? Even if it is not the vaccine, then it is a national emergency that must be explored. It is unacceptable to simply sweep it under the carpet.
- Why is it a doctor can register a Covid-19 vaccine death in the TGA DAENS yet the TGA "experts" do not report it as such?
- Why was there an absence of autopsy's performed on those who died shortly after receiving the Covid-19 vaccine?
- Then Health Minister, Greg Hunt, told all Australians on ABC Insiders in February 2021 that the Covid-19 vaccine was safe and effective. How could he have known that when Pfizer's own internal data showed anything but being safe and effective? Why did the Federal Government establish the Covid-19 Vaccine Compensation Scheme if it was "safe?"
- The average age of a Covid death was 84, longer than the average age of life. So young people were never at risk, and if it was effective, then surely those that took the vaccine were protected? Why did I have to take a headache tablet so you would get a headache? It made no sense.
- We have 19 years without a successful SARS vaccine, and what appeared to be a miracle, we had one. Why were other treatments suppressed, one of which was a Nobel Prize winning drug (2015) with over 4.6 billion doses and little to no deaths? The only way the Biosecurity Act could be enacted was if no other treatments existed. Why did the government shut down and ban known treatments that have been around for 50+ years yet allow an untested, and more disturbing mRNA vaccine on the population? Surely people who were not at risk at dying from Covid could have used other measures that have stood the test of time?
- And on risk, the risk of a healthy person dying from Covid (not with Covid) was something like 0.0094 of one percent. Why on earth would the government push a single, untested, "solution" on every person? And if the answer is, "it was the best available information" where was this information sourced and who funded it?
- People lost their jobs for having the bravery to say no to an untested drug. They may not have been forced, but they were coerced or they lost their job. Can you please explain to me how the application of the Nuremberg Code would apply to this? My comments are in **red**.

The ten points of the Nuremberg Code were given in the section of the judges' verdict entitled "Permissible Medical Experiments":

1. The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential. This means that the person involved should have

legal capacity to give consent *[School kids were able to make their own decisions about whether to take the vaccine or not. I refer to Qudos Stadium in NSW, which was converted as a mass vaccination clinic where parents could not attend the vaccination with their child. How could a 12, 13, 14, or 15 year old possible be considered to have the legal capacity?]* ; should be 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; *[with good conscience, how can any reasonable thinking person not believe that what the Federal and State government did was not coercion? It was an element of fraud as well as the people were told it was safe and effective, yet as it turned out, neither are true. People died from the Covid-19 vaccine. People were injured by the Covid-19 vaccine. People such as Dr Kerryn Phelps who eventually spoke out were criticized. When in Australia's history have so many been suppressed for challenging the government position?]* should have **sufficient knowledge and comprehension** of the elements of the subject matter involved as to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision. This latter element requires that before the acceptance of an affirmative decision by the experimental subject there should be made known to him the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment; the method and means by which it is to be conducted; all inconveniences and hazards reasonably to be expected; and the effects upon his health or person which may possibly come from his participation in the experiment. *[People were told it was safe and effective. They lied as neither are true. The data points clearly to that outcome.]* 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.^[13]

2. The experiment should be such as to yield fruitful results for the good of society, unprocureable by other methods or means of study, and not random and unnecessary in nature. *[50-year old successful antiparasitic drugs were banned. The Queensland Government passed legislation within 2 weeks of lockdowns that prevented Doctors from prescribing Hydroxychloroquine. Why? It has been proven and is effective. Ivermectin was the same. In fact, the Gold Coast Hospital sent people home with Ivermectin yet it was not considered a viable option? A 50-year old Nobel Prize winning drug? People were told it was safe and effective. They lied as neither are true. The data points clearly to that outcome.]*
3. The experiment should be so designed and based on the results of animal experimentation and a knowledge of the natural history of the disease or other problem under study that the

anticipated results will justify the performance of the experiment. *[The panel needs to see the animal results. They were abysmal and if the public ever got wind of them, there would be anger beyond belief.]*

4. The experiment should be so conducted as to avoid all unnecessary physical and mental suffering and injury. *[As we know, mental health in Australia as a result of the lockdowns is off the scale. And this could have been prevented if the politicians who ran the show pivoted in their strategy. But they didn't. Why? If a strategy is failing, wouldn't you pivot and adjust? But they kept the same one-trick pony for the entire State of Emergency.]*
5. No experiment should be conducted where there is an a priori reason to believe that death or disabling injury will occur; except, perhaps, in those experiments where the experimental physicians also serve as subjects. *[This panel needs to refer to Pfizer's own internal documents as this clearly shows people died from the vaccines. People were injured from the vaccines, and people continued to catch Covid despite taking the vaccine, despite Pfizer claiming 95% efficacy. They lied and now the US Attorney General is suing Pfizer for false and misleading information.]*
6. The degree of risk to be taken should never exceed that determined by the humanitarian importance of the problem to be solved by the experiment.
7. Proper preparations should be made and adequate facilities provided to protect the experimental subject against even remote possibilities of injury, disability, or death. *[There is a clear lack of support and empathy for those who have been injured by the vaccine. Facebook removed a group that had over 65,000 people on it, many were injured by the vaccine and were telling their stories. But it was shutdown. Why? They were expressing what happened to them. Does that not make it real just because it doesn't align with the government narrative?]*
8. The experiment should be conducted only by scientifically qualified persons. The highest degree of skill and care should be required through all stages of the experiment of those who conduct or engage in the experiment. *[Getting a jab at Bunnings seems to be a far distance from a safe site. And what happened to transporting the vaccine at -70 degrees? What happened to waiting six months between injections, which became four, then three, and some even a month? How quickly the "science" changed. Yet suggest that something like Ivermectin or Hydroxychloroquine and you are banned off social media.]*
9. During the course of the experiment the human subject should be at liberty to bring the experiment to an end if he has

reached the physical or mental state where continuation of the experiment seems to him to be impossible.

10. During the course of the experiment the scientist in charge must be prepared to terminate the experiment at any stage, if he has probable cause to believe, in the exercise of the good faith, superior skill and careful judgment required of him that a continuation of the experiment is likely to result in injury, disability, or death to the experimental subject.

- Tens of thousands said no and somehow fumbled their way through. As we have seen, critical services are now depleted because people are either sick and off work or the people who were in those roles refused to go back. In the United States, not only have the mandates been removed but Marines are being offered \$50,000 to sign back on.
- Doctors exploited the entire vaccination program by charging people hundreds of dollars just for an appointment. These were people who were literally scared to death did all they could to follow the "health advice."
- And finally, there was the economic catastrophe. As Professor Gigi Foster from UNSW wrote, the costs of lockdowns were 68x greater than any benefit gained, including life years. Her research is freely available for all to see.