

Submission to COVID-19 Response Inquiry, 13.12.2023

I was a senior clinician in a [REDACTED] hospital, caring for patients with life limiting heart conditions. My employment ended in December 2021 due to 'non-compliance' with the Public Health orders. At that time, I was unwilling to undergo injection with an experimental gene therapy for which there was no long term data. The assertion that these injections were "safe and effective" had no basis in reality, as has subsequently been demonstrated by covid admission /vaccine status data to NSW hospitals. These findings have been corroborated I many other nations that embraced this vaccination program. Despite repeated requests my hospital was never able to provide any risk assessment or MDSS.

I would like to note that being stood aside under the duress of the public health order resulted in workplace induced anxiety and distress. This was significant and warranted counselling with a Psychologist.

It has also caused me financial hardship; and this is ongoing. The cancellation of pre-approved long service leave arrangements; plus the refusal to allow me to access accrued annual leave in whilst on unpaid sick leave was unconscionable caused considerable anxiety and personal hardship. Subsequently, I have only been able to work on a casual basis.

In addition, I note that the "mandate" to insist that all staff receive an experimental genetic therapy (in clinical trials till 2023) was in fact a **breach of informed consent**. Every clinician (Dr's, RNs, Pharmacists) who has administered this injection has NOT provided informed consent (*long term adverse effects were not known*), and is in breach of their respective CODE of CONDUCT, which is a legal construct.

A valid consent is not possible as:

*the long term side effects were unknown, and,

***Consent, as per the Australian Immunisation Handbook CANNOT be given under duress or coercion.** I also note that *consent is required for participation in clinical trials*

In the case of **Jennifer Kimber v. Sapphire Coast Community Aged Care Pty Ltd** a full bench of Fair Work Australia had this to say about coercion in employment to participate in the COVID-19 clinical trials:

[114] *Consent is required for all participation in a clinical trial. Consent is necessary because people have a fundamental right to bodily integrity, that being autonomy and self-determination over their own body without unconsented physical intrusion. Voluntary consent for any medical treatment has been a fundamental part of the laws of Australia and internationally for decades.*

It is legally, ethically and morally wrong to coerce a person to participate in a clinical trial.

[115] *Coercion is not consent. Coercion is the practice of persuading someone to do something using force or threats. Some have suggested that there is no coercion in threatening a person with dismissal and withdrawing their ability to participate in society if that person does not have the COVID vaccine. However, nothing could be further from the truth.*

[116] *All COVID vaccines in Australia are only provisionally approved, and as such remain part of a clinical trial 21. This is not part of a conspiracy theory. It is a fact easily verifiable from the website of the TGA, Australia's regulatory authority responsible for assessing and registering/approving all COVID vaccines before they can be used in Australia.*

[118] *The first principle of the Code is that "The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential". The Code goes on to say that "This means that the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent; 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; and 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....”

[119] Informed and freely given consent is at the heart of the Code and is rightly viewed as a protection of a person’s human rights.

[121] The Declaration of Helsinki (the Declaration), made in 1964 by the World Medical Association, is also a statement of ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. Under the heading of “Informed Consent”, the Declaration starts with the acknowledgement that “Participation by individuals capable of giving informed consent as subjects in medical research must be voluntary”.

[122] Australia is a party to the seven core international human rights treaties, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

[123] The Australian Human Right Commission Act 1986 (Cth) gives effect to Australia’s obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which provides in Article 7 that “...no one shall be subjected without his free consent to medical or scientific experimentation”.

[124] In 1984, the American Association for the International Commission of Jurists (AAICJ) held an international colloquium in Siracusa, Italy, which was co-sponsored by the International Commission of Jurists. The focus of the colloquium was the limitation and derogation provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights....

[126] Paragraph 58 of the Siracusa Principles under the heading of Non-Derogable Rights provides:

No state party shall, even in time of emergency threatening the life of the nation, derogate from the Covenant’s guarantees of the right to life; freedom from torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, and from medical or scientific experimentation without free consent; freedom from slavery or involuntary servitude; the right not to be imprisoned for contractual debt; the right not to be convicted or sentenced to a heavier penalty by virtue of retroactive criminal legislation; the right to recognition as a person before the law; and freedom of thought, conscience and religion. These rights are not derogable under any conditions even for the asserted purpose of preserving the life of the nation. (emphasis added)

[127] This is consistent with Article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

[128] Australia’s National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research [23](#) confirms that consent is a fundamental requirement for participation in any clinical trial, and that “no person should be subject to coercion or pressure in deciding whether to participate” in a clinical trial. Further, the Australian Government’s Consumer Guide to Clinical Trials²⁴ also confirms that participation in a clinical trial is voluntary, and states “it is important that you never feel forced to take part in a trial”.

[129] Freely given consent to any medical treatment, particularly in the context of a clinical trial, is not optional. Coercion is completely incompatible with consent, and denying a person the ability to work and participate in society if the person does not have a COVID vaccine will unquestionably breach this fundamental and internationally recognised human right.

As gene therapies, these experimental injections should have been approved, or reviewed by the Australian Office of Gene Technologies Regulator (OGTR), prior to review of the TGA. With the emerging, and corroborated evidence of plasmid DNA contamination in the Pfizer vials, the government will potentially face an onslaught of legal actions, and Pfizer for fraud.

Furthermore, there is now overwhelming evidence of harms from these injections. I saw first hand the increases in deaths and morbidity post jabs amongst the elderly in my work context, when the injections were first rolled out in nursing homes in our local health district. Detailed analyses are available on:

<https://dailyclout.io/dr-naomi-wolfs-warroom-daily-clout-pfizer-documents-analysis-volunteers-reports-ebook-find-it-on-amazon-kindle-to-date-no-one-has-challenged-the-accuracy-of-what-they-report-listen-t>

Additionally, there has been no governmental review of the excess deaths noted in Australia, since the roll out in 2021.

Data analysis can be found here:

<https://amps.redunion.com.au/too-many-dead>

As a Clinician, I have personally witnessed an explosion of what is termed “turbo cancer”. Disturbingly, many of these cases are amongst millennials.

Australian excess death data is also part of the analysis by Ed Dowd, and can be found here:

[https://www.amazon.com/stores/Ed-](https://www.amazon.com/stores/Ed-Dowd/author/B0BBT45GY4?ref=ap_rdr&store_ref=ap_rdr&isDramIntegrated=true&shoppingPortalEnabled=true)

[Dowd/author/B0BBT45GY4?ref=ap_rdr&store_ref=ap_rdr&isDramIntegrated=true&shoppingPortalEnabled=true](https://www.amazon.com/stores/Ed-Dowd/author/B0BBT45GY4?ref=ap_rdr&store_ref=ap_rdr&isDramIntegrated=true&shoppingPortalEnabled=true)

In the broader Australian community, many small businesses were adversely impacted, with a significant number closing and not re-opening. This has had a knock – on effect in the community re small business being the major employing group of Australians.

Many businesses are now struggling now to attract and retain good employees, and they are also impacted by the significantly increased rate of sickness now common in the workforce.

I would attribute this to chronic immune dysfunction post jabs.

Border closures also had a huge impact on the tourism economy across all Australian states.

Those of us that chose not to be experimental subjects experienced discrimination from within the medical system, and from some businesses.

Many have also experienced alienation from friends and family members for their stance.

I witnessed first hand the devastation wrought by border closures blocking family members from being with their sick or dying loved ones in other states. This was inhumane and unjust.

To lose a job, when working completely from home (as I and others experienced) due to not being jabbed was irrational and inexcusable.

I believe the Australian people will never again comply with the level of coercion, surveillance and fear propaganda that they were subjected to during this plandemic.

I believe the ‘National Cabinet’ was an unelected and unconstitutional body making decisions, issuing proclamations, and using the state governments as their proxy to carry out dystopian controls. Additionally, Australians wish to retain our national sovereignty and not be subject to the WHO imposing pandemic controls on us.