Submission to the COVID-19 Response Inquiry

I am an Australian mum, part-time administrator and small business owner. Once upon a time I mostly believed what the government told me. Until 2020.

I never ever imagined that I would ever see an Australia where people were discriminated against for declining to participate in a medical experiment. I never ever imagined that I would see an Australia where people were stood down from their jobs because they declined to participate in a medical experiment. I never ever imagined that I would ever see an Australia where I was not free to go where I wanted because I declined to participate in a medical experiment. I never ever imagined that I would see an Australia where people had to hug each other over a barrier because they weren't allowed to cross a border to visit their loved ones. There is a long list of things that I never ever imagined I would see in my beautiful Australia prior to 2020.

The harm and irreparable damage that has been inflicted on the Australia that I love and its people is heartbreaking and I want answers! In this, I know that I am NOT alone. The Australian public DESERVES answers from those that have been elected to represent them and whose wages are paid for by the Australian public. YOU serve US.

1. Why was our own plan not adhered to? Why was the complete opposite done to that advised in the comprehensive 2019 Australian Health Management Plan for Pandemic (Influenza)? Who was responsible for making that decision? https://www.health.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/2022/05/australian-health-management-plan-for-pandemic-influenza-ahmppi.pdf

   It recommended the following, which the government did the opposite of:
   - Mask wearing – *"No evidence" of effectiveness*. Masking the entire, non-symptomatic population was not even considered.
   - Border closures – *International - "Overall, the quality of the evidence available about the effectiveness of border measures is low".*
     Internal travel restrictions - Not recommended in general as benefits are likely to be minor. Effectiveness – Minor. Direct & Secondary costs – High"
   - School closures – Proactive - *"Not generally recommended. The level of disruption is likely to outweigh benefits".* Reactive– *"Not recommended unless the disease has high clinical severity or children are a group at risk of complications".*
   - Workplace closure – *"Not generally recommended. Effectiveness – moderate. Direct costs & Secondary costs – High. Costs include effects on profits, availability of goods and services, and job security. Modelling has estimated the macroeconomic impacts of school and workplace closure are likely to exceed costs caused by the pandemic itself .*
   - Cancellation of mass gatherings – "*Not generally recommended. Benefits are uncertain. Secondary costs – High".*

   Alternatively, this is what it recommended:

   - Antivirals for treatment of cases – "*Recommended for all cases during the Initial Action stage. Benefits - Treatment may reduce symptoms and thus reduce morbidity*

and mortality, and decrease disease transmission to contacts. It may also contribute to the prevention of secondary bacterial infection.

Surely our national plan was put together carefully by experts and was fit for purpose, so why would the government decide to do the exact opposite of the plan in a situation that it was actually created for?

2. Regarding the Covid-19 mRNA Treatments, the Australian people have a right to know what the arrangements were/are with the Vaccine Manufacturers. We are the ones that are paying the bill, not only now but for many many years to come, in more ways than just our taxes.

    - What is the cost of the Covid-19 injections to date?
    - What are Australia's ongoing commitments?
    - Why was enough for up to or more than 10 injections per person for the Australian population purchased initially, whilst the public were being told that an initial injection plus one follow up booster were a full course for 95% protection against infection and transmission? On what were these now shown to be false figures based?

    - Why and how was immunity for the manufacturers granted and is that immunity legal in light of the trial data fraud ([redacted] documents (available in March 2022 on court order after [redacted] sought to hide them for 75 years) containing hundreds of adverse effects, and the deaths of 1223 people within 3 months of the trials showed "intent to deceive and cause serious harm." https://phmpt.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/5.3.6-postmarketing-experience.pdf (Note: the [redacted] ersion of the mRNA treatment has now been removed in Australia, and the [redacted] version is responsible for more side effects than [redacted]).

3. Regarding the Regulatory Bodies that were supposed to be working for the Australian people, what were they doing and what was their motivation?

    - Therapeutic Goods Administration – Why did the TGA approve the use of the novel mRNA treatments without testing or checks on the contents, genotoxicity and long-term safety of the products? Is it because of the fact that they are a clear example of regulatory capture? They are 94% funded by the pharmaceutical companies whose products they are supposed to police. How did this happen and why was this not a massive red flag prior to Covid-19?

      Their total lack of due diligence in relation to the danger of the Covid-19 injections since their implementation is absolute malfeasance which has resulted in the unnecessary deaths of many Australian people, including the unborn.

    - Australian Health Professionals Regulatory Agency – Why did they effectively gag the entire medical profession with their 9 March 2021 *Position Statement - Registered health practitioners and students and COVID-19 vaccination?*

      It removed Doctor/patient privilege, informed consent and the ability of Doctors to treat patients as individuals. Providing the best treatment for each person as an

individual using a physician's knowledge of their individual history and circumstances has always been the foundation of best practice.

This suppression of information and one size fits all approach to health has had a massive cost on the health of the Australian people which can be seen in the excess death and vaccine injured statistics. The complete gamut of negative effects on the Australian population is yet to be seen and will take many many years to reverse, if we are ever able to.

How was an experimental treatment with no safety data able to be mandated by the Government? This is in breach of everything from the Siracusa Principles to the Nuremberg Code and Australian Immunisation Handbook. Who is going to pay for the damage done? The Australian public have the right to demand a full Royal Commission and the instigation of Criminal Proceedings.

Shari Ware