

I present this submission as both a concerned citizen and as a person who lost his employment due to the Covid-19 vaccine mandates. My main concerns are as follows:

- 1- There are serious questions around conflicts of interest and scientific accuracy in the pandemic messaging, diagnosing of cases and the promotion of the vaccine response.
- 2- The core responses of government – masks, lockdowns, social distancing and vaccines – were fear-based and all have been shown to have deleterious side-effects. There was essentially no positive health messaging, such as sunlight/vitamin D, exercise, fresh air, proper nutrition and social connection.
- 3- The public has been kept in the dark about the details of the secretive contracts between the Federal government and the pharmaceutical companies.
- 4- False messaging was promoted regarding the vaccines. In the case of the mRNA injections, they should have been more accurately called experimental gene therapies. The mantra of 'safe and effective' was shown to be wildly inaccurate: companies later admitted that they did not stop transmission and were not tested for this; some products (e.g. Astra Zeneca) were later withdrawn due to their dangers; and there has been a truly alarming number of injuries from these products.
- 5- Given the inaccurate and incomplete messaging around these products, and the social and financial pressures on Australians to take them, I would argue that no-one was in a position to give fully informed and free consent to these products. There needs to be a thorough investigation of how and why the law on informed consent has been bypassed.
- 6- Nevertheless, some employers are still mandating these products. The Australian Human Rights Commission's response to many individuals who reached out to them was sadly lacking. They did not assess whether the derogation of rights such as non-discrimination in employment, freedom of medical choice and privacy (of an individual's medical records) were truly justified and compliant under international human rights law. In my case, the Commission took a narrow view that was confined to whether a disability prevented an employee from being vaccinated – without doing any thorough evaluation of whether the vaccination mandate was appropriate in the first place.
- 7- The heavy-handed approach of all levels of government should never occur again. Any calls to declare a pandemic should be rigorously examined by independent experts with no conflict of interests, prior to such a declaration. Then, should any response be required, it needs to centre around positive messaging of health promotion, rather than fear-based mandating of anti-human practices and dubious products. Members of the public should not have to endure the loss of their businesses and jobs ever again.