

Commonwealth Government Covid-19 Response Inquiry Submission

Annette Henning

13/12/2023

Given the ridiculously small time window in which responses are to be submitted, I have largely mirrored the submission of [REDACTED] His thoughts are identical to mine.

It is difficult to take seriously a Commonwealth Inquiry which, in the first instance excludes unilateral actions by the states that constitute the Commonwealth, and has now allowed a submission period of a paltry one week, without advanced notice, immediately prior to Christmas New-Year period.

These circumstances collude to give the impression that the Commonwealth Government does not take this inquiry, and especially public input into it, seriously.

I hope to be proven wrong and to see the concerns and issues raised in this and other submissions addressed so rigorously that I am forced to recant my skepticism.

Preamble:

The 'Covid Era' which I define as March 2020 to the present, given that some vaccine mandates remain in place, has been characterised by governments assuming enormous powers never given to them by the people, making life-altering decisions for the entire population based on sparse information, and the use of violence and coercion against those who questioned either the legitimacy or efficacy of the measures taken.

Unless the governments and people of Australia learn critical lessons from this era, fast, then this era will rightly be viewed as the moment when the idea that Australia is a 'free country based on the rule of law with respect to human rights' is laid to rest for the last time.

I will raise issues with direct reference to the relevant terms of reference below:

- ***"Governance including the role of the Commonwealth Government responsibilities of state and territory governments, national governance mechanisms (such as National Cabinet, the National Coordination Mechanism and the Australian Health Protection Principal Committee) and advisory bodies supporting responses to COVID-19."***

There are a plethora of unaddressed issues here including many which amount to a breakdown in the rule of law and the widespread violation of human rights. Each of these need to be soberly examined, accountability ensured for those responsible, and lessons learned for the future.

To itemise only a few of the most obvious points:

1. The refusal to allow Australian citizens to return home at a time of crisis cuts at the very heart of what it means to be a citizen and represents a terrible breach of faith with the Australian public. It was also largely unnecessary save for perhaps the initial two week halt.
2. The National Cabinet combining the executive branches of State and Federal governments is a fiction, has no basis in the Constitution, and completely undermines the rule of law including our emergency laws which clearly lay out the decision making processes, and transparency measures, which are designed to protect the Australian people in exactly these type of moments.
3. The National Cabinet operating in secrecy and still, to this day, not releasing minutes (press releases are not good enough) only serves to further dent public confidence both in the response, and in the prospect of meaningful accountability for mistakes, a crucial part of public trust.

4. The Prime Minister being permitted to give himself a plethora of Ministerial positions with no one, including the Governor General, apparently objecting at all, sets a dangerous precedent for the concentration of power into a single pair of hands, and makes a complete mockery of the Westminster system we supposedly live under.
 5. The Federal Government consenting by effective silence to the border closures and other inhumane, non-medical intervention, up to and including standing by as children died from lack of basic medical care because of those closures, is a stain on our government and our nation. Today the Federal Government threatens to pull funding for almost any reason, but no such leverage was applied on the issue of border closures, amounting to tacit approval.
 6. The Federal Government consenting by silence, and arguably supporting in principle, State level mandates for experimentally approved gene therapy, violates human rights, breeches the Nuremberg code, and represents the government assuming it has total power over every individual's body. The fact that the government did not recoil in horror at the very thought of mandated medical experimentation (by definition an emergency approved therapy is still experimental) speaks volumes and shows the importance of this inquiry doing its job well.
- ***“Key health response measures (for example across COVID-19 vaccinations and treatments, key medical supplies such as personal protective equipment, quarantine facilities, and public health messaging).”***
7. The dismissal, deriding and then banning of known, cheap, effective treatments which were then, and are now, known without doubt to reduce Covid-19 hospitalisations and deaths when used early and in appropriate combinations, most notably Hydroxychloroquine and Ivermectin in their respective triple therapies, represents an inversion of the medical regulatory system, where that system was used to create **worse** health outcomes.
 8. Given the known efficacy of Hydroxychloroquine in reducing Covid-19 hospitalisation and death, the seizure and destruction of a large quantity of Hydroxychloroquine brought into the country privately by Clive Palmer and donated to the public makes the Federal Government directly responsible for at least some of the Covid-19 deaths that have occurred since.
 9. The fact that dismissing these known safe and effective treatments was a necessary prerequisite to the emergency approval of the various novel Covid-19 mRNA based therapies because of the legislative requirement that “there is not adequate, approved, and available alternative to the product” calls into question the purported professional independence of the regulatory bodies who dismissed the proven therapies.
 10. AHPRA's threatening and harassing of doctors who dissented against the government's stated position on either Covid-19, known therapies such as HQC or Ivermectin, or novel unknown gene therapies such as the hastily developed and poorly performing mRNA therapies, represents a weaponisation of the medical regulatory system to achieve political outcomes.
 11. The Federal Government's failure to ensure that the emergency-approved mRNA based therapies were assessed as the Genetically Modified Organisms that they are and complied with the relevant safety standards with regard to pollutant DNA is a failure of duty of care and has already led to lawsuits and may yet lead to considerable compensation payouts for those harmed by these unapproved GMOs.
 12. All of the above still says nothing about whether the emergency-approved mRNA therapies may be contributing to the current extraordinary excess mortality that is being observed in Australia, something that **should** be attracting considerable research to explain, but our government and health bureaucrats, so concerned with every single death during Covid, seem curiously in-curious about these tens of thousands of excess deaths so far, with more still accumulating monthly.

- ***“Mechanisms to better target future responses to the needs of particular populations (including across genders, age groups, socio-economic status, geographic location, people with disability, First Nations peoples and communities and people from culturally and linguistically diverse communities).”***
13. By April 2020 it was known based on data from Italy, Sweden and Israel that Covid-19 was a high risk for the elderly and infirm, and as age dropped and health improved it became a negligible risk for the vast majority of the population. This was never taken into account in any of the non-medical interventions such as Federal and State border closures, lockdowns, business closures, and more. In future the risk profile of a given threat must be a central feature of the design of any response.
 14. Existing therapies that are known to be safe should **never** be banned to Australians even if their effectiveness is debatable. The banning of Hydroxychloroquine and Ivermectin was a violation of the rights of Australians to access medical care, a violation of the sanctity of the doctor-patient relationship, and given they are now known and accepted to be at least moderately effective, these bans certainly lead to deaths.
 15. The Federal Government should never be silent in the face of States violating human rights. At present the Federal Government is threatening to withdraw funding for wetlands over water buy-backs, so don't let them pretend they couldn't have found some 'leverage' to put an end to the inhumane actions of the States that led to deaths from medical neglect of children, among many other devastating outcomes.
 16. Governments both state and Federal must always be required to release ALL the working information from EVERY meeting which is taken on the taxpayers' dime, especially in a time of emergency, when the people's trust is going to be under the most strain.
 17. Governments both state and Federal must act in accordance with their respective constitutions and make decisions in a way that complies with the existing structures, including the relevant check, balances, and transparency requirements. The 'National Cabinet' must be abandoned, and the minutes from all the past meetings released in full.
 18. No government in Australia, State or Federal, should ever be allowed to mandate medical procedures. This is a violation of human rights and individual bodily autonomy no matter the particulars of the case. The believed safety, effectiveness, or necessity of the intervention is **UTTERLY** irrelevant. When it comes to medicine, informed consent is received or it is **NOT** administered, and no exceptions should be allowed or accepted. The stakes are just too high, and history is too replete with the consequences of getting it wrong for us to even contemplate it.

There are a great many more issues that need to be raised, dissected and examined in detail, and there are a great number of people who need to be held personally accountable for their respective decisions, and the resulting violations of human rights and **deaths**. I pray this Inquiry is up to the task.

Annette Henning