

Submission to the Covid 19 Inquiry

The most important thing that this Inquiry can do is look to Sweden. Sweden took a different approach to the handling of the Covid 19 pandemic. Their approach relied on people's commonsense, on people taking advice from government and following the rules e.g. stay home if you sick. In the end Sweden was no worse off than those countries like Australia who adopted Draconian measures. And even if they were slightly worse off – and I'm not saying they were – isn't that better than what happened in Australia we people's rights were taken away, we were governed by people we had not elected, enormous ongoing collateral damage in terms of social cohesion, health, mental health, and economic fallout to name a few.

Governance

I strongly believe that Chief Medical Officers should not be given the power and responsibility that they were given during the Covid 19 pandemic. As Chief Medical Officers their responsibility was only to consider the medical issues that they believed needed to be addressed. They did not have a need or responsibility to consider the collateral effects of the decisions or the effects on other aspects of people's health such as mental health, effects on the economy,, family relationships, the welfare of children. Like any other appointed officer their main responsibility would have been to keep Covid numbers to a minimum despite any consequences of their decisions. Of course they would want to keep numbers to a minimum as their reputation depended on that and that alone. The reputations did not depend on how these decisions affected the other areas of people's lives and society that I have illustrated above. The consequence of this has been that the collateral effects were disastrous for many people and the means did not justify the ends.

I strongly believe that the Chief of Police should not be given the same powers and responsibilities they were given in the Covid 19 pandemic. The same reasons apply that apply to the Chief Medical Officer's role in the Covid 19 pandemic. They were not required to take allowed collateral damage, and in order to protect their reputations acted only to limit Covid numbers.

I strongly believe that a representative committee including the government of the day should be involved in those decisions and Chief Medical Officers and the Chief of Police should be used in a consultancy capacity. We did not elect these offices to need the country. We elected Premiers and the Prime Minister. In my opinion they abrogated their responsibilities during the Covid 19 pandemic.

I was, and still am, very much against mandating vaccines, except perhaps for those people who work directly with the very vulnerable. And is no good claiming that no vaccines were mandated – they were mandated unless people were prepared to give up their career, and who can afford to do that? And do not forget that there were very very very few people who are actually at risk from this infection. This was lost amongst all the exaggeration and propaganda. Even when Chief Medical Officers knew that the vaccine did not prevent transmission and they knew that no- one was at serious risk of death or serious illness from Covid 19 unless they had several serious medical conditions or were old or frail, they kept up the lies and propaganda going so that people were convinced that the risk to them of getting Covid 19 was so great that healthy young people willingly lined up for the vaccine. And parents made sure that

their children got the vaccine – children who were not at all at risk. Some people, because of the propaganda, got the children vaccinated ‘to protect their parents or their grandparents’. This was even the case when it was known that the vaccine did not stop transmission. Was this made clear? No it was not.

The campaign generated across Australia and the world quickly led to many people believing that if they caught Covid they would die or at the very least get a very serious disabling illness. This I believe was deliberate misinformation to convince people to get this untested, experimental vaccine into people. With any new pandemic any vaccine will be untested and experimental. By untested I mean in the sense that it would not have been on the market for more than a few months and the testing before it was approved was, by its very nature, limited. As I’m sure most you are aware that the effects of pharmaceutical interventions are often not discovered for years after their appearance on the market. (And this is in part due to corrupt pharmaceutical companies, all of whom are constantly being sued for lies. Most of these I get to court – they are settled out of court.) I think it was a criminal for Chief Medical Officers and others to call this vaccine safe and effective. No vaccine or medication has been on the market for only a few months can be declared safe for the reasons expressed above. Is a professor of medicine told me that no recently discovered medical intervention can be called safe unless that has been around for at least a generation. I think this one of the most disgraceful aspects of the propaganda campaign get people to have that vaccine. Even pregnant women were required to have the vaccine! For [REDACTED] if you can’t see it that is a crime against those women and their children just because of the risk then I don’t understand your thinking.

Everyone knows people who are badly affected by this vaccine but everyone knows that it’s impossible to get any action about this because doctors were silenced – another thing which was disgraceful and should not happen again – and the difficulty of proving things in a non supportive environment is too much for people.

And [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] University who develop a non-M RNA vaccine which had been trialed successfully in Iran faced active opposition by the Chief Medical Officer in South Australia even refusing to allow the exemption for the mRNA vaccine for those people who were lucky enough to get into the trial here. What a [REDACTED] disgrace! Our own brilliant world-renowned scientist gets no supporting his own country. This needs to be investigated.

And as for lockdowns, the management of those was another disgrace. Since it appears that the federal government has no control over what states do in this regard , there has to be some kind of Federal legislation to enable the federal government to step in where States implement unnecessarily Draconian measures in regards to lockdowns and other actions .

The only advice about how to avoid or minimise the effect of getting Covid 19 was vaccinate! Vaccinate! Vaccinate!. Not once did I hear any government advice about how to strengthen your immune system! This was the perfect opportunity to have some health campaigning to get people off processed and junk foods but no, what happened instead? People were locked in consuming more and more of those

things, putting on weight, becoming more and more unhealthy. And consequently of course more vulnerable to Covid 19.

Lockdowns should occur only under the most extreme- and I mean extreme - circumstances. Covid 19 was not the plague. It was at most a severe version of our flu like illness. Therefore lockdowns were completely unnecessary and should not have happened at all in this country. We are not Italy where families live on top of each other with three generations in crowded situations. The spread to old people and vulnerable people was always going to be less in this country.

If we didn't have lockdowns we wouldn't need to plan for support for increased suicide, domestic violence, mental health problems, educational problems etc. the collateral damage caused by lockdowns is so huge that governments should never resort to them unless there is no other option.

And under no circumstances should schools ever be closed.

And since we know there are going to be other pandemics the federal government should get a process or a policy worked out for how and if they are going to pay people who are forced not to work. A policy like job keeper should never ever happen again. It was deliberately (as admitted by the government) developed to be not transparent (unlike New Zealand which where everything related to their equivalent screen was transparent), and it paid the most ridiculous groups of people a lot of money. For example I know uni students who did a bit of part-time work for a few hours who got the full job keeper! They were laughing all the way to the bank - or to the fashion stores online. And companies that do not lose money but who claimed and received funding to support workers should be required to return the money if they in fact do not make a loss. That that didn't happen this time is outrageous.

It is obvious that the government should support the development and maintenance of all industries that provide essentials for life in terms of medications and food and other essential supplies. In the end the government must protect its people and any free trade agreements should have caveats that allow for this kind of protective enterprise.

People should not be denied access to experts who disagree with government policy. This only creates distrust and so-called conspiracy theories. This is a democracy and we should have access to all the information that is out there.

