

# Voluntary Informed Consent and Mass Population Covid-19 Vaccination: Considering Jab Mandates

[Video Presentation](#) to [PANDA](#), 18 April 2023

by Elizabeth Hart  
[vaccinationispolitical.net](http://vaccinationispolitical.net)

[Presentation slides](#)

Transcript:

**Todd Kenyon:** Today we have, from Australia, Elizabeth Hart. **She's an independent researcher investigating vaccine products and conflicts of interest in vaccination policy.** Elizabeth is challenging the increasing number of questionable vaccine products and repeat vaccinations being foisted upon children, adults, and animals by the burgeoning and unfettered vaccine industry. Elizabeth has a degree majoring in politics and philosophy. Her interest in vaccination was initiated after she discovered companion animals were being unnecessarily revaccinated every year, and needlessly subjected to the risk of an adverse reaction to vaccination. Her experience in investigating vaccination of pets is informing her investigation into the lucrative vaccination of people, as there are interesting comparisons to be made.

**Elizabeth Hart:**

Well, hello everybody. Thank you for coming and listening to my presentation. **I'm talking on the tricky subject of voluntary informed consent and mass population Covid-19 vaccination.** I'm looking at particularly being in Australia, there's a case called Rogers versus Whitaker, which is fundamental to informed consent here.

**And so, I've got 'First do no harm', and I think that baby was thrown out with the bath water a while ago.**

So, yes, as I said, **Australia's likely to be one of the most Covid-vaccinated countries in the world under mandates**, it's just been so shocking to experience this.

And I've wondered **how could the medical profession go along with this, with mandated medical interventions, and to just trash voluntary informed consent?**

**I'm suggesting that health practitioners in Australia have been conscripted to participate in this rollout, and that's in contravention of the Australian constitution.**

There's a clause in the constitution, which I think was put in after the Second World War by Robert Menzies, which is put in there to stop health practitioners being brought in to do medical issues.

**I'm arguing that they've been conscripted, and I've written a letter to Mark Dreyfus, who's the attorney-general, raising this issue, to challenge it.<sup>1</sup>**

To really start at the beginning, I'm asking a question,

**"Why was there a global vaccine solution to Covid-19?"**

I mean, they knew from the beginning... **The World Health Organization was saying from the beginning, that most people weren't going to be seriously affected by this.** Older people with comorbidities, but most people weren't going to be adversely affected.

**Why was there even any suggestion of a vaccine solution?**

And to end up with **a vaccine solution to be targeting everybody in the world, this is complete insanity.**

**I want to know how was this decided? What were the meetings? Where's the minutes?**

And we know that the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation or Bill Gates, he was running the show from the beginning. He was running the race for a coronavirus vaccine.<sup>2</sup>

Anybody who mentioned that in 2020, eyes would roll and you'd be written off as a conspiracy theorist. And yet, he was actually running the show.

**I'm really looking at the UK as well. I'm looking at the UK as being fundamental to getting this off the ground.**

**The AstraZeneca vaccine was already running, I think in January 2020.<sup>3</sup>** So, this was obviously something they'd had in the works for a while, I think with Disease X plans, and here they were running with this.

**Andrew Pollard was the chief investigator on the Oxford AstraZeneca vaccine, he's also the chair of the Joint Committee on [Vaccination and Immunisation] in the UK, so that's a big conflict of interest, that he's also running a commercial trial.**

---

<sup>1</sup> [See updated email thread to attorney-general Mark Dreyfus, including follow-up.](#)

<sup>2</sup> See for example: GatesNotes. [What you need to know about the COVID-19 vaccine.](#) 30 April 2020.

<sup>3</sup> [Developers of Oxford-AstraZeneca Vaccine Tied to UK Eugenics Movement.](#) *Unlimited Hangout*, 26 December 2020

There's a lot to be looked into here. I've written to the ethics committee that was involved with the AstraZeneca vaccine trial [in the UK] to ask them how could they approve trials in healthy people, with a disease that wasn't a problem for healthy people?<sup>4</sup>

This is the sort of thing that I want to be tracked back now, that we've got to investigate this.

And do you remember back, March 2020 in the UK, Patrick Vallance had announced on... It was reported on the 13th of March, 2020 that they were really going to go with a natural herd immunity solution.<sup>5</sup> That's what they were planning, people to catch it and to just get on with life. It would just become an annual situation.

But then, a few days later, the Ferguson Report comes out. Report 9, dated 16th of March, and it's all changed.<sup>6</sup> In this report, they're comparing Covid with the 1918 flu pandemic, which I've got serious question marks over that one as well. That's another issue. But why were they comparing Covid with 1918, which was supposed to be... It's reported about 50 million deaths, or 20 million deaths, or 100 million deaths, give or take 50 million, with the scientific figures that we have on this pandemic. Why were they comparing Covid to this at that time?

In this report, Report 9, they're suggesting that they can either do mitigation or suppression, and they go with suppressing the virus, which leads now to the lockdowns and social distancing and what have you.

And that's going to happen until the vaccine becomes available.

But a really important piece of information that wasn't disclosed at the time, is that Neil Ferguson is sponsored by or funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.<sup>7</sup>

Now, if that had been in that report, we might've looked at things a bit differently, but people went along with this report. Even though Neil Ferguson had this incredible reputation for all these dire predictions with foot and mouth, I think it was in 2000, mad cow disease, swine flu. He made all these dire predictions about what was going to happen, and they didn't transpire. And then they take him at his word with what he's saying about what's going to happen with Covid.

How could that happen? How could they just run with this report? And this has impacted around the whole world. It impacted in Australia because Ferguson's modelling influenced the Doherty modelling<sup>8</sup>, which put us into lockdown in March 2020. So, it had a massive impact here. And subsequently, the Doherty Institute and the Murdoch Children's

---

<sup>4</sup> See my email to Andrew Pollard: [Who initiated the plan to vaccinate the entire global population against SARS-CoV-2?](#)

<sup>5</sup> See for example: [Coronavirus: 60% of UK population need to become infected so country can build 'herd immunity', government's chief scientist says](#). *Independent*, 13 March 2020.

<sup>6</sup> Neil Ferguson et al. [Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions \(NPIs\) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand](#). Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team, 16 March 2020.

<sup>7</sup> [SAGE COVID-19 Register of Participants' Interests](#).

<sup>8</sup> [Doherty modelling](#). 7 April 2020.

Research Institute are involved in Covid-19 vaccines.<sup>9</sup> There's a lot of conflicts of interest to look back on here.

At the time in March 2020, I submitted some rapid responses to *The British Medical Journal*. I was querying at the time, is it ethical to impede access to natural immunity with this vaccine solution?<sup>10</sup>

And I asked, "Who is Neil Ferguson to say that the only exit strategy in the long term for this is really vaccination or other forms of innovative technology that allow us to control transmission?" Who is Neil Ferguson when he's at home? This modeller in the Imperial College London, and yet, he seems to have such enormous power, I suppose, because he's backed by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

In that same rapid response, I was also talking about the impact on young people with the natural immunity. And I quoted Heidi Larson, she's the director of The Vaccine Confidence Project, which is an organisation which is campaigning against vaccine hesitancy, and it's pretty well-backed by the vaccine industry.

And it's very telling to look back now. There was a conference, a WHO global vaccine summit, which was held in December 2019. So, really interesting to think about that now, just prior to the Covid thing exploding. And during that conference, Heidi Larson says,

"We've shifted the human population to dependency on vaccine-induced immunity. We're in a very fragile state now. We've developed a world that is dependent on vaccinations."

Now, that's a startling statement for her to make, to think that that's what we're doing, trying to move people to this artificial state, and it's really trying to make people dependent on the vaccine industry.

We should be thinking about this, about what's happening to children with all these vaccines they've been given, when in most cases, they might have the wherewithal to withstand things themselves, like Covid for example.

And also at that conference, Heidi Larson speaking at that conference, she also made the point that the health professionals were starting to question vaccines and the safety of vaccines, because there's a lot of concern in the community.

And she was saying, "This is very worrying for the vaccine industry because the health professionals are trusted people in society." She's saying, "If we lose them, we're in trouble." She's saying, "We haven't lost them yet, but if they feel like they haven't got the good enough confidence about the safety to stand up to it, to the people who are asking questions..." They're worried about losing them.

---

<sup>9</sup> See [Vaccine and Immunisation Research Group \(VIRGo\)](#) on the Murdoch Children's Research Institute website, as at 28 August 2023.

<sup>10</sup> [Is it ethical to impede access to natural immunity? The case of SARS-CoV2.](#) Elizabeth Hart *BMJ* rapid response, 25 March 2020

She's also making the point too, **that these health professionals do not have a lot of expertise in vaccines, that she's suggesting they might get half a day on vaccines in medical school.**

**When you think these people are giving these medical interventions, they're not expert in these medical interventions, and yet, they're giving them to people, so that's something we really have to think about.**

But this is interesting now to think about what she was saying at that time, **because it looks like the health professionals were reeled in subsequently, and locked into being supportive of this vaccine rollout.**<sup>11</sup>

Another rapid response I had published in *The British Medical Journal* was in August in 2020<sup>12</sup>, **because I was very concerned that children were being lined up for Covid jabs, when it was known that children weren't at risk of Covid...**

I'd read an article in *The Guardian*.<sup>13</sup> In this article **they were saying that children are given nasal spray flu vaccines to protect their grandparents, and children aren't at risk of severe flu, but they've been given a vaccine to protect their grandparents.** I mean, that's just astonishing.

This was acknowledged by Peter Openshaw, who's also from Imperial College London, same as Neil Ferguson. This was disclosed at a Lords' Committee that was discussing the Covid-19 vaccine development. And he was saying that, as well as giving these kids these flu vaccines, **now they were planning to jab children against Covid to protect the elderly. Astonishing admission, and apparently the Lord's Committee didn't even seem to blink an eye at this.**

Also in this *BMJ* rapid response, I'm saying that the children are not at risk of Covid. So, again, I'm saying, **"How can it be ethical to vaccinate mass populations of children to protect the elderly?"** This is just crazy. It can't be ethical to do this.

These are medical interventions that have risks. **How can we be giving these interventions to people when they are not going to benefit from these things themselves?**

I asked in this *BMJ* rapid response, I was sort of asking too, **"What do doctors think about this, about vaccinating children with flu vaccines and future coronavirus vaccines to supposedly protect the elderly? How come doctors are going along with this?"**

Also, and again, in that same rapid response, **I was mentioning how the vaccine manufacturers were going to get protection.** And there was a specific article, a *Reuters* article<sup>14</sup> that was talking about AstraZeneca. And this Ruud Dobber who was an Astra

---

<sup>11</sup> See my challenge re the AHPRA Position Statement 9 March 2021: [Reckless disregard for voluntary informed consent](#). 31 July 2023.

<sup>12</sup> [Is it ethical to vaccinate children to protect the elderly?](#) Elizabeth Hart *BMJ* rapid response, 5 August 2020.

<sup>13</sup> [Covid-19 vaccine may not work for at-risk older people, say scientists](#). *The Guardian*, 24 June 2020.

<sup>14</sup> [AstraZeneca to be exempt from coronavirus vaccine liability claims in most countries](#). *Reuters*, 30 July 2020

executive, he was saying that, **"This is a unique situation where we, as a company, cannot take the risk if in four years the vaccine is showing side effects."**

You think, wow, they're going to be protected, and the people are just going to have to wear any problems with the vaccine. **Now, these are supposed to be so 'safe and effective', why do these things have to be protected like this?** This is what we should be questioning. **It's just insane that they were given protection like this at the beginning.**

Then again, same year, another *BMJ* rapid response that was published from me.<sup>15</sup> And I was making the point that **our liberal democracies are being turned upside down in this response to Covid**. This rapid response was published in December 2020, **so this is just around the time of the start of the rollout in the UK, because the UK got this going at the end of 2020.**

I was making the point that, in the past 11 months, 1.64 million deaths have been attributed to Covid. Now, that's in a world of about 7.9 billion at the time, where about 56 million deaths would be expected. So, 1.64 million deaths is nothing. **And we know at the time they were just trying to beat up the case numbers, beat up the deaths.**

**And this 1.64 million deaths does not justify the subsequent response around the world, the plan to jab the entire population over and over again. It just wasn't justified. How could they do this?**

**Again, we need to go back and see how was this approved? How was this discussed and approved? Where are the minutes of the meetings?**

Also around this time, or in October 2020, November 2020, **the Royal Society in the UK and the British Academy, they put out a report about the vaccine deployment.** And this was really to target people who would dissent about the vaccines. It was looking at behaviour, misinformation. **Anybody who questions the vaccines is regarded as a vaccine denier or a Covid denier.**

**But it wasn't disclosed by the Royal Society and the British Academy that they had conflicts of interest.**

And I wrote to them at the time challenging them about this<sup>16</sup>, **that the Royal Society, for example, was sponsored by AstraZeneca. It has funding from AstraZeneca and also from GlaxoSmithKline, and they were both getting money from the government. So, these were serious conflicts of interest, where they're putting out this report... Because this report was also suggesting that people who put out misinformation should be criminalised.**

This is pretty grim what they were suggesting here, that to just question things... **Who decides what is misinformation? This is what we have to look at too.** The Royal Society is a

---

<sup>15</sup> [Liberal democracies being turned upside down to 'protect health services'](#). Elizabeth Hart *BMJ* rapid response, 18 December 2020.

<sup>16</sup> Email [Failure to disclose conflicts of interest – COVID-19 vaccine deployment report – Royal Society and British Academy](#), 4 December 2020.

pretty heavy organisation, and yet they were part of this massive Covid rollout and promoting it.

Back here in Australia, **it's all happening in Australia because we've been locked in, of course, in March 2020. We're sort of captured again in the prison colony.** And the only people who can really get out of here are politicians, film stars and sports stars. They can seem to get out of the country, but the rest of us are locked in.

**We're really under the control of the Chief Medical Officer.**<sup>17</sup> When this was declared as an emergency in Australia, this was under the Biosecurity Act 2015. And this meant that the Chief Medical Officer was really running the show, **because the government was relying on the advice being provided by the Chief Medical Officer and his, shall I say, henchmen in the Australian Health Protection Principal Committee. And this was keeping us all under control.**

The current Chief Medical Officer is Paul Kelly, and prior to that Brendan Murphy was the Chief Medical Officer. And this committee, the AHPPC, was also relying on advice from other 'experts'.

So, there's a whole lot of groups there. You can see there TGA, Doherty Institute, National Centre for Immunisation Research and Surveillance...

**A lot of these institutes are populated by people who are also involved with the vaccine industry. There are lots of conflicts of interest to consider here.** That's what we have to think about with this vaccine response, that a lot of people had a lot vested into this, and we need to go back and look at this now.

**The AHPPC, they then decided to mandate Covid vaccination for health workers.** Now, this was the thin end of the wedge. This is where this really starts.

**Once you've got the health workers mandated for vaccination, it can lead to everybody being mandated, and that's what happened.**

**We've got most of the population in Australia was subject to mandates in one state or form or another.** There were mandates for jobs, but also businesses...other businesses, like restaurants, sports clubs, were setting mandates. **The state governments were setting very broad mandates.**

**When the AHPPC did this, it really set the cat among the pigeons setting up these mandates.**

I challenged Paul Kelly about this subsequently, in October 2022<sup>18</sup>, about the mandates, because a lot of them were still in place. **And I wanted to know what was the evidence**

---

<sup>17</sup> I have now made [a formal complaint/notification to AHPRA about the Chief Medical Officer Paul Kelly, violating voluntary informed consent via recommending mandatory Covid-19 vaccination](#), 16 June 2023.

<sup>18</sup> Email to Paul Kelly: [Mandated Covid jobs – What is the scientific and medical justification for these mandated medical interventions?](#) 19 October 2022.



**backing these mandates? What was the justification for this?**<sup>19</sup> And as we're finding out here, there's no accountability in Australia. So there's no response.

This is a matter that I'm pursuing ***because this could be a medical indemnity issue with these mandates.***<sup>20</sup>

And now, it is becoming much more of a tricky subject to talk about, and people are running for cover. Former prime minister Scott Morrison, recently he was saying that he's urged the premiers in the states here to drop the mandates, any remaining mandates. And he's sort of saying, **"Oh, the federal government never supported mandates, other than ones that were for medical people."** So, he's trying to offload this responsibility.

But he must be forgetting that back in August in 2020, he'd announced that he wanted vaccination to be **"as mandatory as you can possibly make it"**.<sup>21</sup> He was saying, **"We've got to get to 95%,"** that's 95% of the population he was talking about, and that was on medical advice apparently. **He wanted the vaccination to be mandatory, so he was really behind this.** And others...

Surprisingly, just recently, I found out that Senator Gerard Rennick, who's renowned here as being somebody who's pushed back against the Covid agenda and vaccines and what have you. I came across an article lately, a friend shared it with me from November 2021<sup>22</sup>, and we were astonished to read in this article that **Senator Rennick had actually supported mandates for hospital and aged care workers.** In the same article, **he's saying he's not going to have people being coerced into getting a vaccine, unless you're a hospital and aged care worker.**

And yet, these people are people too. **They're entitled to give informed consent to these medical interventions.** So, again, **if hospital and aged care workers are mandated, this is a danger for everybody, because once that principle is accepted that you can mandate somebody to have a medical intervention, everybody's at risk of this.**

And while all this is going on, **in the UK, the government in the UK, Boris Johnson government, had mandated vaccination through the parliament. But when they tried to roll this out, there were enough people in the NHS to say, "We're walking if you do this," and they had to back off. They had to back off in the UK.**<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Also see my email to then health minister Greg Hunt in July 2021: [The Covid emergency and scientific experts.](#)

<sup>20</sup> See email thread to health minister Mark Butler: [Are health practitioners covered for indemnity re the Covid jabs?](#)

<sup>21</sup> [Scott Morrison expects COVID-19 vaccine will be 'as mandatory as you can possibly make it'.](#) Neil Mitchell, 3AW, 19 August 2020.

<sup>22</sup> ['A hill I'll die on': Senate headache for Morrison over vaccine mandates.](#) *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 19 November 2021.

<sup>23</sup> See for example: [Covid-19: Government abandons mandatory vaccination of NHS staff.](#) *The BMJ*, 1 February 2022.



**Why didn't that happen in Australia? Why didn't we have enough people here in the medical industry to say, "No, you can't mandate vaccination for us." They just didn't do it.**

And so, in the end, **we ended up with these widespread mandates.**

It was just awful here. And Victoria, which is renowned around the world now for what happened here, the draconian response with Victorian Premier Daniel Andrews. He announced it, **"There's going to be a vaccinated economy, and you get to participate in that if you are vaccinated". And if you don't, you're going to be locked out. You're going to be locked out of this economy.**<sup>24</sup> This is what they created here. They created an apartheid.

**It was the most disgusting and shocking situation, that healthy people who did not want to have these medical interventions, who would prefer to just deal with Covid by themselves, were treated like lepers, were excluded from society.**

**And the health officers actually tried to cause dissent and division between people.** The Health Officer in South Australia, Nicola Spurrier, at Christmas, I think in 2021, she said she wouldn't have an unvaccinated person in her house. **These health officers were absolutely deplorable. Everything they did was the antithesis of health.** They made people anxious, they locked people down, they turned people against each other, masked people. It was the most disgusting and disgraceful response. And it's a terrible stain on Australia's history.

Here's an article about **Victorian businesses were going to be facing enormous fines if they had un-vaxxed workers.**<sup>25</sup> So, the businesses were rejecting people who weren't vaccinated, with these laws, **because Daniel Andrews had said, "We are going to lock out people who are not vaccinated."** It was outrageous.

And now here we are in Australia, **apparently over 65 million doses of Covid vaccines have been dispensed.**<sup>26</sup> Now, if those figures are reliable, we can't tell because the government would obviously want to be beating up the idea that everybody's getting injections and giving us a positive spin on things. But if that's true, **millions of adults and children have had these injections, and so many people, these were unnecessary medical interventions.**

**It's just dreadful that people have been made to have these medical interventions, they've been coerced into it.**

**So, looking at this, the rot really set in, in 2016 or before that, 2013 to 2015.** During that time, 2013 to 2015, the Murdoch media ran a campaign for coercive vaccination of children. **It was the No Jab, No Play campaign.** And the politicians took to this very well, because they're very responsive to Murdoch. Nobody wants to upset Rupert Murdoch. So, News Corp was running this campaign.

---

<sup>24</sup> [The Victorian Premier says the state is heading for a 'vaccine economy', here's what that might look like.](#) ABC News, 6 September 2021.

<sup>25</sup> [Victorian businesses face up to \\$10,904 in fines over unvaxxed workers from Friday.](#) SmartCompany, 12 October 2021.

<sup>26</sup> As at 25 August 2023, 68,589,239 Covid-19 vaccine doses have been administered, according to [government statistics](#).

**But people didn't know that News Corp is a corporate partner with the Murdoch Children's Research Institute, which is involved in vaccine research.<sup>27</sup> That's a massive conflict of interest that should have been disclosed at the time.<sup>28</sup>**

Anyway, Scott Morrison, he was the social services Minister at the time in 2015, and he had a private lunch with Rupert Murdoch during that year.<sup>29</sup> And also, during that year, **Scott Morrison raised the No Jab, No Pay Bill, which subsequently became the No Jab, No Pay Law in 2016.** So, this was now for coercive vaccination of children for parents to get tax benefits, and subsequently, state laws with No Jab, No Play to get benefits for childcare.

Now, a lot of people obviously would support children's vaccination, **but there's an awful lot of vaccines being given to children now.** And since that law was put in place, more vaccines have been added to the schedule. And now, **people have been made compliant.**

**So, there's no question now, there's no informed consent happening.** People have just been lined up for the jabs, and more and more are being added to the schedule. And now, we're seeing children being jabbed with Covid jabs. So, this set things going **and we've ended up with this 'No Jab' concept. It's No Jab, No Job now with the Covid times.**

So, again, yes, **Scott Morrison, we remember he said he wanted to make the vaccines as mandatory as you can possibly make them.** And who was one of his advisors? Jane Halton.

**Jane Halton was on the National COVID-19 Coordination Committee. She's the chair of CEPI, which is the front for the vaccine industry, for the pandemic industry. And of course, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation co-founded this organisation.**

And Jane Halton, in May 2020, she was saying, **"Forget the No Jab, No Play for kids. It's now No Jab, No Play for adults. And I would support that. Everybody else, as far as I'm concerned, should actually step up and do the right thing."**<sup>30</sup>

**So, here's a woman with a massive conflict of interest, with the ear of Scott Morrison, demanding No Jab, No Play for adults, and supporting her CEPI and the vaccine industry.**

So, again, mandated Covid vaccinations. For the health practitioners, **they've got an obligation to get voluntary informed consent. And this is where everything went wrong.**

The medical profession at the time should have called this out. **They should have called it out in 2016. They should have said, "We cannot do this under mandates. If the products are good, if they're safe and effective, people will take them, but you cannot mandate these medical interventions."**

---

<sup>27</sup> Murdoch Children's Research Institute Partnerships: <https://www.mcric.edu.au/mcric/partnerships> (As at 28 August 2023.)

<sup>28</sup> For more background see my email to then prime minister Scott Morrison in February 2021: [No Jab, No Play – coercive coronavirus vaccination in Australia – PM Scott Morrison and the Murdoch Media.](#)

<sup>29</sup> [Scott Morrison will almost certainly lead the Liberals. The questions is when?](#) *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 4 September 2015.

<sup>30</sup> [Top adviser to Scott Morrison backs 'no jab, no play' for all.](#) *The Australian*, 18 May 2020.

### **Why did the health practitioners do this? Why did they cooperate with this?**

And there's all these organisations, these professional organisations, the nursing organisation, the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, the Royal Australasian College of Physicians, the Australian Medical Association, **all of these organisations have gone along with this. How could they do this? They were being conscripted as well. They've been conscripted.**

In 2021, and since, I've been writing to these organisations, challenging them about this.<sup>31</sup>

**Even before the mandates were put in place, I was challenging them about they're not getting informed consent with this push on everybody, including children, to be having these vaccine products. How could they do this?**

So, I've written quite a lot of letters on this, to them and to other groups.<sup>32</sup> And Emma McArthur, my colleague here in Adelaide, she's been writing letters too, and also to Scott Morrison, challenging the fact that the pandemic plans were thrown out.<sup>33</sup> And she was also challenging the Doherty modelling behind this as well.<sup>34</sup>

**But there's no accountability. We've an illegitimate government here. We're not getting accountability to the people.**

And I wrote similar emails to *The British Medical Journal*, to the former editor in chief Fiona Godlee<sup>35</sup>, and the current editor is Kamran Abbasi.<sup>36</sup> I'm currently sending emails to him.

**Now, this is the most significant issue for the medical profession, that people are not giving voluntary informed consent to these medical interventions, that they've been coerced into having them.**

**And these people will simply not deal with it. How can *The British Medical Journal* be just refusing to deal with this issue, the biggest issue to face the medical profession? It's absolutely shocking.**

**I'm asking what is the legal basis for these Covid jab mandates that have been happening in Australia?**

---

<sup>31</sup> [Emails on my website vaccinationispolitical.net](https://vaccinationispolitical.net)

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>33</sup> [See Emma McArthur's email to then prime minister Scott Morrison re pandemic planning](#), 16 July 2021.

<sup>34</sup> [See Emma McArthur's email to Jodie McVernon re the Doherty modelling](#), 2 September 2021.

<sup>35</sup> See emails to Fiona Godlee:

- [Why should people not at risk of covid-19 be pressed to have covid-19 injections?](#) 30 May 2021.
- [Is it ethical to vaccinate children to protect the elderly?](#) 14 June 2021.

<sup>36</sup> Emails to Kamran Abbasi, see for example:

- [Mandated Covid jabs and health practitioners' obligation to obtain 'voluntary informed consent'](#) 19 October 2022.
- [Health practitioners, Covid jabs and 'valid informed consent' – a medical ethics disaster](#), 5 December 2022.

**This is an assault, when you stab someone with a needle.** There was a legal guy here, I just picked this up in an article<sup>37</sup>, he's making this point. But he's saying, **"It seems that if a health direction is mandatory, that that overrides the consent."** Well, I'm challenging that.

**Who says that a health direction can override consent?**

This is what we've got to get to the bottom of. **How did these mandates happen?**

**They were put in place by state governments and then Uncle Tom Cobley and all got involved in this, in setting mandates, sports clubs, all sorts of groups were setting these mandates.** We have to go back now. We have to see how did this happen? How could this happen? And again, **how could the medical profession allow it to happen?**

This is *The Australian Immunisation Handbook*. And in that handbook it says<sup>38</sup>,

***"For consent to be legally valid, it must be given voluntarily in the absence of undue pressure, coercion or manipulation. It can only be given after the potential risks and benefits of not having it, and any alternative options have been explained to the person."***

Now, Emma... we were wondering about this. We were wondering about the informed consent. And we'd seen it announced in July '21<sup>39</sup>, **that the Morrison government had announced that health practitioners were going to have special indemnity to protect them for giving the Covid injections**, because there was concern at the time about the AstraZeneca vaccine. You remember with the blood clots and what have you? So, this was announced that they were going to have this protection.

But we were wondering about this. And so, Emma wrote a letter to the health minister at the time, who was Greg Hunt, and she wrote this really well-crafted paragraph, saying,

***"To what extent is the Commonwealth COVID-19 vaccine claims scheme going to provide insurance and indemnity for the civil and criminal liability that would arise where battery and clinical negligence occur due to a failure to obtain valid informed consent?"***

And she got a response from the government<sup>40</sup>, and it turned out, oh, actually after all, **they're not going to have specific indemnity**. There's a vaccine claims scheme for people who are injured who want to claim, **but specifically for practitioners, they don't have this specific indemnity**. So, this means that people could still go after them for not getting informed consent.

So, it is very interesting seeing what could happen here. And this letter also confirms that,

---

<sup>37</sup> [Should you vaccinate your staff? Australian Institute of Company Directors](#), 5 August 2021.

<sup>38</sup> [The Australian Immunisation Handbook – Valid consent](#).

<sup>39</sup> [COVID-19 indemnity scheme to protect health professionals and patients](#). Media release, Department of Health and Aged Care, 2 July 2021.

<sup>40</sup> [Letter received from Department of Health](#), 21 December 2021.

**"Informed consent should be obtained for every COVID-19 vaccination, as per usual consent procedures for other vaccinations".**

**That is a solid gold sentence. Because nobody's given voluntary informed consent to these vaccinations, nobody's been properly informed about these vaccinations and probably for most other vaccinations.**

This has now really set the cat amongst the pigeons again with this sentence. And then, we had a change of government. The Morrison government was kicked out, and then we've got the Albanese government.

I followed up on this now. **I followed up with the current health minister, Mark Butler, and I just want clarification on this.** Let's just check this again. Is this right, that they don't have indemnity? **And they confirmed that they don't have this indemnity.**

Here's the letter I received from the government.<sup>41</sup> And in that letter it says, **"Your letter seeks clarification on whether the government has established a medical indemnity scheme for health professionals administering COVID-19 vaccines."** That was following these media releases that came out in 2021. And Nigel Murray, who's signing off on this letter, he says,

**"I can advise that rather than putting in place a medical indemnity scheme for health professionals, the former government established a no-fault scheme which commenced operations on 13 December 2021."**

So, **they have not got specific indemnity.**

And again, this letter confirms,

**"Informed consent should be obtained for every COVID-19 vaccination, as per usual consent procedures for other vaccinations", and that is not happening.**

I followed up with Mark Butler.<sup>42</sup> I'm saying,

**"Looks like the health practitioners were misled by the former Morrison government. It looks like they were lied to, actually."**

And I'm saying that,

**"These health practitioners need to be warned. They're inserting a needle. This could be battery. They need to be warned that they're not protected by this medical indemnity scheme after all."**

---

<sup>41</sup> [Letter received from Department of Health and Aged Care](#), 17 November 2022.

<sup>42</sup> See email thread to health minister Mark Butler: [Are health practitioners covered for indemnity re the Covid jabs?](#)

**I don't think they've been warned about this. They're not being told.**

But the government's sort of covering itself here. Here's this fact sheet that the government put out, probably when these issues were being raised.<sup>43</sup> **And it's letting the health practitioners know that you have to get consent.** If somebody turns up in front of you, they're there under a mandate. So, they're in this awkward position, they've got a mandate, they're going to the health practitioner, but they're telling the health practitioner, **"I don't really want to have this jab."**

Now, when that happens, **the health practitioner should say, "I can't do this. I can't vaccinate you."** But that hasn't been happening. They have been vaccinating people anyway, even if they've got people in front of them crying and upset and don't want to have the jabs, **they've been going ahead and jabbing them anyway.**

Again, **what is going to happen in future when people realize what's gone on, that they haven't given proper informed consent?**

**This brings me to the case of Rogers versus Whitaker,** where we want to look at this.

Rogers versus Whitaker, **this is the case that underpins informed consent in Australia.** And in this case, Marie Whitaker, she was a patient, she had an existing eye condition, and so she went to an expert. She went to a specific ophthalmic surgeon. So, this was a one-on-one consultation between a patient and a medical professional with a specific expertise.

So, compare that to what's happening with the Covid jab rollout, **where we've got millions of people are being pressured, coerced and manipulated, and even mandated to have a medical intervention, that may be of no benefit to them.**

These people aren't 'patients'. They're being compelled to just front up at a vaccination clinic, and to be injected with a medical product, by a practitioner who's unlikely to have specific expertise in Covid-19 or in Covid-19 vaccine products. This is just such a contrast, what's happening here.

**Mass populations of people should not be being coerced to have medical interventions, and certainly not being mandated to have them.**

So, I've raised this issue with both the health minister, Mark Butler, challenging him about this, and also with Paul Kelly, the chief medical officer, saying, **"You cannot have millions of people being pressured to have these medical interventions. This is just flouting informed consent. It's just not happening at all."**

And so, I'm asking, **what expertise do these people have?** The people who are mainly doing these interventions are nurses, doctors, paramedics, pharmacists, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health practitioners. **What expertise do they have to be giving this medical intervention?**

---

<sup>43</sup> [Handling consent refusal by people presenting for vaccination](#). (As accessed 25 August 2023.)

And I'm wondering about this. So, let's have a look at these medical interventions. There's a paper here which provides the mechanism of action. And here we have the Pfizer vaccine. Now, there's a lot of dense text for you to look at. This is how these Pfizer vaccines are working apparently. And I'm looking at this sort of stuff, blah, blah, blah, injected intramuscularly into the human body and once attached the host cells, inserts its mRNA into cytoplasm in such a way to reach the ribosomes, blah, blah, blah. I haven't got a clue what any of that stuff means. **And I would suggest that the health practitioners giving these injections haven't got a clue either, they're not experts in this stuff.**

And the AstraZeneca vaccine as well. Here we've got a modified chimpanzee DNA adenovirus. Excuse me, I don't want that, thank you very much. **If this is a thing that's not a problem for most people, Covid, why on earth would you want something like this injected into you? It's mad.**

**So, it's an experiment.** The former health minister, Greg Hunt, he admitted this. He admitted this in an interview with David Speers.<sup>44</sup> **"The world is engaged in the largest clinical trial, the largest global vaccination trial ever."**

**And nobody has given informed consent to be part of this trial.** People are being told that these things are 'safe and effective'.

**They're saying that they're being fully approved, that's been a lie.** Brendan Murphy, who was the former chief medical officer, and is the health secretary, who's now just announced he's resigning. **He said in February '21 that these things were fully approved. He lied.**

**Because they weren't fully approved, they were provisionally approved.**<sup>45</sup>

**But this is the sort of misinformation that has been spread around to people, they've been lied to.**

And here we have AHPRA, this is the regulator of the health professionals, health practitioners. **And this organisation laid it out in March 2021.** It was telling these health practitioners that this response: **"Vaccination is a crucial part of the response to the COVID-19 pandemic"**. That the health practitioners have got a vital role in this program, and they're going to educate the public about **"the importance and safety of the COVID-19 vaccines to ensure high participation rates"**.

And this AHPRA, they want the practitioners themselves to have these vaccines, have them themselves, and they want them to lead in the community.<sup>46</sup>

**This is the pressure that's been put on the health practitioners.** That: **"You're part of this. You are running this. We're relying on you. The pressure is on."**

---

<sup>44</sup> [Greg Hunt interview with David Speers](#). ABC, 21 February 2021.

<sup>45</sup> See my email to Brendan Murphy: [COVID-19 vaccines are NOT fully approved by the TGA](#).

<sup>46</sup> See my challenge re the AHPRA Position Statement 9 March 2021: [Reckless disregard for voluntary informed consent](#). 31 July 2023.



But the health practitioners were in an impossible situation, because on the one hand, they're supposed to be getting informed consent, but they're constrained from questioning the information that supports the vaccination. If they question this, they could be at risk of being struck off.

And Malcolm Roberts, he's a senator here, he raised this in a Senate Estimates meeting, and he questioned AHPRA's CEO, Martin Fletcher.

Malcolm Roberts, he actually quoted from a letter that I had received from AHPRA in September '21<sup>47</sup> when I was lobbying to get responses on informed consent, I received this letter. So, he's saying, so in this letter from AHPRA, it says: "When providing care in person or sharing information online, registered health practitioners have a professional obligation to only share information that is evidence-based, in line with the best available health advice, and is consistent with public health campaigns, such as the COVID-19 vaccination policy."

But Malcolm Roberts is saying, 'what if a doctor doesn't believe that the campaign is good advice or good procedure?' He's saying that, AHPRA is "forcing them to adopt it against their will or lose their job."

And the March statement, that I've been mentioning, it says that [Malcolm Roberts paraphrasing] "There's no place for anti-vaccination messages in professional health practice, and any promotion of anti-vaccination claims, including on social media, and advertising may be subject to regulatory action".

This is a warning to the health practitioners. You question things, and you could be out, that's what they're saying.

But Malcolm Roberts is saying, he's repeating what's required for informed consent. That it's got to be voluntary and without pressure or manipulation, and that you've got to be told about the vaccine.

And most importantly, what's been escaped, is that people have to be told about the disease, and that the disease isn't a risk for most people.

Here again, here's that letter that I received from AHPRA.<sup>48</sup> I received this in 2021.

In this letter to me, they've said,

"Practitioners have an obligation to obtain informed consent for treatment, including vaccination. Informed consent is a person's voluntary decision about health care that is made with knowledge and understanding of the benefits and risks involved."

---

<sup>47</sup> [Letter received from AHPRA](#), dated 20 September 2021.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

AHPRA have admitted this in this letter, but at the same time, **they are threatening health practitioners who question vaccination.**

Malcolm Roberts was saying, **"It seems to me that AHPRA is encouraging doctors to break what the High Court is saying is settled law."**

And Fletcher is sort of like saying... He's trying to get away from this, saying, 'This may be an issue, but that there's always an opportunity that a practitioner set forth how they believe they've met the requirements of the code of conduct.'

But in reality, this isn't happening. **Most doctors now are under threat. They're too scared to question things because they could get struck off.** And that's the problem that we've got in Australia now, **that doctors have not really questioned this at all.** And doctors questioning this are very, very rare indeed.

But there's a guy called William Bay. He's a suspended... 'The suspended Dr. William Bay'. And he's going after AHPRA, he's got an application in the Supreme Court, challenging AHPRA.

And in this application, he's saying,

**"The position statement from AHPRA made me consider resigning from my GP registrar role because I found it morally untenable that I should be prevented from giving all the information I knew to be relevant to a patient when advising them on the merits of receiving a Covid-19 vaccine."**

He kept working at the time. Subsequently, **he's been suspended.** He refused to have the vaccines himself. And then, he went and challenged. He went out in public, to an AMA conference, barged into this AMA conference. It was so brave of him to do this. **And he challenged Paul Kelly. The chief medical officer was at this conference. Challenged him for lying to the public.**

But people like William Bay, doctors like William Bay are so rare, **because most doctors have gone along with this.**

So, now we're waiting to see what happens with this case with William Bay challenging AHPRA. Because, **on what authority is AHPRA controlling these doctors and health practitioners?** This is what we've got to look into.

And a relatively new doctor's organisation, the Australian Medical Professionals' Society, they put out a letter,<sup>49</sup> warning health practitioners that they might not have protection, medical indemnity.

---

<sup>49</sup> [The Australian Medical Professionals' Society letter warning medical professionals about the medical indemnity issue](#), dated 11 January 2023.

**They're citing the letter that I got from the Australian government<sup>50</sup>, saying that they haven't got indemnity. And they've also included a link to the AHPRA letter<sup>51</sup> that I received as well.**

**This has gone out to medical professionals.**

**And this letter has been noted internationally. Andrew Bridgen in the UK, he's picked up this letter, he put it on his Twitter feed, acknowledging this. And also, in the US, they're noting doctors down under may be responsible for Covid vax injuries. So, it's gotten international attention.**

So, that's it. That's my presentation. I hope it was of interest. And that's just a bit of background on me. And just thanking my friend, Emma McArthur, who's worked on this as well, and with her advice. And that's a picture of us at a protest, when we were out in the streets campaigning against the lockdowns and mandates, and what have you. And there are other people who also gave me some help with this presentation too. So, thank you for that. Thank you for listening.

---

<sup>50</sup> [Letter received from Department of Health and Aged Care](#), 17 November 2022.

<sup>51</sup> [Letter received from AHPRA](#), dated 20 September 2021.