

In approaching a Code of Conduct decided by a few, one supposes a framework of equity, principles of moral guidelines to do with the welfare of all Australian citizens not derogating their human rights protected under the Int Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, of those it purports to protect.

However if a Code of Conduct like that of AHPRA was to be devised, restricting the right of professionals to do their job supposedly under the pretence of do no harm, then the ability of such govt bodies to frame and deliver helpful healthy outcomes indeed should be questioned and even such phrases like 'never again come to mind'.

Lets see how that worked during a crisis. AHPRA far from allowing doctors to do no harm, promoted under threat to doctors, a product that is now being shown to be unsafe and ineffective. Australia's health has rapidly declined by 15-20% excess deaths numbers 'after' the pandemic and latest research that 74% of those who acted in good faith by taking the suggested and promoted medical intervention, have now been injured.

AHPRA suggested that its professionals act against their duty of care, against their professional responsibility to their hypocritic oath and in not complying to 'promote' an experimental substance(thankyou Greg hunt) The letter intimated this would be cause for possible dismissal. Also in their Code of Conduct, to discuss alternatives apart from chemically supplied solutions on social media or out of their practice constitutes a bad deed, qualifying them for grounds for dismissal. I could go on, if God forbid, doctors did disclose the risk verses benefit of a substance with 'no ingredients listed' then they would be censured. If they talked about the best available evidence for its efficacy that disclosure would constitute grounds for non promotion of the 'prescribed' solution. The treatment of 'information' in this case is deplorable.

We have already been subject to a 'Health Ministry of truth'. What makes you think you have any support for what this bill proposes? Any govts credibility is at a post war low. We are suffering from govt over reach in putting us all in hock for solutions that didn't work, whose policies split families caused damaging mental health outcomes and have left the population harmed – economically, socially, and in our personal health. Do you think your govt will escape the fallout from the Weekend Aust revelations about 'health Authority' coverups.

And now you expect us to agree that this new legislation as 'good' for us? Without questioning your authority to do so? We don't want it!

To have a body define what information 'is' by labelling what it 'isn't' is false logic and arrogantly presupposes the govt (and its minions by any other name, ACMA or public private partnership) has the omniscient power to decide whats is 'good' for its citizens. It is cloaked under the label of saving us from 'harm'. It thinks riding on the coattails of 'protectors of harm' supposedly gained through COVID. Let me tell you there is no kudos gained from the 'govt' handling of COVID.

You need to be reminded of the slim majority you actually hold in 'representing the wishes of the people'. On 32% of the vote your govt can hardly claim a mandate to implement any policy let alone a 'Ministry of truth' aka ACMA.

If the government on the other hand set up a 'Code of Conduct' that requires anyone with a barrow to push publicly be required to state their conflict of interest and any basis in factual science especially politicians then that would be something worth considering. How is it that politicians have the privilege of free speech but not the public. This smacks of hypocrisy which Australians can spot a mile off.

With an election coming up and the COVID cover ups being revealed at a time you promoting a minority 'to have a voice' you seem intent on trying to restrict the voices and freedom of speech of all 'thinking' Australians...what does that say about your respect for Article 19 (ICCPR).

Let me remind you, it states: *'Everyone shall have the **right** to hold opinions without interference. Everyone shall have the **right** to freedom of expression; this **right** shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice.* Restrictions on the basis of current 'national security and public safety' threats are not in existence nor is Australia in a position of threat to 'public health'. Further these should never be decided externally thus threatening national sovereignty.

This article is a fundamental principle of any healthy democracy.

It should be noted that the UN protections of human rights DO NOT extend to

General harm to: '15 (d) harm to the health of Australians;

16 (e) 'harm to the Australian environment'

Nor indirect harm implied here: '17 (f) economic or financial harm to Australians, the Australian 18 economy or a sector of the Australian economy.' In any case of the opening aims of the legislation 'serious' before harm should be inserted to ensure consistency and to rule out mis use of it. (In accordance with the Siracusa principles UN Commission 1984)

A thriving democracy is built around debate, not restricting it by socially shaming and labelling people as this bill proposes to do. We have seen enough of this during COVID.

The government's claim in the interests of 'public safety' by protecting from harm in this legislation is as seems as disingenuous as 'not mandating' the vaccine but left it to businesses. By fines they pressured them to implement a coercive policy (large fines) to apply policy across the whole of society. Do you seriously think Australians do not see this same strategy copied here? Do really think Australians have forgotten?

Australians have a clear sense of what is BS and what isn't. I don't think Ozzies will take kindly to be told we don't. Every Ozzy deserves the right to a transparent govt. Just as 'national cabinet' is non democratic, to set up such an ACMA body would smack of the same arrogance and unaccountability...displayed by govt officials who refused *not once* show the grounds for their decisions....we have had a gut full of that!

And now you want to decide what is 'good' and 'bad' information. I don't think so!

Let me offer this govt some good information, that is if your serious about 'the voice ' for everyone...you are accountable for implementing the UN Covenant of which Australia is a signatory. You are accountable for protecting our right as free citizens to hold and express our opinions and views. It is not the role of government to continue to form laws that formulate and presume guilt rather than innocence. As such I believe this legislation is ill founded, its presumptive framework dehumanizing and against free sharing of information on which any democracy should be based.

I would suggest you start *representing us* not dis -representing us!

Something to reflect on - when the Piper has used you, do you think they have any use for you after that? Think about the role of doctors - how they have been disrespected and treated during COVID by their overseers - Will the same Piper discard you?

Sincerely,
An honest Australian Citizen