

CONNECT	
And They Call This A Debate???	

2455 MA

There's really nothing to see here people or concern you – move along please.

- 1 'Safety' is a word becoming one of the most used – if not one of the most *over-used* words in the national lexicon. People have become obsessed with safety and at the cost of common sense in many cases.

Now, I'd be the last to argue that safety – and I mean safety procedures etc - aren't important. I would admit that safety routines are vital and certainly where common sense, knowledge or experience is missing. So why is it then, the gov't drivers of policy seem to dismiss the issue about jab safety – saying in effect there's no evidence of harm – when there is?



- 2 The harm I refer to, is the harm being caused to countless citizens – having taken the jab on the safety advice of the government. We were - and still are – being told, that the safety advice has come from the government's top scientific advisors - including the MHRA, being the perceived safety watchdog on issues of this nature. We were told that the government was following the science AND that the science was settled.

This has always sounded to me like,

“There's going to be no discussion about this – so push off.”

You might agree – this is NOT in the least a scientific sounding response. Clearly, the government do not want to be challenged on the subject.

The concept, that science is settled, is one NEVER heard in science circles. The reason being that the door to new theories, experience and discoveries is ALWAYS left open. It's the very tenet of science itself - true science that is.

But the government have closed that door and are not willing to reopen it. Aah – and why would that be I am bound to wonder – like you maybe?

Before closing on this, [The Expose reported this.](#)

The Office for National Statistics has revealed that England and Wales suffered another record-breaking week of deaths in the week ending 21st October 2022, with an extra 1,714 people dying compared to the five-year average.

Excluding the weeks affected by the Jubilee Bank Holiday in early June, and the late Queen's funeral in September, this means England and Wales have now recorded significant numbers of excess deaths every week for the past 27 weeks, bringing the grand total to 34,237 since the week ending 24th April.

And not forgetting the fit [sportsmen and women dropping like flies.](#)

3 On **Mon24Oct22**, that government door WAS temporarily opened.

107,122 UK registered citizens signed a petition which called for an inquiry – into the science related to the C19 jab. That science – in this circumstance – included that which relates to data gained from experience. It was based on the reported deaths and other adverse reactions caused by the C19 jabs.

The petition read:

There has been a significant increase in heart attacks and related health issues since the rollout of the Covid19 vaccines began in 2021. This needs immediate and full scientific investigation to establish if there is any possible link with the Covid-19 vaccination rollout.

It is the duty of the Government to ensure that the prescribed medical interventions of its response to Coronavirus are safe. We believe that the recent and increasing volume of data relating to cardiovascular problems since the Covid-19 vaccine rollout began is...enough...to warrant a full Public Inquiry."



To get one's mind around the size of this number – that is the number of people calling for the inquiry – this analogy may help.

Wembley stadium is the largest stadium in the UK and its seating capacity is **90,000**.

The people signing the petition – calling for the inquiry - would fill it – more than one and a quarter times. Anyone might call that significant!

The number flies in the face of government and NHS comments, suggesting only a small number of people have been adversely affected by the jab.

Do hold in mind however, that the **107,000** may not necessarily have been injured themselves – but rather know someone who has been. Many will know of more than one person – as I do – and directly.

Also keep in mind that these are the people who signed the petition knowing of its existence. We might all ponder on how many more would have signed the petition had they also known of it.

The true number of people that would have signed – had they known – and the true number of us who have been harmed by the jab in some way, is very difficult to assess. Many believe though that whatever those numbers are – the numbers involved are without doubt very large and very significant!

A good reason then to debate the issue - you would say, I'd suspect?

- 4 A short word now about parliamentary procedure.
Parliament has an interesting – in principle - facility which allows for ordinary folk to prompt parliament to look into particular subjects of concern. If enough ordinary folk want a particular concern to be looked into – and there needs to be a minimum *normally* of 100,000 citizens calling for such – then MPs will organise a debate on the subject.

For information on how parliamentary petition procedures work [see this](#).

- 5 So, on **24oct222** one such debate took place in Westminster.

I watched the [video debate recording](#).
After doing so, I read the [debate transcript](#) to make sure I understood it.

I have to say – not having any previous knowledge of how this process worked - I was shocked. It is clear from my reading of the published comments which followed, that many others were equally shocked too.

So why was that exactly?

- 6 Firstly, I would invite you to look at this account from a particular perspective. By doing so, I believe it becomes easier to make sense of what happened – what was said – and more importantly, the eventual outcome.

Let's assume then – for this purpose:

- The government does not want to debate this issue
- The reason being it would be forced to reveal sensitive detail
- An inquiry would open the door to challenging views being heard
- The media would be expected to report the inquiry and its findings
- The government doesn't want any negative publicity on this subject

In relation to the last point, it is worth noting that this important debate topic was NOT reported on by the mainstream media – except for these outlets:

1. [Sky News](#)
2. [Shropshire Star](#)
3. The Times – see sec.12 below

The BBC – faithful servant of the government as it is – appears to have fallen into line and remained silent on the story. In fact, on camera is a journalist's admission that it is BBC editorial policy not to interview challengers of government policy – whether they are right or wrong – when it comes to C19 jabs. Stunning you might call that?

See the documentary film '[Safe and Effective](#)' for that admission and more.

7 NOW LET'S LOOK AT THE STORY

The quotes below are taken from the [debate transcript](#) prepared and published by parliament. I would urge everyone to read the whole debate to gain a proper insight into this most *amateurish* of proceedings. It isn't that long – which says something in itself.

The debate is introduced by a 30yr old backbencher for the government.

Elliot Colburn

Throughout my speech, I will point out why I do not think that the Government should launch a public inquiry into vaccine safety; it would be a waste of taxpayers' money, and is not necessary for reasons that I will discuss.

This is the opening marker. He is telling us what he thinks and what he thinks is – this debate should NOT recommend an inquiry. He is not interested to hear the facts – since 'he' already knows enough. Oh yes – and taxpayers money is more important than their safety!

E Colburn supports his view by telling us that 178,000 people across the UK died within 28 days of a positive C19 test. This statement alone is fascinating. His argument would be shot to pieces in the opinion of a plethora of scientific commentators and other observers. In a different and more grown-up forum – his statement would be exposed for what it is by these individuals – to name but four.

1. [Dr Tess Lawrie](#)
2. [Dr John Campbell](#)
3. [Dr Aseem Malhotra](#)
4. [John O'Looney](#)

E Colburn goes on to heap praise on all the medics that helped with the jab roll-out. The debate is not of course about the people contracted to do this work – but I sense he is attempting to deflect attention and muddy the waters here.

Christopher Chope

My hon. Friend has obviously done a lot of preparation for the debate. Did part of that preparation include looking at Oracle Films'

["Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion"](#), which was produced about a month ago and has already had more than 1 million views online? Most people think it highly persuasive.

This interjection should have been a game changer. The documentary **C Chope** refers to is a revealing piece of work and will be seen as an uncomfortable expose - from the government's standpoint - produced as it was by professional investigative journalism.

It is noted that **C Chope** is almost a lone voice in parliament, when it comes to recognising the harm done to citizens - as a result of taking the jab on the government's advice. He is a critic of the government's performance in both recognising those harmed and dealing with their individual cases for compensation payments.

Elliot Colburn

I have not seen that publication, although I have read a lot of the significant amounts of material that have been shoved through my constituency office door by a large number of anti-vax protesters...

Again, he appears to deflect attention and muddy the waters. Having seen the film myself it is nothing short of compelling and any person who was genuinely looking for the truth could not fail to be stunned by its content. Anyone with a responsibility for safety matters in this connection should be leaping on it to discover the true extent of the worrying list of apparent facts - and not least their impact on people. The reality, it seems - is that those responsible are NOT interested.

E Colburn being one among them.

E Colburn steps right over the question put to him - meaning we are left to assume he - and those he is speaking for - really do have no interest whatsoever in finding the truth.

In a nutshell, here we have all we need to know about this debate and the reason for closing it down. Clearly, the truth is not required.

He continues:

The MHRA is responsible for regulating all medicines and medical devices in the UK by ensuring they work and are acceptably safe.

E Colburn devotes a good deal of his speaking time to praising the MHRA. By doing so, he attempts to argue that the MHRA has the whole situation covered. However, the testimony and evidence amassed by scientists and other commentators about the effectiveness of the MHRA would counter all he said. But he ignores the fact that tens of thousands - and those tens might be hundreds - have experienced adverse reactions, which makes a mockery of the MHRA and its work.

As regards those adverse reactions, he tersely dismisses them - in fact belittles them - along with the people who have suffered them -

suggesting they were slight and people got over them quickly.

He should really speak to people like [Charlet Crichton](#) – founder of support group [UK CV Family](#) – or the author of a valuable resource for those injured by the jab:

Covid Vaccine Adverse Reaction Survival Guide

by [Caroline Pover](#) and available via UK CV Family and Amazon.

He might also take a look at another excellent documentary film – [Letter To My MP](#) – purely for the benefit of his own education.

He would come to realise that there is nothing slight about these people's injuries due to the jabs – rather than other causes which he attempted to convince his listeners might be to blame.

Additionally, the adverse reactions instead of being quickly got over, are likely to be permanent and seriously debilitating – as the two documentary films mentioned make plain!

These jabs were declared safe by the MHRA – the watchdog body which is not quite what people have been led to believe that it is.

The film '[Safe and Effective](#)' says more.

Danny Kruger

Interjected and asked this:

*My hon. Friend talks about the independence of the MHRA, and I very much hope he is right about that. **Is he aware that it is overwhelmingly funded by the pharmaceutical companies that it regulates? Does he have any concerns about the objectivity of its work?***

E Colburn replied with total confidence.

No, I see nothing to concern me about the independence of the MHRA. Indeed, I saw a group of anti-vax protesters outside the House today, holding up signs saying, "Vaccines kill," and, "Would you not believe that pharmaceutical companies kill?" It seems a bit of a strange business model for a pharmaceutical company to kill off everyone it is trying to administer a vaccine to. I have seen absolutely nothing to concern me that the MHRA has any problems with independence.

Some would say that he is either blind or he has his eyes wide shut.

Had I the motivation, I would love to question **E Colburn** myself on the things I have seen and read. The thing is – his mind and the government's too – is closed shut on these issues. He and the government are seen to have no interest in finding the truth about anything concerning the matters under debate.

We have to ask, where all this is leading and what will people do?

Change is most certainly on the way – and I sense it will be significant!

As has been said before and cynically, perhaps –
Big Pharma do not wish to kill you...
and in that respect **E Colburn** is right.

Their goal, instead, is really to make you unwell and to keep you there!
Now that would be a perfect business model **E Colburn**.
There are plenty of scientists and commentators who will willingly
support that very theory – and their argument is beyond compelling.

D Kruger went on to make further valid and interesting points.

There was also the widespread claim that the vaccine stops transmission, so people should take the jab to protect other people. We were all told that; we all believed that for many months. Last month, we heard from Pfizer that its vaccine was never tested to see whether it would stop transmission. Despite that, we had the notorious claim by Professor Chris Whitty that even though the vaccine brought no benefit to children, children should be vaccinated to protect wider society. I am all for thinking about society, not the individual, but that, again, feels like a profound break with medical ethics. A lot of people are asking what the vaccine does to children and young people, and Professor Whitty is right that the benefit to healthy children seems to be essentially nil.

The admission by a Pfizer executive was stunning to those who hadn't heard it before – causing a storm in the EU parliament and beyond. It wasn't reported by the BBC though.

But, what **D Kruger** said of **Chris Whitty** was more than interesting. Whitty – of all people – was expected to know and say better. He didn't.
And that should tell us all we need to know to suspect gross misjudgement – even fraud perhaps, given his ties with Big Pharma.

D Kruger continued.

There are genuine questions to be asked. I have not verified these questions; I merely ask them on behalf of my constituents. How do we explain the increase in the rates of myocarditis, heart attacks and excess deaths among young people? Indeed, across the general population, it is plausible, though not definitive, that the vaccine is responsible for more harms than we know about. As I said in my intervention, we know from the yellow card scheme that up to one in 200 hundred people vaccinated report an adverse reaction. That is bad enough in itself, but we also know that adverse effects are significantly under-reported through the yellow card scheme. Based on the MHRA's research, there may be as many as 10 times more serious adverse reactions than the yellow card system shows.

D Kruger then said something truly profound – speaking again about the MHRA which **E Colburn** holds up as being perfection personified.

*We need to go further and talk about efficacy and safety, not just impact. We need to be explicit about what questions we want answers to. These issues need to be covered directly. **We need the public inquiry to consider these matters, because of the compromised nature of medical regulation in our country. I mentioned that the MHRA is funded by the pharmaceutical companies that produce the drugs and vaccines that it regulates. There might be some universe in which that makes sense, but this is not it.***

- 8 But for a relatively short speech towards the end of this one and only session on the subject, the newly appointed Under Secretary of State in the Health Ministry – who might one day look at following her predecessor into the entertainment business when she's done – remained silent until near the end.

Caroline Johnson

She began by suggesting that more than 90% of the UK population have been jabbed. I can think of many commentators that would argue the numbers with her - since the coverage is believed to be way less than the number she suggests.

Interestingly she goes on to say this.

Our safe and effective vaccines have underpinned the Government's strategy for living with covid-19. They have allowed the economy and society to reopen, and the country's ability to live with the virus in the future will continue to depend on deeper and broader population immunity. Critically, they have also reduced the pressure on the national health service and allowed us to start to tackle the elective care backlog.

Absolutely, no intention here of even peeking at the possibility that her information is suspect. She appears not in the least interested in getting to the truth – but instead reinforces the government's policy to inject everyone – children included. And that is despite what has clearly been happening – and continues to happen – to people who have taken her department's advice.

Since we are talking about people's lives and wellbeing here, is it shocking to you – as much as it is to me – that she and her colleagues forge ahead with their heads in a bucket?

C Johnson continued.

Vaccines remain our biggest line of defence as we head into a challenging winter period. Vaccinated people are less likely to get seriously ill with covid-19 or seasonal flu, or to be admitted to hospital, and there is also evidence that they are less likely to pass the

virus on to others.

What she says here I know would be challenged with contradicting evidence in a court forum. Added to the challenge would be the evidence connected with the explosion of health issues which have never been seen before by the NHS.

You might listen to the testimony of one senior nurse who has now quit the NHS and speaks out about the reality of what is going on in hospitals and healthcare. [Fran Adamson](#) is that senior nurse and what she tells us in her interview is not what the BBC is leading people to believe.

In the interview Fran Adamson speaks with another whistleblowing ex-NHS nurse for [UK Column](#).

9 IN CONCLUSION

The above exchanges give a flavour of the process which - in parliamentary circles - they call a debate.

In my honest opinion it was nothing like a debate.

A debate is about exploring different viewpoints - often with the objective to arrive at a consensus of opinion overall - or more often a final decision.

What I witnessed - along with all those others who have watched the process - was akin to a press conference of the type given by **PM BoJo** in early **2021**, flanked - as he nearly always was - by those two senior advisors, prof **Whitty** and prof **Vallance**. The promoters and supporters of the petition sounded like the individuals from the press - asking all too polite questions which were so easily swatted away by **Elliot Colburn** and **Caroline Johnson**.

There was no exploration of the evidence or testimony. In fact, evidence and testimony wasn't even asked for. A debate of this nature with so very much at stake - people's lives, to be clear about it - should have been conducted more along the lines of a court hearing. In other words, people's evidence and testimony laid before the court for both sides of an argument to assess. The debate should then ensue for the purpose of questioning the evidence and testimony to see how well - or not - it stands up to that questioning.

Unlike in a court hearing, however, there should be no winners or losers. But as in a court hearing, the single objective is to arrive at the accepted and provable truth. What other possible reason could there be - after all?

This event in Westminster Hall on **24oct22** was in many people's eyes a sham - and worryingly, I suspect that all debates held in that place are run along the same principles.

Staging a *debate* is something parliament has to do, making it look as if MPs take the views of constituents seriously - 100,000+ in this example - with a concern for safety. But in truth, they don't take people's views seriously at all.

I do sense – based upon what I heard - and supported by what I read in the transcript – that the people of this country have been misled – misguided – misinformed and let down by the institution that is parliament – comprising the very individuals elected and paid to look after the People's interests. And their interests include their SAFETY!

10 In less than **gomin** the whole affair was over.

Not to be left from the record was the official attendance. There were more observers in the gallery than there were MPs attending. These were the **eleven** MPs attending – and in the order of speaking were:

Elliot Colburn [Con]

Christopher Chope [Con]

Danny Kruger [Con]

Richard Holden [Con]

Roger Gale [Chair]

Andrew Bridgen [Con]

Apsana Begum [Lab]

John Hayes [Con]

Natalie Elphicke [Con]

Stephen Bonnar [SNP]

Andrew Gwynne [Lab]

Caroline Johnson [Con+Under-Sec of State for Health and Social Care]

Given the importance and serious nature of the subject for debate, the mind boggles at the lack of evidenced support for it - among MPs that is, who are – as said above - elected and paid to look out for constituents' safety. The balance of the parties represented may say something too.

I had to replay the end of the video record several times and then read the transcript to confirm what I thought was the official end.

The chair called for a vote.

It was not a vote to determine whether the petition should succeed – meaning there would be an inquiry as called for by **107,000** citizens.

No, the vote was to determine whether or not a *debate* had been held. It apparently was – and deemed:

Resolved.

That this House has considered e-petition 602171, relating to the safety of covid-19 vaccines.

And that, ladies and gentlemen – under the current political system – is as good as you are going to get.

This event has provided an enlightening window for everyone on the following:

- The true worth of citizens' concerns as viewed by MPs
- The totally inadequate process for dealing with them, and
- The regard 650 MPs have for your and my safety

I would venture that the people of the UK have some thinking to do – some envisaging perhaps – about the changes that citizens of the UK might adopt for our collective futures.

- 11 This *so-called* debate and the whole matter surrounding it will, I'm sure, provide an eye-opening – if not earth shattering – experience for many. I believe it provides an illuminating viewpoint on so many things – distilled into three basic camps, being the:

- Inadequacies of parliamentary processes
- Inadequacies of the sitting MPs
- Inadequacies of government departments – like the MHRA

This call for an inquiry has been successfully defeated.

What was termed a *debate* has shown people exactly how government works in practice. Instead of there being a democracy in operation – where the wants, needs and desires of the People are central to everything – there is only an illusion of democracy. It is with this illusion of a democracy, that the government will get what it wants – and will – *almost* every time. This *debate* could not show that any more clearly.

I fancy there will come a day when most debates will not be held in parliament and will not be led by politicians. Instead, they will be led by others and in a completely different forum.
In time we shall see – but for now – we are all just coming to understand.

12 **SO HOW WAS IT REPORTED THEN?**

Well, the mainstream media was pretty much silent.
Curious you will be thinking – and why you might wonder?

[Molly Kingsley for the Brownstone Institute said this.](#)

It received virtually no mainstream press attention. This is unfortunate, as the issues it raises – about the scale of adverse vaccine reactions, excess death trends, potential breaches of medical ethics, and regulatory capture – are deserving of both airtime and urgent investigation.

George Grylls did wade in for THE TIMES but with an attack on anti-vaxxers. It was coupled to a smearing of those people, *supposedly harmed* by the new technology. Technology which has been labelled a *vaccine* – but is not a vaccine fitting the accepted definition of one. It seems **G Grylls** though was following orders rather than any journalistic instinct for seeking out the truth.

Writer and producer of the absorbing documentary film "[Safe and Effective](#)" – **Mark Sharman** - responded to **G Grylls**.
TCW covered that response to The TIMES writer in a piece called:
[Times paper does hatchet job on vaccine debate](#).

And there we have it – the poor state of journalism today. What the government wants, it gets – and does so by ensuring the mainstream media supports its ambitions to the exclusion of – the uncomfortable – TRUTH!

We can rejoice that The People's Media is expanding to fill the void.

PS1 The numbers of people affected in some way by the jab – that is any of the suite of jabs – are reported to be in the hundreds of thousands. You will read all about this truth in The People's Media BUT NOT in the mainstream media – it's whitewashed out almost completely.

The main casualties appear to be in the younger age groups – the teens through to late forties - with heart problems being the main issue.

I refer again to the story from [The Expose](#) – reporting that there have been **34,000** excess deaths since **May22**. You might listen to **Fran Adamson** speak about her colleagues' observations. What they all say is,
"This is NOT normal."

One comment made by a hospital consultant to vaccine injured person – **Caroline Pover** – was that there are thousands of people just like you Caroline. And that is an interesting point in itself. Doctors at all levels in the NHS are fully aware of what is happening – but few say anything! They have been told NOT to say anything – under penalty of release.

Some medics have pulled the plug and left – just like **Fran Adamson** - because of what they are seeing, experiencing and being told by their managers in the NHS – who are themselves following dictates from above.

You might listen to [Dr David Cartland](#) - a west country GP – speaking on this subject to UK Column.

As there are few alternative employers for doctors, nurses and paramedics, those who are not leaving the NHS appear to be thinking of their financial commitments rather than patient wellbeing.

Many would be OK with that – effectively putting their mortgages and families first. Personally – if I were in their shoes – I'm certain I wouldn't be able to sleep at night – just like Fran couldn't. That said, no one should be put in a position needing to choose between their livelihood and patient safety. That is not right – it is unforgivable!

It is as well that people understand this situation - since it should cause us all to think about the NHS quite differently from here on.
It has changed out of all recognition over these last three years.
But it can though change again – to be what the People want it to be.

CONNECT'S Maxim and Oath

Connect is only interested in finding and sharing the TRUTH.
In search of that TRUTH, we only pose questions – we have no answers.

By: David Charles

Contact/Source: CONNECT: [Magazine](#)

- 2 [LINK](#) The Expose: England has now suffered 34k Excess Deaths since May
- 2 [LINK](#) Sportsmen and women are dropping like flies
- 4 [LINK](#) Parliament: How Petitions Work
- 5 [LINK](#) Parliament: C19 Vaccines Safety Debate: The video
- 5 [LINK](#) Hansard: C19 Vaccines Safety Debate: The Transcript
- 6 [LINK](#) Sky: Inquiry on solely on safety will not be opened
- 6 [LINK](#) Shropshire Star: Gov't not planning inquiry solely into vaccine safety
- 6 [LINK](#) **Oracle Films: Safe and Effective – A second Opinion**
- 7 [LINK](#) Dr Tess Lawrie: Reveals data showing jabs are NOT required
- 7 [LINK](#) Dr John Campbell: Examines FOIR about real C19 death numbers
- 7 [LINK](#) Dr Aseem Malhotra: Cardiologist has done a 180 on his opinion
- 7 [LINK](#) John O'Looney: Undertaker and whistleblower about what he sees
- 7 [LINK](#) UK CV Family: Charlet Crichton
- 7 [LINK](#) UK CV Family: Supporting those who have adverse reactions after receiving our C19 jab.
- 7 [LINK](#) Author: Caroline Pover
- 7 [LINK](#) **Documentary film:** Letter To My MP
- 8 [LINK](#) UK Column: Debi Evans interviews NHS nurse
- 8 [LINK](#) Fran Adamson: The audio recorded interview
- 11 [LINK](#) Brownstone Institute: The MSM ignored the debate!
- 11 [LINK](#) TCW: Times paper does hatchet job on vaccine debate
- PS1 [LINK](#) UK Column: Dr David Cartland

FURTHER READING

- [LINK](#) UK Column: The Yellow Card scoreboard
- [LINK](#) TCW: how many must suffer before the C19 jab is declared a danger?
- [LINK](#) TCW: Dr Ros Jones on the AZ mystery
- [LINK](#) **Documentary film-trailer:** Died Suddenly

PLEASE DOWNLOAD AND SHARE THIS ARTICLE



Opportunity to join the CONNECT [team and network](#)

END