

133 Molesworth Street PO Box 5013 Wellington 6140 New Zealand T+64 4 496 2000

5 July 2021

D Swift

By email: fyi-request-15889-c58548e9@requests.fyi.org.nz

Ref: H202107681

Tēnā koe D Swift

Response to your request for official information

Thank you for your two requests under the Official Information Act 1982 (the Act) to the Ministry of Health (the Ministry) on 24 June 2021 regarding Pfizer. Copies of each of your requests is enclosed for reference and information in response to each part is as follows.

"...the name of the person, or persons within our government responsible for deciding on Pfizer as a vendor for the Covid "vaccines" being used in New Zealand..."

The New Zealand Cabinet made the decision to buy the Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine. Further information about the vaccine approval process is available at: www.medsafe.govt.nz/COVID-19/vaccine-approval-process.asp

"...Was the above information, which is freely available to all whom seek it, taken into account when selecting Pfizer as a Covid "vaccine" supplier?"

"What legal recourse will NZ citizens have to claim compensation in the event of adverse reactions or serious harm caused by the Pfizer "vaccine".

Will the NZ law be upheld, and applied to any govt official whom has recommended this Pfizer "vaccine" be suitable for the team of 5 million, if it causes harm or death?"

These three parts of your request are a request for an opinion rather than requests for official information. While the Act enables people to request official information from the Ministry, it only applies to information it holds. There is no obligation to create information, nor is the Ministry obliged to provide or prove an opinion. The Act does not support requests where opinions are put to an agency and it is asked to comment on them, couched as a request for official information. These parts of your request are therefore refused under section 18(g)(i) of the Act.

Under section 28(3) of the Act you have the right to ask the Ombudsman to review any decisions made under this request. The Ombudsman may be contacted by email at: info@ombudsman.parliament.nz or by calling 0800 802 602.

Nākū noa, nā

Antony Paltridge

a. Palholo.

Acting Manager OIA Services
Office of the Director-General

Copy of requests:

From: D Swift <fyi-request-15889-c58548e9@requests.fyi.org.nz>

Sent: Thursday, 24 June 2021 10:09
To: OIA Requests < oiagr@health.govt.nz >

Subject: Official Information request - Who decided to buy the Pfizer "vaccine"

Dear Ministry of Health,

I am writing to obtain the name of the person, or persons within our government responsible for deciding on Pfizer as a vendor for the Covid "vaccines" being used in New Zealand.

I ask for this information in light of the following documented, publicly available information, and I want to know if all of this publicly accessable information was taken into account when selecting Pfizer for the most rushed to market "vaccine" in world history.

Pfizer holds the record for the largest single criminal fine in US medical history totaling \$2.3 billion USD for deliberately promoting certain drugs for uses not approved by the FDA.

In the 1990's Pfizer paid out millions in fines for deliberately misleading the US health regulators about the hazards surrounding their defective heart valves. 125 people died as a result of this. This case is enormous, and hundreds of thousands of people received these defectic heart valves.

Pfizer paid a 60 million dollar USD fine to settle a lawsuit for their diabetes drug Rezulin, which was proven to cause acute liver failure.

In 2004 Pfizer paid \$430 million USD to settle criminal charges over it's drug Neurontin, which they bribed US doctors to prescribe for indications it was not approved for. Repeat offence.

Pfizer have paid nearly 4500 doctors and other related medical professionals, to promote Pfizer, or speak on their behalf. The sum they paid is reported to be around \$20 million USD.

Pfizer was sued in the US Federal court for using Nigerian children as guinea pigs for an experimental antibiotic called Trovan, without the children's parents consent. Pfizer settled in the Nigerian court paying \$75 million USD, and an undisclosed amount to the US Govt also. Eleven of these children died, some were paralyzed, and a few became deaf as a result. This case was significant in that Pfizer had violated international law, including the Nuremburg Convention, which established directly after WWII, because of the Nazi experimentation on unwilling prisoners.

In the UK, Pfizer paid out close to 90 million pounds in fines to the taxpayers, because it had charged the UK National Health Service 48 million pounds, when they should have charged 2 million pounds.

In 2011 Pfizer paid out \$142 million USD to settle charges for racketeering fraud over its marketing of the drug Neurontin. This also is a repeat offence.

In 2012 Pfizer paid out a \$45 million USD settlement for charges that it had bribed overseas health professionals including doctors, to increase their sales in those countries.

Pfizer had received worldwide criticism for "gouging" poor countries, and Pfizer made a pledge to give \$50 million USD in AIDS medications to South Africa, which they did not honour, and gave nothing instead.

In 2004 Pfizer suspended advertising for its drug Celebrex, and the following year admitted that in it's 1999 trials of the drug, found that elderly people who received the medication were at a greatly elevated risk of heart issues.

In 2005 Pfizer withdrew it's painkiller "Bextra" from the market, only after the FDA mandated that they had to put a black box warning on the drug, alerting people of the cardiovascular, and gastrointestinal risks associated with the drug. This drug is one of a few included in the record breaking 2.3 billion dollar fine mentioned earlier.

Unfortunately, Pfizer, and it's subsidiary company's history of offenses under the headings of ethical, safety, environmental, human rights and fraud are so extensive, that for me to list them all will be a waste of our time. It should be glaringly obvious from the few that I have chosen, that this company cares about one thing, and that one thing is not human health.

I would like to point something out. Under New Zealand law, if I put a drum of toxic chemical on a truck, and do not identify it by way of a Dangerous Goods declaration, and the truck is involved in an accident, causing the chemical to spill out, even if it harms no one, the relevant NZ regulatory agencies will charge me, and my company director, and fines starting in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, or jail time can be given to me, and anyone else deemed complicit. In these cases, ignorance or lack of research of the law is not deemed a defense, and rightfully so.

The NZ govt repeatedly tell us that laws we follow are put in place for the health and safety of NZ'ers, so if a Govt employee who decides that a medication should be administered to all of the country, does not do their research, and harm or death occurs, will the full force of the law be bought to bear against the person(s) who have not managed to spend the 40 minutes it took me to find Pfizers utterly criminal rap sheet of offenses spanning 5 decades or more?.

It is my own opinion that the people responsible for purchasing a medicine, from what I consider one of the most unethical companies I have ever looked at, are incompetent.

Before the claims of tinfoil hat, or conspiracy are attributed to me, the sources for this information are the US Dept of Justice, and cross checked against several large US law firms, as well to establish credibility.

look forward to your reply.	
Yours faithfully,	
D Swift	

From: D Swift <fyi-request-15899-56c59882@requests.fyi.org.nz>

Sent: Thursday, 24 June 2021 3:45 pm To: OIA Requests <oiagr@health.govt.nz>

Subject: Official Information request - Enforcing laws for medical harm in New Zealand

Dear Ministry of Health,

I made an OIA request today via the

http://scanmail.trustwave.com/?c=15517&d=y__T4BMut9vYGpbatilaBr0PmzF7eDrkWWPde 0rD3A&u=http%3a%2f%2fFYI%2eNZ portal, which was deleted without any reason given. I will try a second time to get my questions answered.

Preface.

The New Zealand Govt has chosen Pfizer as it's "vaccine" provider of choice. I spent approximately 45 minutes researching Pfizers criminal history, via the US Dept of Justice website, and cross checked my findings with several major law firms, and other govt depts to verify the data was accurate, which it was. The data was alarming, and spans many countries, and with fines for convictions, and settlements totaling billions of dollars. The criminal cases include deliberate misrepresentation of data for drug suitability to the regulatory bodies, fraud, bribery, pay offs, dumping of toxic waste into waterways, illegal human experimentation, contravention of the Nuremburg Code, and knowingly selling toxic and harmful medicines, without any warnings of the known side effects. Pfizer currently holds the US record for the largest single criminal fine given in the field of medicine @ 2.3 billion dollars for deliberate sale of drugs not approved by the FDA for the purposes that Pfizer

advertised and sold them for. For some bizarre reason, vaccine manufacturers are exempt from litigation in the USA, meaning they cannot be sued, so all compensation is paid by the Govt.

My questions this time will be simpler.

- Q1 Was the above information, which is freely available to all whom seek it, taken into account when selecting Pfizer as a Covid "vaccine" supplier?
- Q2 What legal recourse will NZ citizens have to claim compensation in the event of adverse reactions or serious harm caused by the Pfizer "vaccine".
- Q3 Will the NZ law be upheld, and applied to any govt official whom has recommended this Pfizer "vaccine" be suitable for the team of 5 million, if it causes harm or death?

In reference to Q3. - In my workplace, I am liable for hundreds of thousands of dollars in fines if I am negligent and cause harm or death, and can face imprisonment. Lack of research into the relative laws, or pleading ignorance, is not a defense when it comes to these laws, which I agree with,

•
ours faithfully,
Swift