

2024-07-14 - Graham and John speak with Dr Hobart and Senator Rennick...

Hi everybody, Sunday, the 14th of July and a special Club Grubbery tonight. Um, John, we decided we don't normally do these on a Sunday night. We're going to put this one out straight away tonight, uh, because we have two, uh, regulars on the program in Dr. Mark Hobart and Senator Gerard Rennick. Welcome to you both.

Thanks for joining us. Thank you. Hi, guys. Uh, John, you, uh, you rang me over the weekend and said we need to do this because there's been some news coming out. Well, today's a day that's going to go down in history because today's the day that Donald Trump was, uh, shot and, uh, I don't think there's any need to talk about that.

It's, uh, who knows what, what all that's about. We'll just let that go, but it's a memorable day either way you look at it. So, uh, Uh, but, uh, we're talking about issues within Australia now, and that's what's really, really important. We go back now for some three years, where Dr. Mark Hobart was raided by Victorian health officials who, uh, illegally took his documents from his, uh, surgery from his practice where he'd been, uh, growing up as a child, watching his parents do GP work in, in, uh, in sunshine in Melbourne.

And, uh, that practice has been going for almost half a century and Dr. Mark has filled the shoes of his parents and kept going in that practice. He has a beloved, uh, group of patients there who are fighting tooth and nail to keep him going. He did the, the right thing at the opening of this whole pandemic, uh, thing that was going on that we've all been through in the last three years, call it what you will.

And he has been thoroughly victimized all the way through. He has been fighting in the courts. He's run for election, uh, to, to do his part. He stood at various rallies and gatherings, and he's been a very outspoken doctor in, in, uh, at a time when we needed it most. We've seen a voluntary informed consent trashed.

By the government, we've seen, uh, we've seen lies told, we've seen coercion, bullying and bribery at every level, uh, which all indicates that the, the things that they're trying to push us into are not in our best interest. Many of us have stood against that because we believe in bodily autonomy and Dr.

Mark Hobart's been a champion of that ever since the very beginning of this. So, Mark, the reason we're doing this tonight is that you've had various setbacks along the way. You've been in court. You've, uh, You've sort of had a pyrrhic victory, but it's been hard slog the whole way. But now something incredible has happened.

Do you want to allude to what's just happened in the last few days? Yes, well,

uh, I'll have to go back to, uh, December 2021 where I put my appeal into the Supreme Court of Victoria to, uh, ask them to tell the medical board to send me to VCAT for, uh, to take me to trial to prove their allegations against me that I was a danger to the public, uh, because doctors were being, uh, just, uh, left in limbo.

after being suspended and not being granted a trial. I also asked at that stage for the return of my medical records, which were, I believe were seized, uh, in the raid of 10th of November, 2021, when seven authorized officers entered my surgery. And, uh, went through all the drawers, all the, um, cabinets trying to find vaccine exemptions.

Uh, well, I should specify medical files relating to vaccine exemptions because they had been there twice before on the 29th of October. And on the 1st of November demanding I give them my patient files relating to vaccine exemptions and I refused and that's, uh, they shut down my practice from trading on the 1st of November.

So they came back on the 10th of November, there were seven of them, and rated my practice, the video is up there for all to see, and, uh, I would not give it to them, give them any patient files because I said they're private and confidential patient files. They had no, uh, warrant at all. They said they did not, uh, need a warrant.

They said because of these new laws, uh, there's no such thing as private and confidential patient files anymore. So I refused to give it to them. Then it came up to the court case on the 20, on the 12th of July, 2022. And uh, as I said, I had requested in my originating motion, I want the return of my patient files.

As well as, uh, I want to be referred to the VCAT for a proper trial. You have to prove that I'm a danger to the public. Well, at that trial on the 12th of July, 2022, they stated, We don't have your patient, any patient files. We don't have them. So I thought, well, That's good. I thought that was a bit odd. I must say it was a bit odd, but you know, uh, I trusted them still.

I can't believe it. How naive I was. I trusted them. And, uh, I said, and I, uh, I made some statements saying, I'm really happy. The, uh, The, uh, medical board say they didn't obtain any patient files when they rated me on the 10th of November. So that went on until finally I got them to take me to VCAT for a trial and, uh, this is the trial I've just had the other day.

But in the lead up to that trial, they had to provide the evidence they were going to use against me. And this was provided to me. In late December, 2023, and in that body of evidence, which was voluminous, uh, 500 megabytes or something like that, there were 11 patient files. I thought, goodness me, there are the files.

So, I, uh, wrote in my response to their, um, submission. I, uh, I am, uh, charging the, or accusing of the, the, the, uh, medical board for withholding these patient files on the, um, uh, 12th of July. And now they've suddenly, um, revealed them to me. And I am saying this, these files have been taken illegally, uh, because they didn't have a warrant.

And they cannot be used in evidence against me. So, uh, I said that in my submission to the VCAT on the 21st of January. This year, 2024. So I finally got to trial on the last Thursday, but on the, on the Tuesday beforehand, so that's less than a week ago, five days ago, I got an email and it stated the, uh, an apology by the board to the Supreme Court of Victoria saying, we apologize.

We have provide, we have. provided incorrect information in that trial and because of an inadvertent, they use the word inadvertent error, we did not tell the lawyers who are acting in that trial that we actually had the patient files. So, uh, this I brought up in the trial on, uh, last Thursday and I, I've said now this is, uh, the, the medical board opinion.

Looks like they have misled the court, uh, either, and they should have known that this, if they didn't know, they should have known that this was the case. And this case should be thrown out because This could have changed the whole, uh, outcome of the trial, the, uh, so they wrote, uh, the medical board wrote, uh, an apology to the court, an affidavit to the court, which I sent on Monday, the 8th of July, this is it.

There it is. That's their excuse.

So the response of the Supreme Court to this is that basically we accept your apology and we are waiting until the other party makes, uh, um, contacts us before we take you to a directions hearing. The other party, of course, is me. So where it is now, I'm in the process of, uh, sending the letter to the court.

The Supreme Court of Victoria and I'll be writing something like this.

I'll just, uh, hang on.

I'm sorry.

Dear Justice, as one of the parties to the proceedings, I seek to have the hearing reopened, as I believe a grave injustice has been done to me due to the fact that the board had misled the Supreme Court of Victoria in my proceeding, in that they made statements to the court knowing or ought to have known that their statements were erroneous or misleading and have altered the course of the proceeding two years ago.

As I contend, my patient files were seized illegally. I seek full costs on an indemnity basis. As a lay person of the law and self represented, I seek the court's assistance in having the matter reopened with a directions hearing forthwith. So that's the letter I'll be sending to the Supreme Court of Victoria to reopen the case.

And in that case, I'll be, um, claiming that the break in and seizure of my documents was illegal. And, uh, the other things that, uh, will come to be exposed is that the, the, uh, the board thinks that, uh, the board or APRA can tell doctors how to behave. Now, that's not the case. The conduct according to doctors is determined by their peers of similar training and experience.

Not by the board, not by APRA or any conditions or position statements they make. That doesn't, that has no legal basis whatsoever, whatsoever. And, um, of course I'll be seeking, uh, You know, the action by the Supreme Court on the fact that the board has misled the Supreme Court of Victoria, which has grave implications on their conduct and APRA.

And we'll just see how that goes. Sorry, that's a lot of, a lot of information there. But that's basically what's happened. John.

Well, I mean, what can you say, Gerard, as a sitting, uh, Senator in the Australian Parliament, uh, APRA, uh, we know is an octopus out of control. I mean, what does this mean? What does this really mean?

Uh, I mean, should they be allowed to lie to the court? I mean, surely they've got to come under some sort of, uh, review themselves, haven't they?

Yeah, that's a good question, John. And the answer is, I actually don't know, uh, how the legal process works in regards to, um, you know, I don't know if the right word's perjury, um, but that would appear that they've given incorrect information to the court.

So, Yeah, I honestly don't know, but let's just, uh, reflect on ARPA. They, they didn't give any leeway. Towards, you know, thousands of, uh, nurses, uh, and, and health professionals over the vaccine mandates and the social media posts, they were more than happy to suspend them from their roles. So, I think it's fair to say, I know certainly most of your listeners will be thinking, well, you know, what's good for the goose is good for the gander.

And ARPA should be held to account for this. I mean, that was just, you know, going after, uh, Dr. Hobart's records, patient records. And I mean, that's the other thing. So it's not a, a there's contempt of court or perjury or whatever that the particular, you know, uh, crime might be or alleged crime or, you know, for, for.

Telling the court the wrong thing. But then the other thing is, there's the breach of privacy act as well. Were they actually allowed to take private, uh, the medical records of, of clients, um, without, you know, who, you know, where did they get the authority to do that? Uh, and it's a question that if they did have the authority, why do they have the authority?

I mean, who are these people? ARPA is, is that, you know, They're more, the staff, there's more lawyers on the staff than there are medical professionals. So they're more of a, you know, bureaucratic organization and it seems more intent, you know, hammer looking for a nail type scenario than actually, uh, you know, trying to improve patient health outcomes for people and, and the professionals that they should be trying to serve.

Senator, as, as somebody who's had an awful lot of contact, you've been bombarded with messages from health professionals for the last three years. Uh, since taking this stand and I don't know how you cope with it to be

honest, but, uh, we're hearing especially from your own state of Queensland that, uh, there are so many nurses and paramedics up there.

That is still unemployed because of the mandates, despite of the court's rulings that those mandates were unlawful, uh, in Queensland and a breach of human rights. That's still going on. And there are, there are dozens and dozens of nurses in contact with us telling us that, uh, Queensland Health are just playing games with them like a cat.

Uh, teasing a mouse, it just, it's like there's this punishment trial going on. And we've seen ARPA as well over the last three years, creating such a situation where uh, they've completely destroyed faith in the medical profession by so many people in Australia because doctors were not allowed to tell the truth about their own educated position on the vaccines.

Um, how do you see that overall playing out? APRA obviously has a very large case to answer as to applying the rules that they did and pushing doctors as far as they did. And we're also hearing from some doctors that they know of many who have committed suicide. I'm talking about doctors. Because of opera.

And many who are still, you know, unregistered without any date of, uh, completion. They're unregistered for years now without opera being able to tell them whether they're ever going to practice medicine again or not.

Well, opera are untouchable.

And unfortunately, and I don't want to disappoint your listeners if you are, but I can't see anything getting to them because you have to get the eight health ministers, state health ministers and one federal health minister. And my experience with Mark Butler is he has absolutely no interest in holding these, uh, ARPA to account.

Um, so. Yeah, it's, it's, I mean, by all means, keep fighting if you've got to fight in you. And I mean, I don't blame you if you don't, because there's only so many times you can beat your head against the brick wall. But they have destroyed confidence, ARPA, and I mean, the entire, you know, um, health industry, bureaucratic industry, the government, they have destroyed, uh, so much trust in our health system.

I mean, it's one thing to have low trust in Uh, politicians in the media, I think that was already evident before the COVID crisis, but most people, I think, as, as even, you know, Dr. Hobart pointed out before he trusted them, uh, you know, you, you, we used to think the people in authority, we could trust, trust them to do the right thing.

Now that didn't always mean to say that they did the right thing, but we generally put that down to, you know, you don't always get a hundred out of a hundred for everything you do. So sometimes people do make mistakes and there is genuine incompetence. No one's perfect. Um, but it seems to be a real deliberate belligerence out there amongst not just ARPA but other people in positions of authority right across the leadership spectrum in government, bureaucracy, corporate corporations, um, in terms of doing the right thing.

There just seems to be so little integrity out there amongst our leadership in this country and across the Western world and it's very demoralizing.

Johnny, well, we recently interviewed, didn't we? Hoodie, uh, Dr. Sarah McDonald, uh, who, who's been, uh, sanctioned by, uh, by health, um, for, uh, prescribing cannabis with about 40 other, uh, doctors.

Now I understand that that has been progressed even further. They've now got, uh, sanctions in place and they've gotta be supervised. So, I, I, I mean, this opera mob, they're just, they're just completely out of control. I mean, all they're doing, they're not managing risk at all. I mean, I don't know how you can say Dr.

Hobart, uh, opera or is, is a risk to the public. I mean, he has been a stellar GP for, I don't know how many years, uh, so why does one event make it okay for you to do what you're doing, uh, in light of what we've now seen in the Supreme Court? You've lied. Uh, you, you, your organization cannot be trusted.

Martin Fletcher, you're an absolute disgrace. Uh, all you're doing, mate, is putting people at risk by not allowing people like Dr. Mark Hobart to continue in their roles. I mean, even if you were, were, were, were a little bit worried. I mean, surely it would be better to put them under supervision in a hospital where at least they could keep working.

Uh, but no, you, you just want to run roughshod over everyone and, uh, ruin lives. And you're not only ruining the lives of people like Dr. Mark Hobart, but you're also ruining the lives of the many people that are now not seeing a doctor, uh, because, because of the actions that you've taken. Uh, there would be those people in your practice, Mark, wouldn't there, that haven't seen a doctor probably since you

left?

Yes, well, I meet a lot of my patients. Uh, in, in, in North Sunshine, I, when I pop into the practice to check on things and so forth. Yes, and I, uh, invariably say it's very hard to find a doctor. I can't find a doctor and that sort of thing. Um, and, uh, I, I, I just, I think there's two really key points that, uh, affect us that, uh, you know, like when I say us, I mean the Australian population.

Transcribed by <https://otter.ai> That the, the government is trying to, uh, make people believe. That is legal to break into a doctor's surgery and seize patient files. This is what I was told in the hearing on Thursday. It is not legal. The basis for this, uh, the legality of this, which was, uh, which was stated by the council for the board, was that It's, uh, underpinned by a so called Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Health Victoria and APRA.

Now, I looked up the Memorandum of Understanding because it was sent to me in their apology. It's just a document. It is not an Act of Parliament. It's just a document which states, They can communicate with each other and pass information back and forth between each other. And that is why when the Department of Health raided my practice on the 10th of November with seven people and stole the files, that was, uh, that was in the morning.

Four hours later, I got a communication from APRA saying they intended to suspend me the next day. Okay, so that was the memorandum of understanding, you see, of the passage of information. So basically APRA was using the Department of Health as their thugs to enter doctors practices and take information.

So that's the first thing. The second thing is that the government thinks, and when I say the government, I mean the Medical Board in APRA thinks they can tell doctors what to tell patients. They can't. They cannot do this. There is no law that says they can do this. They just base it on these so called position statements and conditions and so forth, which have no legal weight.

Uh, the, the doctor's conduct is based on conduct according to their peers of similar training and experience. That's it. So you'll have in the old days, you'd have the medical board of Victoria. It will be 12 doctors. And they would judge you and most of these doctors would be private private doctors. Now we have a different situation where the board is comprised 50 percent non doctors, so called community, uh, appointees, and we all know what that means, and then you've got the other half, which are doctors, most of which work for the government, and there might be one private GP on it, and they're making the decisions, but in the national law, it's supposed to be doctors of similar training and experience, which get to judge you.

So this is how they have pulled the wool over our eyes and bluffed us into submission. So we have to get rid of the idea that they can get into our practices without a warrant. They need a warrant. If they haven't got a warrant, don't let them in. Tell them to go and get a warrant. And I know that because I've refused many, many times to give them my patient records and they have not got a warrant at any time, no subpoena, no warrant, nothing because I know they haven't got a leg to stand on.

So just, you know, just stand up doctors and other health professionals. Stand up for your patient's rights and tell them I'm not giving you my patient records. They're private and confidential. I don't care what you say. This, the, these records are private and confidential and this is established by the Hippocratic Oath.

2500 years ago. So don't tell me a law that you've come up with in 2020, uh, obviates that. It doesn't. The other thing is the idea that the doctors can be told what to do by the government is a very frightening thing because then doctors are totally controlled by the government. They'll be agents of the government.

They will just have to do what the government tells them and they can do all sorts of horrible things to you. operations, injections, all sorts of horrible things. Incarceration, that's what they can do.

We have to stop it. It has to be stopped. Otherwise, we are, we face a horrible future.

Senator Rennick, um, I've always appreciated your candor when you've come on and spoken with us. You, and you've demonstrated that again tonight with your previous comments. Um, there's been a lot of work put into trying to get the government to establish a, a, a toothy Royal commission.

How do you see that panning out? Is this ever going to eventuate and will it, will it be able to provide the answers that we need?

It may eventuate if, uh, a Dutton led government, you know, was to get into government. Um, I'll say may, crossbench in the Senate to support it. Um, but would it provide the answers we need?

No, it wouldn't. It'll be a whitewash, quite frankly. Um, and the first reason for that is, is that judges don't understand, uh, biology. And, you know, I went to the, um, Supreme Court hearing up here in Queensland a couple of years ago with the Queensland police and I heard the judge say he's not interested in getting to know the biochemistry of the vaccines.

Um, and I just shook my head at that statement and I thought, and I mean, look, to be fair, the judge wasn't a biochemist, right? I'm not knocking him for that. But, um, That's the problem. You know, there's a big difference between mandating someone eats an orange every day for breakfast and someone takes an mRNA vaccine that, you know, has so many potential side effects, uh, for next to no, uh, uh, effectiveness, reward, benefit.

That, um, yeah, so, no, I, I'm not, and look, if, if we were going to put it this way, if I, look, I won't, I won't, I'd never vote against having a Royal Commission, I just think it'll end up being, uh, if not a complete whitewash, it'll end up focusing on things like we didn't get the vaccines fast enough, did we have enough masks, you know, I'm, I'm sceptical that it would look down, look at the, Right.

The government overreach. I mean, my experience with the courts has been, because one thing I would like them to look at, and this really needs to be asked, and it's maybe not a, a covid issue, but the courts relied, the, the high court relied on a, uh, a, a precedent, uh, I think it's Cole Cole first Whitford.

It was a, it was a case about lobster trading between two states. I think South Australia was one of them, and Victoria or Tasmania was the other. state involved and whether or not, you know, the states had the right to block the bigger lobsters coming into the state that only sold smaller lobsters or vice versa.

But, so under section 92 of the constitution, it's, it's obviously free trade and then free intercourse amongst the states and there's two, two limbs to that. One's goods and services and one's human beings. They had no precedent, the High Court had no precedent effectively For the trap, you know, shutting down the borders for, um, people.

So they had to then join the two limbs up against and then rely on this really flimsy lobster case and somehow imply this was a precedent on how to treat people crossing borders. Uh, so, um, that's just one, one aspect of this long COVID saga, but it's often overlooked that, you know, when Palmer took the High Court, you know, the

West Australia Court, You know, the High Courts in themselves are implicit in this, as well as the government, so you'd have this interesting situation where the Royal Commission actually look at the High Court's role in allowing people to be locked up, locked down and locked out, uh, because that first 18 months or so, let's say the first 15 months, um, of the, you know, the COVID, you know, let's call it pandemic, that's inverted commas, um, uh, COVID 19.

You know, it was all about the government overreach and the daily fear mongering, uh, and just a unnecessary and inhumane lockdowns and lockups and lockouts versus the next 12 months was the mandates and the vaccine. So, There's a, you know, huge amount of stuff to look at, but if we're going to spend money on anything, first and foremost, it still has to be on those people that are injured by the vaccine.

Um, and, you know, it just, uh, makes me weep tears of blood when I know we're now up to 18 billion that has been spent on COVID measures, you know, drugs, these are just drugs. From the health department, these aren't the masks and everything else. These are just vaccines and those bloody tablets, those useless tablets, a thousand bucks a pop.

They're up to almost 18 billion dollars spent on, uh, medical, um, you know, tablets, whatever you call it for, for Um, COVID, but yet they have still spent next to nothing, a paltry couple of million, uh, on people injured by the vaccine. Um, and, uh, you know, it just, yeah, you, you know, like words can't describe how angry it makes, it makes me feel, and I know many of your listeners feel the same way, it's just the cruel and inhumane treatment of the people being, you know, have, who have been injured by the vaccine.

It, it just, yeah. And, and we can't let that be forgotten.

Jared, um, we've seen Nick Kaldos, uh, undertake a very successful, uh, well, I think it will be very successful, uh, rural commission, um, leadership role as a commissioner. He's not a judge comes from a policing background. I mean, so I suppose it opens up the question, uh, Given that you've got such, you know, you've really been, uh, the, the, the strength of, uh, of common sense in relation to these matters at a federal level, uh, do you think you would, uh, if Peter Dutton knocked you on the shoulder and said, uh, would you take on a role?

Uh, either leading the recovery of these poor people that have been injured or, or as a commissioner looking into this entire mess, uh, given that, you know, you're not going to be around, uh, in the upper house, uh, uh, in 12 months time, is that something that you would, would consider?

Oh, I, I definitely consider it, but I doubt that Peter would tap me on the shoulder to look at it.

Yeah.

Well,

maybe we need to, uh, make some noise. Oh, do you look, you know, the one, the one big thing that's really disappointed me as a citizen and, um, I never really took it all that seriously until COVID is the way that the Commonwealth constitution has been pretty much walked all over. It just seems like it's been disemboweled before the people.

Is that the way you see it as well? Do you think the constitution is getting that? the foundation it deserves to be the document it was designed to be.

Well, Graeme, I read a really good article. I'm going to post it. It's not necessarily specific to anything, but there's a phrase in there from an article I read last week, how so much of the law has changed.

And this was based in the States, but it applies to anywhere, you know, be true interpretation through the judge's interpretation. And my favorite one to pick on this and us in a, in a, in a. Notorious way is that Franklin Dam decision in 1983. This was the start of the. Um, I know a lot of you listeners think it's the Lima decision and

all that, but for me it's the Franklin Dam decision because the High Court ruled that the Constitution 5129, when the foreign government has the foreign treaties powers, allows foreign treaties, the federal government, to override the powers of state governments through foreign treaties.

And, you know, I wasn't around in 1900 to talk to the Founding Fathers who wrote that document, but I'm pretty sure when they said that the Federal Government has powers in regards to foreign treaties, that wasn't to override domestic powers here in Australia of the state governments. And this is why up here in Queensland at least, and I'm probably, it's probably fair to say in most other states, we haven't had a dam built.

Or next to no dams built in the last 40 years. Um, so, uh, it's not just the constitution that, that gets manipulated. Um, in terms of, you know, the way the government's meant to work. But the constitution is a very simple document in terms of legalese. I've got a Masters of Tax Law and like there's four thick books of that stuff, right?

Like, you know, because the Tax Act, what you do is you put a tax on a spade, so then they start selling shovels. So the Tax Act has to really drill down and be very specific about certain actions, hence why it's so big. The Constitution was written, to be fair to the founding fathers, so that it was kind of open, um, to, to people that were elected to sort of choose how things were run.

Um, So, um, But, you know, I would have thought 5123A, with that, that conscription now, you know, that was, what was it, you can't conscript people to Um, you know, give injections or vaccinate or whatever, whatever that is, that verbiage is in that one, but I think your listeners will be familiar with it. I would have thought the way they, they basically coerced doctors, not directly, well, it was almost directly.

I mean, they say they did, but you know, they literally, you know, if you didn't sort of hand, you know, get on the vaccine bandwagon, you would have had ARPA coming, coming around, breathing down your throat. Um, And I know that I've spoken to a whistleblower from APRA whose job it was to actually flag people who'd been writing exemptions or, um, writing vaccine injuries.

So APRA were targeting these people, um, and it's worth remembering Martin Fletcher himself, the CEO, has been the APRA from when it was created, I think in 2009, and came from the World Health Organization. So he's, so how does a bloke, is an Englishman who used to work for the World Health Organization, get a job in Australia as the head is the, As head of the whole entire medical industry when he has absolutely no experience in Australia of of the of the medical industry and Australia is a different country to Britain in the sense that Britain has one national government.

It doesn't have six state governments. So the whole framework is entirely different here. And yet here this bloke was just picked out of obscurity. I mean, I don't know how he managed to get the job and he's been there since 2009. He's been there now 15 That in itself is a red flag, if you ask me, uh, because that sort of longevity just breeds um, you know, a power structure whereby he's, he and the staff underneath him, uh, you know, have been stuck in their ways for far too long.

And it seems like the, uh, the, the highest lawmakers in the land, given that august body that you belong to, the Australian Senate, seem to have no power to change that.

No, because it's national law. So health is still a state law. So this national law that Mark was talking about is combined state law. So it's not federal law and it's not state law.

It's, it's, it's this quasi in between law that basically is, is, is consolidate state law. And then, and this happened a couple of years ago, apparently Queensland changed something, and that therefore impacted the rest of the country. I'm not quite up to speed with it, but, and in terms of APRA, um, sorry, I've got a cough in my throat, a frog in my throat, um, so, yeah, it's very hard to get at.

It is very hard. Even if we had the numbers in the Senate, it would still be hard to change that national law, because I think it's got to be agreed upon by the states.

Which is never going to happen.

No, well, it'll only happen when the media and everyone create a, you know, pandemic, inverted commas. Um, and everyone sort of, you know, the media basically make it impossible to disagree with the narrative.

Um, like I said,

it's never going to happen.

Yeah, no, you're right. Yeah, it won't happen. It won't

happen. We're going to have to wind this up in a minute. John, any, any final questions for Dr. Hobart?

Well, I think, uh, Mark, I mean, what's, what's your final plea to everyone out there? I mean, what do they need to do?

Do they need to, do they need to write to the,

get in contact with them? Okay. Well, look, it's very disappointing to hear that, um, Senator Rennick doesn't sound confident about doing anything about this. Basically, I want it to be widely known that Department of Health Officers Do not have the legal right to enter a doctor's clinic and take patient's clinical notes.

It is illegal. They are trying to say it is legal now under the Memorandum of Understanding between APRA and the Department of Health. And under Schedule 5 of the National Law, which, uh, does not make it legal either. And we must stop this because you'll just have these government officers taking private and confidential patient files from their doctors and using them how they see fit, which, in my experience, is not very good at all.

The other thing is that the government, uh, APRA boards cannot tell doctors how to behave. They are not doctors, they just tell doctors how to behave for political reasons. And that was exemplified in the COVID situation here, where doctors were told not to tell patients anything which might undermine the COVID vaccine rollout.

Because of this, many, many patients died. We're given, well, probably 60 percent of the patients were given vaccines against their will. And as Senator Rennick noted, he is very distressed by the side effects of these vaccines. And he, he is very upset about that. Well, this would not have happened had doctors been able to tell.

Patients and given them the full informed consent of it, but because the medical board said threatened doctors with suspension and did suspend them in the case of myself and several other doctors in Victoria that stopped all doctors from giving well from basically telling patients the truth. So please, Senator Rennick, address those two issues.

Government officers have no legal right to enter doctors premises and take patients files without a warrant, and medical boards cannot tell doctors what to do. The doctors are governed by their conduct according to peers of similar training and experience. That is the national law. They're the two points I want to drive home today.

Thank you. Yeah.

Senator Rennick. Can you hear me?

Yeah. Yeah. I can hear you. Yeah.

Yeah. Did you want to respond to Mark on those?

Uh, look, no, that's, that's fine. I mean, I'm, I'm happy to raise these issues and, uh, I'll send Mark. I've got his number. So I'll text him my, uh, email address if he wants to, uh, you know, we can try and rattle the cage.

I mean, the problem is. And this is what, you know, I agree with everything you said, and the thing that has struck me in the last three years, we all know, for example, that you can't be coerced into taking a vaccine, people were coerced into taking a vaccine, and you think, well, that's, that's illegal, there should be repercussions, and there isn't, and I mean, it's not just, I mean, those of you who follow me in estimates, it's gold bars, it's the lies by BOM, it's the lies by the CSIRO, it's the lies by the TGA, I, I seem to just have, get away with it.

If they have the numbers, and they've got the power, and there doesn't seem to be any, this is what I was saying before, no integrity about upholding the law. Um, they just don't want to know about it. But anyway, look Mark, I'll send you my, um, I think you may have it, but I'll send it to you again, and we can write letters, and.

I can try and bang the drum, um, with the, with the, um, Mark Butler, but he, he, you know, I've never had a positive, um, response from Butler yet, but I'll try. I mean, I'll, I'll definitely try for you, mark, um, because it is a fight worth fighting for.

Thank you. I've got, uh, I can give you the legal arguments, uh, not that I'm a lawyer, but the, the, the law is, supports what I'm saying.

There is no law that says they can, uh, do what they're doing

and I don't disagree with you for a minute, Mark. It's not that it's that the, you know, what the law says and whether or not it gets upheld, uh, are two different things and, and, and maybe that wasn't always the world we lived in, but just, you know, it just the world, it, it seems to be that way now.

And anyway, but we'll, we'll fight the fight and see how far we can get.

Has Martin Fletcher ever turned up to estimates?

Yeah, he has. Yeah. Yeah, he's pretty sheepish nowadays. He was a bit more, uh, in the early days, a bit more confident, but now, nowadays, I think he's pretty, um, yeah. He's definitely scaled it down.

But yet again, you know, uh, they turn up, they, they, you know, answer their questions for 15 minutes and they're out again and it's not for another four months. And, you know, they'll see me out, I've only got another year and they win. I mean, this is it, right? I mean, the bureaucrats, they're there for life, most of them.

You know, they get a 30 or 40 year run at the system and, you know, if you're lucky, if, if you're a good politician, you'll be booted in one or two terms because you speak up and get your head shot off. And if you're a poor politician, even poor politicians are lucky to get past 20, 25 years. Um, and then those guys that do generally get that far because they don't, you know, rock the boat.

So, um, Yeah, it's gonna take, uh, you know, I, I don't know what it's gonna take to start to get the, in improvement in government, uh, in, in government delivery of services and upholding the law and things like that because, uh, um, it is uh, very, very disappointing.

Yeah. As we bring it to a close, a lot of our listeners have, have been, um, uh, a lot of the people who follow us follow you quite religiously and for good reason.

You've been really great at this sort of stuff. You came into the senate. On the basis on the platform of taxation reform, um, I doubt you've had an awful lot of time to work on that, which has been your passion, uh, given that you've spent so much time studying and working out through the science of COVID.

Um, how much, uh, what's your political future looking like at the moment for those who'd be interested?

Okay, I'll just touch on that taxation stuff. So I got a lot of that taxation stuff out to the tax office and treasury early on, uh, because I, I, you know, within the first year, um, uh, and this was say, well, I got in July 19 and Covid pretty much hit the fan in March nine 20.

So I had about nine months, but the first 12 months and in a couple of the weekends we were locked down in Covid. I had, you know. Frydenberg and I also went to see Jim Chalmers when he first got in under Labor and just outlined, um, the issues I had with the Tax Act. So, yet again, you know, I could fix some of these issues in the space of a week because I know the sections to get rid of, or, you know, the tax rates, which tax rates to lift and which tax rates to decrease, um, but yet again, it's, it's what you think is the right thing to do, Thank you.

Um, and what should be the right thing to do isn't, isn't necessarily, uh, what happens. Um, yeah, there's a no brainer, right? Foreigners are allowed to buy water rights. That's a bad one for a start. Shouldn't be allowed to do that. But when they sell those water rights, they don't pay capital gains tax on it.

So, yeah. I don't know what you have to do when you take it to the treasurer or assistant treasurer or whatever and say, this isn't right, bring a tax in on capital gains tax it. Well, if you can ban the sale of water rights, that'd be better altogether. But even imposing a capital gains tax on the sale of water rights.

Now, you're not going to lose any votes for that because they're foreigners. Um, likewise with foreigners who own rental properties in Australia, the rental agent can just pay the rent offshore and they'll never see it again. There's no tax. There's not paying any tax here. Um, and I wonder why they've got a money laundering problem.

I mean, give me a break. So, I have beat the drum on that stuff. I don't tend, that stuff doesn't tend to get to the front onto my social media pages because a lot of it's technical and to do with the tax act. Even though occasionally I'll post something. I just did a post the other day on the, the foreign investors of rental properties.

I have done posts on the water rights thing as well. But, um, so look, I have, I have raised those issues. Um, yeah. But, unfortunately, you know, you get treasurers that are just beholden to treasury, who are beholden to Um, you know, it's, it's, you know, I think people often look at corruption and think money gets changed hands between politicians and lobbyists or whatever.

Um, I, I'd like to take a deeper dive into the bureaucracy, uh, because, you know, it would be, the, the bureaucrats don't necessarily have to disguise their interests and, um, There's one thing I've learned, a minister once told me, when I first got in, that his own department was leaking against him all the time, so, and I, you know, our bureaucrats really need, you know, a broom put through their closet, uh, and, you know, and I'm not saying that Fletcher's involved in this.

But yeah, if you've been there 15, yeah, as I said before, Fletcher's been there 15 years. Some of these guys have been in their departments for 20, 25, 30 years. Um, so they would know people in the private sector and the private sector goes straight to them. It was interesting when that Mike Pizzullo got pinged, uh, a couple of months ago for texting Scott Briggs and it didn't really go.

It should have been, it did get into the mainstream news, but it should have been bigger news because Scott Briggs was a lobbyist and he was also Scott Morrison's FEC chair for Cook. And I just found it interesting that a senior public servant would be texting a lobbyist directly. I mean, I don't have Pazzullo's number.

Um, well, you know, I'm Senator, not that that means much, but. Um, I thought to myself, how is it, and, and yet this is how the game's played. Often the politicians, we're out there doing the Punch and Judy show, but it's the people who pull the strings in the background, namely bureaucrats and lobbyists. Um, and a lot of these lobbyists are ex ministers themselves, so they won't be knocking on my door when my term's up.

for me to be a lobbyist because I was never in the ministry and got to know who's who in the bureaucracy. I don't have their phone numbers, but ex ministers have phone numbers of bureaucrats. Um, and I, you know, if you

wanted to, well, I don't know if a royal commission's the way to do it, but, uh, you know, certainly investigate, you know, I'd love to know, What the relationship between lobbyists and bureaucrats are because if I, if I was a smart, if I wanted to get something done, you do it all in the background.

No one ever knows about it. Never hits the front pages. And I mean, that's, that's what peaked my interest in getting into politics when I started off was that there were all these sections in the Tax Act where I was just shaking my head going, this is so against Australia's national interest. How on earth have we done this?

Allowed this to happen. Um, and I can tell you, I know how it happens from the political, the, the politician side of stuff is that most of the time when we get changes to the, what they call TLABs, Treasury Laws Amendment Bills, um, you get like one or two words and unless you know the Tax Act and what that, the meaning of that Act is, you have no idea what you're voting on.

Um, and that's like a lot of legislation, like you don't actually get a proper sit down, um, and, and study it. So, unless you've gone into politics knowing certain, you know, certain parts of the law, so I know the tax law, I know corporations law, for example, um, they're my two that I know. Better than most. Um, you know, you, you're really in the dark, uh, unless you sit down and study that partic particular act.

Um, so anyway, so I, I did, you know, I, I certainly did try and throw some spears in, in the way of the tax act and hopefully, you know, the guys in the treasury have at least, um, you know, taken out on board. Um, and then where I'm going, going forward, I've got another 12 months in the Senate, uh, so I have two decisions to make, well, I have quite a lot of decisions to make, what do I do in the next 12 months, how do I go about it, do I stay in the LNP, do I go as independent, do I join another party, um, or do I just flame out, um, you know, flame out period, uh, and then whether or not I want to stay in politics once my term's up.

Um, Uh, Yeah. And, and at this stage, I mean, obviously I won't be in politics because my term's up for a start. So, then I'll be on the sidelines, you know, just shouting at the clouds like everyone else. And, you know, I made a decision when I came back from New South Wales, that if I was going to get involved in politics again, I'd go for the, you know, go for the, You know, the top jobs are one of the top jobs because my experience with politicians is that they're no smarter than the rest of us and if I'm gonna, you know, go to a party room meeting, I may as well go to the one that matters in Canberra.

So, I don't know, Graeme, what I'm gonna do. Um, you know, obviously, I feel very let down by my own party, not my members, not the members, uh, and not by my federal colleagues by any means, but certainly head office, um, have let me down as well as the state executive or certain members of the state executive.

Um, so, yeah, I mean, I, you know, so the answer is I don't know, Graeme, I'm sort of trying to work through that at the moment and I think there's no real, you're not going to get a clear, I'm not going to get a clear pathway forward here, I'm just going to have to make a decision and run with it.

You paint a very dismal picture.

And that will

involve burning bridges, you know, one way or the other. I don't see how, you know, this is a problem. It'd be nice not to burn bridges, but I think I'm going to burn, have to burn bridges when I make certain decisions. Yeah.

Well, we're going to watch with interest, but you paint a very dismal picture of the government structure of this country.

It's a mess, isn't it?

Yeah, it is. Yeah, absolutely. And we're really going to need someone with integrity who isn't afraid to stand up to the bureaucracy, isn't afraid to stand up to corporations, isn't superannuation, and really, you know, Break down

those walls, you know, the 3 trillion in superannuation, the independent statutory authorities of the CSIRO, the RBA, the TGA, um, you know, ARPA, what we just talked about tonight.

These people are untouchable. Um, well, Yeah, they are untouchable, but they shouldn't be, you know, and we should have ministers who are sacking these people, you know, and you've only got to do, you've only got to start sacking a few, few of the bad eggs at the top and you watch everyone else underneath will suddenly start worrying about losing their job again, uh, and you'll start to see it, you know, definite lift in performance and integrity if they think that they're going to get called out for, um, their misbehaviour.

So it really only takes one, you know, a really good leader to suddenly start. Crawling the shots and doing the right things. And you'd be amazed at how quickly you can turn things around.

You've segued into a question that everyone's going to scream at me to ask you. Do you see anyone on the horizon that fits that bill?

Um, well, look, I'm impressed with Peter Dutton, uh, pushing the nuclear debate. I mean, I know from my party's members point of view, um, they're just glad not, I mean, they support nuclear, or most of them do. What they're glad, though, is that they've got a leader that's prepared to have a crack, right? Because under Morrison, so many of our members, you know, and, and, And, and Australians in general were just so disappointed in the fact that he allowed himself to be railroaded by the state premiers, the media, you know, vested interests, you name it.

When you're the Prime Minister of the country, you can make a difference in how you lead the country. And Jacinda Price was a good example of that with her voice last year. She just came in as shadow minister and just said, right, well, this is how it is, this is how I see it, I don't care what you think.

And she was unapologetic. And we need more politicians who aren't afraid. Um, of their own shadow and aren't afraid of what they, you know, to say what they think, and to actually fight for the values that we hold dear. Um, because, you know, and, you know, for too long we've had too many weak politicians, and obviously our nine years in the coalition, Tony Abbott started off well with, um, stopping the boats, but then it was all downhill after that for him.

Um, Turnbull, you know, yet again, uh, very strong character, I didn't know him personally, but could have been someone if he, you know, Sort of didn't, you know, go, you know, didn't do what he did. Um, and then Scott, you know, yet again, you know, Scott got into government in 19 on the back of just bread and butter.

Um, we're not gonna fall for this, you know, net zero crap. And yet two years later, he rolls over and signs up for the net zero crap, not to mention the whole COVID stuff. And now look, I will qualify early on with the COVID stuff. There's no way, you know, Scott had to do what he had to do, right? I mean, no one knew enough to know.

I mean, I was always skeptical. I mean, when I say no, I knew enough to know I was genuinely sceptical that this wasn't going to be used for political purposes. Um, but by the second year, when it was obvious that the premiers were, pardon my French, taking the piss, you know, with Daley, you know, up here, Palaszczuk, oh, well, there's COVID in the sewerage.

Um, you know, well, if there was COVID in the sewerage, why haven't people tested for COVID? Um, You know, some of the crazy statements made by the premiers, it was becoming obvious that they were clearly out of control and we needed a Prime Minister to put them back in their, in their box and that didn't happen.

Um, but it's not just things like, it was also like the Linda Reynolds, Brittany Higgins thing, what they did to Linda Reynolds. Um, you know, and I'm not particularly close to Linda, but they abused her in the Senate for effectively two weeks in question time. Katie Gallagher and, um, Penny Wong just abused Senate privilege to score political points and, and, and weaponized, you know, politicized a rape, you know, a rape allegation.

I mean, these people claim to care about women, but we were too weak. We, we didn't push back. Um, and I'll blame Simon Birmingham for that. He should have stood up to that. I don't think Matisse would have put up with that crap. Um, uh, you know, where else did we fall down? You know, there were things that we weren't strong.

But then, you know, we come on Albanese and he's, he's, you know, he's just, uh, completely fallen off a cliff, um, since the boys as well. He's just completely clueless. Uh, and I'm not surprised, the Albanese has always been a career politician and, and often with these career politicians that it's power for the sake of power, uh, and they don't know how to govern or they don't know what they want to do.

Um, and if there's one word, you know, if you take out the characteristics of a politician, the only way you're gonna fix this country is to build, you know, start building infrastructure again. I mean, if you got washed up in a desert island, would you sit around, you know, holding government or would you start building?

And, and obviously the answer is you gotta start building dams, power stations, roads, rail, you know, and all that infrastructure will then, you know, provide economic, um, you know, energy and water and, you know, faster transportation, um, That'll all start getting our businesses back on, on track. But while you're building, you're not sitting around pushing a pen, shuffling paper and create, you know, whether it's in superannuation or the bureaucrats, um, you know, making laws that are just inhibiting people from, you know, getting on with their lives.

Yeah, that was pretty candid, and I don't think there's too many people who can disagree with that. And, uh, sadly, the people like yourself who have got the guts to say the things that you're saying, they don't last long. And this is the problem in government, um, you know, the tail's wagging the dog, and the bureaucracy is leading the country, unelected.

Absolutely, yeah. Yep. That's a hundred percent. Yeah.

All right, well, Johnny and I will come back after the break, but I'd like to thank you both. Dr Mark Hobart, thanks so much for sharing that news with us tonight and we please keep us updated on the outcomes and we want to, we'll put you to air again if we know that something is eventuating out of all of this, but well done and thank you for bringing it to our attention and Gerard Rennick as always, Um, there's a whole bunch of people who tip their hat to you and, and wear one of them and, uh, or wear a pair of them, I should say.

And, uh, we hope to talk to you again, too, before the next 12 months is up. Thanks for joining us.

Yeah, no worries, Graeme. And have a good night, guys. And good to see you, John and Mark. Take care.

God

bless you.

Bye for now. Bye, guys. And we'll be back straight after the break with more on Club Grubbery. Well, hi, everyone.

And welcome back to, uh, to tonight's episode of Club Grubbery. Uh, John, you've got to, you've got to say that that was, uh, I mean, Dr. Mark Hobart. is a man clearly under stress. He's been under stress for a long time and um, to get the news that he got that, that, that he shared with us all tonight, which is a bit of a scoop really, that, that um, that APRA, even, even John, if they didn't do it deliberately, it shows just how incompetent they are as an organization not to know or not to know to admit that they, they had those files by saying that they didn't.

Well, I think actions speak louder than words, Woody. And, you know, the fact that they've been chasing health professionals, uh, for years, uh, more emphasis on it during COVID, uh, obviously, but, you know, when we spoke to Dr. Sarah a few weeks back and we found out that they're targeting those guys for, uh, little misdemeanor

stuff, you know, like not having the, you know, The right date on a bottle or, you know, the, you know, there was a spelling error or something on the, on the, on the prescription bottle or the prescription.

Yeah. So that's sort of madness. Uh, yet these people have lied. lied to a Supreme Court. Now, I don't care what, uh, they think. I mean, the, the public's view of this should be an outrage. Uh, you know, it's not good enough. It's not good enough just to apologize. I mean, this organization knew they had those records.

I can't believe they didn't know they, they didn't have those.

Especially if you're involved in a court action. Like you're going to dot all your i's and cross all your t's, aren't you?

I mean, look, I clearly remember that day because there was live video footage of stuff being taken out of that office.

Now, it was inconceivable to think That records weren't taken. And as, as we find out, one of our dear friends, Tony Nikolic, is one of the people whose medical records is being, uh, lifted by this mob. I mean, it's, it's crazy stuff.

It is crazy stuff. So we look with interest in what Mark Hobart has to say, Johnny, and, um, and also Gerard Rennick, um, he's just straight up honest.

I mean, the guy's got more integrity than you can poke a stick at. Now, some people are going to be angered by some of his comments. He's Uh, you know, saying he's given up too early and nobody can accuse Gerard Rennick of giving up. I mean, far out. The stuff he said about the tax act was, was fantastic. I mean, we could do a whole show on that because that impacts on every Australian.

A lot of people would say, Oh, that'd be like watching grass grow, but honestly it points to the corruption and the, and the incompetence of our governing bodies. Uh, bureaucratic and political, doesn't it? I mean, it's just incredible stuff.

Yeah, look, and you know, he just mentioned one item there, which, which is just a no brainer.

You know, it should be, it should be tidied up in 30 seconds with the flick of a pen and a, and an email to someone to say, rectify this. But, uh, clearly, uh, we are being, uh, run by buffoons. Um, and it's not, not, not at the political level. Uh, you've got to say, I think the real problem is The, the underlings, uh, the bureaucrats, they're really the ones that are holding the power.

Uh, and until we get somebody, uh, to come along and question them. I mean, a perfect example to me, what he was, uh, Tucker Carlson, uh, speaking back to those journalists, holding them to account, uh, having a view and sticking to it. Um, and sure, if information comes that changes your mind or changes your view, well, that's good.

Uh, have the capacity to be able to say, well, look, we did get that wrong. Um. And that's where Morrison stuffed up, didn't he? I mean, uh, as was alluded to, um, in, in the interview, um, uh, Morrison should have intervened and he didn't, he just let things fester on and these idiots running these states, uh, were, were just, Out of control.

Absolutely. I mean, uh, so much to be drawn to from, from the, uh, Tucker Carlson press conference in Canberra that you attended personally, John, as the caliber of the journalists that were sent to ask those questions of a, of a seasoned journalist in Tucker Carlson. Uh, I mean, that's like the main, the mainstream media going to a gunfight with a knife.

I mean, that was just ridiculous. They were such dishwasher journalists. I mean, the ABC guy didn't sort of get too controversial to any great extent, but I mean, it was, it was pathetic. It was an embarrassment to watch that, uh, massacre of those journalists by Tucker Carlson. I mean, I wish more people would do that.

You know, we go back to the days of Hawk when, uh, Hawk was tackling, um, who was it? Uh, Carlton. Um, you know, and, uh, said, you haven't gotten any better, have you? You're a, you're an idiot. Basically, we need more of that kind of stuff going on. I'm not a big fan of Hawke, but I've got to tell you that, uh, you know, he knew how to take on the media for long and, um, and John, there's a whole bunch of stuff going on in the world at the moment, but our government is an absolute mess.

Albanese coming out today, um, you know, expressing condolences to the people who died at the Trump shooting, um, you know, expressing his concerns for democracy. I mean, are you serious, John? He was expressing his concerns for the democratic process.

Yeah. Look, the bloke's a buffoon, Woody. Uh, there's no question.

Uh, I mean, Jared alluded to that. I mean, he's clueless. He's a career politician. He should never be there. It's an absolute blight on Australia that this guy is the prime minister of this country. I mean, You know, it just demonstrates how bad our system is, uh, that somebody like that idiot can rise up to be the prime minister of Australia.

Uh, it's, it's an embarrassment. I mean, I don't see it as being any, any different to Joe Biden. Uh, I mean, that's, that's the sort of, uh, that's what you're dealing with. I

mean, it's, it's an empty vessel. It is. It is. Uh, that's exactly what it is. It's just become more and more of an embarrassment. And there are so many politicians, uh, leading countries around the world, John, who just all fall into the same milk.

They are an embarrassment. They are an absolute embarrassment. And you got the tough guys like Putin and Xi Jinping and, uh, and Trump, cause nobody can say Trump's not a tough guy, whether you like him or love him, he's a tough guy, these guys stand out, they look like Eagles because they're surrounded by turkeys, you know, and it's, it's, it's, Anyhow.

We'll, we'll bring this to a close Before we do your take on what happened over in, uh, Pennsylvania today, mate, you had a chance to have much of .

Well, look, well look, I, I, I think, uh, the world needs, needs Donald Trump to be elected because I, I, I think the issue is, uh, what he, uh, the swamp still needs to be drained, and I don't see anyone draining it other than him.

Um, I, I just think that those actions there today have, uh, have. Have improved, uh, his chances of being elected, uh, greatly. Um, I mean, he, it was a defining moment. I mean, seeing him there literally. Uh, 30 seconds after he, he had a bullet go past his ear, uh, there was blood pouring down his face. I mean, to, to, uh, to be, you know, throwing the fist up and, and, and, and, and basically saying, well, don't let the bastards win.

Uh, that, that's how I sort of interpreted it. Um, you know, I, I think that, that, that moment will, will be, uh, a defining moment in history and, and, and in his reelection, I think.

I think that photograph of him standing up from, at the podium with blood streaming down his face, raising his fist, uh, it's already been compared to the U.

S. Marine Corps raising the flag on Iwo Jima. Um, you know, um, just, uh, powerful imagery. There's no doubt about it. A lot of people saying, oh, it's been staged and all that. Well, who knows? I mean, it's irrelevant at the end of the day, how it's going to play out is how it's going to play out. Uh, if I were Bobby Kennedy, I'd be screaming out for a security detachment.

That

Yeah, yeah, it's not, not, not, not good times. That's for sure. And I, I mean, you've got to feel for those poor people that were, uh, fatally injured behind, uh, Trump. I mean, that, you know, that bullet's obviously gone somewhere. Those bullets have gone, uh, and, and people have died as a, as a result of it. So, you know, uh, Thoughts and prayers are with those people.

It's, it's a tragic situation, um, and, and would have been very frightening for all those people involved there, not, not knowing what was happening. And I'm sure we'll hear a lot more about it in coming days, but, uh, definitely a day that people should mark in their calendar as, as one to, as one to, uh, you know, what they were doing at the time.

It's, it will certainly be one of those moments, I think.

Well, I think, uh, also, it's, it's positioned America on the brink of a very dangerous precipice. What goes on in the next 48 to 72 hours over there, I think, is critical. Uh, mainstream media are going to have to play their cards very, very close to their chest, uh, because it's so inflamed over there at the moment.

You've got 8 million illegal immigrants in the country. Um, you've got all this stuff going on with Biden. Uh, America is a sitting duck at the moment, unless they get their act together. And they're poised for civil war. If this goes South in the next 72 hours, you can, you can just see it in the language.

And we, you know, however it plays out, we just pray that peace prevails and common sense prevails. But boy, oh boy, we've got a lot of work to do in our own country with our own government. And we've got to be relentless in our pursuit of this, uh, these bureaucrats and this government structure that we're in.

It's an absolute mess. But anyway, uh, Johnny, I'll bring it to a close with a prayer. Dear Lord, father in heaven, we pray Lord for peace, compassion, and common sense that it would reign supreme in our thinking and in our governments. And in the way that we live in this country and others around the world, father, we are poised on a precipice.

And I, for one who believe in you. With all of my heart, my body and soul. I just, I'm so glad that you're in control as much as this seems like it's out of control. I know in my heart, through my faith, where this is leading. And I thank you Lord, that you've given me that confidence, uh, going forward. And I pray you instill that in all those who love and believe in you be with our great country and be with all of those who are standing at the moment.

Give us the courage and the strength and the energy to keep going is our prayer in your precious name, Lord. Amen. Johnny, you've often been heard to say, You just couldn't make this stuff up. You couldn't. I mean, it gets curiouser and curiouser. Stay out of the trees, everybody. We love you. And if you love somebody and you haven't told them, please give them a call and let them know.

Uh, it's a wonderful country we live in and it's wonderful because we're all in it, you know. And, uh, despite our differences, we can still pull this country out of the gutter. And it certainly needs a lot of help to do that. So, let's get behind it. clubgrubbery. com. au We appreciate your support and, uh, your love and prayers.

And we'll see you through the week as we launch this week with what I think was a really great interview with Gerard Rennick and Dr. Mark Hobart. God bless you and good night for now.