

Introduction

The majority of Canadians view the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations (UN) as benign and praise-worthy organizations: the Gold Standard for International Cooperation. As Canada is one of the member nations of the WHO and UN, the WHO constitution and the 2005 International Health Regulations (IHR) are legally binding. However, behind the scenes in the past few years, significantly disturbing developments have taken place with respect to amendments to the IHR as well as a newly introduced 'pandemic treaty'. This treaty "in its current form would create a new, cost-intensive supranational bureaucracy and impose an ideological framework under which to operate in matters of global health."¹ Furthermore, IHR amendments and the pandemic treaty have not been debated in our nation's parliament nor discussed in our main stream media. Our concerns about this are three-fold

1. The **WHO's secretive process around adoption of amendments** to the 2005 IHR, is at the least troubling, at most duplicitous: The WHO does not abide by, nor respect their own binding rules.
2. The **nature of the amendments** themselves, and the "**pandemic treaty/accord**" if accepted, transition the WHO from an advisory board to an unelected legislative authority, giving the WHO power to make and enforce decisions' about Canadians' (and other member nations citizens') health and way of life.
3. Tax payers money funds the WHO, as do private unaccountable organizations (e.g. Bill Gates & Melinda Gates Foundation). These latter organizations strongly influence WHO directions and priorities.

1. The WHO disregards its own process rules and regulations for adopting amendments

On May 27, 2022, the WHO published a set of amendments that alter the terms of the original 2005 treaty essentially shortening the period of time from for member nations to assess & reject future amendments. A citizen's petition sponsored by MP Leslyn Lewis to debate the amendments was closed on April 20, 2023, Consequently, these amendments "came into force" on November 27, 2023. Canada's silence meant consent to these legally-binding amendments.

On December 19, 2023 MP Leslyn Lewis sounded the alarm about Canada's silence and the WHO's disregard of its own rules in a letter to Canada's Minister of Health. In addition, twelve Members of the European Parliament (MEP) penned a letter to the WHO's Director General, giving a deadline to provide evidence of the voting conditions being met which resulted in adoption of the amendments. These MEPs declared the amendments NULL & VOID if no such evidence was forthcoming. No proof was given, so it is unclear what the standing of the amendments are.

¹ <https://worldcouncilforhealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Rejecting-Monopoly-Power-over-Global-Public-Health.-WCH-Policy-Brief-on-the-Proposed-IHR-Amendments-and-Pandemic-Treaty.pdf> p.3

Furthermore, another alarming development is *currently occurring*: The WHO again is ignoring their own rules. The rules state that any amendments have to be submitted to the World Health Assembly (WHA) 4 months before their annual meeting. The next WHA meeting will take place on May 27, 2024. The WHO's Working Group have indicated that they will not meet the deadline of January 27, 2024 to submit the amendments and the pandemic treaty. Consequently, the WHO is now saying it will shorten the period required to submit amendments to the WHA. This is not only contrary to the WHO's own rules for submission, *but will not allow the WHA members time to assess the impact of amendments on their respective nations before voting to accept or reject them.*

2. The nature of key proposed amendments for acceptance on May 27, 2024 are troubling. Some are referenced below:

[Article 1& 42] Change from advisory to Mandatory: Change the overall nature of the WHO from an advisory organization that merely makes recommendations to a governing body whose proclamations would be legally-binding.

[Article 3], **the amendment seeks to remove” with full respect for dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms of people”**. This proposed amendment supposedly has been removed, but it shows the direction that the WHO is moving to.

[Article 13A] Give the WHO's Director General control over the means of production through an “allocation plan for health products” to require development members to supply pandemic responses as required.

[Article 18] Give the **WHO the authority to require** medical examinations, proof of vaccine, implement contact tracing, quarantine & Treatments.

[Article 44A] redirect billions of dollars to the Pharmaceutical Hospital Emergency Industrial Complex with no accountability.

“Officially, the IHR amendments and the pandemic treaty are presented as instruments to increase international collaboration, efficient sharing of information and equity in case of another global crisis.” In reality, they can turn into “central dictates, stifle dissent, and legitimize a cartel that imposes on populations interest-driven health products that generate profits over those that work better and are less profitable.”² [WCH p.3]

3. Private Unaccountable Organizations that Fund the WHO (Who runs the WHO -Structural Reality

“The WHO is steering a course that balances the interests of a few powerful countries such as the US and Germany (two top donors) , major private contributors (primarily the Bill &

² Ibid. p.3

Melinda Gates Foundation and the Gates-funded GAVI Alliance) and China, which is the 11th largest donor but holds significant geopolitical influence.³

Eighty percent of the WHO's budget comes from voluntary contributions from rich member states (Germany, US, China) and private corporations (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and GAVI). In the past, 80% of the total WHO budget came from assessed contributions, with the WHO deciding how to spend them, while only 20% were earmarked voluntary contributions. Since funds now come with caveats, the organization is compromised on a number of issues that involve the interest of its owners.⁴

Why should Canadians citizens be very concerned about this?

The mountain of information on the current situation of the WHO can fall into three broad Categories:

Competence, Loss of Control (Health), Values & Ethics

We have used quotes from three credible people to illustrate this. Their videos can be viewed on the video wall of this Information package, along with more quotes with timestamps.

Astrid Stuckelberger (MSc, PhD, PD) is an international health scientist conducting and directing research in clinical and epidemiological studies on the science for policy makers for 30 years. She is a former member of the Research and Ethics Review Committee at the WHO and has contributed to several WHO books, notably International Research Ethics Training. Quotes from her are labelled AS

David Bell is a clinical and public health physician with a PhD in population health and a background in internal medicine, modelling and epidemiology of infectious disease. He has worked in global health and biotech for 20 years, including coordinating malaria diagnostics strategy with the WHO. Quotes from him are labelled DB

Andrew Bridgen is a British politician who has served as a member of parliament for the Conservative Party since 2010 and was suspended from that party in April 2023 for having serious concerns about the harms that vaccines cause. He joined the Reclaim Party in May 2023. Quotes from him are labelled AB

Competence

“What was being published was that because Africa was poorer, they were going to have a disaster from COVID, even though everyone including the WHO knew that wasn't the case. Despite that the WHO pushed hard for lockdowns in Africa.” DB

“The WHO is a bureaucracy with less expertise than is found in most developed countries and it has a highly centralized control of complex situations like pandemics. We need a localized response.” DB

³ Ibid. p.26

⁴ Ibid. p.26

“Because of these measures (of the WHO), in South Asia a quarter of a million children died not from COVID but from lockdowns.”8:28” This is the outcome of ignoring everything we knew about COVID in early 2020 in low-income countries.” DB

” Koch’s Postulates were not applied. You have to establish whether it is a virus, bacteria, parasite, a chemical agent, radio-nuclear or is it a bioweapon. This was in the IHR course. First you do detective work. None of this was done. It was standardized.” AS

Loss of control over national and individual health issues

“The WHO has moved from a technical agency to a tool for funders to do what they want or essentially a gun for hire.” DB

“The IHR is a legally binding document that makes recommendations into requirements for countries. That’s how it affects sovereignty.” DB

“The pandemic is organized internationally in a systemic way and the WHO doesn’t communicate but dictates.” AS

“I saw that the WHO wanted to take down the constitution of the member states and establish the WHO constitution as the only one government” AS

“People have to take over their sovereignty and they have a hard time to think that their government lies.” AS

“The WHO Director General will have the sole authority to decide when and where they are applied, and the proposals are intended to be binding under international law. Continued claims that sovereignty is not lost, echoed by politicians and the media therefore raise important questions concerning motivations, competence, and ethics.” AB

“These UDHR stipulations are the basis of the modern concept of individual sovereignty... considered the highest codifications of the rights and freedoms of individuals in the 20th century. They may soon be dismantled behind closed doors in a meeting room in Geneva.” AB.

“It’s difficult to think of another international instrument where such powers over national resources are passed on to an unelected external organization. It’s even more challenging to envisage how this is seen as anything other than a loss of sovereignty.” AB

“There is a current mechanism for the rejection of the new amendments, however unless a high number of countries voice their opposition and rejection, the adoption of the current published version dated February 2023 will likely lead to a future shadowed by the permanent risks of the WHO lockdown and lockstep dictates.” AB

Values and Ethics

“To summarize, the WHO is directed by individuals with clear conflicts of interest, 50% of member states are not democracies, and there is a poor track record.” DB

“This is the work of public-private partnerships which is the new model for public health...we end up with commodity-based public health that will make money for private interests...This will be run by public money to produce private profit.” DB

“Where does this money come from but our taxes? We are financing the vaccine campaign and the death of people. Do you see how unethical this is?” AS

“In 2020 and 2021, there was the creation of fear... the scientific lies and deception were rolled out under this fear very easily”. AS.

“In 2021 they rolled out the experimental clinical trial...this has never happened; why do you put a million people in a clinical trial?” AS

“There is no validation even today (on the 2021 clinical trial), people may not realize. It is unethical because there is conflict of interest, no liability, forced consent, and abuse of power. As a former member of the WHO Ethics and Review committee, none of this is ethical.” AS

On genome editing within the WHO: “Genome editing is a no go. The convention of Bioethics of Oviedo says ‘Don’t touch the genome. It’s an inheritance of humanity.” AS

“They said that there is a ‘junk genome’ but some people say the junk genome is the most interesting. That’s where our power, our antennae our spiritual connection lies.” AS

“What we need to be doing: on a political level, say no. Cut finances to those people (where are our taxes going?) On a human level, reinforce our power, work together on solutions, create a new way of living, own yourself and come back to simple ways like making food yourself. Reconsider life very differently because we have been programmed.” AS

“If sovereignty is being forfeited by governments without the knowledge and consent of their peoples based on false claims by their governments and the WHO the implications are very serious. It would imply that the leaders are working directly against the interests of their people.” AS