

[REDACTED]

From: Robin Birch [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, 4 October 2015 2:19 PM
To: SARC
Subject: Public Health and Wellbeing Amendment (No Jab, No Play) Bill 2015

I am writing to you about the Public Health and Wellbeing Amendment (No Jab, No Play) Bill 2015.

I wish to make the following points regarding this amendment:

In the USA, the government has indemnified vaccine manufacturers from being sued for damage by vaccines. Their legal justification for doing this is that they have deemed vaccines as "unavoidably unsafe", even when prepared and administered correctly [Source 1]. They instigated the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program (VICP) to compensate for vaccine injury, it has paid out over 3 billion dollars since inception in 1986.

The Australian Government has made no attempt to justify violating the most fundamental medical ethics: the requirement of informed consent and the right not to bear medical risk, which as described above is acknowledged as unavoidable with vaccination, for the benefit of another.

The parents who refuse vaccination of their children are conscientious parents, and discriminating against them causes unnecessary stress on finances and health for no documented gain.

Conscientious objectors to childhood vaccinations are by and large well-educated [Source 2], and their objections truly are conscientious, as they have taken the trouble to research the important questions that the vaccination regimen raises rather than make foolhardy decisions on a basis of authoritative hearsay.

In many cases, they have sought the answers to difficult questions from their medical practitioners and health authorities and have been ignored, treated very badly, or told that the information requisite to a responsible decision to vaccinate simply does not exist.

In flagrant disregard both of legal requirements and of parental pleas for trustworthy information, parents facing vaccine decisions most commonly are not shown even the package inserts that accompany the vaccines whose injection into their children they are expected to acquiesce.

Financially penalising parents who conscientiously decide against unknown risks for undocumented benefits, rather than those who make uninformed decisions to risk drugs with little to no assurance of safety and no proof of benefit, not only entrenches irresponsible parenting but also arbitrarily discriminates against responsible parents and deprives their children of the very income with which their parents feed, clothe, house, and educate them and thereby keep them physically and mentally healthy.

Source 1: The United States 1986 National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act acknowledges that vaccine injury or death may be "unavoidable even though the vaccine was properly prepared and accompanied by proper directions and warnings" [42 U.S.C. 300aa-22(b)(1)]. The "unavoidable" language in the Act is from the Restatement (Second) of Torts that applies to "products which, in the present state of human knowledge, are quite incapable of being made safe" [Restatement (Second) of Torts Section 402A, comment k (1965)].

Source 2: Rich suburbs have low immunisation rates, research shows <http://www.smh.com.au/national/health/rich-suburbs-have-low-immunisation-rates-research-shows-20140326-35iy3.html>

Robin Birch