

I am a parent who has chosen not to get vaccinated my beautiful healthy and lively children. I'm not anti – vaccinations, I am pro choice and pro informed consent. You should know that it was not a decision that my partner and I took lightly. We completed extensive research before we came to our ultimate conclusion because I believe as a parent it is not only my responsibility but my duty to make intellectual informed decision about what goes into my myself and my children, rather than following others blindly.

In the governments Explanatory Memorandum, which includes the Statement of Compatibility With Human Rights it states:

This Bill is compatible with human rights because it advances the protection of the right to physical health, and, to the extent that it may also limit human rights, those limitations are reasonable, necessary and proportionate.

I thought that it posed exactly the questions I was asking myself when considering my answer. Is it reasonable, are they necessary and are the amount of vaccinations proportionate to the burden of disease we see in our society?

Is it reasonable:

- When there are **NO** infectious disease epidemics in Australia.
- To enforce a one box fits all approach to restrictive and intrusive medical procedures when the medical profession acknowledge that some people, especially infants and those with unknown immunodeficiency's will and can have adverse reactions to vaccinations that may be worse than contracting the actual disease that it was supposed to protect them from. No one, not even Drs. can say how anyone will react to any of the ingredients found in vaccines or the cumulative effect of multiples vaccines injected at the same time. Imposing mandatory vaccinations with the knowledge that members of our society will be sacrificed should make the decision makers STOP and rethink. Vaccines have not been proven to be safe, therefore they require adequate independent, unbiased, research before any mandatory legislation be put in place
- That in a democratic political system people should have their right protected to make free and informed choice in regard to their healthcare for themselves and their children. When you take that right away it becomes dictatorship.

Is it necessary:

- When there are NO infectious disease epidemics in Australia.
- When the publication **PEDIATRICS**, the journal of the American Academy of pediatrics, admitted in 2000 that "vaccination does NOT

account for the impressive declines in mortality seen in the first half of the century” It is well documented that mortality due to infectious disease was already well on the decline prior to vaccinations, which Health officials assign to the advancements in modern sanitation and hygiene. We need to challenge the assumption that a forced vaccination program is strictly necessary for the good of the public.

- When in the last hundred years massive developments have been made which have improved the public health in households and communities. Such as simple hand washing, indoor flush toilets, good plumbing, covered cesspools, and sewage treatment. New medical procedures, importantly the sterilization of surgical equipment. Refrigeration, modern roads and railways helped to deliver fresh produce to the cities. Housing improvements and decreased crowding led to a reduction in deaths from airborne diseases. Effective antibiotics, which saw the number of fatalities due to infectious diseases plummet. All of these occurred before vaccine use became widespread.
- When to date there has been no serious epidemiological, independent, randomized, controlled study completed with vaccinated versus unvaccinated to find out the long-term health benefits, if there are any.
- When not all vaccines today are ‘strictly necessary’. Many vaccines on the schedule are for diseases our children do not typically die from. For example chickenpox, and rotavirus, have never caused a significant number of deaths in children. Other diseases such as pertussis, have become less virulent and more easily treated with modern medical technology and antibiotics.
- When a number of vaccines on the schedule are for diseases our children do not routinely afflict them such as hepatitis B and human papillomavirus, these diseases are spread primarily through intravenous drug use and sexual contact. Toddlers are vaccinated against Rubella, which is usually a mild disease, principally to protect a pregnant woman’s unborn child. However this immunity will diminish over time and could possibly leave the adult individual vulnerable to the disease at a time when the health risks are bigger.
- When we cannot say for certain if a vaccinated person would have contracted the disease in spite of being vaccinated. We cannot prove why something did not happen, we simply can not say what would happen without vaccinations. Diseases such as Typhoid fever, scarlet fever and the bubonic plague have almost completely disappeared even though vaccines were never developed or not routinely administered therefore we cannot assert with certainty that vaccinations are responsible for the eradication of disease.
- When unvaccinated children and not dying in droves.

Is it proportionate:

- To impose a mandatory vaccination schedule for over a dozen diseases when there are no widespread infectious epidemics of any disease that exist today within Australia. The problem with disease is not proportionate to the number of vaccination administered. As there has never been any research to prove that an epidemic will occur if not all children are vaccinated then the government can not prove the proportionality of compulsory vaccinations.

Whilst I understand where the Government are coming from using Article 24 of the Convention of the right of the child with the disconnected, excessive and punitive measures they are conjoining this legislation with it is in direct contradiction to Article 28:

1. States Parties recognize the right of the child to education, and with a view to achieving this right progressively and on the basis of equal opportunity, they shall, in particular

Whilst the goal of trying to protect society from the surge of disease is reasonable the measures that the Government are using to achieve it are excessive and in direct violation of a number of our human rights. By punishing parents who choose not to take up the **optional** health care available it violates not only the convention of rights of the child but our basic universal human right set of in the Declaration of Human rights that Australian ratifies many years ago. Including our freedom from discrimination, our right to life, liberty and **personal security** and the freedom from the state or personal interference in the aforementioned rights. Without sufficient independent research into the safety of these vaccines then mandatory vaccinations is just an experiment which contravenes the Nuremberg Code, which states that the voluntary consent of the human individual is absolutely necessary.

In conclusion the debate about vaccination children is a highly emotive one. What is lacking is a sense of perspective, which is what I have tried to highlight here. The governments scare mongering, fear tactics, intimidation and coercive pressures that have provoked the bewildered herd into an anti-vaccination frenzied lynch mob is not productive. It is the job of our honorable, elected officials to be upstanding role models and bastions for the protection of everyone's inalienable human rights set out in the international Bill of human rights. By taking away our right to philosophically object to vaccinating our children I believe it is a gross misuse of the power they have been entrusted with and to be quite frank I am appealed and sickened that my children's education can be used as leverage. I implore you to see sense and reject the legislation that will see the conscientious objection option removed.

"Right is right even if no one is doing it; wrong is wrong even if everyone is doing it."
— [Augustine of Hippo](#)

"Wrong does not cease to be wrong because the majority share in it."
— [Leo Tolstoy, A Confession](#)

Vannessa Jones