

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Kerry Mazur <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Sunday, 27 September 2015 9:37 PM  
**To:** SARC  
**Subject:** SARC Mtg: No Jab, No Play Bill

Att: SARC members meeting to discuss no jab, no play bill on Monday 28th September 2015

I am writing to voice my concerns over the No Jab, No Play legislation

I feel that it is discrimination.

I believe that it violates our human rights, medical freedom, freedom of thought, ability to protect our families and the right to informed consent.

This conflicts with the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities (Section 10(c), 14(2), 17)

While there are some that say we still have choice, this legislation will not leave us "free" to choose what we feel is best for our families, in fact it will reduce us to an educational choice of either, no childcare or kinder for our young children or a hurried catch-up of vaccines to access these services.

The Nuremberg Code tells us that no government may engage in "force, fraud, deceit, duress, over-reaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion" to make people accept any medical intervention.

It's interesting to note the Victorian legislation is trying to take this a step further and link medical intervention (or lack of it) with removal of our children's fundamental right to an education. This is extremely concerning. This is not equality.

As per the Australian Immunisation Handbook

2.1.3 – point 2 states "It must be given voluntarily in the absence of undue pressure, coercion or manipulation". The No Jab, No Play legislation is coercive and certainly puts pressure on working families to vaccinate, therefore it is no longer a voluntary choice!

Each vaccine comes with an insert outlining possible side effects (ad most medication does), to be able to obtain informed consent from a patient to have a vaccine they must be happy with the risks that are outlined in the insert. This is informed consent.

Where there is risk there must be choice "voluntarily in the absence of undue pressure, coercion or manipulation".

The Australian Immunisation Handbook states that (2.1.4) a "family history of any adverse affects after immunisation" is "false contraindication to vaccination". Meaning that if one child has a reaction then there is no reason subsequent children should not have vaccinations. This is alarming. When a GP sees a new patient, they ask about family history, any allergies, any reactions to medications etc. How can this not also apply to vaccinations?

Who is liable for possible damage due to reactions?

As I understand it Pharmaceutical companies, Government and Doctors are NOT liable for any damage that may occur due to a vaccine reaction. There have also been no long term studies into vaccines or any studies into the use or effects of having multiple vaccines at the same time.

These are reasons for concern and I would raise it as another point that parents, as the only parties responsible for their child's well being, should be the only ones to make the choice, freely without coercion or penalty.

I certainly acknowledge that vaccines are a good medical tool, however we need to be able to choose whether or not they are right for us as individuals and what risks we are willing to take, without financial or educational penalties. The penalties proposed via the No Jab, No Pay legislation and the removal of "conscientious objection" are "undue pressure, coercion and manipulation".

Please oppose this bill.

Many thanks  
Kerry Mazur