

Amanda Olsen

Ms Lizzie Blandthorn MP,
Chair, Scrutiny of Acts and Regulations Committee
Parliament of Victoria,
Spring Street,
East Melbourne Vic 3002

sarc@parliament.vic.gov.au

29th September 2015

RE: Public Health and Wellbeing Amendment (No Jab, No Play) Bill 2015

Amendment of the Public Health and Wellbeing Act 2008

The Bill's objective of reducing risk from infectious diseases

I oppose the proposed bill for the following documented reasons:

1) Victorian Charter of Human Rights

The proposed legislation is in breach of the following rights under the charter:

a) Your right to recognition and equality before the law (section 8)

Everyone is entitled to equal and effective protection against discrimination, and to enjoy their human rights without discrimination.

This legislation is discriminatory to children and their parents by denying them access to early childhood education due to their health choices and beliefs.

b) Your right to life (section 9)

Every person has the right to life and to not have their life taken. The right to life includes a duty on government to take appropriate steps to protect the right to life.

This legislation poses a risk to the health and safety of children's lives as vaccines are not efficacious or safe and deaths do occur due to vaccine reactions.

c) Your right to protection from torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment (section 10)

*People must not be tortured. People must also not be treated or punished in a cruel, inhuman or degrading way. This includes **protection from treatment that humiliates a person.***

People must not be subjected to medical treatment or experiments without their full and informed consent

This charter point is breached in two different ways. Firstly, to be forced to pull your child out of kindergarten or not be able to go at all is humiliating; our private medical choices will no longer be private and vilification from the community will ensue. Secondly, **full and informed consent** of all of the risks of vaccination and a right to decline the procedure once the risks are understood is absolutely essential and not occurring with this bill. You must have the option to opt out of medical procedures without risk of discrimination or negative treatment by the government.

According to the Better Health Victoria website *'Informed consent is a process of finding out information about the recommended treatment, and weighing up the benefits and risks involved. It is not about just signing a form.*

Some ways to take an active role in your own treatment include:

Find out as much as you can about the procedure. The best way to be actively involved in your care is to learn about the procedure, as well as about its risks and possible complications.

Find out beforehand if something could go wrong. It's too late once the procedure is done.

Take responsibility for your health care decisions. You need to decide about your medical treatment, although it is important to consider the advice of your doctor when doing so'.

http://www.betterhealth.vic.gov.au/bhcv2/bhcarticles.nsf/pages/Informed_consult_for_medical_treatment

This legislation will take away our right to informed consent and medical choices for our families. Non vaccinating parents undertake hours of research and due to this understand that there are huge risks associated with vaccination, especially in high risk groups with genetic polymorphisms.

d) Your right to privacy and reputation (section 13)

Everyone has the right to keep their lives private. Your family, home or personal information cannot be interfered with, unless the law allows it.

If forced to pull their child out of kindergarten and childcare, or not being able to enrol at all, families' private medical decisions will become common knowledge within their community. The result of this would be exclusion, vilification and fear due to the amount of misinformation written in the media about non vaccinating families. I for one greatly fear my privacy being invaded.

e) Your right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion and belief (section 14)

People have the freedom to think and believe what they want, for example, religion. They can do this in public or private, as part of a group or alone.

This bill does not allow for freedom of belief. If our beliefs do not fit with mainstream then we will be punished by the bill and treated differently to others. That is discrimination.

f) Your right to protection of families and children (section 17)

Families are entitled to protection. Children have the same rights as adults with added protection according to their best interests.

Vaccination is not a one size fits all model. Children are not small adults and have a unique immune system. Many children suffer from genetic polymorphisms, such as MTHFR, that leaves their systems unable to process and eliminate large amounts of toxins. This causes large scale toxic build up,

causing neurological damage and comes with great risk to their systems. Known vaccine toxins such as aluminium adjuvants, formaldehyde and mercury pose a great danger to their delicate systems and vaccinating is a huge risk to their health. Genetic polymorphisms should be recognised by the legislation and included within the too strict medical exemption parameters.

g) Your right to liberty and security of person (section 21)

*Everyone has the right to freedom and safety. The right to liberty includes the right to not be arrested or detained except in accordance with the law. The right to security means that reasonable steps must be taken to **ensure the physical safety of people who are in danger of physical harm.***

Vaccines can and do cause great harm. Taking away rights to access education by forcing parents to vaccinate to enter kindergarten puts children in the danger of physical harm, especially those in high risk categories, like MTHFR, that are not recognised by the strict parameters of this legislation.

2) Convention of the Rights of a Child

According to the "Convention of the Rights of a Child" document, the No Jab, No Play policy breaches this convention for the following reasons:

Article 18

1. States Parties shall use their best efforts to ensure recognition of the principle that both parents have common responsibilities for the upbringing and development of the child. Parents or, as the case may be, legal guardians, have the primary responsibility for the upbringing and development of the child. The best interests of the child will be their basic concern.

As a parent my primary concern is to protect my child from being injected with vaccines that have many possible side effects as listed on the information provided by the vaccine manufacturer.

2. For the purpose of guaranteeing and promoting the rights set forth in the present Convention, States Parties shall render appropriate assistance to parents and legal guardians in the performance of their child-rearing responsibilities and shall ensure the development of institutions, facilities and services for the care of children.

Denying unvaccinated children of access to early education is a clear breach of this act.

3. States Parties shall take all appropriate measures to ensure that children of working parents have the right to benefit from child-care services and facilities for which they are eligible.

The "No Jab No Play policy" would discriminate against children whose parents choose not to vaccinate.

3) The genetic basis for vaccine damage in children

The No Jab No Play legislation poses a grave risk of permanent neurological injury to genetically vulnerable children who can't efficiently eliminate the many toxins found in vaccines. Vaccines given to children today are admitted by the CDC to contain aluminum, mercury, monosodium glutamate and formaldehyde -- all known neurotoxins. While healthy people with the right genetic makeup might eliminate these toxins relatively quickly, there is a subgroup of genetically susceptible children and adults who cannot. These individuals are genetically "hyper-susceptible" to vaccine damage. In effect, they are "genetic ticking time bombs" of vaccine damage.

The legislation and rigid medical exemption parameters makes no mention of this genetic susceptibility, nor does the law require the state to conduct genetic screening of children before subjecting them to the potentially dangerous medical intervention of vaccines.

Those children who suffer from these genetic vulnerabilities will be deliberately sacrificed by the Victorian government in this effort to coerce all children into being vaccinated in order to access kindergarten and early childcare services.

4) MTHFR gene polymorphism and Vaccine Reactions

If vaccinations are to be linked to access to early childhood education, then all families need to be aware and have the right to know about their children's genetic weaknesses before vaccinations are imposed! **This is a very personal issue for my family, as myself and both my children have the genetic polymorphism MTHFR.**

Did you know that approx 15% of the general population have 2 mutations in the MTHFR C677T enzyme which means they are unable to remove most toxins from their body?

The point I am making is that we need to know what our genetic weaknesses are before being subjected to vaccines and their preservatives. If the government sincerely believe that mandatory vaccinations for all is for the good of the people, then it needs to be mandatory that genetic counselling and testing be a requirement prior to the forced vaccinations.

I am asking the SARC to think this through before too many more genetically weakened children are harmed. Before children are vaccinated, there needs to be some sort of mandated "Your Right To Know Your Genetics and Side Effects of Vaccinations" disclosure and genetic tests done prior to vaccinations so parents can chose to opt out upon disclosure of genetic results.

The published medical study Genetic Basis for Adverse Events after Smallpox Vaccination, which says:

Genetic polymorphisms in genes expressing an enzyme previously associated with adverse reactions to a variety of pharmacologic agents (MTHFR) and an immunological transcription factor (IRF1) were associated with [Adverse Events] after smallpox vaccination in 2 independent study samples... All of the vaccinia virus-naive subjects who were enrolled in the study developed pock formation at the vaccination site, and a subset experienced systemic reactions that included fever, rash, or regional lymphadenopathy.

...Three variant genotypes were confirmed to be associated with AEs in the second study. These included 1 SNP in the methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase gene (MTHFR) ($P < .01$) and 2 SNPs in the interferon regulatory factor-1 gene (IRF1) ($P = .03$). The strong significance of the association in the replication study suggested a high level of plausibility that the gene products were involved in the pathogenesis of the [Adverse Events].

This study confirms that vaccines caused a spike in adverse events among those with the

genetic predisposition. Vaccine damage, in other words, can be correlated with a child's DNA. A genetic test, conducted *before* vaccinating, could alert a parent or a doctor to a heightened risk of vaccine injury. Armed with this information, a parent might rationally decide to avoid vaccinating that child and thereby prevent that child from becoming brain damaged or even made autistic by the vaccine's toxic adjuvants and additives.

My children already suffer from health issues due to MTHFR, including gut issues, behavioural and concentration issues and many food sensitivities. We have excluded chemicals from all areas of our lives due to the condition and I know that vaccinating them would be a huge risk to their health.

For all of the above reasons, I implore you to reconsider this bill.

Sincerely,

Amanda Olsen