

From: Rolly Services - Rob and Molly [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 2 October 2015 12:39 AM
To: SARC
Subject: Proposed no jab no play policy

Dear Ms Lizzie Blandthorn,

We write to express our sincere opposition to the proposed changes to the rights of all parents and children in Victoria, with the proposed removal of a basic human right, the freedom of choice as to whether to undertake or refuse a medical procedure.

This is wrong on many levels. It is a form of discrimination against people who choose to make informed decisions based upon many factors including speaking with their doctor assess the risks of vaccinating (real risks which the scientists and vaccine documentation acknowledge) no matter how 'rare' the risks might be people should have a choice as to whether they expose their child to these risks without fear of segregation and persecution from the community and public places. The discrimination laws are in place to protect those with known disability and illness, how can the same laws discriminate against kids who aren't sick? Even kids known to have transmittable diseases are granted access to childcare and early childhood education, how is it fair to deny the same basic rights to children who do not carry disease?

I'm sure I don't need to list and quote the specific areas of the Victorian charter of human rights and the convention of the rights of a child as listed under Australia's international human rights obligations, as this is your area of expertise particularly.

By all means implement the policy as a way of encouraging and reminding people who choose to vaccinate that they are behind the recommended schedule, but do not remove contentious objection. If you remove conscientious objection and parents are forced to vaccinate to be given the basic rights afforded to all families, then please tell us who will be held accountable for any vaccine related injuries - which we know do occur by looking at the vaccine damage payouts in many other countries around the world! If it is up to the government to decide what is best for all children, then I'm guessing the government will be the ones putting their hand up to take responsibility for any vaccine damage, is this so?

Also if you are thinking of removing these rights of parents to conscientiously object based on a 'greater community good' then we guess every person who enters a childcare facility be it a parent, carer, visitor or center administrator will also need to provide evidence of up to date vaccines for all vaccine preventable diseases too? This would only be right, if a child who's not up to date is a genuine risk then I guess any person not up to date would be a risk?

I really hope that you see that there are many floors in the proposed policy that push many legal and ethical boundaries when it comes to discrimination and human rights. This issue also brings to mind the basic legal principals of contracting out of law. If it is not illegal to not vaccinate, how can we make a law to penalize and discriminate against people who choose not too? How can we deny children access to services and education for doing something which is legal? It is legal to not vaccinate! Parents and children are not breaking laws by not vaccinating or vaccinating on a delayed schedule because they feel it better for the health and well being of their child.

Thankyou for taking the time to read and consider our submission and our apologies if this piece may not be 100% cohesive in content, but we hope you understand that we believe in choice for all. True choice without consequence and discrimination, true choice without the government holding childcare services and education as a ransom. Implement the policy as a reminder for those who need it, but recognise the need and place for genuine conformed consent and conscientious objection.

Kind regards,

Rob and Molly Booth