

From: Miranda Mayo <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, 1 October 2015 10:27 PM
To: SARC
Subject: Vaccination objection

I write to object to the changes to Social Services Legislation Amendment (No Jab, No Pay) Bill 2015 No. , 2015 removing conscientious objection for personal, philosophical, religious or medical beliefs. Vaccines are unavoidably unsafe. The National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act itself says that vaccines are "products which, in the present state of human knowledge, are quite incapable of being made safe." The list of known side effects of vaccines include death, encephalitis, anaphylaxis, brain damage, paralytic disorders, and seizures to name a few.

Under the Bill of Rights of the Child, "States Parties shall respect the rights and duties of the parents and, when applicable, legal guardians, to provide direction to the child in the exercise of his or her right in a manner consistent with the evolving capacities of the child."

Article 26 "States Parties shall recognize for every child the right to benefit from social security, including social insurance, and shall take the necessary measures to achieve the full realization of this right in accordance with their national law.

The benefits should, where appropriate, be granted, taking into account the resources and the circumstances of the child and persons having responsibility for the maintenance of the child, as well as any other consideration relevant to an application for benefits made by or on behalf of the child."

The legislation diminishes the capacity for parents to provide and make decisions for the child's health and well-being based on the individual circumstances without coercion or threat of exclusion. It is a discriminatory law

In <http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/.../503827.pdf;fileType=applicatio...>

"Article 12 recognises the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health. In particular, State Parties shall take steps necessary for 'the reduction of ... infant mortality and for the healthy development of the child' and the 'prevention, treatment and control of epidemic, endemic, occupational and other diseases'

In this study, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3170075/> a strong correlation was found between infant mortality and the number of vaccines given. The conclusion being that "All nations—rich and poor, advanced and developing—have an obligation to determine whether their immunization schedules are achieving their desired goals." And "Although some studies were unable to find correlations between SIDS and vaccines, 22–24 there is some evidence that a subset of infants may be more susceptible to SIDS shortly after being vaccinated. For example, Torch found that two-thirds of babies who had died from SIDS had been vaccinated against DPT (diphtheria–pertussis–tetanus toxoid) prior to death. Of these, 6.5% died within 12 hours of vaccination; 13% within 24 hours; 26% within 3 days; and 37%, 61%, and 70% within 1, 2, and 3 weeks, respectively."

Clearly it is premature for Premier Daniel Andrews to state categorically that "the science is in" when it is a fact that unvaccinated children are far healthier than vaccinated and it is irrefutable that there is evidence that vaccination can lead to death and many parents awarded compensation for injury and death. Since the inception of the Vaccine Injuries and Adverse Reactions program in the United States, over \$2.5 billion to individuals and families who have suffered vaccine injury and death. These awards are funded by taxes on vaccines but more alarming is that only 1-10% of vaccine injuries and deaths are actually filed with the government. This is a far cry from the 1 in a million reactions. In Australia, we have no such program.

When the Minister says, "Further, these families continue to have the right to uphold their conscientious or religious belief by electing not to receive child care benefit, child care rebate or the family tax benefit Part A supplement". It would surely follow that these families should also be exempt from paying all taxes and rates, in order to exact their free will and common law rights to conscientious or religious beliefs and should receive compensation from all taxes paid, including taxes paid by their parents, who

have built the nation of Australia. The State is effectively discriminating against parents for their choice to make decisions that do not conform to the state sanctioned belief in vaccination.

I say belief, because vaccination is not proven to provide immunity and in many cases, such as with whooping cough has been linked to the spread of disease. The CDC reports that in the United States, cases of whooping cough have increased approximately 10-fold in the last twenty years, DESPITE AN INCREASE IN VACCINATION COVERAGE FROM 61% to 96%.

The Minister for Social Services also writes, "Additionally, families affected by this measure are still eligible to receive fortnightly payments of family tax benefit to assist with the costs of raising children"

Yet, the Australian Council of Social Service in 2015, released a report revealing poverty is growing in Australia, with an estimated 2.5 million people, or 13.9 per cent, living below the internationally accepted poverty line. It also found 603,000, or 17.7 per cent, of all children are living in poverty.

The impact of a loss of FTB supplement (approximately \$700 per child per year) and childcare rebates that enable parents, to return to work is substantial and tantamount to coercion and assault. At Common Law, assault is defined as an intentional act by one person that creates an apprehension in another of an imminent harmful or offensive contact.

The legislation is designed by its own admission to take \$508 million dollars from families in the next 4 years. It is a budget measure not a health measure because savings could only be made if parents continue to refuse to vaccinate their children. There is no exemptions for home schooling families who already save the government in excess of \$10,000 per student per year and thus the State is failing in upholding, the rights of the child, in respect to "benefits should, where appropriate, be granted, taking into account the resources and the circumstances of the child"

It is a discriminatory law because the government is targeting low income earning families, and not high income families who will not be impacted by the changes. Professor Leask of the University of Sydney, says the policy amounts to a form of "mandatory vaccination" for lower income families that won't motivate higher income families who are more prevalent among vaccine objectors.

I regard, that changes to Social Services Legislation

Amendment is tantamount to assault on the most vulnerable in our society, denial of fundamental human rights, especially to freedom of thought and religion.

The extension of this legislation to affect all children under 20 from receiving FTB supplement unless they adhere to a government mandated vaccine schedule is abhorrent. It is akin to the dark days of conscription, when Australia sent her young men to fight in the Vietnam War, only to abandon them when they came home. Vaccine damaged children are left by the wayside, as are grieving parents to pick up the pieces. Denial and coincidence are used as weapons by the medical establishment against parents who watch their children harmed or killed by vaccination.

This legislation takes away the rights of parents to informed consent but it opens a conversation that we as a society should be having about vaccination. We should not blindly trust pharmaceutical companies that make billions of dollars profit from vaccination. If the government is going to have a register for vaccination then this register should also record all vaccine reactions from minor to major, all deaths, and linked to Medicare to provide data about the short and long term effects of vaccination on both the vaccinated and unvaccinated and the collated data should be made publically available online and be independently audited.

There will be many unintended consequences of this legislation, as parents will be caught up in the need to catch up on vaccination in order to receive payment. This catch-up interval of 6 months will put many lives at risk and cause grievous bodily harm to a whole generation of children. Parents will no longer be able to make decisions to selectively vaccinate, delay vaccination, or refuse all vaccination based on their child's individual needs because of these coercive policies. The rights of the child is diminished when you diminish the rights of their parents.

Vaccines carry risks and parents have the right to be informed of the risks with at least a 10 business day cooling off period to fully consider whether or not to vaccinate their child. Ultimately, they and their children will bear the consequences of that decision. Doctors should be mandated to document all health issues and health status prior to and after vaccination. There should be a website and forms available to report vaccine reactions and data collected. Doctors should face criminal prosecution for injecting babies and children with adult vaccines, incorrect vaccines, and when

they do not follow due process and inject sick children with vaccines causing serious reactions and damage or vaccinating premature babies. Pharmaceutical companies should be held liable for vaccine damage and death. Families of vaccine injured children should be given immediate financial support and not left to fend for themselves. Doctors should not be allowed to write off injury, death or reactions to vaccines as coincidence and it should be mandatory that all deaths of babies be investigated for whether vaccination contributed to or caused the death.

The death or injury of a vaccinated child should not be considered collateral damage.

Parents must retain the right to conscientious objection.

They should retain the right to refuse to object without financial penalty to injecting their children with human albumin, human diploid cells, residual components of MRC-5 cells including DNA and proteins, bovine serum, hydrolyzed gelatin, and chicken embryo, monkey kidney cells and calf serum, vesicle fluid from calf skins, human diploid cells from aborted fetal tissue, thimerosal, sorbitol, formaldehyde, polysorbate 80 (Tween-80), ammonium sulfate, formalin, and sucrose and many other chemicals and neurotoxins that have unknown consequences in each individual.

Yours sincerely,

Miranda Mayo