

Newsletter 18 Vaccines and the Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill

23 April 2013

Many of you will have received a reply from the HR Commission claiming that discrimination on the basis of vaccination status does not come under the scope of the draft HR and Anti-discrimination Bill even though the Health Act of 1953, which covers vaccination, does. This is a confusing statement and I have sent the following letter to the Commission to ask them to explain. I have also listed for you the ingredients of vaccines that were listed on the Australian Government's website until March 2013:

The ingredients of vaccines that were listed on the government website until March 2013:

- **Aluminium hydroxide**
- **Aluminium hydroxide/phosphate**
- **Aluminium phosphate**
- **Borax**
- **Egg Protein**
- **Formaldehyde**
- **Gelatin**
- **Gentamicin (antibiotic)**
- **Kanamycin (antibiotic)**
- **Monosodium Glutamate (MSG)**
- **Neomycin (Antibiotic)**
- **Phenol**
- **Phenoxyethanol**
- **Polymyxin (antibiotic)**
- **Thiomersal (49% ethyl mercury compound)**
- **Yeast**

Here is my reply to the Human Rights Commission:

Dear Mr. Mason,

Thankyou for your reply.

The Commission's claim that this Bill did not include discrimination on the basis of vaccination status even though discrimination under the Health Act of 1953 *is covered* in the scope of this Bill – is difficult to comprehend. In fact, the statements that the Commission has made in support of this claim are misleading and do not support the facts. I will address the claims the Commission has made to support this statement:

1. The Commission claims '***...there is nothing in any of these Acts or in regulations or legislative instruments under them, which compels a person to accept administration of the vaccines provided***'.

Yet Australia currently has a vaccination policy that is discriminating against parents when they enrol in some schools and childcare centres and when they collect their entitlement of \$2,100 in welfare benefits for each child. It is also affecting health students who wish to work in clinical positions and court cases between parents who disagree on the use of vaccines. These cases are ruling that children ***must be vaccinated*** when one parent opposes vaccination because the government states it is for 'the good of the community'. This *belief* is promoted by many individuals and lobby groups with known links to industry – many of whom do not have qualifications in health or vaccination science.

2. The evidence above shows that your statement that '**vaccination in Australia is not compulsory**' is not supported by the current policy and discrimination is already occurring *under the existing Health Act of 1953* – which is covered by the scope of this Bill.
3. **If bodily integrity is covered under the existing criminal law** (as is stated) can parents utilise this law to prevent their children being forced to have vaccines in court cases that are ruling that children must be vaccinated? Why should the Australian public have to apply criminal law to protect their bodily integrity in preventative public health policies?

4. **The Commission's claim that 'vaccination is outside the scope of the Bill'** does not explain why my submission on vaccination was accepted and published by the Committee for the Senate Inquiry?

There are many members of the community who do not support a vaccination policy that requires infants under one to be injected with 11 vaccines. In case you are not aware of what the government is asking parents to inject into their newborn babies I have listed the ingredients at the beginning of this letter. The media is providing misinformation to the public on the issue of vaccination and if point 1 (above) is correct then many institutions in Australia are unlawfully pressuring individuals to vaccinate and discriminating against unvaccinated individuals.

Educated parents do not want to inject these toxins into their newborn babies and I hope that you will provide a response that addresses these issues and explains how these toxins are in the best interest of the health of children when the government has not provided evidence that they are not linked to the escalating autism, allergies, anaphylaxis, ADHD and other neurological damage in children.

The government updated this list in March 2013 but until February 2013 mercury (thiomersal) was still an ingredient in the Hepatitis B vaccine (Engerix-B) that was given to infants and the Fluarix and Fluad influenza vaccines. To suggest that 'trace' amounts cannot cause harm is disingenuous and in combination with all the other ingredients the effects of these ingredients are unknown. This is because the schedule has never been tested in animals or in a controlled vaccinated and unvaccinated group of children. The Health Department has been claiming for decades that the rise in autism in children is a 'coincidence' and yet they have not funded an appropriate study with the correct parameters to find out. This is not an evidence –based policy and current vaccination policies that are pressuring parents to vaccinate are unethical.

A link to the new list of ingredients (March 2013) on the government website is here

<http://www.immunise.health.gov.au/internet/immunise/publishing.nsf/Content/appendix3>

I hope that the next response provided by the Commission will address these issues instead of ignoring them. Further evidence of the communities concerns can be found on my website www.vaccinationdecisions.net

Kind regards,

Judy Wilyman MSc (Population Health)

PhD Candidate