

# Newsletter 78 The Australian Government's Disclaimer for Vaccine Information

If the Australian government is introducing public policies that mandate a medical intervention *in the community's best interest*, then the public would expect the government to be supporting the information because it is stated to be for a legitimate public health purpose. The public also expects that the government can claim the information is accurate, current and complete. However, the Commonwealth of Australia states in the [disclaimer](#) on the Immunise Australia Program (IAP) website that the actions recommended on this website do not necessarily indicate the government's 'commitment to a particular course of action' and that the views and recommendations may be from 'third parties'. It also states that it does not warrant that the information is 'accurate, current or complete' or accept any legal liability for 'injury, loss or damage'.

A government that is implementing mandatory use of multiple vaccines in infants should be able to declare that it endorses the information it is providing to support its policy and that it is committed to the actions it is recommending to the public. The public expects the government, *not third parties*, to be making the recommendations for public health policy and they expect it to be *for a legitimate public health purpose*. Yet the Australian government not only does not endorse the information it is providing about vaccines but states 'Users should exercise their own independent skill or judgement or seek professional advice before relying on it' and it is for 'information purposes only'.

If mandating vaccines in public policies is necessary for public health then the Australian government would be declaring its commitment to this course of action. The government has not declared its commitment or stated that the actions are for a legitimate public health purpose, instead it has disowned the views and recommendations in the statements in this disclaimer. Yet, based on the information it is providing, the Australian government is implementing a policy that will remove the right for *some* employees and families to control what substances they inject into their own bodies. Surely, a legitimate public health purpose would require that the policy is applied to the whole Australian community and not a selected section of the community?

The Australian Human Rights Commissioner, Tim Wilson, states that governments can only infringe on human rights if the recommended actions are for a legitimate public health purpose and proportionate to the risk. If the health department cannot state it is committed to the actions it is recommending on the IAP website, and warrant that the information is accurate and complete, then mandating vaccines for *some* people in a public policy is not for a legitimate public health purpose. The critical question for the development of this policy is 'Has the safety, efficacy and necessity of vaccines recommended in the government schedule been conclusively demonstrated?' The government's disclaimer implies that it has not been conclusively demonstrated and until the government can commit to this course of action there is no case for removing human rights by implementing mandatory vaccination for some Australians. Such a policy discriminates against healthy people and can cause more harm than good to human health.

The Australian government is claiming that vaccines are safe and effective based on selective studies that are funded by industry or by government bodies such as the US [Centers for Disease Control and Prevention](#) (CDC) and the Australian NCIRS with industry sponsorship. These bodies also have a conflict of interest in funding this research because they influence policy decisions. Vaccines are being recommended by national governments based on information that is not

assessed by independent researchers and [many studies have not been done](#) that would prove the safety and efficacy of the government's schedule of vaccines. This is why the Australian government will not declare that the information it is providing is accurate, current or complete.

Judy Wilyman  
PhD Candidate

[www.vaccinationdecisions.net](http://www.vaccinationdecisions.net)

## No Jab, No Pay, No Way! National Rallies

[National rallies](#) are being held across Australia on 20 September 2015 to protest the governments 'No Jab, No Play' policy that requires all children (up to 19 years of age) to be fully vaccinated with all the recommended vaccines for parents to receive childcare and family welfare benefits. Full vaccination is also being required by some institutions for employment. The government has been increasing the number of vaccines on this national schedule since 1990 *after all infectious diseases declined as a risk to the majority of people in developed countries*. This protest is about freedom of choice yet the mainstream media will not present the community's voice on this issue. continues to present the issue as a pro- and anti- vaccination debate. This is incorrect because all the science needs to be debated to determine the benefits of vaccination programs. Here is a [flyer](#) to promote the national rallies in your capital city. The government is providing selective

## Petition to Prevent and Adult Vaccination Register

Please sign this [petition](#) to prevent an adult vaccination register from being established in Australia and support the rallies in your nearest capital city on 20 September to demonstrate your support for *freedom of choice* in all medical interventions.

---

[Email Judy Wilman](mailto:Judy.Wilman@forward-to-friend2.com) | [http://us8.forward-to-friend2.com/forward?  
u=f20605fde3732e41929f4a3f2&id=4ff41e4eb4&e=fec8337d3c](http://us8.forward-to-friend2.com/forward?u=f20605fde3732e41929f4a3f2&id=4ff41e4eb4&e=fec8337d3c)

Copyright © 2015 Judy Wilyman, All rights reserved.  
You are receiving this email because you opted in at our website.