

## Newsletter 62: The Australian Government and Choice in the Use of Vaccines

31 October 2013

Thank you to all of you who are following this research and recognising that *choice in vaccination* is a human rights issue. I am currently upgrading subscribers to my newsletter so if you would like to keep receiving these newsletters please visit my website and sign up through the website.

The Australian government consistently informs the public that vaccination in Australia is not compulsory yet many parents and employees risk losing their livelihoods if they choose not to vaccinate. A choice not to vaccinate in Australia, and still get [employment](#) in clinical situations, get a place in childcare centres, or receive the government parental welfare benefit of \$2,100, requires a signature from a doctor. Yet this is a medical practice that should require the informed consent of the parent.

In other words, *instead of doctors requiring parental consent to administer vaccines (a medical procedure) parents are required to get a doctor's signature to refuse this medical procedure.* Doctors are also being informed by the AMA that they do not have to sign parent's [refusal forms](#).

This is an infringement of our human rights and bodily integrity. Informed consent for medical procedures is covered by the International Bill of Human Rights that applies to all countries. I would also like to draw your attention to our Prime Minister, Tony Abbott's claims about the treatment of his own body. When Mr. Abbott was Health Minister nine years ago he stated "No-one is in charge of what goes into my mouth except me" *and* "No-one is in charge of what children put into their mouths except parents" (Four Corners, *Fat Chance*, 13 October 2014).

So, Mr. Abbott why is this claim different for substances that are injected into the human body - substances that are not listed to the public before a doctor gives a vaccine? And why are the ingredients of vaccines not easily accessible on the Immunise Australia Program (IAP) website? Does this classify as 'informed choice?' and why has the government misused the words [vaccination, immunisation and vaccine-preventable diseases](#) on the IAP website? This is misinforming the public.

Doctors are required to inform the public of the benefits and *risks* of vaccines but the risks of vaccines are being dismissed as 'anti-vaccination information' - does this classify as informed choice for a medical procedure? A lack of informed choice contravenes the *Good Practice Guidelines* for doctors *and* human rights conventions. This situation is also being promoted by a media that will not present the 'other side of the vaccination debate'. This situation has been documented with evidence on the [lobby group page](#) of my website.

This matter has been raised with Tim Wilson (6th February 2014), our new Commissioner for Individual Freedoms since January 2014. Prior to this, Australia did not have a Commissioner for individual human rights. Yet he has not answered the question of how it is legal for Australians to be discriminated against in employment, childcare places and welfare benefits when the government claims *vaccination in Australia is **not** compulsory. Is it compulsory or not?*

Please write to the government about your concerns for this discriminatory policy when doctors and the media are not fully informing the public about this medical practice even though our right to fully informed consent for medical practices is covered in all [human rights acts](#) since the Nuremberg Code.

**Judy Wilyman MSc (Population Health)**

**PhD Candidate**

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