

**From:** [Nick \[REDACTED\]](#)  
**To:** [Health and Community Services Committee](#)  
**Subject:** Public Health (Exclusion of Unvaccinated Children from Child Care) Amendment Bill 2013  
**Date:** Wednesday, 3 July 2013 8:48:52 PM

---

Dear Sir / Madam

I am writing with concern in regard to the proposed Public Health (Exclusion of Unvaccinated Children from Child Care) Amendment Bill 2013. I do not want this amendment to go through.

I do not agree with discrimination, segregation or penalties for parents and children who do not vaccinate. Especially since vaccinated families continue to contract the diseases for which they have been vaccinated against. Using measles as an example I would direct you to the following papers which illustrate this point (of which there are many more).

- Centres for Disease Control, Measles Outbreak amongst Vaccinated High School Students – Illinois. *MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* June 22 1984; 33(24):349-351.
- Hull, H.F., Montes, J.M., et al., Risk Factors for measles vaccine failure amongst immunized students. *Paediatrics* 1985;76:518-523.
- Davis, R.M., Whitman, E.D., et al., A persistent outbreak of measles despite appropriate prevention and control measures. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 1987;126:438-449.

This bill fundamentally attacks the right of the individual to control what is introduced into their own body. It is a fundamental, god given right that a man or woman has ownership of their person and may not be coerced or penalised into compliance of government with fear or bullying (rather than education).

As a parent who decided not to vaccinate our children after considerable research, I would like to point out that I am highly educated and make informed decisions. It is not the role of government to force compliance of (in my opinion) unsound medical practice onto the populace of Australia. This bill if passed will pave the way for all states of Australia to enact similar legislation.

I would like to draw your attention to your own literature in the Queensland Health Guide to Informed Decision Making in Healthcare, specifically Part 1:1.2 where it is stated that:

“Informed decision-making is the two-way communication process between a patient and one or more health practitioners that is central to patient-centred healthcare. It reflects the ethical principle that a patient has the right to decide what is appropriate for them, taking into account their personal circumstances, beliefs and priorities.

This includes the right to accept or to decline the offer of certain healthcare and to change that decision. In order for a patient to exercise this right to decide, they require the information that is relevant to them. Consent is a basic legal principle that reflects a person's agreement to something. In a healthcare context it means a person's agreement to something being performed on them or a sample being taken from them.

Informed consent, in a legal sense, reflects that a patient has received the information relevant to them to make an informed decision and they have given permission for the healthcare to be provided. In an ethical sense the provision of informed consent by a patient reflects the end point of a process of engagement in which one or more health practitioners have supported the patient to come to an informed decision to agree to the healthcare offered.”

The proposed bill will violate this basic right of the patient to “accept or to decline the offer of certain healthcare and to change that decision” as the bill would penalise those who have made the informed decision not to vaccinate from accessing the right of every individual to public education and care.

Yours faithfully

Nicholas Robinson

 Porongurup WA 6324