

July 9, 2018

The following is my response to the Globe and Mail's Andre Picard's Opinion piece of July 9, 2018 - '**No Jab, No Pay'. In Australia, no excuse accepted for unvaccinated kids**'. <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/opinion/article-no-jab-no-pay-in-australia-no-excuse-accepted-for-unvaccinated>

There is a significant challenge to our democracy and our rights as citizens of Canada. And Mr. Picard is a leading advocate to deprive Canadians of their Charter rights to fundamental freedoms of conscience and religion, but also the legal right to security of the person. Mr. Picard has regularly advocated for the loss of our rights under the guise of medical security through forced vaccinations.

For the government to attempt to enforce any vaccination program would mean that individuals no longer have self-determination over their own bodies or that of their children. Instead industry and government agents will have the right and the authority to impose medical interventions upon unwilling citizens. Mandatory vaccination would mean a significant change in how medicine is practiced. Presently every physician embraces informed consent. Forced vaccinations would disregard this medical ethic.

Mr. Picard seems to ignore that vaccination is a medical treatment with known risks including death. The fact is there is a major epidemic today, and contrary to media reports, the epidemic is not measles, the flu, polio, or whooping cough. It is autism, neurological disorders such as ADD and ADHD, learning disabilities, life threatening allergies, and juvenile diabetes. Polio was considered a major national emergency when 1 in 15,000 children developed symptoms of a paralytic condition. Today 1 child in 48 will develop autism, and 1 child in 5 will develop a life long disabling condition. But rather than address this medical emergency, Mr. Picard is promoting the loss of our Charter rights.

If my child were to develop a serious illness from a tainted food product, government inspectors would take immediate action. Food processing facilities would be closed, products would be recalled, health inspectors would test all products and equipment, media would make public announcements, medical treatments would be offered, and financial compensation would be expected.

Compare this response to the response when a child develops a disabling condition from a vaccine. No government inspectors are called. No vaccine processing is suspended. No products are identified and recalled. No public announcements are made. No medical treatment is offered. No financial compensation is provided. Instead there is silence and denial.

Instead of concern and care, concerted and intentional efforts are being made to silence victims of vaccine injury even more. Legislation is being considered in more than 13 states and at numerous provinces to remove the medical right to informed

consent. Personal and religious exceptions are being stripped away. And media has joined the chorus demanding forced vaccinations with no opportunity for dialogue. Any discussion on vaccine safety is considered irresponsible. Forced action for the 'common good' is urgently required.

The challenge is that the system as currently constructed has no independent oversight, no independent evaluation of risk, and no effective counter balance to the drive for more and more vaccines to be "recommended" by the pharmaceutical industry. Witness the tripling of the number of vaccines recommended since 1980 from 23 doses by age 18 to 70 doses today. And the 300 vaccines currently under development, 137 for infectious diseases

Consider:

The vaccine industry in the USA is exempted from legal liability for their products. In Canada, the industry enjoys de facto exemption due to the requirement of our court system to prove not only "causality", but also "negligence".

The issue of vaccination has become so politically charged that no government official or institution will openly question the need for vaccinations or the safety of vaccines.

The media has been told that the "science on vaccines is settled" and that giving voice to vaccine safety concerns is irresponsible journalism and therefore balance in reporting and programming with regards to vaccines in neither warranted nor required.

As a Consequence:

- There is no industry accountability.
- There is no effective government oversight.
- There is no legal accountability.
- There is no media scrutiny or oversight.

The system is perfectly designed to encourage and enable an unlimited number of vaccines to be "recommended" and ultimately mandated without informed consent or choice.

The decision to force vaccinations upon unwilling and non-consenting citizens is THE most serious and comprehensive action since the founding of Canada. The implications exceed the consequences of conscription during war, internment of Japanese Canadians in WWII, or the Indian Act that saw the forced removal of tens of thousands of Native children from their homes and placed in residential schools. The decision of forced vaccinations would affect each and every Canadian. No one would be exempt.

A One-Sided Conversation

However, rather than have thoughtful dialogue supported by extensive and rigorous evidence, we have a one sided conversation, which is no conversation at all. Could you imagine a trial where only the prosecution got to present their arguments? What confidence would we have in a judgment where the position taken and allowed was – “everyone knows the defendant is guilty and so we won’t bother to hear their position”.

Could you imagine a discussion on oil pipelines where only the arguments of the oil companies were presented? Or a discussion on fish farming where only the commercial fish farm owners got to make their claims? Yet, when the topic is the safety and effectiveness of vaccinations our media has abandoned the long standing tradition of open and thoughtful dialogue. Only one side of the story is being told.

Vaccines and immunology are incredibly complex issues. Not all vaccines are the same, made the same, contain the same ingredients, are made by the same manufacturers, or given to children at the same age with the same immune capacity. Vaccines are not a fixed, static entity. They are constantly changing, morphing, increasing, variable and multi-faceted. However, the medical establishment and the media treat vaccines as one uniform, homologous drug. Saying all vaccines are safe and effective is like saying all cars are safe and effective.

Questioning the safety of vaccines is not ‘anti-vaccine’ any more than questioning the safety of a particular model of car is ‘anti-automobile’.

Medicine is a for profit business. It operates on business principles. Its goal is to have the highest financial return possible, it attempts to eliminate competition, uses advertising and propaganda to promote its products, and uses lobbyists to influence government to provide it a favourable position in the market.

We ought to be extremely careful when business gets in the delivery of health products and is given authority to decide what goes into our bodies.

A decision of the significance of mandatory vaccinations and the loss of informed consent requires more conversation, not less. More information, not less. More evidence and scrutiny, not less. More caution, not less. More oversight, not less. Unfortunately the opposite is occurring.

The right to informed consent is being attacked and eroded. Those who have experienced the risks of vaccinations are being marginalized and silenced. And this medical tyranny is being aided and abetted by our national media, especially the Globe and Mail. Columnists as Andre Picard who describe those who question the safety of vaccines as “an oddball group of conspiracy theorists and religious zealots” are the norm rather than the exception. Numerous media reporters and journalists have disclosed that a de facto blackout exists in the media with regards to expressing concern about vaccine safety.

If Mr. Picard took his own question seriously - "Who are they?" he would discover most all of his so called "conspiracy theorists and religious zealots" are parents whose children have been damaged by vaccines. They obviously weren't anti-vaccine when they took their child in to their doctor, trusting he was doing the right thing. It was only after the damage by the vaccines and the lack of acknowledgement and ability to treat the damage that these parents became advocates for vaccine safety.

We are only now attempting to reconcile and heal from the damage done to an entire generation of Native people who experienced the tragic consequences of decisions made for their common good. The impact and the arrogance of the Canadian government will be felt by the Native community for generations to come. Yet this damage will pale in comparison to the potential damage caused by the forced injection of a pharmaceutical product without consent that carries known risks including life long disabilities and death.

We have a responsibility to the Canadian people to get this right. Short-circuiting the dialogue on vaccinations won't serve us well. Forcing vaccinations upon unwilling citizens will undermine our democracy. Taking away personal rights and freedoms will change Canada forever.

Rather than name calling and acting as an unabashed cheerleader for the pharmaceutical industry, Mr. Picard would do a better service by researching the answers to the following questions:

1. Has the current vaccine schedule ever been tested for safety in the real world way in which the schedule is implemented? For example, when a child goes receives 4 injections with 9 viruses, some live, some not, with various combinations of manufacturers at the same time, have these combinations been tested for safety?
2. Have we compared the long-term health outcomes of vaccinated children versus never vaccinated children?
3. Is there any independent biological science that has shown injecting ethyl mercury (thimerosal) into human beings is safe?
4. Is it reasonable or responsible to continue to inject human beings, particularly pregnant women, with this form of mercury that has never been tested by the FDA for safety?
5. Is the insistence in continuing to use mercury in vaccines in part responsible for the distrust of the public of the vaccine program?
6. Why is it that we don't hold the recently vaccinated with a live vaccine - chicken pox, measles, rubella, intranasal influenza, polio or smallpox

responsible for the spread of infectious diseases rather than the unvaccinated?

7. Is it more accurate to describe the current resistance to vaccine uptake a result of the lack of trust in vaccine policy, policy-makers, product manufacturers, profit motives, industry-apologists, biased media, and politicians?
8. Do you believe we should do everything in our power to restore that trust before enacting legislation designed to strong-arm, threaten, belittle, marginalize, and bully consumers into vaccine compliance?
9. Is it possible those bullying tactics, if employed, will backfire and have long lasting consequences on the vaccine program that could negatively affect public health?
10. Can and should the Center for Disease Control and Health Canada continue to be trusted on issues of vaccine safety given one of their own leading scientists has come forth as a federal whistleblower alleging scientific fraud by vaccine manufacturer Merck on MMR vaccine safety studies and two CDC scientists are suing Merck for fraud?
11. Is the breadth and depth of the studies done on the safety of the current vaccine schedule adequate given the research is being done only by those who profit from vaccines and/or are in charge of vaccine uptake?
12. Have the children who have gotten sick, disabled, or died from vaccine reactions been studied to identify their vulnerabilities, or the vaccine's defects so that we may identify other vulnerable children and prevent further tragedies and loss of life in the future?
13. Do we have a responsibility to those children, their families, and potential vaccine victims to conduct that independent science immediately?
14. Should anyone be forced to participate in the vaccine program until we can identify other vulnerable children and prevent further tragedies and loss of life in the future?
15. Is it "anti-vaccine" to take the position that we want evidence of long-term safety and the ability to identify vulnerable children and prevent further tragedies and loss of life in the future?
16. Is calling concerned parents "anti-vaccine" a way to control the discussion about vaccine safety by silencing and marginalizing them?

17. Is the current measles outbreak hysteria possibly a disguised way to use fear to remove religious and philosophical exemptions and a parent's right to determine what medical treatments their child will be subjected to?"

Tragically, I shared the above information with Mr. Picard in October 2016. At that time I was willing to give Mr. Picard a pass on the basis of ignorance. I now know that Mr. Picard knows better and still chooses to attack Canadians who wish to exercise their legal and moral right to informed consent and security of the person.

What is evident is Mr. Picard is not interested in what is in the best interests of Canadians. He is not interested in vaccine injury. He is not interested in proper oversight and accountability of the vaccine industry. Instead, Picard is an unabashed cheerleader for the medical/pharmaceutical industry with no regard for the consequences upon our children's health.

This callous disregard for victims of vaccine injury is unacceptable. If the Globe and Mail is genuinely committed to its code of ethics, this assault would no longer be tolerated.

Sincerely,

Ted Kuntz, Parent of a vaccine injured child
Vancouver, BC