

December 19, 2019

David Coon
MLA, Fredericton South
Leader, Green Party

Dear David

I am writing to you in your capacity as a member of the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick, and, even more importantly, in your capacity as the leader of the Green Party of New Brunswick.

It is my understanding that you have declared your support for Bill 11: An Act Respecting Proof of Immunization with the condition that the notwithstanding clause be removed. Your position is that “*all children who are able, should be immunized.*”

If I understand your position correctly, then it appears that you do not understand the nature of vaccination, nor do you recognize the impact of this legislation on our rights and freedoms.

Vaccination is Not Immunization

Bill 11 requires “*proof of immunization*” in order for our children to access their legal and moral right to a public education. The fact is a child’s *immune status* is not even considered in this legislation. This legislation only considers their ‘*vaccination status*’. Vaccination is not immunization. Immunity is a complex phenomenon that is grossly oversimplified by the claim that the temporary production of antibodies via vaccination means that one is immune from infection.

Are you aware that many of the vaccines required under Bill 11 are not even designed to prevent infection or transmission; these vaccines are designed solely to reduce the symptoms of an infection should one occur. To mandate all vaccines under the guise of preventing infection is false, dishonest, and deceptive. This legislation furthers this deception by implying that vaccination equals immunization and therefore prevents infection.

An undisputed example of this is the pertussis vaccine. According to the FDA, those vaccinated with DTaP will have fewer symptoms of pertussis, however they can still become infected and transmit pertussis. Of concern is recent research which reveals that individuals vaccinated for pertussis “*will be more susceptible to pertussis throughout their lifetimes*”.¹

What this means is that children who are vaccinated for pertussis are more likely to become infected with pertussis than those who are unvaccinated. Further, these children are more likely to spread pertussis because they are asymptomatic carriers. Vaccination with pertussis actually places vulnerable individuals *more at risk* given an vaccinated individual may not be aware that he or she is infectious and therefore will not take necessary precautions to prevent transmission to others. In contrast, an unvaccinated individual who contracts pertussis is more likely to be aware that he or she is infected and take the necessary precautions to avoid infecting others.

¹ <https://academic.oup.com/jpids/article-abstract/8/4/334/5359449>

If the intention of New Brunswick's vaccine mandates is to prevent those that are not "immunized" from attending and receiving a public education, then it follows that the government will need to be more vigilant and take further actions to prevent unimmunized children from attending school.

Specifically:

1. Approximately 10% of the population are 'non-responders' to artificial immune stimulation. Will these non-responders be allowed to attend school?
2. The anti-body levels of the vaccinated wanes over time meaning they are no longer "immunized". Will titre testing be conducted on an annual basis on every individual to determine who has adequate antibody levels? Will those with less than adequate antibody levels be denied a public education?
3. Will immune-compromised children who can't be vaccinated be allowed to receive a public education? And if so, will they not pose a risk to other immune compromised children?
4. If disease transmission is really what the proponents of vaccine mandates are concerned about, would it not follow that children recently vaccinated with live-virus vaccines also be excluded from schools until it has been established that the viral shedding has ceased?

I think we both know the answers to these questions.

None of the unvaccinated immune-compromised children will be denied access to a public education. None of the non-responders to the artificial stimulation of the immune system via vaccines will be denied a public education. None of the significant number of children and adults whose immunity has waned because of the temporary nature of the immunity provided by vaccines will be denied a public education.

We know there is no proposed titre testing to determine who is actually considered immune to infection and who is not. And there is no acknowledgement given, much less consideration of the viral shedding from a recently vaccinated child. The fact is a child can be vaccinated with a live virus vaccine in the gymnasium and be back in their classroom within minutes.

This means that the restrictions being imposed upon unvaccinated or selectively vaccinated children is not about medical risk. What is obvious, if we dare to think about it, is that vaccine mandates are not about making the public space safer. Vaccine mandates and school expulsion are punishment for challenging vaccine ideology. Vaccine mandates are a crude and heartless means to coerce families to vaccinate their children by creating hardship and threatening the future of their children. Vaccine mandates is effectively threatening a parent by saying – *"Do as I say or your child will be denied a public education."*

Finally, public health official recognize that anti-body levels are a poor predictor of "immunity". The fact is individuals can have high antibody levels and still become infected, and others can have low antibody levels and be immune to infection. Our understanding of immunity is in its infancy.

Violating Humanitarian Rights

David, I find it confusing that you recognize the serious and detrimental impact of including the 'notwithstanding clause', however fail to recognize that removing the clause does not alter the fact that Bill 11 is a clear and flagrant violation of our Charter rights and freedoms.

Your position in support of Bill 11, albeit without the notwithstanding clause, is a statement that you support the elimination of the legal and ethical right to informed consent, you support the denial of a parent's right and responsibility to make medical decisions for their children, you support the denial of bodily sovereignty (my body, my choice), and you support withholding a child's right to a public education.

Do you not recognize that those who suppress individual rights and freedoms are enablers of fascism, authoritarianism, totalitarianism, despotism and corporatism?

There is no medical emergency to justify the loss of our precious rights and freedoms. The "crisis" being foisted upon the Province of New Brunswick is a 'manufactured crisis' by a financially conflicted and liability-free industry. Eleven cases of measles with no permanent disability or mortality is not a medical crisis. Further, your own Chief Medical Officer is unwilling to disclose how many of the individuals who contracted measles were fully vaccinated. Her unwillingness to be fully transparent with this information ought to send strong warning signals to legislators.

Mandating the Injection of Neurotoxins

Finally, how is it that the Green Party can be avid champions and show admirable leadership in defending our right to live in a toxic-free environment, yet seem completely oblivious to the impact of injecting known toxins into our infants and children? Mercury and aluminum are even more dangerous in the internal environment of the human body, especially in infancy when the brain and neurological infrastructure is developing.

It seems there is some cognitive dissonance here for the Greens.

I trust you are aware that mercury is the most toxic substance on the planet that is not radioactive. Yet we are injecting mercury into our citizens and pregnant mothers. Aluminum is a known neurotoxin and is used in medical research to purposely stimulate autoimmunity disease in animals. The safety of injected aluminum has not been established, yet over 60% of the vaccines on the NB childhood vaccine schedule contain aluminum.

In my presentation to the Standing Committee on Law Amendments I outlined how the safety of the vaccine program has not been established. Again, this is not my opinion, rather it is the opinion of the Institute of Medicine. In 2011 the Institute of Medicine reviewed 155 health conditions associated with the *Varicella*, *Tetanus*, *Hepatitis B* and *MMR* vaccines. In only 5 cases did the scientific evidence reject causation. In 134 cases the IOM deemed that there were **too few scientifically sound studies** published in the medical literature to determine whether more than 100 serious brain and immune system problems *are or are not caused by the vaccines*, including multiple sclerosis, arthritis, lupus, stroke, SIDS, autism and asthma.²

I also explained how none of the vaccines on the NB childhood vaccination schedule were safety tested against a neutral placebo. The bottom line is that the science has not been done to demonstrate the safety or effectiveness of artificial immune stimulation using injected ingredients. To mandate the injection of these powerful and dangerous ingredients that permanently alter the immune system is more than medical malpractice, it is criminal and cannot be permitted.

²<https://www.nvic.org/PDFs/IOM/2013researchgaps-IOMchildhoodimmunizationschedulea.aspx>

It is the place of government to make recommendations. To shift from recommendations to mandates, without adequate evidence of safety and effectiveness, and to do so in the absence of any true emergency is to support a society based upon tyranny rather than humanitarianism.

When you examine the justification given for eroding parental rights, the medical right to informed consent and constitutional rights, it isn't what they claim it is. It isn't about medical risk. It isn't about compassion for the medically fragile. This is the sham of the medical industry. This is the deception of the vaccine lobbyists. This is the lie perpetuated by the mainstream media.

The medical industry is a for-profit corporation that is captured by greed, arrogance, a lack of accountability, and willful ignorance. This is a profession that purports to have compassion for the vulnerable but has no compassion for the vaccine injured or those made medically fragile as a result of vaccination. This is all about imposing vaccine products, with or without your consent.

So, when a politician, medical professional or vaccine industry lobbyist tells you that school mandates are necessary to protect the vulnerable, let them know that you see through their fraud and deception. Tell them you see their lack of integrity. Tell them that if they really had compassion for the vulnerable, they would have compassion for the vaccine injured.

Dr Gregory Poland of the Mayo Clinic Vaccine Research Group has stated – *“The current science doesn't allow for an informed understanding of an individual's genetically determined risk for an adverse event due to a vaccine.”* This means we do not know who will be injured or killed from a vaccine and who will be unscathed. To mandate a liability-free product that has the potential to permanently injure and kill and not permit the ethical and legal right to informed consent is unconscionable.

The reality is that this is not a medical issue. This is a human rights issue. This is conceivably the most important human rights issue in the history of New Brunswick. If the risk is really about measles, the NB government would be developing health policies focused on measles and measles alone. Instead, what we are seeing is a broad attack on the basic human right of free, prior and informed consent.

The right decision is to strike down Bill 11, with or without the notwithstanding clause.

Sincerely,

Ted Kuntz, parent of a vaccine injured child, now deceased