

# Danger to Children in California's "No Parental Consent" Vaccination Law

By Kevin A Muhammad

<http://www.kamuhammad.net>

THE FINAL CALL

January 10, 2012

Vol. 31, No. 14

Thousands of parents have expressed deep concern over California's newly amended Section 6926 of the Family Code (Section 6926), which allows minor children, ages 12 years and older, to consent to vaccinations and other prophylactic medication, without requiring the approval of their parents. Conceptually, the decision rests solely with minors; however, realistically, state governments require children to be vaccinated. Many states plan to enact similar laws. This makes California's law everyone's concern.

Previous to its amending, Section 6926 allowed minors to "consent to medical care related to the diagnosis or treatment" of infectious, contagious, or communicable diseases. Through Bill AB499 (amendment), which was ratified by Governor Jerry Brown on October 9, 2011, minors can now "consent to medical care related to the prevention of a sexually transmitted disease."

As so-called prophylactics, vaccines will be administered under this law. The vaccines alleged to prevent sexually transmitted diseases include human papillomavirus (HPV), Hepatitis B, and soon-to-be-released HIV vaccines, as well as current and future vaccines and medications assigned to this category.

GlaxoSmithKline and Merck & Co., produce the primary HPV and Hepatitis B vaccines on the market. Merck manufactures Gardasil and Recombivax, while GlaxoSmithKline make Cervarix and Engerix-B. According to reports submitted to the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS), these vaccines have caused serious injuries, even fatalities, to thousands, if not millions, of children and adults. Vaccine Information Statements (VIS) are too inadequate to effectively inform minors about the dangers associated with vaccination.

Under Section 6926, parents and guardians are not liable for payment for medical care provided to their children; however, this law does not indicate who or whom will be responsible for the injuries and fatalities of children caused by these vaccinations. By default, parents will be responsible, even though they are denied the natural right to consent to the vaccinating of their children, and may be refused access to their children's medical records when vaccine-related injuries occur.

Parents should also be aware that under federal law, pharmaceutical companies (that manufacture vaccines) are not liable for vaccine-related injuries, even in light of the proven link between vaccines and the vast neurological and autoimmune illnesses afflicting millions of children. This means that minors who are unaware of the dangers of vaccination are extremely

vulnerable to injury because they are likely to receive the vaccine without consulting their parents.

Generally, this law (Section 6926) has broad implications that threatened the family structure. First, it undermines parental authority. Secondly, it places children at risk of injury because of federal laws that protect pharmaceutical companies from “all” liability and responsibility. The latter, subsequently, relieves these companies of the ethical commitment to ensure that vaccines are as safe as possible. This increases the risk of injury to children 100-fold, to say the least.

For example, over the course of several years, millions of children were injected with contaminated rotavirus vaccines. Would this have occurred if pharmaceutical companies were liable for vaccine-related injuries? The most repulsive offense in this tragedy was that the FDA allowed these vaccines to continue to be distributed, alleging to have found no safety concerns associated with the contamination. How could that be? Is not contamination indicative of danger?

Consumer health advocates are making gallant efforts to have the amendment of Section 6926 rescinded before it goes into effect January 2012. However, the most pressing goal must be to educate ourselves, children and communities about the dangers inherent in vaccination. This will enable us to make informed decisions about whether to receive vaccinations. More importantly, children will be motivated to contact their parents before acquiescing to anyone urging them to receive HPV and Hepatitis B vaccinations.

Californians must raise questions concerning the “liability” for injuries and deaths of children vaccinated under Section 6926. They should also probe their public officials to ascertain how this law will be applied, particularly as it relates to vaccine exemptions.