

Dear Members of the Oregon House of Representatives Committee On Rules,

Regarding SB 132 A, Public Hearing on June 12, 2013

As you decide the validity of SB132 there are several critical issues you need to very seriously consider.

The Senate Legal Council report that was prepared in February was based on the original bill, not the Majority A-Engrossed which passed the Senate on June 6, 2103.

During the Senate floor debate, Senator Tim Knopp emphatically quoted from the State of Oregon Constitution, of which, you took Oath to uphold. SB132 is a clear violation of the following sections:

Article I, section 5 of the Oregon Constitution states in part: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury for the benefit of any religious (sic), or theological institution."

Article I, section 2 provides "All men shall be secure in the Natural right, to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences" and '

Article I, section 3 states "No law shall in any case whatever control the free exercise, and enjoyment of religious (sic) opinions, or interfere with the rights of conscience."

Parents who choose to exempt their child from one or more of the required vaccines for religious reasons MUST get the signature of either a state official or a medical practitioner. (1) (2)

(1) Current version that passed the Senate, see page 1 and 2 starting on line 20," Internet" has been removed. <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2013R1/Measures/Text/SB132/A-Engrossed> -

(2) Bill as introduced included "internet" see page 1 line 25.

<https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2013R1/Measures/Text/SB132/Introduced>

The Senate floor debate contained many "mis-quotes" based on the readings of the original bill by the supporters. I encourage you to watch the Senate floor debate here: <http://youtu.be/8-fR1bWfhvg>

Leading supporters of the bill, Monnes Anderson and Steiner Hayward support a woman's "Right to Choose" medical intervention for her unborn child. One can't help but notice the hypercritical position taken for mother's "Right to Choose" medical interventions when the child is living outside the womb. Especially when the Supreme Court "defines" vaccines as "unavoidably unsafe" The US Supreme Court Case is BRUESEWITZ ET AL. v. WYETH LLC, FKA WYETH, INC., ET AL.
<http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/10pdf/09-152.pdf>

Senator Steiner Hayward said there are supreme court decisions that support denying religious freedom. She mentioned a case, Prince vs. MA. She also said Massachusetts banned the religious exemption. The state of Massachusetts currently has a religious exemption on the books and the case she mentioned was a child labor law case. In that ruling the Supreme Court said:

Our ruling does not extend beyond the facts the case presents. We neither lay the foundation "for any [that is, every] state intervention in the indoctrination and participation of children in religion" which may be done "in the name of their health and welfare" nor give warrant for "every limitation on their religious training and activities." The religious training and indoctrination of children may be accomplished in many ways, some of which, as we have noted, have received constitutional protection through decisions of this Court. These and all others except the public proclaiming of religion on the streets, if this may be taken as either training or indoctrination of the proclaimer, remain unaffected by the decision.

http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/historics/USSC_CR_0321_0158_ZO.html#321_US_158n12ref

Here are some highlights in case you don't have time to watch the entire debate.

Majority Senators in support of SB132 claimed the following:

- That the Oregon "immunization" rate is allegedly getting "worse" and that this is a huge problem.
- That vaccines are a "very safe" way to keep children and families safe from what used to be "devastating diseases."
- That Measles means death.
- That the "medically vulnerable" need to be protected ("by other people getting the immunizations")
- That vaccination rates are falling, mostly due to lack of "accurate information" and unfounded belief.
- One Senator, a primary care physician claimed that the CDC and physicians are the only reliable authority.
- That a similar bill was passed in Washington, that exemption rates went down 25% (they did not).
- Someone who clearly did not read the bill stated that Majority report bill does not infringe on religious freedom, because parents can simply watch an internet video and do not need a signature. (this has been removed from the bill)

Minority Senators opposition pointed out that:

- This bill, SB132 tramples on the constitution in an effort to do something "good."
- That we are headed down a bad pathway here, Stomping on the 1st amendment right of freedom of religion.
- That this bill is about moral judgment on somebody else's belief system

- That the US was founded on freedom.
- That the people of Oregon said resoundingly they want the right to make their own decision on fluoride and that for vaccines it should be the same approach – for people to make their own decisions.
- That the goal may be worthy but that when we are going to trample on the rights of other people to get to that goal it is wrong.
- That education before restriction would be best.
- That the right to decide on a vaccine is the people's right.
- That no moral judgment should be placed on somebody else's belief system.
- That the US was founded on freedom.
- That the constitution is there to protect the people from actions of government.
- That Oregon's vaccination rates are between 93.7-95% for any given vaccine according to CDC.
- That we are not facing a public health emergency.
- That this bill addresses a core problem that does not exist.
- That the "Minority report" honors diversity in our state, honors freedom of religion and the "Majority report" does NOT have religious exemption in it. SB132 removes specific exemption from law
- That the California governor, in signing a similar bill, assured "separate religious exemption" on form.
- One senator, a veterinarian, pointed out that "No-one in this building" has administered more vaccines than he has and that occasionally, a vaccine causes a reaction, and sometimes those reactions are fatal. He said that he will still promote the vaccines, but at the end of the day that is the owner of the animal that gets to choose. He then queried the senate: "Who are we to tell parents of children that this is what they MUST do? We cannot take the choice away from people. It is their kids! I am a no vote."
- Another senator against Sb132 pointed out that the National Vaccine Injury Act has cost taxpayers over \$2 billion in payouts. (This does not include of course the product costs of over \$4 billion per year.)
- Tromping on right to choose your own healthcare. Trampling on parent's right.

The case that actually concerns you is established with legal precedent at the US Supreme Court level is, Sharon Levy vs. Northcourt as James Filenbaum, Attorney at Law, explains:

"A parent's religious "beliefs" are sufficient to qualify for the religious exemption. The "belief" is defined as a faith that occupies a place in their lives parallel to that held by the orthodox belief in God or any sincere religious beliefs which are based upon a power or being to which all else is subordinate and on which all else is ultimately dependent.

They qualify if they believe that not giving the vaccines is what they must do to follow God's will for them in fulfilling their role as responsible parents. Their child's immune system is a creation of God and that God has given their child and that to vaccinate would violate their faith in what God created. The parents do NOT have to be part of a recognized religious organization. You don't have to join any church, you can be any religion at all. But if they are a part of an established religion (Catholic, Protestant, Islam, etc.) they can still have their own perceptions of what it means to follow God's will which may be counter to what that organization states.

The important rule here is that if a school district denies religious exemption they are violating your federally protected civil rights under the First Amendment by what is called state action and under federal law you are entitled to money damages."

As a concerned parent and grandparent, I would be remiss if I neglected to share with you what is happening on the Federal level regarding vaccines. If you are unaware of the bigger picture you have absolutely no business whatsoever considering any legislation regarding the enforcement of vaccine mandates while infringing on the Religious Freedoms of Oregonians. For the sake of your own future generation, please watch this short 12 min clip from the Congressional Hearings on Autism and Vaccines: <http://youtu.be/3wwDPcNdxJQ>

Also know that FOIA documents have been released with more to come. There is a great deal of evidence of malfeasance on the part of HHS. In part, FOIA documents show vaccines cause the diseases they are supposed to prevent. Dr. Tomljenovic's full paper can be downloaded here: <http://www.ecomed.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/3-tomljenovic.pdf>

The only childhood universal factor that is associated with all three changepoints is the introduction of vaccines contaminated with aborted fetal DNA and retroviral fragments. In 1979 the first aborted fetal vaccine was introduced to the US (MMRII), in 1989 a second dose of this vaccine was added and compliance doubled, and in 1995 another aborted fetal vaccine was introduced to the US (Varicella – chickenpox). Dr. Theresa Deisher Read more here: <http://www.cogforlife.org/ChickenpoxAutism.pdf>

I could also provide you with numerous studies already published by NIH, if you wish. Informed parents have done more research and are more knowledgeable than the vast majority of medical professionals or State Health Departments on the subject of vaccines. We read the full disclosures from the FDA, for one thing. You can too, right here: http://www.vaccinesafety.edu/package_inserts.htm Then read the actual "clinical trial" studies . You should know what you're mandating for my children and what your

children are injected with. Once truly informed, I doubt you will be so eager to go along with recommended injections based on fraudulent science. Nor would you be enforcing additional "education" for only those parents who have convictions and beliefs that differ from what is expected. You should be passing laws requiring ALL parents be given full documentation of vaccine ingredients and adverse reactions. You should be passing laws requiring medical professionals to be educated on and report adverse reactions. You should be passing laws that mandate anyone administering vaccines know what is in them. And that they follow the Hazmat evacuation and clean-up procedures if a vial is dropped and broken.

Based on the CDC Goals of 2020, the aim is 95% compliance in newborns, infants, toddlers, and school children in order to satisfy safe "herd immunity" levels. I must ask you - What about all the adults? And why the concern for and fear of unvaccinated children? The adult population far outnumber the small fraction of partially or fully unvaccinated children. Who, btw, are very healthy with high IQ's. These children do not suffer from the many childhood physical and neurological diseases that are devastating an entire generation of our children. That's why the CDC has dug their feet on doing a comparison study! You should know the USA ranks 34 in Infant Mortality. Yet we administer more childhood vaccines than any other country in the world. What is wrong with this picture? We have an entire generation of the sickest kids in the entire history of mankind!

The vast majority of verified pertussis cases in the recent outbreaks are in the fully vaccinated population, who are carriers of a more virulent strain. This is well documented on the CDC site. The same goes for Chickenpox/ Shingles as well as measles.

Here's a good example of just how absurd this bill really is - It's like being required to seek an "official approval" get an "authorized signature" on "approved documents" for me to vote Republican, from a Democrat or vice-versa. I do not need permission for my vote or my Deeply Held Spiritual Beliefs!

In closing I will simply state - This is not a partisan issue! I pray you vote with your heart and your conscience. You have the ability to make the good and noble decision today. For all of the above reasons, I implore you to strike AB132 from the books today.

Faithfully,

Terry Roark

Surviving parent of vaccine injured child - Grandparent of Autistic child - Autism Prevention and Recovery Advocate