

Dear Senator Laurie Monnes Anderson,

My name is Amber Sims and I oppose SB 2644. I implore you to also oppose this unnecessary bill!

In Oregon, how many infants have been admitted to hospitals with life-threatening bleeding in the last year? Has there been a steep rise in cases in recent years? How many Oregon parents opt for the Oral K? WHY is this bill even being considered still, when SO MANY OTHERS are not even given hearings?

The U.S. actually has a high infant mortality rate compared to other developed nations, so maybe we should actually spend time and resources looking at whether the injectable form of Vitamin K has something to do with that sad fact!

(<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2091rank.html>)

Where are the studies showing that injectable Vitamin K is *safer* the oral form available? I have NOT seen them, and I have looked. What I have uncovered in my research, is that most injectable Vitamin K shots actually carry the STRICTEST warning for any medicine by the FDA.

I do not believe a medical procedure, that involves *serious known risk* from the manufacturers and carries a black box warning--again, the FDA's strictest warning--should be my option offered, or I have to sign a statement I'm declining, considering that the Oral vitamin K is a safe, effective option and does not pose risk. In the initial hearing on this bill, which I attended, a statement of decline was discussed as what parents would have to sign if they do not want the injection!

SB 2644 would effectively mandate a known black box carrying medical procedure on newborn babies!

My husband and I received oral Vitamin K for our daughter, in gel form, and it was a pain-free experience and provided the necessary dose to keep her safe. This step is quick, simple and does not carry a black box warning, nor any harmful additives or the possibility of adverse reactions!

We want to have another child, and would also decline a vitamin K injection, and opt for oral. However, I fear that medical professionals would not support our decision if it not a "best practice" as this bill effectively dictates, and consider shaming and coercing us and other parents with the threat of DHS, as the SB689 hearing clearly demonstrated is happening with other vaccination status choices.

Both my husband and I carry a genetic mutation called the MTHFR that means we do not have the same ability to process or metabolize known toxins like poly-oxil 35 (anti-freeze), benzoyl alcohol, and aluminum--all contained in the injection but NOT in the oral option--making an injection like the Vitamin K shot a dangerous and ill-advised procedure for our family, let alone a newborn baby!

Another dangerous additive is Polysorbate 80. "Injected polysorbate 80 has also been shown to abruptly change heart function. A statement about a drug used to treat anaemia related to chronic kidney disease and chemotherapy warns: "Clinical studies have shown darbepoetin alfa (polysorbate 80) to increase the risk of serious side effects (eg, blood clots, stroke, heart attack, heart failure) and death in some

cases." <http://vaccinechoicecanada.com/health-risks/anaphylaxis-allergies-asthma/polysorbate-80-risks-2/>

Our family is NOT alone with the MTHFR genetic susceptibility, and it is *not rare*! Currently, the medical practice does not even screen for this genetic variability (they could!), so they do not know who will have an adverse reaction, and who will not! Again, there is a *SAFER risk-free alternative* with oral Vitamin K. And what about the families who are not current with the latest science about genetic susceptibilities like we are, and have not been tested to know they may carry this clear risk?

The current law is being changed from language that allows for both oral or injection of Vitamin K to "Provides that administration of vitamin K to newborn infants must be by most effective means."

This is clear to me and everyone I have spoken to about this bill that this bill would effectively translate into the oral option being removed (and strongly discouraged as not a "best practice" even if still an "option"), and "most effective means" will be termed by the medical profession as injection form only, which has *SERIOUS KNOWN RISK!*

How can tax payer funded resources and your precious and valuable time even be going into hearing this unnecessary legislative change? This feels outrageous, and I heard all the "in favor" testimony for this bill in person at the senate hearing, and not ONE reason he stated makes this bill warranted or deserving of any more time and resources.

Again, I urge you to oppose HB2644. Please put kids and their families *first* by keeping all options on the table without effectively mandating a known-risk medical procedure. Here is a video that also provides information from a well respected doctor: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6rxEo8R5Fwk>

Kind Regards,
Amber

Amber Sims
Mother, Wife, Activist, Oregon Business Owner
All Stages Marketing
www.AllStagesMarketing.com