

Good afternoon,

As a registered voter in Oregon, I am writing to request that you oppose HB 3063 (Relating to health care; declaring an emergency) and NOT take it to hearing. My first and foremost objection to this bill is that, if passed, it effectively alienates the *inalienable* RIGHTS of persons to make their own choices for the health of their children and families. By its own summary statement, it acknowledges that it “removes the ability of parent to decline required immunizations on behalf of child for reason other than child's indicated medical diagnosis”. Put simply, this means it deprives persons of the ability to exercise religious freedom, and runs counter to the very foundation of our country's principles. It also removes philosophical individual freedom. One need not even reach the underlying subject matter, that of the vaccine “debate” in order to justify opposition to this bill. It matters not whether you think vaccines are efficacious. At its very core, this bill is an unjust removal of natural human rights, and should not be allowed to move forward.

If you disagree with preserving human rights, and are not swayed to opposition on that front alone, then I implore you to research vaccine ingredients and really get to know what you are forcing on the people in your community. Vaccines include various neurotoxins in addition to cells from multiple species of animals, and cells from aborted human fetuses. They also contain allergenic ingredients, and often contain retroviruses and/or carcinogenic or other forms of infectious mycoplasmic agents known to cause cancers and other harm. Many people have very real philosophical and religious objections to these ingredients, and no government on earth should be allowed to commit medical tyranny by forcing people to inject objectionable ingredients into their living bodies. No doctor should be a gatekeeper to shut out persons from the ability to make and exercise their own medical choices.

I understand the “greater good” argument, and the “herd immunity” argument, but there are multiple peer-reviewed scientific studies and a vast collection of anecdotal evidence that show these arguments are at least in part fallacious. Natural immunity is much stronger and longer lasting than artificial immunity. Many persons who have been vaccinated still get the various diseases from which they have been vaccinated. I personally know at least 4 vaccine injured individuals, and the VAERS database is brimming with thousands upon thousands more. There are many more thousands upon thousands who never managed to get their complaints logged in VAERS, but have incurred harm, nonetheless. All those people were injured “for the greater good”, apparently. Then the question becomes: whose greater good is more important? Trading one possibility of harm in that some may or may not ever get certain diseases, from which most recover with no complications at all, for another very real harm in forced injections of toxic and objectionable substances does not yield a zero-sum equal outcome. Inflicting harm on some to potentially “protect” others from harm is not a justifiable risk/benefit analysis. Since pharmaceutical companies enjoy absolute immunity from lawsuit by harmed individuals, it adds insult to injury to force harm and deny real redress for that harm. It is a known fact that harm does occur. If that were not true, there would be no need for pharmaceutical companies to have immunity from litigation.

Who gets to decide that causing harm to some in an effort to prevent a perceived risk of harm to others is acceptable? Each and every citizen of a government by the people should get to each exercise their own inalienable rights to freedom of choice, and make their own informed decisions about the health of their children and themselves. No statute should ever infringe those rights.

In closing, I would simply like to ask you to use rational thought regarding the dangerous and slippery slope we will be on when government is allowed to infringe inalienable rights and impose despotic medical force on the people. When that happens, we have ceased to be a government OF THE PEOPLE, BY THE PEOPLE. Your duty is to preserve the rights of the people of the state of Oregon while considering legislation for the betterment of the communities in which we live. Removing rights to medical freedom and the free exercise thereof is not in any way a betterment of community. There is no “emergency”, and no harm will ensue if we get to keep the rights that are already ours to exercise.

Thank you,

Shonda M. Siler, J.D.