

Tamara Snaith, OTR/L

Meeting Date: March 1, 2019

Topic: HR 3063

I am a therapist, educated in the sciences at a respected research university. I recognize the value of vaccination, but also the necessity of informed consent. Legislation which is crafted to deny educational access to students based upon vaccine history is obtrusive and unreasonable. It is predicated on potential disease rather than infection itself. This is an arbitrary precedent which paves the way to mandate isolation, or worse, for individuals who do not submit to invasive procedures.

Surely the state government which institutes sanctuary for illegal foreigners, whose vaccine status is unknown, does so to enable those groups of people to function within society without the burden of living in isolation or the fear of deportation away from our nation's opportunities. Such a position declares that federal immigration laws are oppressive and inhibit the free movement of people within society. While their presence increases the potential for disease transmission, most citizens would not shrink from public interaction for fear of exposure. The same state now seeks to isolate and burden its own citizens, denying them equal access to educational opportunity. This violates basic freedom.

Should a record of vaccination be requisite prior to shopping at the grocery store, using public transportation, attending concerts or meetings? Shall we impose routine skin cultures and nasal swabs, to detect the possible presence of resistant bacterial organisms in health practitioners before they are permitted to enter public places? Probability suggests that they are vectors of disease within our community. Perhaps we should subject the same tests to migrant farm workers who handle our produce? The potential for disease is insufficient grounds for prohibiting social engagement.

We live in a free society. Invasive medical procedures necessitate consent. There is inherent risk associated with inoculation: well documented adverse reactions which have culminated in irrevocable harm. Thoughtful consideration of such an important subject would not hastily dismiss the voice of concern. Medical exemptions are unnecessarily difficult to obtain, as clinical judgment is coerced by the intense pressure toward conformity. Sensitive children who are at risk for adverse reactions are easily overlooked by a uniform system of vaccination and, at times, become victims of medical abandonment.

The best governance for sound medical practice is rooted in reason and compassion. It does not deny citizens of basic liberty.