

Dear Representatives and members of the House Health Care Committee,

Thank you for your service to the voters and families in the State of Oregon and for taking the time to read this letter.

My name is Tanya Pasimio and I am an independent, pro-choice voter in district 49. I am pro-vaccine but I am not pro-all-vaccines-for-all-children and I do not support House Bill 3063. As a parent and concerned citizen, I ask you to remain vigilant and mindful in the midst of the recent media fear mongering campaign on the measles “outbreak” and uphold Oregon parents’ right to make health care decisions for their children. Please vote NO on House Bill 3063.

I support complete and comprehensive informed consent to any and all medical interventions, including vaccination for all Oregonians without fear of punishment, harassment, or exclusion and the right of Oregon parents to maintain the freedom of choice and consent regarding any and all medical interventions and treatments, including vaccination, for their children.

Each of you have received an email from me stating, less than eloquently I’m afraid, my opinions on vaccine “safety” and the forced vaccination of children and adults to be an act of violence against a human person. I will not reiterate that here. I have however, been educating myself on the ten points of the Nuremberg Code, which is widely received as one of the most important documents in the history of clinical research ethics. Forgive me for quoting Wikipedia here, but there’s no way to tease this out. Feel free to follow the trail of references, I’ve included the source link.

“The Nuremberg Code and the related [Declaration of Helsinki](#) are the basis for the [Code of Federal Regulations](#) Title 45 Part 46,^{[11][12]} which are the regulations issued by the [United States Department of Health and Human Services](#) for the ethical treatment of human subjects, and are used in [Institutional Review Boards](#) (IRBs). In addition, the idea of [informed consent](#) has been universally accepted and now constitutes Article 7 of the United Nations’ [International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights](#). It also served as the basis for [International Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical Research Involving Human Subjects](#) proposed by the [World Health Organization](#).^{[8]”} (source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuremberg_Code).

The ten points with commentary are as follows and taken directly from the PDF provided on the website for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services:

“THE NUREMBERG CODE

1. The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential.

This means that the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent; should be so situated as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, over-reaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion; and

should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved, as to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision. This latter element requires that, before the acceptance of an affirmative decision by the experimental subject, there should be made known to him the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment; the method and means by which it is to be conducted; all inconveniences and hazards reasonably to be expected; and the effects upon his health or person, which may possibly come from his participation in the experiment. The duty and responsibility for ascertaining the quality of the consent rests upon each individual who initiates, directs or engages in the experiment. It is a personal duty and responsibility which may not be delegated to another with impunity.

2. The experiment should be such as to yield fruitful results for the good of society, unprocurable by other methods or means of study, and not random and unnecessary in nature.
3. The experiment should be so designed and based on the results of animal experimentation and a knowledge of the natural history of the disease or other problem under study, that the anticipated results will justify the performance of the experiment.
4. The experiment should be so conducted as to avoid all unnecessary physical and mental suffering and injury.
5. No experiment should be conducted, where there is an a priori reason to believe that death or disabling injury will occur; except, perhaps, in those experiments where the experimental physicians also serve as subjects.
6. The degree of risk to be taken should never exceed that determined by the humanitarian importance of the problem to be solved by the experiment.
7. Proper preparations should be made and adequate facilities provided to protect the experimental subject against even remote possibilities of injury, disability, or death.
8. The experiment should be conducted only by scientifically qualified persons. The highest degree of skill and care should be required through all stages of the experiment of those who conduct or engage in the experiment.

9. During the course of the experiment, the human subject should be at liberty to bring the experiment to an end, if he has reached the physical or mental state, where continuation of the experiment seemed to him to be impossible.
10. During the course of the experiment, the scientist in charge must be prepared to terminate the experiment at any stage, if he has probable cause to believe, in the exercise of the good faith, superior skill and careful judgement required of him, that a continuation of the experiment is likely to result in injury, disability, or death to the experimental subject. ["Trials of War Criminals before the Nuremberg Military Tribunals under Control Council Law No. 10", Vol. 2, pp. 181-182. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1949.] (<https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/international/ethical-codes-and-research-standards/index.html>)

The United States Supreme Court and Congress have recognized that vaccines carry significant risk. Approximately \$4 billion have been paid in damages to families of vaccine injured persons. There are no standards for vaccine safety testing and the studies which have been done on vaccine safety have largely been paid for by vaccine manufacturers themselves. There are no standards for randomized/double-blind/placebo-controlled/long-term safety studies during the licensing trial for vaccines that includes physical checkups and blood work. These are basic scientific trial standards that we all learned in high school statistics class. There are no studies assuring us of the long term efficacy of vaccines, in fact, there are numerous instances of vaccine failure over the long term and the need for booster after booster. (<https://aapsonline.org/measles-outbreak-and-federal-vaccine-mandates/>)

The informational paper inserts which come with each and every vaccine clearly state ingredients, adverse effects, and contraindications. How often are these reviewed in detail with patients or legal guardians of minors before administration?

Even if mass vaccinations are not considered an "experiment" on the American (and worldwide) population, are these standards met consistently in actual human trials? A reframe of the conversation might include the possibility that vaccines still are experimental, even in their massive scope of administration given their lack of long term safety data and poorly assessed success rate. Does House Bill 3063 mandating vaccines to a functionally captive consumer base encourage vaccine makers to meet or exceed any of the above standards?

In my opinion, and it is just that, HB 3063 at least violates #1 on the above list which is affirmed by the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services as well as the World Health Organization. Actually, this might affirm that it is a violation of a child's rights to

be injected at all, but in our country thus far, parents maintain the right to decide if a child will be subject to medical procedures or experiments. This requires us to use discernment and good judgment regarding what we do or don't allow our children to participate in. If House Bill 3063 passes, YOU will have taken on this responsibility and YOU should not have impunity for the results of your actions or the results of the vaccine mandate.

Think hard about the rights you take away from parents because they become your responsibilities. Please vote NO on House Bill 3063 because voting yes would take away my child's right to consent to what is injected into their body or in what ways they are experimented on and my right and responsibility to decide if and how they should participate at all. I'm sure there are some people who believe that this is acceptable, but I don't see how this aligns with Oregon's values of respect, honoring diversity, and the right to choose.

You have no doubt been bombarded by statistics and testimony from all sides, so if you are at all recognizing that, at this time, vaccines are experimental and not scientifically proven to be safe and effective at preventing illness, please vote no. One testimony given yesterday pointed out that this bill is essentially a blank check. It would be hand inordinate amounts of power to vaccine manufacturers and those with decision making power who financially profit from them. I could keep writing, but my time is up and this has taken a significant amount of time away from my kids already. The hardest part has been explaining to my 5.5 year old what I'm doing writing this.

"There are people who make laws in our state who want to require you to have chemicals injected into your body because the people who make the chemicals have convinced them that it's healthier for everyone if you do. I'm trying to tell the lawmakers that I don't want to be forced to consent to that."

"They would make me do that, mom?"

"If you want to go to school, yes."

"Chemicals to make us healthier? That doesn't make sense. Don't they know that's not kind?"

How do I answer that? How do I answer my extremely smart child who knows that his body is his own and that no one has a right to act violently against it and that chemicals should be a last resort for problems?

As a parent who is trying to raise sons who understand consent and honor all people, revere strong women, and support women who are not yet strong, how do I tell him that the lawmakers who are supposed to protect our rights are actually trying to take them away? Is that what's happening here? I seriously have more questions than answers.

Please vote NO on House Bill 3063 and support my family and many families who will not have the opportunity to write to you because this bill has been so rushed. Please consider investing in better ways to help Oregonians live healthier and more vibrant lives and protect our rights to informed consent.

Thank you again for your time and your service.

Best Regards,

Tanya Pasimio