

Madam Chair, Members of the committee, Senator Thatcher and Representative Post;

I am writing today to express my opposition to HB 3063. I attended the public hearing February 28 on the proposed bill but was unable to give my testimony due to time constraints, along with approximately 180 other individuals waiting. During the testimony of the hearing, there were compelling arguments, both for and against, though the opposition far outnumbered the supporters, and many of us left in the evening without having been called to speak.

Before I begin outlining my objections to HB 3063, I would like to provide some history on myself and my family. I am not anti-vaccine in general nor am I opposed to state policy surrounding health and medicine needs, when done appropriately. My husband and I have two daughters, one currently in elementary school the other in full time daycare, both immunized under the current provisions of required vaccinations to attend school. My husband works full time in Beaverton, I work full time in Salem, and we have lived in Keizer for the past 10 years, in Salem prior to that. I am a graduate of Willamette University and maintain professional certification for my employment.

All that background information to say I vehemently and fundamentally oppose the recommended changes to the Oregon Revised Statutes under House Bill 3063.

Firstly, declaring this to be an emergency, making this bill effective immediately upon passage, is irresponsible and a misuse of the emergency provision. It is creating a fear-driven sense of urgency and is a knee-jerk reaction to the current situation with the measles outbreak making headlines. Fast tracking a bill of this nature inherently creates a poorly written bill without the proper research, validation, or educated support.

Secondly, the current statutes already sorely lack any true definition of what are considered "required" vaccinations and give the Oregon Health Authority the sweeping ability to make determinations regarding what is a "preventable disease" under ORS 433.040. This bill does nothing to clarify that definition. By leaving such a lack of definition and subsequently removing a parent's right to abstain on behalf of their child (should HB3063 pass) the door is left open to require far more vaccinations be administered to children prior to school attendance.

You may argue the intent of the bill is to enforce those vaccinations currently required, however by not clearly defining the terms under the ORS other vaccinations, such as the flu shot and Gardasil, could become required at the sole discretion of the OHA. In fact, ORS 433.104 already allows for registry, and thereby requirement, of other vaccines in the event of "potential catastrophic disease threat". As we heard in the testimony at hearing, by rule the Oregon Health Authority can amend and extend the list of required vaccines essentially at will.

Creating additional required vaccination is a cause of concern as we, my husband and I, have chosen with the support of our healthcare providers and after research and careful consideration not to participate in the flu shot vaccination or have it administered to our children. This decision was made in great part due to the fact the CDC themselves cannot demonstrate efficacy rates with any consistency. Their own information indicates the flu shot seasonally "may" provide up to 40% protection. That rate is alarmingly low to be considered effective. We have also opted out of the Gardasil vaccination due to its list of potential side effects, the efficacy rates, its lack of long term clinical testing, and the fact that while HPV is a grave concern, it can be prevented by other means. However, as the statutes are

currently written and should HB 3063 pass, both the influenza vaccine and Gardasil could become required under the “preventable disease” definition, regardless of parental consent.

My third objection with this new proposal is the lack of allowance for extended schedule of vaccinations or partial vaccination. As I mentioned previously, my daughters are vaccinated. However one of my children has experienced allergic reactions to two forms of medication as well as one vaccine. To have the ability to monitor her reactions and allergies we have utilized an extended schedule, never having more than 2 immunizations administered at one time, often only one. We must also carefully monitor the ingredients and contents of the vaccines as they may contain some of the medicinal agents to which she is allergic. This has been discussed with our pediatrician and is done under her guidance. If this bill were to pass it has the potential to effectively eliminate this option for us and for other families going forward. This could potentially expose my child to another reaction but limit our ability to truly decipher what had caused the reaction. This bill also fails to allow for selective vaccination, for example opting not to vaccinate for Hepatitis B, in school age children. I will not presume to say I understand more than the medical professionals, suffice it to say all research indicates Hepatitis B is not spread by an infected person sitting at a desk next to an unvaccinated child. Yet, should this vaccine be missing a child would not be permitted to attend school under HB 3063.

While I could continue to list out the faults of this bill, I will end with this. These objections are my own, my personal beliefs and come from our conscience on what is right and good for our children. Yet there is another objection I feel compelled to expand upon. It is more fundamental and goes back our state constitution. Article 1 Section 3 of the Oregon Constitution states, “No law shall in any case whatever control the free exercise, and enjoyment of, religious opinions or interfere with the rights of conscience”. Yet HB 3063 does exactly that. It oversteps the bounds of our government, **as outlined in our own constitution**, and removes the rights of conscience and religion as expressed by parents regarding the well-being of our children.

My sincere hope is that following the testimony, both in person and submitted in written form, the committee refers to our constitution and will vote to kill HB3063. It is written in haste, reactionary, and ill informed. Instead, advocate for the time and research to provide the citizens of Oregon with what they deserve – true understanding and access to the research needed to make informed decisions regarding vaccinations.

Thank you for your time and service,

Shannon Moore

Shannonmoore17@yahoo.com

503.949.2846