

Good morning,

I oppose HB 3063 and am highly disappointed in this bill, set to remove personal liberty from Oregonians using the public education system as the strongarm to coerce people into performing medical procedures on their children with little protection from the consequences of those procedures. It is very underhanded and also completely unnecessary and highly dangerous.

Below, I outline the three reasons I find this bill distasteful and it is my hope you will read and consider those thoughts, and return to me with any comments on those issues. I have also included some suggestions which I think will help with this issue, which I hope you will also review.

1. Not only are there **no outbreaks of vaccine preventable disease in Oregon** beyond what is considered unavoidable and normal in a highly vaccinated population, but our vaccination rates have always been and remain extremely high.
2. I am also extremely concerned that **Oregon does not give physicians the power to write medical exemptions for their patients**, and that the Oregon Health Authority, which must approve all medical exemptions, limits those exemptions to anaphylactic shock and intussusception, despite the CDC's clear indications that many other conditions contraindicate vaccination.
3. **This bill ultimately states that epilepsy, auto-immune conditions, encephalitis, syncope and shock, and death are all acceptable**, and I find that extremely disturbing. Our children deserve your protection, you work for their benefit, and in sponsoring this bill I find that responsibility to be blatantly ignored.

It is my wish that, in light of this information, you would remove your sponsorship for HB 3063.

There are many ways to prevent disease and keep vaccination rates high without injuring and killing children unnecessarily. Being the parent of a vaccine-injured child for the past 10 years, **I believe the state of Oregon can increase vaccination rates yet keep at-risk children safe by doing the following** (which, clearly cannot be done within the scope of this bill, but would be good to think on for future bills):

1. **Doctors should have complete control over medical exemptions, as each person's case is unique.**
2. Oregon should create and run a reaction, injury, and death tracking system for all vaccine doses given, and follow up on each reaction to see what could have been done to prevent the reaction, or what might be done in the future to lessen a reaction. This will be separate from the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System, and run only within our own state.
3. This system should be part of a mandatory education module for all physicians, nurses, and anyone else who administers vaccines, with clearly set guidelines on what to look for, how to report, and consequences for not following guidelines. The Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System should also be included in this.
4. Similar information should be prepared for the layperson and given to every person or guardian of a person who receives any vaccination.

5. All deaths in which anyone reasonably suspects vaccination as a cause (and also in SIDS deaths, as SIDS is listed as a vaccine reaction in all childhood vaccines) should include a proper autopsy which includes specific testing for vaccine-related death. As of now, survivors must pay out of pocket for this, which we know is skewing statistics on vaccine deaths.
6. This system of tracking should be reviewed yearly and suggestions put forth in the following year on how to avoid these reactions, injuries, and deaths.

I believe these suggestions, which I realize would require much preparation, would significantly reduce vaccine hesitancy, and vaccine-related deaths and injury. It would restore faith in our doctors, legislators, and government. Most importantly, **it would truly protect children in a way that HB 3063 cannot**--by acknowledging the fears in vaccine hesitancy and providing a safeguard against the real threat of injury vaccines have.

Because these safeguards are not currently in place, I would again encourage you to vote no on this bill. There should be a way to opt out of a medical procedure which has no sufficient after market safety tracking, and in which the cost and burden of injury is solely on the patient themselves.

Thank you for reading,
Victoria Mercer