

Submitter: Kara Schmidt
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Health Care
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB1598

I urge you to VOTE NO ON SB1598 for the following reasons:

1. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

SB1598 would force insurers to cover any vaccine or service recommended by a single Public Health Officer — an unelected appointee following the lead of organizations like the American Academy of Pediatrics, which receives funding from vaccine manufacturers.

When corporations fund the gatekeepers of “guidance,” neutrality vanishes. These conflicts of interest corrupt science, steer policy toward profit, and erode public trust. We demand science free from corporate capture — science that serves people, not profits.

2. ACCOUNTABILITY

Proponents say this bill will have no fiscal impact. But it really requires ALL OF US TO PAY!

When insurers must fully cover high-priced vaccines (\$100 to several hundred dollars each), those expenses don’t disappear; they’re simply shifted onto:

- Taxpayers, through the Oregon Health Plan, and
- Families, through higher insurance premiums.

The pharmaceutical industry gets guaranteed profits, while ordinary Oregonians foot the bill.

3. TOO MUCH CENTRALIZED POWER, NO OVERSIGHT

SB1598 gives sweeping authority to a single unelected official to decide what products insurers must cover — without legislative oversight, public debate, or accountability.

One person could unilaterally trigger millions in new spending and shape statewide medical policy. That level of authority does not belong in Oregon; it belongs in a monarchy.

4. DANGEROUS LOOPHOLE

The bill’s sponsors claim its wording protects choice because it says a standing order “may not” require a drug or device. But legal precedent makes clear: “May not” and

“shall not” are "equivalent," not "identical," even according to Oregon’s own Bill Drafting Manual. "Equivalent" is not strong enough to stop a mandate. That single difference creates a loophole wide enough to drive a mandate through.

If lawmakers TRULY intend to protect informed consent and bodily autonomy, they can prove it — by changing “may not” to “shall not.”

In conclusion, in the interest of medical freedom, fiscal responsibility, and accountability, I oppose SB1598 and implore you to represent myself and countless others in rejecting SB1598 unless it includes:

- ? Full transparency about funding and influence;
- ? A balanced decision-making process with legislative oversight;
- ? The language change from “may not” to “shall not.”

Concerned Oregonian,
Kara Schmidt