

Submitter: KATARZYNA SACZKO
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Health Care
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB1598

The language of the bill opens the door to medical mandates and puts medical freedom at risk in the state of Oregon. It provides unelected officials with unchecked authority. Overrides doctors' ability to make patient-specific medical decisions, which is nothing short of government overreach. It brings the risk of implementing taxpayer-funded mandates, as it compels public programs and insurance to pay. It is a conflict of interest if vaccine policy decisions are made by groups funded by vaccine manufacturers.

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, the people, demand science free from corporate capture — science that serves people, not corporations.

The bill in fact 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.

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.

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.”