

Dear Representatives of the House Committee on Health Care,
Thank you for this opportunity to share four of my concerns about SB1598.

1. Conflicts of Interest

SB1598 would require insurers to cover any vaccine or service recommended by the unelected Public Health Officer, *following the lead of groups like the **American Academy of Pediatrics** – which receives funding from vaccine manufacturers.*

When the same ***companies that profit also influence the guidance, science stops being neutral.*** We get policies shaped by profit and a clear conflict of interest.

And when Oregonians are told to “trust the experts,” but those experts are financially tied to industry, trust evaporates – and rightfully so.

We deserve uncorrupted science that serves people and the truth, not corporations.

2. Who REALLY Pays

We’ve been told this bill has no fiscal impact. I’m no financial expert, but I can see how ***this bill requires all of us to pay.***

When insurers must fully cover costly vaccines – from \$100 to several hundred dollars each – those costs don’t vanish. They’re rerouted to:

- All of us taxpayers, through the Oregon Health Plan, and
- Everyone with private insurance, through higher premiums.

In the end, ***regular Oregonians pay while pharmaceutical companies enjoy guaranteed profit secured by law.***

3. Too Much Power for One Person

SB 1598 grants ***sweeping authority to a single unelected official to decide – without legislative oversight or public comment*** – which products must be covered.

Think about that.

One person, acting alone, could trigger millions of dollars in spending commitments from private and public insurers, with no checks, no balances, and no accountability.

That’s a level of authority does not belong in Oregon; it belongs in a **monarchy.**

4. The Language Loophole

The bill reads that ***a standing order “may not” require or withhold a drug or device.***

Senator Reynolds has promised that this is protective language against a mandate. BUT, according to attorneys I’ve conferred with, it is NOT.

Oregon’s Bill Drafting Manual admits “may not” and “shall not” are only equivalent terms, not identical.

In law, being equivalent is weaker than being identical. And that’s a dangerous loophole when it concerns bodily autonomy and informed choice.

“May not” leaves the door open. “Shall not” closes it.

If your intention is truly to protect our choice, prove it to us by changing the text to “shall not.” VOTE YES ON THE -2 AMENDMENT!

5. Closing

Protecting public health requires transparency, legislative oversight, and public trust, not blind faith in unelected officials. Oregon law must:

1. Require legislative approval for new insurance mandates;
2. Ban financial conflicts in public-health policy;
3. Ensure public input before Oregonians are forced to pay for new products;
4. And NOT include sneaky language to create medical mandates.

For those reasons, I urge you to vote NO on SB 1598.

Thank you for your time and your service to Oregon.

Sincerely,

Lisa Carroll