May 13, 2019 Informational Hearing on Religious Exemptions

I'm here to OPPOSE THE ELIMINATION OF THE RELIGIOUS EXEMPTION FOR VACCINATION because the government has no power without the evidence of a credible health emergency to mandate vaccination and deny a child an education. There is no evidence that vaccines are safe and effective, that the least restrictive means are not being investigated, and that those who don't or selectively vaccinate risk the health of the immune compromised.

Emergencies are not declared based on outdated and inaccurate DPH school exemption data. There have already been three versions released.

If this is truly an 'Informational Hearing', the public and our legislators are entitled to hear the evidence to back up or discredit the claims that 'vaccines are safe and effective', 'the science is settled' and 'vaccines save lives.' When I met with my Rep he stated, "You lose me at the science." During the public hearing for proposed mandates for HPV and Meningitis, I asked the Public Health Committee if they knew what a vaccine 'excipient was. They all responded no. In March, Representative Josh Elliott and his pro vaccine experts backed out of the 'Science of Vaccines Forum' at the last minute. It was a historic chance to debate the evidence of Robert F. Kennedy Jr. that is labeled 'misinformation.' The (ACIP) Advisory Committee on Immunization practices uses the 'Evidence to Recommendations Framework Form' when recommending vaccines to be added to the schedule. The bottom on every page notes "**When no evidence is available, provide transparent reflection by guideline panel on the matter." It is possible that our legislators can potentially legislate the mandate of a medical treatment without evidence?

The Attorney General's opinion details government power and omits the details of the vaccine risk of injury or death. He did not cite the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act (NCVIA) of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 300aa-1 to 300aa-34) which protects vaccine manufacturers from liability and protects those who administer vaccines from liability. He did not mention the Supreme Court in 2011 (Bruesewitz v Wyeth) determined vaccines are 'unavoidably unsafe.' He did not mention the current pending litigations against the manufacturer of the MMR, Gardasil and the Zostavax vaccines. Do these cases support an intent to protect the public?

Beware of whom you label the public health threat. Immunoglobulins (donated antibodies) are required for organ transplants and used to treat autoimmune conditions, Autism and to boost the immunity of the immune compromised. Immunoglobulins are also used in the treatment of measles. Studies are showing that vaccine titers don't last in the IVIG. Are you willing to compromise the quality of the IVIG by jeopardizing the supply of naturally acquired antibodies?

The aggressive, calculated government and media campaign has falsely labeled those who hold religious exemptions as public health threats by accusing them of being the ones who spread disease and endanger the non vaccinated in society. Releasing outdated and inaccurate data to the public has identified false 'hot spots' and has created a mob that are intent on finding out who the public threats are. If and when an outbreak or emergency is declared, the identity of the children will be revealed because by law they must be absent from school and school activities for the determined amount of time. The healthy children that simply hold religious beliefs against vaccines will be innocent victims of discrimination, hate crimes and denied their HIPPA rights. There are laws against shouting 'fire' in a crowded movie theater. I urge you step back and promote laws that actually protect and promote public health.

Barbara R.

https://www.cthousegop.com/dauphinais/should-vaccines-be-mandatedpresentation-by-robert-f-kennedy-jr/

https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/acip/recs/grade/downloads/ACIP-evidence-recframe-508.pdf

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16941344/ https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28968738/