

2/26/2019

Honorable Representatives of the People of the State of Oregon:

I am an Oregon constituent, a physician, and a parent - and I strongly oppose HB 3063.

I direct a medical clinic in Portland, Oregon that provides approximately 10,000 healthcare visits annually. In existence for over 20 years, the clinic patients come from all walks of life - young and old, from varied religious and political affiliation, and from varied social strata.

It includes many patients who survived measles and mumps when it was endemic. It includes patients who survived wild polio during the era when it was endemic in the United States. Most came through from that era without sequelae but my patients also include those with post-polio syndrome.

It also includes patients who came to us having suffered vaccine injuries. Some of these injuries were temporary, some we resolved, some are permanent, and some are severely and completely disabling. They include neurological regression and loss of motor, emotional, and sensory function. These patients or their guardians for them decided to exercise their right to choose exemption from some or all future vaccinations – but the damage was already done.

I bring these examples, my professional role, my fatherhood, to your attention because I would like to make it clear that consideration of this topic is one that I have not taken lightly nor one that I have examined in a one sided, cursory, or reactive manner. Rather I have considered this from all of these various perspectives. This additionally includes extensive ongoing detailed study regarding the evolution of modern medicine in which I rely upon my academic training in historical anthropology and the study of cross cultural medical and religious beliefs.

You will undoubtedly receive two apparent contradictory messages about vaccination. One will tell you that they are safe, that they are a quintessential representative of the effective benefit of modern medicine, a grand triumph. On the other side, you will hear stories of injury, of trauma, and fundamental questions as to the safety of those vaccinations. These juxtaposed positions seem irreconcilable. In reality they are not. And I believe that neither side wants anyone to be harmed, especially children. However, I will not be addressing you from either of those positions.

If vaccinations were 'entirely safe' than there would have been no need to create the Vaccine Adverse Events Reaction System (VAERS) legislation. They are not entirely safe. Aside from examples such as the Cutter incident when improperly inactivated polio virus led to vaccine induced polio in large numbers or the contamination of the polio virus with SV40, a monkey virus, that has contributed to cancer years later, there are other known and established side effects that are listed in the pharmaceutical inserts of every vaccine. These unfortunately include rare deaths that occur unpredictably.

Sometimes those risks are not known until many years later - such as the SV40 contamination leading to increased rates of various cancers. Other risks are understood over time such as the emerging field of autoimmune diseases related to vaccination reactions. Science cannot predict all of the future. The belief that it can is an article of faith. And faith is a religious matter. Anyone who promotes a position that 'the science is settled' on any topic, especially a medical one, is presenting a position of their belief and faith and not one of science. The apple still falls as Newton observed but along came Einstein and his theories of relativity – because science evolves over time as evidence accrues.

However - safety and science is not the actual legal or legislative issue today.

Compulsory medical intervention without informed consent is actually the question.

Does the state have a vested interest to supervene the rights of an individual when it comes to consent to medical care? Does the public good trump the individual right to choose their medical care and do the people not have a right to consent to care without punishment for their decisions?

Regarding vaccines that answer is increasingly seen in public discussions and news forums as an assumed yes. It is sold with a simple formula that vaccines are safe medical interventions with no significant risks. And that the benefits outweigh those risks.

If we know that there is a risk of harm, and we do, where are the models to help physicians stratify who is at risk to prevent the harm from occurring? There simply are none. There are no stratification models of prediction of harm. In the absence of those predictive models the damage must come first before a medical exemption can be generated. And harm does occur – both sides agree on that.

However - these are all distractions from the core issue which is not safety of the intervention but the right to choose and consent to our medical care. That is the core legal issue.

Choice and the right to informed consent without punishment is the issue at hand.

The current laws work – epidemics are not occurring when outbreaks occur. Our vaccination rates in Oregon are high. It is not about an 'emergency'. It is about Choice and Consent.

Research shows that four interventions would prevent almost 80% of all chronic diseases including cancer, diabetes, and heart disease. If medical choice is a function of the state then why is there no move to make compulsory those four interventions: not smoking, exercising regularly, eating healthy foods, and maintaining a healthy weight?

This country was founded upon religious liberty and the protection of the minority from the tyranny of the majority. The belief that vaccines are the sole medical intervention in the history of humanity to not have any significant health risks and that they can be combined in any form of polypharmacy with no unforeseen consequence has got to be an article of deep faith. Such an unrealistic belief in such unique safety is a religious faith and not a scientific one. The reason being is that it contradicts the agreed upon clear scientific and historical evidence that there are unpredictable risks and unforeseen consequence in a minority of persons.

This bill would tyrannize the minority of the population who choose to vaccinate in a limited or modified fashion or not at all. A tyranny by the majority who have an unreasonable faith that is in defiance of the undisputed scientific facts. This bill would subject Oregon citizens to medical interventions that they may not have consented to and will be a step backwards in the entire concept of informed consent and the right to choose our medical care. This bill is bad for vaccines and for the government and it will stimulate more mistrust of both.

It's all really about Choice and Informed Consent. Please vote no on HB 3063

Eric Blake, ND, MSOM, Dipl. Ac.