

Chairman Lipps, Vice Chair Holmes, Ranking Member Russo, and Members of the House Health Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide proponent testimony on House Bill 248. My name is Michelle McGreevy and I am a stay-at-home mother living in Independence, Ohio. I am in full support of House Bill 248 for the following reasons:

1. This legislation would uphold citizens' religious freedoms. I, and many others in my family, oppose receiving this vaccine because of deeply held religious convictions. We want to maintain the freedom to reject this medical treatment on the basis of our beliefs and to not be discriminated against because we hold to those beliefs.

2. Hard working Ohioans would be protected from being fired by employers or being denied access to institutions of higher education if they choose not to be vaccinated. This legislation would uphold the healthcare privacy and health freedoms of each individual in the state.

3. This legislation may protect the economy and welfare of the state by keeping individuals employed and educated in the state rather than being forced to find employment or educational institutions in other states which have already passed laws protecting vaccination choice. If this legislation is passed, not only would it allow individuals to be employed and educated here without having to be vaccinated, but it may draw other families and individuals here from other states with the promise of their freedoms being upheld.

Personally, my brother is currently fighting against his employer who is trying to force him to take the vaccine against his will. He has been harassed and told he must be vaccinated. He believes the company is seeking the legal means to fire him based on his unwillingness to receive the vaccine. He is a hard working civil engineer and the sole provider for his family.

In addition, I have two daughters currently attending Cleveland State University studying engineering and nursing. The university has mandated those students wishing to live on campus to receive the vaccine. My daughters can commute to the university, but the administration has left the language very vague regarding the need for commuters to be vaccinated. If they remain unvaccinated and commute, they will be forced to wear masks and undergo surveillance testing while those who are vaccinated neither have to be masked nor tested. It has been medically proven the vaccinated can still contract the virus, and therefore, can spread it just the same as the unvaccinated. If the university is allowed to make these distinctions based on vaccination status, they are effectively creating two separate classes of students and violating students' healthcare privacy. This I believe is a form of discrimination. This is a way to shame students into receiving the vaccine or else be socially segregated from the whole of the student body. My fear is the university will require all students to receive this vaccine to be able to attend in person classes. If this does occur, my children will not be receiving an education in the state of Ohio and will be forced to find a university which protects their freedom of choice. In the end, they will most likely take their skill sets with them to other states where their freedoms are upheld by the legislature.

In conclusion, this is an experimental form of gene therapy, not a vaccine as is commonly understood. It has not been thoroughly and rigorously tested in order to be approved by the FDA. Therefore, no person, employer, or organization has the right to force or coerce an individual to participate in a medical experiment. I humbly ask this committee to please protect Ohioans' right to vaccination choice and to be protected under the law from potential discrimination by refusing to receive this medical treatment.

Thank you again for allowing the citizens' voices to be heard on House Bill 248.

Sincerely,  
Michelle McGreevy