

RENZ LAW, LLC.

Date: 05/23/2021

Testimony Regarding HB 248

Esteemed Members of the Committee:

Below is my testimony regarding HB 248. In addition to my written testimony I have attached a petition for TRO that we filed in the Northern District of Alabama (pending now) and an attachment to that petition. Both contain critically important information.

The information in the attachments demonstrate the need for this bill. There simply is no right more critical than the right of self determination related to one's health.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this bill and sincerely hope you will consider the cited information in the attachments when weighing its gravity.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas Renz

RENZ LAW, LLC.

Testimony

I opened a recent petition for a temporary restraining order with this quote:

“The Constitution of this Republic should make special provision for medical freedom. To restrict the art of healing to one class will constitute the Bastille of medical science. All such laws are un-American and despotic. ... Unless we put medical freedom into the constitution the time will come when medicine will organize into an undercover dictatorship and force people who wish doctors and treatment of their own choice to submit to only what the dictating outfit offers.” Attributed to Dr. Benjamin Rush – Founding Father, signer of the Declaration of Independence and personal physician to George Washington.

We are now seeing the truth of that statement.

For over a year now the citizens of Ohio have been manipulated in the most egregious manner. Career bureaucrats, with the help of self-interested politicians like our Governor, have destroyed businesses, taken freedoms, and convinced people that they have no choice but to submit to taking one of three completely experimental drugs under the guise of “safety.” They have changed the traditional approach to determining cause of death and defined a disease so broadly that anyone could be categorized as having it when, in reality, they had nothing more than a cold. All for no other reason than to create fear.

Make no mistake, COVID-19 is real and has killed people. This terrible disease, which may well have been made more dangerous due to funding from these same bureaucrats, appears to have had a substantial impact on our elderly, though we may never actually know the real extent. What we do know is that COVID-19 is nowhere near as dangerous as we have been misled to believe, and also that the same bureaucrats that appear to have funded the gain of function research related to the virus are now profiteering off of the “vaccines” they approved to stop it.

HB 248 is long overdue and at the same time should not be necessary. I believe a strong argument could be made that many of the protections offered by HB 248

RENZ LAW, LLC.

already exist in a natural reading of the law. That said, our Governor has made it clear that the implied freedoms we enjoy under the law are meaningless and so we are now at a point that we must codify basic freedoms that are so fundamental that our founding fathers could never have imagined they would need to be spelled out.

In Ohio we have a Governor attempting to coerce children that are at ZERO statistical risk of death from COVID according to CDC statistics to take an experimental vaccine with unknown levels of risk. Allow me to say this again: according to CDC statistics, and as we submitted in federal court, **CHILDREN HAVE A STATISTICALLY ZERO RISK OF DEATH FROM COVID-19 AND OUR GOVERNOR IS ATTEMPTING TO COERCE THEM INTO ACCEPTING THIS EXPERIMENTAL VACCINE!** He is even ignoring the separation of powers doctrine and funding a “lottery” without approval of this body.

As demonstrated by the Governor’s approval levels, this is unpopular. So the new plan appears to be to push private industry to do the dirty work. HB 248 will prevent private business from doing what is politically impossible to continue to do – ignore citizens’ right to personal autonomy.

HB 248 protects individual freedom and, for anyone not heavily supported by the largest lobby in America – the pharmaceutical industry – this bill should be easy to support. If you are a Democrat, you have probably supported the idea of my body my choice for decades. If you do then you simply cannot oppose HB 248. Allow me to share a quote from one of the most seminal abortion cases in history. In *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, 505 U.S. 833, the Court stated:

Roe, however, may be seen not only as an exemplar of *Griswold* liberty but as a rule (whether or not mistaken) of personal autonomy and bodily integrity, with doctrinal affinity to cases recognizing limits on governmental power to mandate medical treatment or to bar its rejection. If so, our cases since *Roe* accord with *Roe's* view that a State's interest in the protection of life falls short of justifying any plenary override of individual liberty claims. [*Cruzan v. Director, Mo. Dept. of Health*, 497 U.S. 261, 278, 111 L. Ed. 2d 224, 110 S. Ct. 2841 \(1990\)](#); cf., e. g., [*Riggins v. Nevada*, 504 U.S. 127, 135, 118 L. Ed. 2d 479, 112 S. Ct. 1810 \(1992\)](#); [*Washington v. Harper*](#),

RENZ LAW, LLC.

[494 U.S. 210, 108 L. Ed. 2d 178, 110 S. Ct. 1028 \(1990\)](#); see also, *e. g.*, [*Rochin v. California*, 342 U.S. 165, 96 L. Ed. 183, 72 S. Ct. 205 \(1952\)](#); [*Jacobson v. Massachusetts*, 197 U.S. 11, 24-30, 49 L. Ed. 643, 25 S. Ct. 358 \(1905\)](#).

To reiterate – “a State’s interest in the protection of life falls short of justifying any plenary override of individual liberty claims.” It must be noted that the Court actually cites *Jacobson* in its justification for this quote. So unless you believe that *Roe v. Wade* is just about killing fetuses you cannot be pro *Roe v. Wade* and against HB 248.

For the Republicans here I want to challenge the preposterous idea that you are universally opposed to regulating private business. This idea appears to have come from a pharmaceutical messaging group and has very successfully fooled many into opposing freedom.

Let us consider the idea that ANYONE is opposed to regulating business. Are you okay with racism? We currently regulate business by saying it is illegal to discriminate on race. Are you okay with sexism? We currently regulate business by saying you cannot discriminate based on sex. How about ensuring the food you eat when you go to a restaurant is not spoiled? Another regulation on business. The point is that regulating business is both necessary and sensible and NO one opposes all regulation on business. Rather, Republicans (not including our Governor) generally prefer minimal regulation that promotes freedom.

Let’s talk about freedom with regards to the individual. Would anyone suggest that a business’s rights should trump the fundamental rights of the individual? If that were the case then you would have to believe that a business should be able to discriminate on things like faith. It is a fundamental right for anyone to believe as he or she chooses. Would anyone suggest that we should allow businesses to discriminate based on the choice of who you choose to worship? Of course not because we all know the fundamental rights of the individual should generally trump the rights of a business. To oppose HB 248 is to oppose this ideal.

Sects from every major religion have firmly held religious beliefs against vaccination. It is absolutely discrimination to force people to jump through hoops,

RENZ LAW, LLC.

fill out papers, and share private medical information to gain access to businesses. Are we really okay with type of xenophobia and/or theophobia?

All of this leads to the underlying question, if these vaccinations work so well why do the people that have the vaccines seem to worry so much about those that do not? The same question applies for masks and nearly any of the other absurd impositions on our freedoms we have had to endure for the past year.

The Constitutional foundations of both our great state and our great nation stem from the idea of individual freedom. Individual freedom, in this case, means that if you want to be experimented on with a vaccine that is barely tested then you may do it. It also means I am free to choose not to and should not be discriminated against based on my choice.

HB 248 should not be necessary, but it is. I urge this committee to support this bill.