

I worked as an RN for 6 years, my main focus of patient care was critical care, as well as home care, hospice as needed, and a post surgical care unit. I have since been doing my most important work raising and homeschooling my four children. I support House Bill 248 because I want to secure my children's future freedoms and fight for those who have already lost so much in such a short time. My husband is a Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetist at a local hospital, so we are no strangers to the medical community and the core of health care.

I applaud the individual health care decisions, personal health care rights, and freedoms that this bill supports, which is the main focus of this legislation, **not vaccine efficacy**. To vote against it **devalues the independent person**. Parents, guardians, and individuals have the right to be clearly informed of exemptions with the current notifications of recommended vaccines. A person or parent who decides to turn down a vaccine or vaccines should be able to make those decisions confidently, independently, privately, and most importantly, without fear of repercussions.

A recurring argument for employee vaccinations rests on the thought that this bill would prevent hospitals and employers from requiring employees to wear masks and/or be reassigned in the interest of patient safety. The majority of health care providers are highly-trained, rationally minded, and educated in a specialty that allows them to recognize and respond responsibly in their position when it comes to public health safety. In the profession of health care, a provider, knowingly treating an immunocompromised patient, a potentially or confirmed ill patient with a communicable disease, has been properly trained in personal health care protection and would follow such recommendations to use personal protective equipment without hesitation. In other words, they would have no problem wearing a mask for the protection of themselves and/or their other patients and family members. Health care providers should not have to surrender their personal health care freedoms to keep their job and continue to follow their passions in caring for people.

While offering protection for our most basic medical privacy rights in the public sector, this bill appears to continue to follow legitimate channels for hospital and medical communications as it pertains to patient care and treatment, per the current HIPPA act. There is no need for the public health department to panic that there will be no pertinent medical information available in the event of an outbreak. According to the bill and other revised codes, that information is still accessible through the

proper medical processes as needed for health care purposes.

The growing concern for the unvaccinated population is an unsubstantiated argument. This idea suggests that a majority of children/people don't get vaccinated, whereas in reality it is a very small percentage of the population that bypass vaccines. According to an article in the Washington Post from 2018, only 1.3% of children under 2 years of age in the US had not received the recommended vaccines while the greater part of parents choose to vaccinate per the recommendations. Blocking this bill would completely remove that freedom of choice for parents and individuals. While such a small portion of the population concerns medical professionals, it is yet still an inalienable right of parents and people of all ages. This bill would be a move in the right direction to protect individual freedoms.

Health care providers have abandoned natural health promotion and prevention. While vaccines are proven to decrease mortality and hospitalizations, there is little stress on natural vitamins, herbs, and healthy lifestyle habits to increase our immune response and prevention. Our government and health care system cannot take the intimate personal choice to decline a substance to be injected or otherwise placed in one's body away from individuals. As health care providers we cannot force or control how a person decides to treat their personal health. We do our best to inform people of treatment options and healthy lifestyle behaviors. People have the right to make personal health care decisions even if they result in unpleasant outcomes. We teach them how to make healthy lifestyle choices, while respecting their right to make an informed decision. We do not get to make that decision for them, we do however continue to support them by providing information, including any possibly consequences even when we do not agree with their decisions and continuing to do all that we can for them.

In the case of the COVID-19 vaccine, the coercion to receive the shot has been unethical and deceitful. From conducting a statewide lottery for only vaccinated individuals using **Federal Relief Monies** to offering incentives; monetary, social participation permission, the ability to keep one's job, as well as more unmentioned. As it is evident, although with the pressure to receive a shot, one could not know, the COVID-19 Vaccine has NOT been fully approved. There is so much we DON'T know concerning this shot. Even the approval is being urged to be made at a hurried pace. According to several sources, Pfizer Inc. applied in July of 2021 for a "Priority Review", in which a decision for approval must be made within six months. An

article from the site [The History of Vaccines, An Educational Resource](https://www.historyofvaccines.org/content/articles/vaccine-development-testing-and-regulation) by the College of Physicians of Philadelphia, called “Vaccine Development, Testing and Regulation” (<https://www.historyofvaccines.org/content/articles/vaccine-development-testing-and-regulation>) states that in the US, vaccine development has a standard of steps, with the first steps being laboratory and animal studies. The exploratory stage of the initial step is reported to last 2-4 years. The pre-clinical stage lasts 1-2 years, which studies tissue-culture and cell-culture systems to assess the safety and ability of the vaccine to create an immune response. Then follows the Investigational New Drug Application to the FDA, which includes a description of the manufacturing, testing processes, lab reports. Once approved by the FDA, **then** the vaccine starts three phases of testing, which include clinical studies in humans. We have essentially skipped 3-6 years of studies, moved right into the phase trials and on top of that have immense pressure from all directions, with little to no allowance for rebuttal, questioning, or hesitancy.

Privately owned businesses have been manipulated into enforcing regulations that remove personal freedoms due to the restrictions and threats of reprimands that government has put on them. The government has conned privately owned businesses and retail giants into doing the work they want done, but in a way that makes it appear they are not involved. The unconstitutional, forceful closure of businesses, along with fines for not following poorly reported, incomplete studies has businesses at the mercy of government demands as the need for basic financial providence is depended on by so many of the employees. Our Governor recently released a less than forthright statement claiming that since January, 98% of hospitalizations have been unvaccinated peoples. While true, he neglected to include the vaccination rollout and the phases that were in place in Ohio during the first part of the year. It wasn't until March, that people aged 50 and older were eligible for the vaccine, as well as the definition that people vaccinated less than two weeks or with only one shot were considered unvaccinated.

Blocking this bill would lead to potentially more severe mandates and future recommendations to become more intrusive on our personal freedoms without taking into consideration the effect of a particular treatment or recommendation on an individual. There are valid reasons for a person to not take a vaccine(s) including allergies, injuries, or other medical contraindications, not to mention religious exemptions or personal decisions. This bill would put that small but equally important population in a

position that would make it even more difficult for them to apply their exemptions with an employer or school and cause them fear of any repercussions in their decision.

House Bill 248 protects the right of the individual from being mandated to disclose vaccine status, participate in a vaccine passport system, registry, or other mechanisms designed to track an individual's vaccine status. It is obvious, although not specifically stated, that the event that spurred the need for this particular bill is directly related to the current controversial tactics and coercion to receiving and tracking the current Covid-19 virus shot. The population, especially those in the medical field who are choosing not to take this shot yet, understand that the Covid-19 shots **are not approved**, but for emergency use only. They are clinically still in the experimental phase, regardless of how imperative the shot is to some people. The push for the shot is excessive, even for those who have already recovered from the virus, which seems like an unwarranted suggestion, as even reported by the Cleveland Clinic in recent studies. There has not been an opportunity for long term studies on side effects. With research and understanding, the risk of the shot outweighs the benefit at this time for younger populations, which has been confirmed by the WHO. Scientists and health care providers cannot yet report on the dangers of the vaccine on the young population, however we do know that there is a very low threat of young people having serious side effects or death from the Covid virus. If the majority of people, including those with comorbidities, do get the vaccine, then according to past reports their risk is greatly decreased. From an article on yahoo news "The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) released a report that found the two-dose Pfizer and Moderna vaccine regimen prevents 90 percent of infections two weeks after the second dose, meaning a majority of recipients are unable to contract the virus and thus spread it to others." That report quickly changed to vaccinated people carry high viral loads and can spread the virus just as easily as non-vaccinated people. The science is continuously changing because we are still in the experimental phase – we are still learning about this virus, the variants, which *could* be caused by the massive vaccination, and immunity. After the constant changing of rules, science, recommendations, it is not it not surprising so many people have lost trust in our government representatives and agencies.

Relating to other vaccines, which have been previously and are continued to be recommended for participation in society, such as the meningococcal vaccine, this bill will continue to secure future protections for those who choose not to take them. According to the CDC, vaccines **cannot** prevent an

illness. Specifically related to the meningococcal vaccine, the CDC states that as part of the licensure process for both MenACWY and MenB vaccines, they showed that the vaccine produces an immune response which **suggests** that the vaccines provide protection, **however data is limited on how well they [the vaccines] work**. It goes on to state that meningococcal disease is uncommon and at a historic low, but people should still get them to measure their effectiveness. Since the first recommended vaccine of MenACWY in 2005, meningococcal disease by the serogroups C, Y & W have decreased by over 90%. This data suggests that the vaccine provides protection **for those vaccinated**, but *probably not* to those unvaccinated. The reports by these experts are not agreeably not convincing enough for everyone to get the vaccine. The first thing to note is that it is obvious the experts don't have a confident claim on the infection of the unvaccinated or the effectiveness of the vaccine since the disease is so uncommon. With these statements people realize the risk they are taking and that risk is solely their responsibility not the governments. Those who have received the vaccine, according to these statements, should not have grave concerns since the disease decreased in those who have been vaccinated. So it can be concluded that the population that foregoes vaccination is of very little threat to those who have been vaccinated and should not be ostracized.

Voting against this bill presumes that someone else knows your body and health better than you do. It also suggests that because a person has spent their adulthood studying a particular area of science, it negates all other areas of science along with personal research and individual physical health needs. While vaccine injuries are controversial to some, people who have experienced them should not have to face the possibility of forcible treatment to be employed or attend school.

Death is melancholy, but unavoidable, the healthcare providers main focus is the individual patient and that is something that has been devalued under collectivist mindsets.

Thank you for taking my testimony into consideration. I hope that you will see the importance of this bill for people to keep their personal health choice freedom without fearing repercussions that can negatively affect their careers or personal lives.

Sincerely,

Marti Auckerman, RN, BSN