

31 January 2025
Proponent SB 19
Senate Public Health & Welfare

Madam Chair Gossage and Members of the Senate Public Health & Welfare Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to express my support for SB19 today. The Conscientious Right to Refuse gives Kansans the choice of conscience instead of proving religious beliefs to refuse certain medical treatments. (It's also only 2 pages, which we can all agree on is our favorite kind of bill--ha!)

I firmly believe that any medical intervention that has death as a side effect should be allowed to be refused for reasons other than religion. What other companies do you know of that don't have liability to sue for damages if their product causes harm? There is only one. The pharmaceutical industry. Since 1986, the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act (NCVIA) has been protecting the vaccine industry from liability for any damage vaccines do to unsuspecting victims. We've been on the other side of the COVID vaccine long enough to see the studies showing the tremendous harms and danger associated with it. It should be pulled from the market, but while it isn't you should have the choice to refuse it without retribution.

According to the NIH, randomized double blind placebo control (RDBPC) studies are considered the "gold standard" of epidemiologic studies. Sadly, NIH shares a study performed in 2021 where the RDBPC wasn't a vaccine vs. saline for the control. Instead, the control was filled with all of the same toxic ingredients of the vaccine except the virus portion so that the trial participants were equally ill from the toxins of the vaccine instead of comparing COVID-19 mRNA vaccine with saline which would've been a true study. How can you say it's safe and effective if you haven't tested it the way you're supposed to? How can you force a biologic on someone without adequate safety studies? Example: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33849629/>

MTHFR is an abbreviation for methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase. It interacts with folate (vitamin B9) to break down the amino acid homocysteine. In layman's terms, this gene mutation does not allow bodies to detox like other bodies are able, which leads to short term and long-term health issues that can pull someone from the workforce entirely. In fact, a healthy air traffic controller here in Kansas followed his employer's mandate for the COVID-19 vaccine and he is now disabled and unable to work to provide for his family. You can't say that these vaccines/biologics an employer mandates are safe. Where there is a risk, there should always be choice. This is another reason why I ask you to support SB 19.

The jury verdict and award hit on a theme playing out in recent court cases: Employers risk costly litigation if they fail to carefully consider each religious accommodation request on an individual basis and if they make blanket assumptions about the legitimacy or sincerity of an employee's religious beliefs, including those who also mention conscientious rights and bodily autonomy alongside their religious beliefs. The Constitution gives individual liberty, and you as a Senator have taken the oath to uphold this document. An August ruling by the 7th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals highlights what may be an under-the-radar issue for many employers: An accommodation request can still be religious in nature even if it is based partly on secular reasons. Please support SB 19. <https://www.hrdive.com/news/jury-awards-catholic-woman-12-million-vaccine-religious-discrimination-lawsuit/733152/>

You can't say these vaccines/biologics/mRNA/drugs are safe and effective because they haven't truly been tested using true placebos. There are no quality studies to be found. We know the Journals control narratives on the front end then they control on the back end—and any exposure gets cleaned up online and vanishes. Journals cover up harms.
https://petermcculloughmd.substack.com/p/new-peer-reviewed-paper-exposes-journal?publication_id=1119676&utm_campaign=email-post-title&r=44aelz&utm_medium=email

Vaccines become mainstream rapidly because there's no liability. We the people are not getting the full truth. The people pay the price with their health and their livelihoods are destroyed. Where there is risk, there should always be choice, and that's why we must have SB 19 in Kansas Statute.

We do have constitutional rights.
We should also have conscientious rights to refuse medical interventions.
One size does not fit all.
When the risk is death, you should have a right to choose.
This is the place for that line to be drawn.
Please support SB 19 as written.

Sincerely,

Melissa Campbell
Senate District 9