



Dawn Richardson  
Director of Advocacy  
National Vaccine Information Center  
Statement Opposing SB 277  
California Senate Education Committee

Thank you for providing this opportunity to express our opposition to SB 277 which proposes to eliminate the personal belief exemption to mandatory vaccination in California.

I am offering this statement of opposition on behalf of California donor supporters of the non-profit National Vaccine Information Center, a consumer advocacy organization founded in 1982 to prevent vaccine injuries and deaths through public education and the protection of the informed consent ethic.

This bill, if passed, would make the only vaccine exemption option in California a difficult to obtain medical exemption.

There are many outstanding questions the bill sponsor and other legislators have failed or refused to answer if this bill passes including:

- How will families who still decide to delay or decline vaccines provide a legally required education for their child? Have you considered the implications for the future for these children for whom you would be denying an education?
- What happens to a parent who still refuses to vaccinate their child if this bill passes? Will they be punished for truancy? Will they be arrested? Will families be broken apart by child protective services?
- What happens to the child whose parent does not agree with the safety, efficacy, or necessity of every single California mandated vaccine? Will the child be taken from their loving parents and forcibly vaccinated?
- What will happen to children who have family histories or personal histories with vaccine reactions that families can't find a doctor to write a medical exemption?

It is wrong for the bill authors to promote this type of condemning and discriminating legislation without clearly telling families of this state and other legislators what passage would actually mean for families in disagreement with the use of every mandated vaccine.

There are many legitimate reasons why families may question the use of some or all vaccines including:

- Vaccines are pharmaceutical products that cause injury and death for some. [The United States Government has paid out more than \\$3 billion dollars to vaccine victims. Many more people have adverse reactions.](#) Nobody can predict who will be harmed from vaccines.

- Vaccines manufacturers and the doctors who administer vaccines [are completely shielded from liability for vaccine injuries and deaths](#).
- [Vaccines fail sometimes where even fully vaccinated people become infected](#). Nobody can predict who will or will not respond to vaccines.
- [Children today receive 69 doses of vaccines for 16 different viral and bacterial illnesses](#) which more than doubles the government childhood schedule of [34 doses of 11 different vaccines in the year 2000](#). A vaccine exemption is filed regardless of whether the exemption is filed for one dose or all doses. 35 doses and 5 more unique vaccines have been added to the schedule in the last 15 years. Those supporting forced vaccination are being dishonest by not acknowledging the exploding vaccine schedule while sounding alarms over small increases in overall non-medical exemptions.
- [There are hundreds of new vaccines in development](#) including some of the following in clinical trials: HIV, herpes, E. coli, dengue fever, avian influenza, smallpox, tuberculosis, typhoid, norovirus, cholera, smoking cessation, syphilis, and gonorrhea. If vaccine manufacturers and others who profit from forced vaccination convince legislators to take away our right to delay or decline a vaccine now, what will our future look like?
- [In the past 5 years, drug makers have paid the U.S. Government \\$19.2 billion in criminal and civil FRAUD penalties](#). Skepticism of the pharmaceutical industry is well deserved, and it doesn't imply a skepticism of science.

It is particularly disturbing that Physicians, in the American Medical Association Code of Ethics, affirm philosophical and religious exemptions for themselves (see Opinion [9.133 Routine Universal Immunization of Physicians](#)) and yet they want to remove this same right in law for California parents.

By targeting only those students with personal belief exemptions, SB 277 has absolutely nothing to do with public health and protecting immune compromised students. Some people are non-responders to some vaccines and vaccine effectiveness for some vaccines, especially for pertussis containing vaccines, wanes rapidly. Some students are provisionally enrolled and not fully vaccinated at the time of enrollment. Federal law, the McKinney-Vento Act, requires that homeless students be allowed to attend school without proof of immunizations. Some students are delinquent on vaccinations (no vaccine and no exemption to comply with the mandate). There are no requirements (and there shouldn't be) that teachers, staff, and administration be vaccinated with the same childhood vaccine schedule. These all are people who are no different immunologically than a healthy student with a vaccine exemption and yet they represent a much larger percentage of the school population than the small percentage of students holding a personal belief exemption targeted for expulsion by this bill.

On the other hand, students with active HIV infections are not only allowed to attend school, the confidentiality of their infection status is protected in law. Students infected with Hepatitis B and Hepatitis C also attend school without parents of other students being told. Students who are vaccinated with live viral vaccines experience viral shedding and can infect susceptible individuals for a period of several weeks post vaccination and yet they are allowed to attend school too. Some people who are vaccinated still get the illness (vaccine failures) while some have subclinical infections and can still transmit vaccine preventable diseases and not show symptoms because the vaccine suppresses them.

Prohibiting kids with personal belief vaccine exemptions from attending school won't prevent vaccine targeted communicable diseases. There was a recent outbreak of pertussis at [Monterrey Park School in Salinas, California](#). All 4 cases were in vaccinated students even in spite of a 99.5% school vaccination rate. The previous year in that same school district, only [9% of the cases of pertussis were in students never vaccinated](#). Claiming SB 277 will create a safe environment for immune compromised students is not only dishonest, it puts those students at risk of being a victim of a false sense of security.

SB 277 will not make parents vaccinate their children who don't want to; the bill just kicks their children out of school, but these kids still live here and are part of the community and future of this state. SB 277 is based on the faulty assumption that denying partially or unvaccinated children an education produces an overall desirable outcome for the state of California. The bottom line is SB 277 needs to be opposed because it isolates, marginalizes and punishes healthy California children whose parents don't agree with all government mandated vaccines by extorting an education with vaccination. Vote no on SB 277.