

Oppose Senate Bill 372

Before the Senate Finance Committee

of the

Maryland General Assembly

Hearing on SB 372

February 28, 2023

Written Testimony in Opposition to Senate Bill 372

John M. Kelly

Bethesda, Maryland

Senate Bill 373 is an assault on the children's health masked as an effort to protect them. If, as assumed, children have the capacity to make decisions about the risks and benefits of taking a vaccine, then, by the same logic, they should be allowed to make decisions about possessing loaded firearms so they can better protect themselves against the danger of assault.

Obvious reasons for opposing the bill are that it: (1) violates fundamental parental rights; (2) ignores informed consent; (3) falsely assumes there is a public health emergency; (4) neglects the medical history of minors; (5) assumes that pharmacists with only 20 hours of additional education are qualified to respond to serious adverse vaccine reactions; (6) ignores evidence to the contrary that vaccines listed on the CDC's (Center for Disease Control and Prevention) recommended schedule have been properly tested and are safe and effective; (7) ignores evidence to the contrary that vaccines approved and authorized by the US. Food and Drug Administration are safe and effective; (8) and assumes minors have the capacity, legal or otherwise, to make informed choices about whether to take a vaccine.

These and other shortcomings in the bill rest on two fundamental flaws: the violation of fundamental parental rights and the and the grossly mistaken assumption that minor children have the capacity to make informed decisions about vaccines. This testimony focuses on them.

In regard to parental rights, the central issue is: Who will makes decisions for minor children, the government or parents? In the history of the United States and other countries the primary authority and responsibly of parents to raise their children has been taken for granted so long as a parent adequately cares for his or her children. Several US Supreme Court rulings have affirmed the primary right of parents in raising their children.

Consequently, it is necessary to ask: What authority the bill relies to allow the state government to usurp fundamental parental rights regarding vaccination of their minor children? The only authority suggested in the bill is that there is a “state of emergency”. But it does not say what the emergency is. It can not identify one because there is no emergency. On this basis alone the bill should be rejected. Even if there where an emergency that fact alone is not sufficient grounds to abrogate parental rights in such a sweeping manner.

The bill ignores over two hundred thirty years of US. history and a hundred years of US Supreme Court precedents recognizing parental rights as traditional rights. Not until a hundred years ago in 1923 were traditional parental rights challenged, and the Court ruled (in *Myer v. Neb.*) that parental rights are a fundamental right and ruled in favor of the parents. Two years later the Court affirmed these rights (in *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*) saying that parents are not the mere creatures of the state and that liberty provides that parents are the ones to make decisions about raising their children. In 1972 the Court (in *Wisconsin v. Yoder*) affirmed parental rights stating:

“The history and culture of Western civilization reflect a strong tradition of parental concern for the nurture and upbringing of their children. This primary role of the parents in the upbringing of their children is now established beyond debate as an enduring American tradition”.

In 2000 the Court (in the *Troxel v. Granville*) in upholding parental rights cited an earlier court opinion which stated:

“[O]ur constitutional system long ago rejected any notion that a child is the mere creature of the State and, on the contrary, asserted that parents generally have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare [their children] for additional obligations. The law’s concept of the family rests on a presumption that parents possess what a child lacks in maturity, experience, and capacity for judgment required for making life’s difficult decisions. More important, historically it has recognized that natural bonds of affection lead parents to act in the best interests of their children.”

In the cited opinion the only qualification was if a parent were not adequately caring for his or her children. Absent that “... there will normally be no reason for the State to inject itself into the private realm of the family to further question the ability of that parent to make the best decisions concerning the rearing of that parent’s children.”

Most recently, this past fall the federal district court for Washington, DC. blocked the

implementation of a law that would allow children to receive vaccinations without the knowledge or approval of their parents. These court decisions affirm that “parental rights” are a “fundamental rights”, the highest right in our legal system and should never be ignored. Senate Bill 372 blatantly ignores them.

Further, the bill’s assumption that minor children have the capacity, legal or otherwise, to make informed decisions about receiving a vaccine is clearly unreasonable. Children do not have the knowledge, experience and judgment to make decisions about the necessity of vaccines or to weigh their respective risks and benefits. This is precisely the issue the Court addressed in *Troxel v. Granville* when it stated: “...Parents possess what a child lacks in maturity, experience, and capacity for judgment required for making life’s difficult decisions”.

It is important to note that while the assertion the Court makes in *Wisconsin v. Yoder* that the “primary role of the parents in the upbringing of their children is now established beyond debate”, the same certainty does not apply to the safety and effectiveness of vaccines. The latter fact is evidenced by contentious debates among leading scientists and doctors, and more importantly and painfully by tens of thousands of children with recognized injuries and death from vaccines.* Consequently, the judgment of parents is required to make decisions about vaccines for their minor children.

Voluntary consent is not sufficient even for an adult receiving a vaccine let alone a child. A person must have the legal capacity to give consent. And to be able to give *informed consent*, the person must be provided with information about the risks and benefits of, and the alternatives to a proposed medical treatment.

It is grossly unreasonable to expect a child to ask and understand answers to basic questions such as:

1. If the vaccine was tested in a pre-licensure clinical trial with a *real* placebo;
[As of 2017 none of the mandated childhood vaccines had been tested for safety in pre-licensure tests with *real* placebos.]
2. If the vaccine was not tested against a real placebo, how can the true rate of adverse effects be calculated?
3. Is there a medical test that can be performed to determine if there is a high risk of being injured by the vaccine?
4. What types of, and how many serious injuries have been reported from the vaccine, and where is it available?

5. Where is information on relative risks and benefits of the vaccine?
6. Is there evidence that children who take the vaccine have significantly worse outcomes than those who do not?; and
7. What do the technical terms in the information sheet included with the vaccine mean?

The difficulty for children obtaining the necessary information to properly give informed consent became even more challenging the past two years with the roll-out of the COVID-19 vaccine. Scientific debate was censored and alternative health care interventions were suppressed. It was and continues to be difficult even for adults to find out basic information about the vaccine and alternatives in order to make informed decisions. To expect children to do is unrealistic.

For example, children do not have the capacity to ask probing questions or evaluate the meaning and significance of information and issues such as:

1. Whether the COVID-19 mRNA vaccine stays near the point of injection or enters the bloodstream and accumulates in several organs;
2. Understand the FDA's June 2021 revision of its Fact Sheets for Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna COVID-19 vaccines that added a warning about the increased risks of inflammation of the heart muscle and inflammation of the tissue surrounding the heart (myocarditis and pericarditis, respectively);
3. Understand the CDC and FDA's "Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System" which is intended to be an early warning system to detect possible safety problems with vaccines. (More than 32 thousand deaths and more than 260 thousand serious injuries including deaths have been reported for COVID-19 vaccines. These deaths and injuries are more than have been reported for all other vaccines since 1990. In addition, it is widely recognized that the vaccine injuries are greatly under-reported);
4. Why the ingredients of the COVID-19 vaccine injected into people are not fully disclosed?; and
5. Why one of the vaccine manufactures wants seventy years to release data about the clinical trials of its COVID vaccine?

There are many other issues and questions such as these that are important, complex and contentious. It takes great effort and time for most adults to understand the complex facts and issues involving vaccines and weigh the pros and cons. Children are in no position to do so, and it is nothing short of preposterous to suppose they do.

For all the above reasons, both individually and collectively, Senate Bill 372 should be opposed.

*See these sources for the contentious debate over vaccines: ***The Real Anthony Fauci: Bill Gates, Big Pharma, and the Global War on Democracy and Public Health***, Robert F. Kennedy Jr. (2021); ***Lies My Government Told Me: And the Better Future Coming***, Robert W. Malone (2022); ***Turtles All the Way Down: Vaccine Science and Myth***, Edited by Zoey O’Toole and Mary Holland (2022); ***The Courage to Face COVID-19: Preventing Hospitalization and Death While Battling the Bio-Pharmaceutical Complex***, John Leake and Peter McCullough (2022); ***The Truth about COVID-19: Exposing the Great Reset, Lockdowns, Vaccine Passports and the New Normal***, Dr. Joseph Mercola and Ronnie Cummins; ***The New Abnormal: The Rise of the Biomedical Security State***, Aaron Kheriaty (2022); ***COVID-19 and the Global Predators: We are the Prey***, Peter R. Breggin and Ginger Ross Breggin (2021); ***Cause Unknown: The Epidemic of Sudden Deaths in 2021 and 2022***, Edward Dowd (2022)