

April 5, 2021

## OREGONIANS FOR MEDICAL FREEDOM

Dear Co Chairs and members of the Committee,

My name is Nicole De Graff. I am the Executive Director for Oregonians for Medical Freedom. I represent a grassroots organization that includes medical professionals, teachers, parents, civil servants, from all walks of life and political parties. We protect medical privacy, informed consent and choice.

I am testifying today to ask that Key measures and budget notes be included to the budget for the Department of Justice.

On March 24, Attorney General Rosenblum, along with 11 other State Attorney Generals, signed a letter calling for Facebook and Twitter to immediately take steps to remove Covid-19 vaccine "misinformation." While you are calling for restricting free speech, are you failing to protect Oregonians First Amendment rights? The message came through loud and clear as a week later, Facebook complied. They updated their policies that removal would be one of the consequences for, "making exaggerated or hyperbolic claims about vaccine safety or advocating others not get the vaccine to name a few."

We call on the AG to issue a Public statement removing her name from letter and denounce any government agency violating free speech.

We also call on the Attorney General to report back to the legislature on their support for Civil liberties. How will the Attorney General defend free speech?

They used the derogatory term, "anti-vaxxers" which sows hatred and division. We should be called medical freedom advocates and anything else is offensive and dehumanizing. It is debatable that Twitter and Facebook may be a private company but operating as a modern public square where the free flow of ideas should be allowed to be exchanged instead of shutting down debate. Me thinks thou protest too much. It is less ambiguous that our tax dollars are being used by Rosenblum to violate the First Amendment of the US Constitution and Article I, Section 8 of the Oregon Constitution, which states: "No law shall be passed restraining the free expression of opinion, or restricting the right to speak, write, or print freely on any subject whatever; but every person shall be responsible for the abuse of this right."

By signing this letter the, AG is in violation and looks to be on the wrong side of history if Section 230 protections are proven to be null and void. In a statement by Justice Thomas today on the absolute power of social media firms he said, "Today's digital platforms provide avenues for historically unprecedented amounts of speech, including speech in the hands of a few private parties. We will soon have no choice but to address how our legal doctrines apply to highly concentrated, privately owned information infrastructure such as digital platforms." Are they common carriers? How can the AGs Antitrust Enforcement Unit with 48 other Attorney Generals file a lawsuit that Facebook unlawfully maintained its monopoly in the personal social Networking services market and then do this? It is highly contradictory when they know they have a monopoly and yet are asking them to further limit consumers use and benefits anyway!

Why are Attorney Generals, who are not medical experts, allowed to offer their opinion while also stating, "these individuals lack medical expertise"? Many healthcare professionals including doctors are members of our group. Despite, or rather because we are in an emergency, it is entirely appropriate for people to be aware of their legal rights and to know that the Covid-19 vaccines are unlicensed, unapproved, and are still in Phase 3 Trials, which do not end until October 2022, at the earliest.



## OREGONIANS FOR MEDICAL FREEDOM

What does the Attorney General consider misinformation? Is it the individual or is it the information being shared?

For example, listed In the FDA EUA fact sheet it clearly states, "These may not be all the possible side effects of the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine. Serious and unexpected side effects may occur. Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine is still being studied in clinical trials."

Is it ok if FDA shares this but no one else is allowed to share they had Bell's Palsy or another previously unknown adverse reaction? How is it ok to report thousands of presumptive covid cases daily, but not raw data from VAERS?

Is it ok if FDA shares this but no one else is allowed to share they had Bell's Palsy or another previously unknown adverse reaction? How is it ok to report thousands of presumptive covid cases daily, but not raw data from VAERS?

Would the AG consider this misinformation: "If you experience a severe allergic reaction, call 9-1-1, or go to the nearest hospital...AND Report vaccine side effects to FDA/CDC Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS). Using the phone number provided or report online..." Is it ok if only vaccine manufacturers share this but no one else shares those same reports of injury or death? The vaccine manufacturer is required to rely on this data to complete their trials and its logical to conclude, where there's smoke, there's fire.

Is it misinformation to tell others it is their choice as stated in the FDA EUA fact sheet or is this considered, "advocating others not get the vaccine?"- The factsheet clearly states, "It is your choice to receive or not receive the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine..."

Is it misinformation to state that the vaccine is not FDA approved but authorized for emergency use authorization only as the OHA has misinforming the public with for months in violation of the FDA's requirement, outside of finally printing a disclaimer at the bottom of the website landing page, though not all promotional material as is the law."

Wouldn't this be closer to misinformation? I don't see the Attorney General using taxpayer funds to bully Mark Zuckerberg or Jack Dorsey to delete Oregon Health Authority from social media.

We condemn the actions of the Attorney General and call for her to remove her name from the letter immediately. Thank you for your time.

Nicole De Graff  
Executive Director  
Oregonians for Medical Freedom

