

Dear Members of the Committee:

I am writing to oppose the passage of HB 7005 and I pray that this bill does not move forward.

My religion prohibits the injection of known carcinogenic substances into my body and my children's bodies. As a fit parent, I hold the right and am tasked with the duty to teach my child my religious beliefs. This belief is protected by the First Amendment at strict scrutiny.

I choose to not attend a place of worship for my religious practice, and therefore I could never use a clergyman to sign my religious exemption unless I began attending church AND my clergyman felt comfortable signing the exemption.

This bill does not advance a compelling state interest. The passage of this bill doesn't benefit taxpayers, children, families, schools, and the like.

The only benefit is that the school nurse would have fewer documents to sign each year. With roughly 1200 families using a religious exemption, and less than 1200 public schools in Connecticut, a school nurse in Connecticut would average processing one religious exemption per year.

The workload and inconvenience to school nurses is negligible. I don't believe inconvenience in the workplace should be lobbied. Almost all jobs have aspects that are inconvenient, and very few warrant government intervention.

The removal of school nurses from the list is NOT a compelling state interest and benefits no one, but forces parents to expose their child's vaccine status to someone other than the school nurse, who would have access to this data anyway.

When laws are passed, the harms and benefits must be adequately balanced between the citizens and the government. When there is far more harm (exposing medical information, the chilling effect of the exercise of free religion) than perceived benefit to others (a school nurse not having to sign forms), the passage of the law is not a compelling state interest and fails the constitutional balancing test.

The only logical reason why nurses and other members of the public wish to put this bill forth is to begin the process of removing our religious exemptions through legislative creep. I believe this bill was created as a template to amend each year until parental rights and free exercise of religion are eroded, and to mirror the California statute that removed religious exemptions.

If private citizens and school nurses are concerned with parents "lying" about religion (which again, I don't believe lying about religion and other matters of conscience is a compelling state interest), then legislating a philosophical exemption would solve that problem. It's unconstitutional to force a parent to believe in a religion in order to ensure a free public education for their child while safeguarding their child from the heavy

metals, toxins, and known carcinogens such as formaldehyde and glyphosate which is found in all vaccines. They may feel they have no other choice because the government has prohibited them from using informed consent rights to protect their child.

The solution to this problem is not to further invade fundamental rights, but kill any legislation that puts these rights in conflict. Connecticut, for example, has Informed Consent laws that are codified in our statutes. They are also well defined in federal law and case law.

I urge this honorable committee to not move this bill forward, and consider looking into the true public health threat, which is the influx of toxins damaging the brains of infants and young children through these mandated vaccines.

Thank you for reading my testimony,

Monica Szymonik
Glastonbury, CT