



# CLINT P. MOSES

STATE REPRESENTATIVE • 29<sup>TH</sup> ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

Office: (608) 266-7683  
Toll Free: (888) 529-0029  
Rep.Moses@legis.wi.gov

P.O. Box 8953  
Madison, WI 53708-8953

Testimony in Support of Assembly Bill 1007  
Assembly Committee on Constitution and Ethics  
Thursday, February 17

Thank you Chair Wichgers and members of the Assembly Committee on Constitution and Ethics for the opportunity to testify in favor of Assembly Bill 1007. I appreciate your time and consideration of this legislation.

Assembly Bill 1007 protects healthcare providers by prohibiting any healthcare entity and credentialing board within the Department of Safety and Professional Services from punishing or discriminating in any form against medical professionals who express their professional opinion to a patient or individual.

I'm a healthcare provider in my community, I have patients who come to for my professional opinion. The patient may like what I tell them regarding a treatment plan as well as not like the medical advice I give. However, they can go see a second or third or even a fourth opinion from other healthcare professionals. If all healthcare providers have the same opinions pushed by a corporation or government entity, there is no point in having doctors. We might as well be technicians because we would have to prescribe the same advice or treatment. And not be healthcare providers.

I've heard from many healthcare providers across state about how they have been threatened to lose their jobs and licenses if they express an opinion that is different than their employers and affiliated health system. Healthcare providers should be able to express their professional opinions and advice to patients without retribution.

Protecting the first amendment rights of all people including our healthcare professionals is essential and will provide the best possible healthcare to citizens of Wisconsin.

I ask you to support Assembly Bill 1007 and thank you once again for your time to consider this piece of legislation that protects medical rights and freedoms.



---

# SHAE SORTWELL

---

STATE REPRESENTATIVE • 2<sup>nd</sup> ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

**Hearing Testimony**  
**Assembly Committee on Constitution and Ethics**  
**February 17th, 2022**  
**Assembly Bill 1007**

Chairman Wichgers and members of the Assembly Committee on Constitution and Ethics – thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak on AB 1007, relating to the right of health care providers to express professional opinions related to health or medical information or guidance.

During the last several months, I have received contacts from medical professionals who are concerned that if they express controversial professional opinions, their licenses would be threatened and their jobs terminated.

Their jobs and licenses are being jeopardized if they dare to challenge the echo chamber and choose to fulfil their sacred duty to speak out as best as they understand the science using their “greatest ability and judgement” as it says in the Hippocratic Oath.

AB 1007 protects these individuals by prohibiting any health care entity and credentialing board within the Department of Safety and Professional Services from punishing or discriminating in any form against medical professionals who express their professional opinion to a patient or individual. With this bill, medical professionals in Wisconsin will be protected from any employer or licensing board/agency that attempts to unjustly punish them for simply upholding their oath.

Let’s make it a legislative priority to protect the medical rights, freedoms, consciences and judgements of all our medical professionals who are working hard to bring the facts and science to light without fear of retaliation.

I want to thank the committee for your time and consideration. I am happy to answer any questions members of the committee may have.



## **AB 1007 The Right of Health Care Providers to Express Professional Opinions on Health and Medical Information**

Testimony of Senator Steve Nass  
Assembly Committee on Constitution and Ethics  
February 17, 2022 • 300 Northeast, State Capitol

Thank you Chairman and committee members for allowing me to provide written testimony in support of AB 1007. This bill will help protect the ability of health care providers to express professional opinions related to health or medical information or guidance.

The foundation of scientific inquiry involves the questioning and challenging of hypotheses and conclusions before, during, and after the research process. Free inquiry is integral to scientific progress and discovery.

Today, unfortunately, we have seen efforts to undermine and diminish this free inquiry through various forms of censorship, intimidation, or the application of the label “misinformation” – whether accurate or not.

These actions have been used against some medical professionals, attempting to silence them from challenging the political status quo, such as speaking in favor of the novel use of drugs and treatments to combat symptoms of the Covid-19 virus. Some medical professionals have had their jobs and licenses threatened if they challenge the views of the political and healthcare establishments as they try to treat their patients and provide information to the best of their scientific knowledge and ability.

This bill establishes a right of health care providers to express their professional opinions related to health or medical information or guidance, including any statements, policies, studies, publications, or orders. The bill prohibits any health care entity from retaliating against, discriminating against, or taking action to punish a health care provider for expressing his or her professional opinions.

*“In God We Trust”*

---

11th Senate District  
P.O. Box 7882 • Madison, WI 53707-7882 • (608) 266-2635  
Toll Free: (800) 578-1457 • E-mail: [Sen.Nass@legis.wi.gov](mailto:Sen.Nass@legis.wi.gov)

In addition, the bill prohibits any examining board or credentialing board in the Department of Safety and Professional Services (DPS) from retaliating against, discriminating against, or otherwise punishing a health care provider for expressing his or her professional opinions. This includes denying, suspending, limiting, or revoking a credential or license.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony in support of AB 1007. This bill will help to protect scientific inquiry and progress by protecting the free exercise of speech by medical professionals. Please contact my office if committee members have further questions on this legislation.



---

**Assembly Committee on Constitution and Ethics  
Testimony In Support of AB1007  
February 17, 2022  
By Denise Brusveen, M.S.  
Co-Founder, Vaccine Choice Wisconsin**

Thank you Rep. Wichgers for holding this important hearing; and thank you to all the members of this committee for reading my testimony on behalf of Vaccine Choice Wisconsin in support of this bill.

As I am sure you are all aware through interactions with family and friends and constituents, medical professionals are being silenced if their professional opinion contradicts what the CDC, the FDA, DHS, or even their employer tells them is acceptable. The issue with this suppression of their voices is that it gives the appearance that all medical professionals are united around one medical opinion, but this couldn't be further from the truth.

This has been happening since long before COVID-19 on a wide variety of medical issues including but not limited to cancer, Lyme disease, fibromyalgia, Alzheimer's, and most chronic diseases. COVID-19 has simply brought the issue to light. I know nurses who have lost their jobs because they have shared information from credible experts and medical professionals on their personal social media accounts that contradicts the prevailing mainstream message.

A doctor in my community is going through a legal battle with the hospital she is trying to leave because she does not support many of their policies. The hospital is doing everything in their power to prevent her from starting her own private practice because they do not want her spreading a different message in the community. And quite frankly, they are concerned that she will take business from them because they know that people are waking up and beginning to do their own research. Published medical journal and research articles are readily available online as is access to medical conferences, grand rounds lectures, and more.

She's only a couple steps behind another doctor who left that same hospital system about 10 years ago because she was providing full informed consent to her patients regarding vaccines, and her employer didn't like it.

This other doctor went into private medical practice, and parents with vaccine injured children began flocking to her in hopes that she would consider writing a medical exemption from vaccines for them if she deemed it appropriate. They had tried repeatedly to get exemptions from their doctors who were covered by insurance only to be told that they couldn't write one, even though in many cases they agreed that their child had been injured, because it would be the end of their career.

This doctor was different than those other doctors. She was willing to put her career on the line. She had been researching for years and knew that vaccine injury was real and wasn't afraid to diagnose it when she legitimately saw it. This eventually did cost her the ability to see children in her practice.

She was subpoenaed to court in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan during a custody battle between a child's parents whom she had written a vaccine medical exemption for. The father wanted the child vaccinated, but the mother insisted that it was a terrible idea due to the child's past reaction to vaccines. This medical doctor shared her reasoning for writing the medical exemption, but the judge sided with the father as they do in nearly 100% of this type of case.

Further, this doctor, by testifying, opened herself up to further scrutiny and legal repercussions. She became proof and the reason why the vast majority of medical doctors refuse to write medical exemptions for vaccines. She was left with two choices – either spend weeks or months in the U.P. going through a long drawn out court case to defend herself (at her expense and away from her practice), or agree to stop seeing children in her practice.

She made the difficult decision to return to the Madison area to continue seeing the adult patients who were depending on her for quality medical care and no longer treated children in her practice.

As I mentioned earlier, this issue isn't limited to vaccines. I know more than one person who has gone to Mexico to receive treatment for cancer. The program there has a very high success rate and does not utilize chemotherapy or radiation therapy. Instead, it focuses on nutrition and healing the body physically, mentally, and emotionally.

If you're asking yourself why people are going to Mexico for this, it's because it will cost a doctor their license in the United States to recommend let alone begin treating the cancer with anything other than chemotherapy or radiation *even if* they know that other treatments may be more effective. I know a woman who was literally denied IV vitamin C a few years ago because she had cancer. This sounds a lot like what's happening in hospitals today – patients being denied basic IV nutrients simply because of their diagnosis even if the patient wants to utilize their right to try.

It's long overdue that we have a law in Wisconsin that allows doctors and other licensed medical professionals to openly express their professional medical opinion, even if it contradicts the message being perpetrated in the media or by government agencies. We all pay the price when they are silenced.

*We must remember that medicine is not one size fits all, and thus medical professionals cannot and should not be expected to practice one size fits all medicine. These are smart individuals who have made it through school and have passed their exams to be licensed. It is not ok to simply go after their license when employers or government agencies or officials don't like that they have done research for themselves and have come to a different conclusion as to the best course of action or treatment.*

I urge you to vote yes on AB1007 today, and I hope that it will quickly make its way to the governor's desk to be signed into law.

Respectfully,

Denise Brusveen

**Submission to the Wisconsin Assembly Committee on Constitution and Ethics**  
**Support of AB1007 – February 17, 2022**  
**By Judith Jolly, RN, BSN**

Dear Representative Wichgers and members of the Assembly Committee on Constitution and Ethics. Thank you for your time.

My name is Judith Jolly and I am a resident of Pardeeville Wisconsin. I am a registered nurse with a Bachelor of Science in nursing and nearly 27 years of nursing experience in several different areas of nursing practice. While I am the Director of Diseases and Vaccines Website Content for the National Vaccine Information Center, or NVIC, the nation's oldest vaccine safety and informed consent advocacy organization, I am here today representing myself.

I am speaking in support of AB1007 and I would like to thank Representative Moses and all of the co-sponsors of this important legislation.

In the past few years, many physicians, nurses, and other health care providers who have dared to share information that differs from the approved narrative have had their professional licenses investigated and their careers either jeopardized or ended. Many of these health care providers can back up their statements based on their personal experience or with credible medical literature, but they are quickly learning that doing so may cost them the ability to practice.

In my 27 years of nursing practice, I have seen many practice protocols change. Many drugs that were once considered safe and FDA approved have been pulled from the market. I have had conversations with nurses and doctors who have expressed frustration with facility-based protocols with which they disagree, but they won't speak out for fear of losing their livelihood.

For 3,000 years bloodletting was the standard of care in the medical community. Can you imagine if the doctors who spoke up against this practice were silenced? In the 18<sup>th</sup> Century, Dr. Semmelweis realized that handwashing between patients would save lives. He shared his findings and was rewarded with the loss of his career. He was attacked and vilified. Yet we now know he was right.

Doctors used to recommend cigarettes. They prescribed thalidomide that caused birth defects and DES, an estrogen medication, which caused cancer and sterility. They prescribed antibiotics for colds and to anyone who didn't feel well and opioids to nearly anyone for pain. This was accepted science, until it was not. The use of lead arsenate, DDT, and PFAS here in our state was once supported by our governmental agencies. These products were widely accepted as safe and effective, until they were not.

My first experience with an opposing view came from a nurse practitioner friend back in 2001. In July 2001, I had a serious cycling accident and fractured my right elbow and my sacrum. I was prescribed Vioxx for the pain, which I took, because I trusted my doctor. A few weeks later, I ran into my nurse practitioner friend, a fellow cyclist, and mentioned that I was taking this medication. While he didn't tell me not to take it, he did mention that he was concerned about the medication as he had heard of heart issues associated with it, and suggested that I

consider just taking a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory medication as it would likely be just as effective. Being an athlete, I ended up taking his advice. I try not to think about what my health outcomes might have been had I stayed on Vioxx long-term.

In addition to researching vaccines and diseases for my position with NVIC, I also monitor many of the federal health agency advisory committee meetings, including the CDC's Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) and the FDA's Vaccine and Related Biologicals Products Advisory Committee meetings. I have monitored meetings where the science supporting their recommendations was considered either the poorest quality studies or there were no studies at all. I have seen recommendations made based on models and estimates and not actual science. I have heard discussions among committee members regarding the lack of data to support their recommendations and statements expressing concerns over a product only to watch them vote in favor of the recommendation. I have read clinical guidance on vaccines made by the CDC without any evidence to support such guidance. This is somehow considered "science" and those who question this "science" are attacked personally and professionally, and accused of spreading misinformation. Or as I like to call it, wrong speak.

Certain federal health "experts" have declared their science to be the truth and the only truth, and yet none of them are willing to defend their science in a public forum. Why not?

Many of you here today know me because I have testified a number of times on vaccine related legislation. I can back up my testimony with references from governmental agencies and the medical literature and yet each time I am mindful that someone who disagrees with the information that I am sharing might go after my nursing license. In my clinical practice, I am self-employed so I do not fear losing my job for speaking against "consensus science." However, I know that without AB1007, I might end up having to defend my ability to maintain a nursing license should someone decide that they did not like the information that I offer.

While I love my current nursing practice, I am in a position where I can walk away from the nursing profession without hesitation and without regret. I've been working as a private duty home health nurse in this state for over two years, at times working between 50 and 60 hours a week due to a lack of available staffing. I won't suffer if I lose my ability to practice as a nurse, but I can guarantee that my patient and their family will. When I don't work, no one does because there is a severe shortage of nurses in this state.

As a health care professional, I always advise my patients to do their own research and consult with different professionals before deciding on a plan of care. I give them information to allow them to make the best decision for themselves and their families. I don't tell them what to do, but I share my knowledge and experience and allow them to make their own choice based on their own risk factors. I advise second and third and fourth opinions because at the end of the day, it's their health and their life.

Science is never settled. History has shown this, time and time again. Please ensure scientific integrity by supporting AB1007.