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**Constitutional rights and liberties**

**Imagine that a state legislature passes a law requiring everyone in that state to receive one of the COVID-19 vaccines. What kind of a) penalties for the people and b) limitations to the law would have to be included for you to consider it Constitutional?**

The state legislature has the responsibility of ensuring that law is enforced in a country. If there is a COVID 19 vaccine received in a state, then the country's health is in safe hands, and all citizens should ensure that they concur with the law of taking the vaccine stipulated by the state. The health of the citizens is the best option that a state would like to observe because this will ensure the smooth running of activities in the state without any disruptions. As much as some of the penalties may be followed by the people who decide not to take the vaccines intentionally or some limitations in the law would be included to consider the COVID19 vaccine provision procedure is constitutional, the state's health should be the main focus. Below is a discussion of some of the penalties that people might receive if the state legislature passes a law requiring everyone in the state to receive one of the COVID19 vaccines and the limitations to the law that would have to be included for one to consider the act constitutional.

The first penalty charged to the people when COVID 19 vaccine is recurred to be taken by citizens, and they do not concur in the fines. Suppose the state recommends that the citizens take the vaccine without force and focus on fine penalties (Skolnik). Without the fine penalties situation, some citizens will not agree to the terms and conditions of getting the vaccine because of their difference in beliefs. The state will be forced to fine the citizens to be able to abide by the states legislature law; taking the vaccine in such a situation is not forced, but in a case where an adult refuses to take the vaccine, then there is no other option to make them do it apart from fining them. These fining penalties will ensure that everyone abides by taking the vaccines, which helps the country fight against COVD 19. People may have different views concerning the vaccine; for example, some people believe that the vaccine is deadly and may deny taking the vaccine. There is no other way that a country can help such a situation if not placing the fine penalty to ensure that all citizens do as the state law stipulates.

The second penalty is forcing the citizens to take the COVID 19 vaccine. This penalty is not usually the best idea that a state can pick on as much as the state is trying to observe the safety of its citizens; forcing them to take the vaccine will be a form of dictatorship as much as most of the countries, especially the U.S, are democratic countries. Countries with dictatorship forms of leadership will always take this as an option with consequences that may follow the citizens forced to take the vaccine (Sharfuddin et al.). It is, therefore, a person's responsibility to abide by the state regulations that are stipulated in the law and ensure that their health is well observed. No state would wish harm to its citizens to the extent of introducing vaccines that may be harmful to their lives. If anything, states have some duties and responsibilities towards their citizens. Good health is the first necessity to the citizens of a specific state. The forcing penalty is not a good option, but mostly it is applied in states that are not democratic, and it works just well because the legislative law of that particular country sees it as the best procedure.

Another penalty that a citizen can face if he or she refuses intentionally taking the COVID 19 vaccine is the civil liability penalty, which acts as a remedy to a non-crime act against a person who has violated the stipulated laws by the state legislature. Civil liabilities involve the finances paid for intentionally going against the rules and regulations (Nelson et al.). Citizens should ensure that they abide by the laws and rules stated by the state legislation because accepting to take the COVID19 vaccine will mean that the state legislature Is working towards ensuring that the health of their citizens is well observed and their safety is the priority of the government. Failure to commit this order will mean that the state legislature is failing in fighting COVID 19, and the lives of citizens will be at stake. The state legislature always brings about penalties like the civil liability penalty to help them enforce laws that should be followed because they contain consequences that may act as a critical focus to anyone to go against the stipulated law of accepting to take the COVID 19 vaccine.

The limitation to the law that would be included for considering taking off the COVID19 vaccine constitutional is considering the preamble of the COVID 19 vaccine constitutional and legally binding that makes it lawful for the citizens to observe it as a law. With the observation of the preamble of COVID 19 as a lawfully binding procedure, citizens will be in a position of getting the seriousness in this situation; hence they will not have any choice but abide by the rules and regulations of the state. Secondly, the section concerning the fight against COVID 19 should be secured. It should be amended by the constitution stating that the state has a right to enforce laws of ensuring the immunities of the citizens are looked upon, and none is deprived, and failure to do that there are consequences. This amendment of the law would ensure that all citizens abide by the law because failure to do that would break the state's rules and regulations. This amendment of the COVID 19 law will reduce the limitations that a government may face in the fight against its citizen's denial to abide by the vaccine's rule. It will ensure that the citizens master the consequences of their denial to stick to a stipulated law.

The manifold restraints that every citizen is subjected to for their common good should never have any limitations because people in any society would not accept to abide by the regulations that have limitations. It is always an obvious question that citizens at times tend to ask themselves if truly the manifesto restraints made by the state legislatures have limitations, how the manifestos then tend to benefit their well-being, especially the issue of COVID 19 vaccine how sure are they that their health is in safe hands. Yet, the manifestos restraints are full of limitations. The state's legislation should ensure that their manifesto restraints do not contain any limitation and should convince citizens that whatever they are driving at has potential benefits without any limitations for the citizens to accept to take the vaccines without any doubts or questions. For the citizens to have a comfortable decision to partake the COVID 19 vaccine, the legislation that has been given a mandate of governing this procedure should carry out this activity without any restraints ensuring that all the citizens look up to what is legit and what makes them more comfortable without any fear of the limitations that are accompanying the restraints.

Limitations of enjoyment of rights secured by the amendments should be included for the health of the citizens to be adequately observed. Some situations where the citizens cannot volunteer freely, submitting to conditions stipulated by the state legislature, yet they do not enjoy their rights. A state must ensure that the limitations facing the citizens' rights are keenly looked upon to ensure that the citizens are offered health rights that will always make them feel free to take the COVID 19 vaccine without any problem. The rights of citizens should be the critical focus of a democratic country. Citizens should enjoy their rights without the fear of limitations that make them lack even the freedom of seeking medical attention, especially in the COVID 19 cases. Enjoyment of rights includes reasonable conditions as the government authorities state in a country essential to the people's safety, health, peace, morals, and virtues. Liberty should be a right that the state authorities should ensure that has no limitations because if it does, then the citizens will never have trust for its country to the extent of even not trusting if the COVID 19 vaccine that is stipulated by a state to be taken is genuine or not genuine. With observations of all limitations to the law would have to be included to consider it Constitutional, there will be a smooth running of activities to provide the COVID 19 vaccines.

In conclusion, the state is always concerned with the health of its citizens. Every person should abide by the laws of a state to ensure that their health i9s looked upon and that they are all on the safe side of COVID 19. As much as there are penalties placed to govern situations like taking the vaccines, citizens should also follow the rules and regulations stipulated to be abided to. A healthy state will always experience the smooth running of activities. Once a virus attacks a country, then the citizens should be ready to comply with the rules that may help with the fight against the spread of the infection.

On the other hand, the state should ensure that the limitation to the law included for considering the taking of the COVID19 vaccine constitutional is looked observed, and the citizens get an opportunity to trust what they are asked to partake. Citizens always want to work with facts and constitutional laws that they can observe and abide by. In a situation where the law has a lot of limitations, they will have to question it if it is truly genuine or not. A state should be able to ensure that they are working hand in hand with the citizens so that the health situation in the state becomes effective.
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