

Date: 5/7/2021

Dear Representative Tawna Sanchez,

Like many Oregonians I value my ability to choose my own providers when it comes to feeling better, acting in a more healthy way, and improving myself. **HB2493** is scheduled to become a bill in January. This bill will not only limit, but in some cases completely eliminate, my choices for care.

I have learned and used a number of alternative well-being practices for decades and received enormous benefits from their techniques to improve my life. I am opposed to this legislation with these additional concerns:

1. This bill states (line 3) that it is declaring an emergency. What is that emergency and why does it require this type of regulation?
2. This proposed legislation begins by identifying the fact that Oregonians have long been given free choices of the types of care they seek and have been successfully using many types of alternative well-being practices. These are generally techniques that are not provided by conventional, licensed medical practice. It is unclear why regulation of these practices is suddenly needed.
3. This proposed regulation states that it includes philosophically and spiritually based practices. It is attempting to control how people think and what they believe by controlling who gets to speak to others about life-affirming ideas and practices that go deeper than just physical or mental well-being. That means this legislation would cross the separation of church and state and denies people their right to free speech. Everyone has the right to speak about, give demonstration, and encourage others to follow ideas that promote life-affirming concepts and methods. Since it is **unconstitutional** to regulate religion, this bill will be illegal in attempting to regulate techniques that involve spiritual and philosophical teachings and practices as a part, or the foundation, of their holistic methods.
4. Many of the alternative well-being care techniques that would be covered under this legislation are very low-cost or totally free to learn, use and share. Making it illegal for anyone to use or share these techniques with others unless they spend time on applications, required training and testing, and to pay licensing costs would remove these practices from availability because people cannot afford to meet these rules. It also means that only those who are wealthy enough to afford the cost of meeting these regulations will be allowed to share and use alternative techniques.
5. Who is this bill really attempting to serve? Some practices that would be covered under this type of legislation have been in use by people for longer than the United States or the State of Oregon have been in existence. Others have been successfully helping people for decades. If a type of care is not efficacious or a particular practitioner is not effective, people quickly avoid that type of practice or that specific person. This makes it seem that those who would gain by these regulations are those who feel that competition from alternative well-being practices hurts their business.
6. This regulation also appears prone to scope creep in that it starts out being voluntary. But if it remains voluntary, it accomplishes nothing as a regulatory process. Why would anyone practicing alternative well-being techniques expend the cost in time and money for registering when the bill clearly states that they cannot use their registration to promote their work, so there is no advantage for them? This bill appears to simply be a first step toward mandatory licensing and expansion to include more and more types of alternative practices.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Margaret Anderson  
Monmouth, Oregon