

Comments on Oregon HB 2493

I OPPOSE the bill

You will be sending to Oregonians the wrong message if you include an alternative practitioner registry of all complementary (alternative) health practitioners. Even if the registry states they are not licensed, consumers will assume they are. It will come across like they are licensed and have your approval. Just by stating a practitioner is on a state registry will lead people to assume they are licensed and have your approval. Section 6 will not prevent people from making those assumptions.

There are more than 214 different modalities practicing in Oregon and you would have to review and approve certification credentialing and process for all the 214 different modalities; the administrative costs would be prohibitive and new ones appear regularly. It would be better to require practitioners provide a Professional Disclosure Statement, as defined in HB 2493. If you wanted a small administrative arm to respond to complaints and investigate the rare fraudulent or unethical behaviors, that would be less costly and more manageable. When there are bad actors doing bad things, they can be dealt with individually. Most people getting into these professions are educated, generally older, and do so with compassion. Let the existing business and professional codes for all Oregonian businesses apply and be the teeth to deal with the few bad actors.

According to studies by David Eisenberg M., et. al. 1993 & 1998), clients of complementary therapies are well educated with discretionary income. This in and of itself lends an element to public safety. The decision to seek complementary therapies is controlled by the client (self-referred) and well-educated clients are more likely to know when to seek legal recourse and have adequate resources to pursue damages. Public recourse against unethical practitioners or services received may include:

1. Filing a complaint with local law enforcement and/or the District Attorney to investigate;
2. Filing a claim with the Better Business Bureau; and
3. Filing a grievance with any membership association or national testing agency to which a practitioner belongs as a breach of the Code of Ethics.
4. Sue the practitioner in civil court.

Re: Section 12.2.k. This is not clarified, but I'm assuming this is any 'active' conviction and does not include convictions and times served, unless they are

directly connected with their profession. (i.e. Rape conviction for a Bowen Therapy practitioner.)

Establishing this huge bureaucratic administration will cost monies. The fees to be registered should not create a burden to registering. Also, training that does not support the work of the practitioner, should not be required. (i.e. massage training for non-massage practitioners.)

While Reiki is an ancient practice, many new energy therapies are emerging and being reviewed and used in the medical community. Unless each therapy were fully vetted, tested, and understood, doing so by a government agency would be prohibitive. It is better to set standards and deal with the bad actors as they occur. The Oregon Government would be setting itself up for lawsuits by even indicating they have reviewed each practitioner.

Thank you for your consideration.

Susan Roberts, Reiki Master
susan@spiritofsuccess.us