

This seems like discrimination. To pass a law mandating a medical procedure for employment in a field that directly affects access to care for some of the most vulnerable patients could potentially serve to limit their access to an interpreter. It's also discriminatory to the translators themselves who would be forced to choose between their bodily autonomy and personal risk factors of vaccination vs their employment and financial stability, their insurance coverage, and ultimately their ability to care for their family. Placing conditions on their already existing or potential future employment is tantamount to forcing them to decide between a medical procedure with known potential for risk of adverse events up to and including death and disability or the duress of potential destitution and poverty. This is antithetical to the premise of free and informed consent, as this could be interpreted as punishment for choosing the right to exercise bodily autonomy. More so given that adequate supplies are not yet available or accessible to quite a few people who are still waiting to get them, let alone this who are not yet eligible, or are choosing to wait based on the facts that an EUA is not the equivalent of Full approval, but rather a large extension of a Phase 3 trial.

This bill is unnecessary. It might very well even be unconstitutional, as arguments could be made that it violates EEOC and ADA laws, among other potential scenarios, and regardless of any hypothetical eventual ruling, could put Oregon taxpayers on the hook to pay for extensive litigation over a bill that not only isn't needed, but is not at all a requested priority of constituents who are more concerned with immediate needs that whether or not their translator, (who they may not even come in contact with directly if they use virtual medicine) is vaccinated. Obviously this particular employment sector, who is a very small portion of the healthcare workforce, and an even smaller part of the general workforce, was targeted to set a precedent of mandates for employment. What a terrible precedent to set, given the multitude of unpredictable risks that can arise out of ANY invasive medical procedure, including the administration of biological or synthetic vaccines. Government should not be interfering in the medical decisions of individuals under duress.

Thank you for your time.