

SB 891 to repeal the residency requirement

When evaluating bills that have been submitted, I ask “Who will benefit if this measure passes?”. The Oregon legislature should address issues that pertain to Oregon citizens, and not make rules for the benefit of those living outside of our state.

Who is it that the sponsors of this bill are trying to serve? For starters, this bill does not have any legislative sponsors.

Back to the question of who is being served: Is it the citizens of Idaho? Has this bill been brought forth out of concern that eastern Oregon may soon become part of Idaho causing these citizens to lose their right to assisted suicide? I suggest that out-of-staters can go to California or Washington or Colorado or New Mexico if they find hospice care in their home state to be inadequate.

Instead, we are being asked to allow others to come to Oregon to die. I am opposed to creating a tourism death bill. We should not be known as the death magnet of the world.

It is also interesting to note that the bill defines an “adult” as an individual who is 18 years of age or older. Yet, other bills seek to allow 16 and 17-year-olds the right to vote. For consistency, shouldn’t SB 891 be amended to allow the right of out-of-staters who are at least 16, the right to come to Oregon to die?

There has been a deluge of over 2800 bills introduced this year. There are more important bills to be considered. I suggest that this bill be allowed to die in committee and focus on bills that address issues being faced by Oregonians.

Brad Dennis
Albany