

Submitter: Maggie Donohue  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB2467

I am an attorney with an interest in civil and human rights and I adamantly oppose this bill. The bill demeans the judicial function by purporting to grant judges the ability to determine whether someone will be a danger to themselves or others 30 days in the future. No medical professional would put their license on the line to say that they know with any certainty what a person is going to do within 30 days, yet somehow a judge with no medical training is supposed to make that guess in the context of taking away a person's civil liberties. This is a joke, a complete mockery of reasoned evidence-based decision making. It makes civil commitment a kangaroo court. It also discriminates against people on the basis of a disability by subjecting a person to confinement solely on the basis of having been hospitalized in the past. The language of this bill is likely unconstitutionally vague, staggeringly broad in scope, and the relaxation of procedure it promotes in removing a person's civil rights is disturbing. I fully expect that if passed, Oregon will be spending millions to defend this bill from constitutional challenge. The standard to confine an adult who has not been convicted of a crime and in some cases to override that person's bodily autonomy to administer drugs or other treatments against their will is high. It is supposed to be a high standard because civil rights matter. Bodily autonomy matters. Involuntarily committing more people is not the solution to the homelessness crisis. In fact, repeatedly traumatizing the homeless by locking them up against their will and then spitting them back out into the street with a prescription (often for drugs so debilitating that the unhoused can't take them without compromising their safety) they have no way of keeping up with is likely to make the crisis a lot worse. This is a terrible bill and I urge lawmakers to vote no.