Joseph Bennette Salem, Oregon

Date: May 26, 2017

To: Senate Committee on Health Care

Re: Opposition to HB2303-A3

My name is Joseph Bennette. I testified at the May 16 hearing – thank you for hearing me again. I wish to add my voice to many others in opposition to the amendment to HB2303 that institutes a new name, "Alternative Behavioral Health Practitioner" and a Board to regulate them via registration.

I have several issues with the amendment:

- 1. "Alternative Behavioral Health Practitioner" is not defined in the legislation nor are any of its subcategories.
- 2. The amendment appeared without adequate warning. No mention of an amendment was made in the announcement of HB2303 to the public.
- 3. The amendment appears to be a rush job with little to no participation from affected parties (stakeholders).
- 4. The amendment seeks to fix problems that do not exist.
 - a. Hypnotherapists uphold practice standards and ethics, monitor their community, and obey the healthcare practice laws of Oregon.
 - b. Online presence, so essential to today's businesses, dictates that hypnotherapists maintain a good reputation. Just one critical review can sink a hypnotherapist's business.
 - c. Significant consumer protections currently exist to protect against any unscrupulous actors in Oregon under the Consumer Protection Program of the Justice Department.
- 5. The amendment does not limit the action of the Oregon Health Authority to at some future date further regulate practice to licensed individuals only.
- 6. The amendment provides no guidance as to standards for registration, leaving this job to a Board that may consist of well-meaning yet uneducated, inexperienced individuals.
- 7. The amendment will not provide better directory services than Google already provides. That is, to locate a hypnotherapist in one's area, one simply needs to type in "Hypnotherapist in [town you live in]". Organizations to which hypnotherapists belong, such as the Oregon Hypnotherapy Association, typically offer directory services for the public and agencies.

This legislation is as yet poorly written, showing a lack of due diligence in researching the subject, exclusion of stakeholder participation, and no or poor definitions. It also has nothing whatsoever to do with the legislation to which it is attached.

I ask the committee to reject the amendment.

Warm regards,

Joseph Bennette

Salem, Oregon

Retired Hypnotherapist