

Submitter: Morgan Dominguez
On Behalf Of: Highlight Northwest
Committee: Senate Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB4088

We the people oppose this bill.

Opposition to HB 4088 – Request for Reconsideration

I am writing to respectfully express my opposition to HB 4088.

While I understand the stated intent of the bill is to protect access to reproductive health care and gender-affirming treatment, I have serious concerns regarding the scope, structure, and long-term implications of this legislation.

First, HB 4088 significantly limits interstate cooperation in investigations related to legally protected health care activities. Although framed as a privacy and autonomy safeguard, the bill creates broad restrictions on information sharing and extradition that may place Oregon in direct tension with other states and federal authorities. This raises constitutional concerns under the Extradition Clause and risks costly legal disputes funded by Oregon taxpayers.

Second, the bill's language is expansive and may unintentionally shield conduct beyond what most Oregonians would reasonably define as lawful medical practice. By restricting public bodies and law enforcement agencies from cooperating in investigations if the conduct would be lawful in Oregon, the bill creates potential enforcement inconsistencies and reduces transparency. This may erode public trust in the rule of law and in intergovernmental accountability.

Third, HB 4088 appears to prioritize political positioning over careful statutory balance. Complex matters involving interstate jurisdiction, medical standards, and public record limitations require narrowly tailored language. Instead, this bill adopts broad prohibitions that could produce unintended consequences for licensing boards, public universities, state agencies, and future administrations.

I also believe that legislation of this magnitude should include clearer guardrails, defined limitations, and stronger oversight mechanisms. Public policy particularly in areas as sensitive as health care and constitutional authority must be precise, measured, and resilient under judicial scrutiny. HB 4088, in its current form, does not meet that standard.

Oregon can protect lawful medical practice while still maintaining transparency, intergovernmental cooperation, and constitutional balance. These objectives are not mutually exclusive. I urge you to reconsider this bill, narrow its scope, and engage in

further public dialogue before advancing it.
Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,
Morgan Dominguez