

Submitter: Alise Weaver

On Behalf Of: Detransitioners

Committee: House Committee On Behavioral Health and Health Care

Measure: HB2458

Chair Nosse, Vic Chairs Goodwin and Nelson, and esteemed members of the Committee:

Reflecting on my testimony delivered at the hearing Tuesday and that of my peers, I would like to add that with respect to the testimony of detransitioner Camille Kiefel, what are we to call the kind of therapy she received? If we as Oregonians are interested in passing a bill that will protect citizens with diverse sexual and gender identities, would this bill have protected her from harm? We heard testimony from citizens who have been harmed psychologically by conversion therapy practices they found shaming to their identities, and we heard therapists testify to the duration and intensity of suffering following such a dehumanizing experience. Did you also listen to Camille's experience? Here is an Oregonian adult therapy patient left with not only tremendous emotional and psychological suffering, but permanent physical disfigurement as a result of the care she received by Oregon helping professionals. Why should her experience be exempted as one we do not need to address in a bill intended to protect adult, as well as minor, Oregon therapy patients? Is it because she is only one, because I assure you, she is not. Is it because she ultimately does not fit neatly in the LGBTQIA2+ basket and is therefore less deserving of protection? Is there some reason we assume that only heterosexual, cisgendered people are sometimes guilty of bringing to the therapy room a conscious or unconscious bias around sexuality and sex roles? Are LGBTQIA2+ persons somehow immune from projection or unconscious bias? One of the presenters of testimony given in support of this bill stated "You cannot prescribe treatment where there is no illness," intending to underscore the inherence of diverse sexualities and gender identities. If this is the case for gender as well as sexuality, then how do we explain what happened to Camille? And was the removal of her breasts by a surgeon to be considered "treatment," or something else? I am left with so many questions after this week's hearing, but the most important one of all I direct to the Committee: How can you all, in good conscience, pass a bill into law that purports to protect gender diverse youth and adults, when you have direct feedback from an Oregon patient whose egregious therapeutic mistreatment demonstrates unequivocally that it will not?

Again, I respectfully thank you for your attention to this matter and I hope you will see fit to ensure protection for all Oregonians with appropriate legislation. Thank you.