Submitter:	K Danowski
On Behalf Of:	
Committee:	House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic:	HB4088

To Whom It Will Concern:

Oregon HB 4088 restricts information about “Reproductive and Gender Affirming Health Care.” While this is intended to protect the privacy of patients and providers, it is written so broadly that it would prevent ANYONE – including “private citizens” – from ANY information about “Reproductive and Gender Affirming Health Care.”

This bill will shield providers of unevidenced sex-rejecting procedures (a.k.a. "gender affirming care") from accountability.

This bill applies to ANY information about these medical activities, effectively blocking public-health researchers from seeking data. Even people seeking treatment could be prevented from obtaining any information.

As a woman concerned with sex-based rights and child protection, I STRONGLY OPPOSE HB 4088 because:

1. Conflation of Issues — This bill bundles broadly supported reproductive medicine for females with experimental and dangerous "gender-affirming" treatments, diluting sex-based protections by prioritizing "gender identity" over biological reality. I suspect the reason for this forced teaming is that sex-rejecting procedures lack support on their own.

2. Risks to Minors and Other Vulnerable Groups — It shields irreversible interventions that have very weak to nonexistent long-term evidence, while non-cooperation clauses could block probes into regret or trauma and favor ideology over child safeguarding. I refer you to the UK's Cass Report and the recent US HHS report on sex-rejecting procedures.

3. Erosion of Women's Sex-Based Rights — Provisions easing name/sex changes in the name of privacy could undermine single-sex facilities like women's shelters, homeless shelters, rape and domestic violence services, prisons, education, and athletics by enabling unchecked legal recognition of "gender identity," contributing to the erasure of sex distinctions and compelled speech concerns.

4. Lack of Accountability and Evidence — Provider immunities risk protecting ideologically driven procedures without requiring rigorous informed consent or follow-up studies. Sex-rejecting procedures must not be exempt from standard and widely

accepted medical standards.

5. Broader Societal Impacts — The bill may fuel medical tourism from restrictive states, strain Oregon resources, and normalize practices rooted in misogyny and homophobia. "Gender identity" seeks to eliminate biological sex from law and policy. It is fundamentally misogynist by denying that women are human females. It is fundamentally homophobic because denying the existence of biological sex means that sexual orientation does not exist.

6. "Gender Identity" Does Not Exist -- No convincing scientific or medical evidence shows that something called a "gender identity" exists. It is simply an unsubstantiated belief system. Our laws must be based on physical, objective reality in order to be reasonable and fair.

For these reasons, I STRONGLY OPPOSE HB 4088.

Thank you for meaningfully considering my comments.