

## Roberta DiMezza

---

**From:** Pam Berkeley <pamberkeley@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 5, 2024 9:47 PM  
**To:** House Judiciary Committee  
**Subject:** Fwd: Follow up to your questions on my NO on H7577 testimony

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Pam Berkeley <Pamberkeley@gmail.com>  
**Date:** March 5, 2024 at 10:25:05 PM GMT-4  
**To:** rep-knight@rilegislature.gov  
**Subject:** Follow up to your questions on my NO on H7577 testimony

Representative Knight,

I believe you were out of the room when I highlighted the fact that the bill relies on language for the definition of "transgender care" which references WPATH "or its successor organizations". The WPATH files (which can be found at Michael Schellenberger et al's EnvironmentalProgress.org, search "WPATH") expose the unscientific and unethical practices behind this organizations recommendations.

This puts the Rhode Island legislature in an awkward place. If they go with the simple definition of "transgender care" as it currently exists in the law, then they are relying on an organization that is unlikely to have "successors", or at least substantially similar successors, once it is thoroughly discredited in the coming weeks and months following the WPATH files' release. If it tries to define "transgender care" some other way, it will be unable to find a succinct definition without relying on specific medical procedures mentioned by name, such as castration, breast amputation, surgical and medical sterilization, etc. I do not see how the law could function if passed given this severe limitation.

Putting aside the definitional limitations of "transgender care" as given in the bill, I am also questioning why Rhode Island would want to protect an unethical practice happening in this state from external legislation? Why should it matter where the legislation comes from if the practices are unethical and are harming the most vulnerable in society?

Finally, Rhode Island is a tiny state. The state may protect its own citizens through other forms of legislation, but many of the people being affected by the actions of transgender healthcare providers in the state are coming here from other states. I, personally, as a citizen of Rhode Island, who grew up in Massachusetts, was born in Indiana, lived in California, and moved here from New York State, would rather not see Rhode Island bullishly protecting practices that will put people from other states at a reduced capacity to pursue justice in Rhode Island. A lot of people in Rhode Island forget that there is a whole country outside the state, of people who freely travel between the states, and form thoughts and opinions about whether or not to move to Rhode Island or continue to live in Rhode Island, or whether to do business with Rhode Island. Maybe it isn't the best idea to have a shield law for this particular line of business.

Sincerely,

Pam Berkeley, PhD.