

Submitter: Zack Lippi  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: Senate Committee On Rules  
Measure: SJR33

Hello, my name is Zack Lippi I'm 23, I am a resident of Oregon and have been all my life. Today I am here on behalf both myself and of Gays Against Groomers as the Oregon Chapter lead. Gays against Groomers is a coalition of gays against the sexualization, indoctrination, and medicalization of children. Today I am here to talk about the new Senate Joint Resolution 33. Once again Oregon has introduced what should be a singular issue into something more. We were on the right track repealing Section 5(a) within article XV as it has no place within our constitution. However, we quickly got off track with the dangerously loose language changed within section 46 of Article I.

Article I section 46 should be separated from this Joint Resolution as it has no foundation. As Transgenderism is on the rise amongst youth it is imperative that we put measures in place that protect these children from making decisions that are life altering. This change to our constitution would block any legislature that would restrict these children from making choices they may later regret. I say children because there are no age restrictions within this proposal. For instance, if House Bill 2002 were to pass, a child who cannot smoke, drink or even get a tattoo would be able to mutilate their genitalia to change it into something not of their assigned sex without any consent from a parent or guardian. We then would be defenseless in protecting these kids from that as it would then be deemed unconstitutional.

Not only is what I just mentioned is a very real scenario, that certain Oregon Congressmen are actively pursuing, but a very dangerous one at that. A study from UCLA Williams Institute found that nearly 1 in 5 people who identify as transgender is under 13-17. Another study from April 2020 from the National Library of Medicine studied the suicidality amongst transgender youth. According to the study 86% of transgender youth have considered killing themselves and 56% have attempted suicide. Do we really want to block any legislation that would address this because someone classified it as "discriminatory" against related health issues to gender identity?

According to a study conducted by the National Library of Medicine in June of 2021, they found that out of 17,151 who have pursued gender affirmation care or "transitioned" of these, 2,242 reported a history of detransition. That is a 13% detransition rate. That is a little over more than a 1/10 rate that occurs here in the United States. 1/10. In 2015 a similar study was conducted that showed a result of 8% detransitioned. That number is only increasing. To block any future bills that would address this issue because it deemed "discriminatory" would be an injustice to all involved.

At the end of 2022 the UK put a ban on puberty blockers. The only place they are allowed are in a formal research setting, due to the unknown effects and potential

harm that these can cause to our youth. According to the three judges who issued the ruling, it was said that it was, "highly unlikely that a child of 13 or under was competent to give consent to puberty blockers and it was doubtful that 15-year-olds could weigh the long-term risks and consequences." Oregon's Senate Joint Resolution 33 would again block a bill or ruling like this.

These are just some of the many scenarios and restrictions that come with this Senate proposal. Do we really want to be in another position of where we are having to go back and change the constitution in 20 years when the times change again. Outdated policy rings out as we have seen with Article XV section 5(a). I ask you to stand with me in saying no to Senate Joint Resolution 33. The proposal should not only be separate language from Article XV section 5(a) and Article I section 46 but Article I section 46 should have more extensive language for individual specifics or be dropped entirely.

Thank You.