

# Oppose HB 691

Dear Chair and members of the committee,

WPATH “standards” are not absolute facts. They are not based on firmly established science. Rather they are experimental treatments for which the research is being conducted and has not resulted in well-defined benefits. The scientific findings from such research show mixed and uncertain outcomes, often indicating greater risks of the treatments than plausible benefits.

Legally protecting providers of such treatments allows medical experimentation without responsibility. The patient committing to the treatments cannot be adequately informed simply because the current knowledge is insufficient to ascertain the risks and benefits. Thus, the patients unknowingly become research subjects. And this law would leave them with the full responsibility for such decisions without any protection.

WPATH experts continue discussing the need for research of the broader and long-term effects of the “standard” treatments. What’s worse is that many patients belong to vulnerable groups, such as on the autism spectrum:

<https://youtu.be/TCYXNxK3oGw?t=1480>

Dr. Kaltiala, a prominent expert in gender-affirming care, openly expresses concern about the risks of such treatments:

<https://www.thefp.com/p/gender-affirming-care-dangerous-finland-doctor>

Expert gender-affirming surgeons certify that the treatments are experimental and require innovative decisions by the doctors in order to accomplish desired effects:

<https://youtu.be/qAqNCo7RTWI?t=90>

Dr. Biggs testified in a legislature that the research has not yet established clear benefits, while certain risks become apparent:

<https://youtu.be/THPv11HdtaQ>

It is appalling that we even consider giving legal protections to such treatments, while the overall benefits and harms are barely known. The legal protections and obligations for such treatment in Maryland are problematic for Maryland taxpayers already. Obtaining truly informed patient consent is practically impossible, and even less certain when providers obtain legal immunity for the treatments, while clearly benefiting financially.

Why don’t you propose a bill to protect patients rights instead? Please vote unfavorably.

Sincerely,  
Mark Meyerovich  
Gaithersburg, MD  
District 15