

Amelia Morris
Sullivan, ME
May 08 2025

RE: Proposed Anti-Transgender Legislation
LD 233; LD 868; LD 1002; LD 1134; LD 1704

Dear Senator Carney, Representative Kuhn, and Honorable Members of the Judiciary Committee,

Thank you for providing the opportunity to address the committee. My name is Amelia Morris. I am a resident of Sullivan, Maine. I am a law school graduate and aspiring attorney, a sole provider for my family, and a successful small business owner. I am also transgender. I am writing in opposition to the suite of bills aimed specifically at transgender Mainers (LD 233; LD 868; LD 1002; LD 1134; LD 1704; & LD 1337; LD 1432; LD 380.)

I believe that all legislation should be logical and informed. I also believe in self-determination and feel compelled to say my piece as our voices are routinely ignored by people who are gender congruent. While I hope the proposed legislation is made with good intentions, I know this is a vicious attack on my community, in line with the national Republican party's stance. The way these issues are being addressed will adversely impact my community. The current climate is exceedingly hostile to transgender people; we are being made pariahs despite existing quietly for decades, not too unlike prior dark periods in our nation's history (Jim Crowe, the Sodomy Laws, to name but a few). I would be testifying in person had I not feared outing myself as transgender would harm the wellbeing of myself or my family. Outright bans will be further fuel to the fire and will embolden further hostility towards people who just want to exist. Outright bans are far from the best solution, and they completely ignore the facts at hand. I will discuss some of the reality below:

The Issue: Participation in Sports

Unfair advantages in women's sports are a valid issue, unfair advantages in any sport are valid issues. If a born-female takes testosterone (hereinafter, "T") that would be considered doping. T is a hardcore hormone that promotes muscle growth and retention and can provide an unfair advantage if taken to enhance athletic performance. As such, it needs to be addressed. One side wants blanket bans; the other side wants acceptance above all else. A just, informed, solution must be cognizant of the facts and lie in between. The proposed legislation falls short of this.

There is an elephant in the room that I have not seen addressed by either side. The goal of male to female hormone replacement therapy (HRT) is to suppress natural T production to at or below the female range, and to raise the estrogen (hereinafter, "E") up into the female range where it is maintained in perpetuity. This is to achieve desired feminization.

There is a saying in my community: YMMV (Your Mileage May Vary). The success of *visible* feminization is entirely dependent on the individual's genetics. Where the mileage

Amelia Morris
Sullivan, ME
May 08 2025

does not vary is the effect on the body's ability to gain and retain muscle. When T is suppressed, any strength present prior to transition will atrophy along with the muscle. The body reacts the same way a born-female's body does, and you will find it harder to keep weight off and strength in. In my personal experience, my wife can now easily pin me down with ZERO hope of me getting up, no matter how much I fight it. Your mileage does not vary when it comes to this, every transgender woman/girl will see this happen to them if T is suppressed and E is in the female range for long enough. The body is ostensibly the same as a born female, insofar as athletic performance and strength is concerned. There are zero inherent advantages between the two¹. And the effects of this are even more stark in children or teenagers who undergo puberty blockers and HRT – as the body has never been exposed to testosterone and will never grow with that hormone guiding how the body develops through puberty.

The Solution: Participation in Sports

With this in mind, a just solution would be to legislate the minimum requirements for participation in women's/girls' sports, not outright ban participation. This would ensure fairness of admission, as stated previously if a born female athlete were to take T it would be doping and they would be banned from participation. The same standards should be applied to transgender women/girls seeking participation.

Prior to the U.K. Supreme Court decision to rule in favor of a "two gender" policy, the Football Association (FA), updated their trans policy where *"transgender women players must provide proof that they have been below the testosterone limit for at least 12 months, as well as a medical record of hormone therapy and an annual review of treatment."*² These requirements are easily met, all transgender people, whether transitioning from male or female, are required to get routine blood tests to monitor hormone changes. And a rule like this ensures it is maintained throughout an athlete's career or period of participation. This eliminates any real or perceived advantages and supplants it with something quantifiable that can be used to measure fairness of admission and continued participation.

The FA has now banned all transgender women from participation due to the recent Supreme Court ruling. This will cause issues in future as the "two genders" policy claims that those who transition from female to male are now considered women. For people transitioning from female to male the process is almost always very successful as T is a hardcore hormone that grants very permanent changes to the body; much like how a transgender woman's body becomes ostensibly no different to a born female's, the same happens here. A transgender man/boy's body will maintain and build muscle and strength just as easy as a born male. You will have "women" eligible for participation in women's/girl's sports despite having more testosterone than the targeted demographic –

¹ In 2021 a transgender woman competed in weightlifting at the Tokyo Olympics. She failed her lifts and won zero medals. This is someone at the top of their ability, at the Olympics, performing worse than born females: Source: <https://www.olympics.com/en/news/weightlifting-laurel-hubbard-transgender-three-failed-lifts-tokyo> , accessed May 07, 2025

² <https://www.bbc.com/sport/football/articles/cx207yx8ve2o>

Amelia Morris

Sullivan, ME

May 08 2025

transgender women/girls. This proposed solution not only ensures a minimum standard for trans women, it also ensures transgender men are barred from entry into women's sports. An outright ban of transgender women does not do this.

If the argument is to include perceived advantage based on height or other physical factor (born males being generally taller, etc.) then you must be prepared to ban taller than average women/girls from playing sports. Otherwise, the argument is fallacious, as the same advantage is shared between them: they both have female-level hormones, and they are both taller. The fact is, sports are dominated by people who are genetically gifted, otherwise we would all be getting medals at the Olympics. A born girl who is taller than her peers on the basketball team will always have an advantage, a born girl with a smaller frame will always find it easier with gymnastics, a born girl with a larger frame would be better at contact sports. This is seen in the wider sports community too, see Serena Williams, Usain Bolt, and Michael Phelps. All have been genetically gifted and performed leagues better than their peers due to these advantages. In children's sport the same applies, there are child athletes who are just naturally better than their peers. Absent of T, these should also become fairness issues.

Based on the foregoing, LD 233, LD 868, and LD 1134 are not sincerely enacting provisions for fairness, but to exclude and denigrate transgender people in line with the national political agenda. LD 233, LD 868, and LD 1134 are clearly instruments to target a minority demographic who make up less than 1% of the population, even less when accounting for those of that percentage who participate in sport. The barrage of attacks on transgender people is no different than the "gay panic" and anti-homosexual laws of the 20th century. The march of time has proven that to be wrong, and yet here we are making similar mistakes again. LD 233, LD 868, and LD 1134 are moralism masquerading as legislation.

The Issue: LD 1704

Enforcing trans people to use bathrooms of their born sex is bad law for the reasons outlined above, specifically on how the body reacts to HRT. LD 1704 is inviting trans boys into the girl's bathrooms. Trans boys who have the same levels of testosterone as born boys and will be undergoing the same puberty as born boys, they will also look like born boys. This is another targeted legislation aimed solely at trans girls, as it completely fails to address the issue of transgender boys being in girl's bathrooms and fails to account for the changes a trans girl will also go through. On puberty blockers and HRT, a transgender girl will be going through the same visible and mental changes and will be more in line with being a female than a transgender boy will. Legislation such as this is making children pariahs in their own schools, it is enabling gender-based bullying regardless of whether a child is transgender or not.

Bills such as these will promote a culture of "otherism" for anyone who does not conform to strict norms on how boys and girls should look or behave. If we are to claim sympathy towards the issues women face, why is this not being considered? Body image has, and always will be, a very serious issue faced by girls. We already know the effects this can

Amelia Morris

Sullivan, ME

May 08 2025

have, it can lead to self-harm, depression, and in extreme cases anorexia or suicide attempts. All because a girl does not feel like she is good enough, that she does not meet societal expectations. Bills such as these seem to skirt this fact in favor of allowing it as collateral damage so long as it oppresses transgender Mainers, or those being suspected of such.

I may be transgender, but I am also a parent, and I would not want transgender boys around my children in the girl's bathroom, and I do not want my child, or anyone's child, being subject to bullying for how they look or who they are. A school should be a safe environment, not used as a political pawn to push national agendas. Again, this is moralism masquerading as legislation.

Conclusion

I feel compelled to talk about other issues, but my testimony will be even longer. In respect of the Committee's time, I have focused on the main issues only. But I vehemently oppose all transgender legislation that is being proposed, for the same or similar reasons as provided above.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my perspective with the Committee. I urge you to vote "Ought not to Pass" on these bills.

Thank you,
Amelia