

Roberta DiMezza

From: jennifer raimondi <raimondi1975@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2024 1:58 AM
To: Rep. Craven, Robert E.; Rep. McEntee, Carol Hagan; Rep. Knight, Jason; Rep. Ajello, Edith H.; Rep. Batista, Jose F.; Rep. Bennett, David A.; Rep. Caldwell, Justine A.; Rep. Casimiro, Julie A.; Rep. Corvese, Arthur J.; Rep. Dawson, Matthew S.; Rep. Felix, Leonela; Rep. Noret, Thomas E.; Rep. Place, David J.; Rep. Roberts, Sherry; Rep. Cruz, Cherie L.; House Judiciary Committee
Cc: Coyote.rhodeisland@gmail.com
Subject: in support of H7307

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear House Judiciary Committee,

I've been a licensed massage therapist since 2007. I live in Warren, RI, 02885, and I own a busy massage practice in Providence, RI. My practice has been in business for over a decade, and we currently have a team of 11 massage therapists.

I'm writing **in support of H7307** and against H7165.

I see no point in a bill that allows sex workers to access immunity for prostitution charges when reporting violent crimes, if spa workers who massage clients are excluded from having immunity (from being charged for practicing massage without a license).

Not granting immunity to spa workers who massage clients without a license undermines the point of the whole thing, which seems to be to try to create a safe way for any sex worker to report a crime.

Allowing this immunity doesn't seem to me like it would lead to the end of regulating and licensing massage therapists. The RI AMTA seems more concerned with their own reputation than the safety of everyone.

It's 2024. People know the difference between sex work and massage therapy done by a trained, licensed professional. In my opinion, predators are predators. They know the difference between a non-licensed spa and a licensed massage practice, too. If they're going to assault someone, they'll do it in either place. The only difference is their approach. **Everyone** should be able to report these crimes without fear of repercussion.

Built into the law that defines massage therapy is a section that outlines an entire realm of legal hands-on therapy that does not require a license, or even any training. This includes shiatsu, reiki, "therapeutic touch," reflexology, and a host of other modalities that most people would associate with non-sexual massage. So to single out Asian spa workers as the only ones who aren't allowed to touch people under the name "bodywork" or even "massage," and to disregard their safety so blatantly, strikes me as classist and racist.

Thank you.