
From: C [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 20 December 2022 6:54 PM
To: Legal Affairs and Safety Committee
Subject: Legal Affairs and Safety Cttee - Sex Seld ID legislation

Good afternoon

I am writing to express my profound dismay regarding the introduction to sex self-identification laws in Queensland, which I oppose, and the implications this has for gay and lesbian and female sex-based rights.

It seems that Australia is heading down this path just at the time that the rest of the world is beginning to wake up to the dangers.

1. Women (and men) should be entitled to opt for same sex (i.e. same biological sex) care e.g. in nursing homes, hospitals, crisis centres, counselling. In Scotland there is already a trans-woman i.e. biologically male head of a rape crisis centre. In Victoria and NSW there have been women who have attended rape crisis counselling only to find male-bodied persons (however they may identify) in the group.
2. Women need to be able to have spaces separate from men including changing rooms, toilets, prisons. Male pattern offending is markedly different from female offending and there is the threat from males misusing the legislation. They have already been rapes in school changing rooms in the US schools (Loudoun county), inappropriate sexualised dress from teachers (Oakville, Canada), and the introduction of sexualised content and age inappropriate content in primary schools in the US, England, Scotland and Wales.
3. The introduction of such legislation has also had an effect on the freedom of association and impinged the sex based rights of other groups e.g. Lesbians in New Zealand and Tasmania unable to have same sex meetings and dating sites. This is a case where sex based rights for same sex attracted people are undermined by this proposed legislation. Please read the wealth of information from LGB Alliance, for example. The "LGBT" community is not united and many in the LGB community are very aware that their rights are threatened by this legislation.
4. There has been minimal engagement with women's groups, or indeed the general public, regarding the issue of trans rights and the implications for the rights of other groups, especially women. It makes a mockery of any legislation designed to protect women, and safeguard children, if men can simply identify as women e.g. as girl guide leaders (this has already taken place in the UK and WA) or on school camps (numerous examples in the US). Any male with an ulterior motive could take advantage of this and there would be no legal means to oppose it).
5. In Scotland similar legislation has led to a senior leading UN official pointing out that gender recognition reforms pose a danger to women, particularly from violent males who could abuse the legislation. Reem Alsalem amplified many of the concerns raised by campaigners: "Such proposals would potentially open the door for violent males who identify as men to abuse the process of acquiring a GRC and the rights associated with it. This presents potential risks to the safety of women in all their diversity." There are no "safeguarding measures to ensure that the procedure is not, as far as can be reasonably assured, abused by sexual predators and other perpetrators of violence. These include access to both single-sex spaces and gender-based spaces." She also pointed out "that the majority of sex offenders are male, and that persistent sex offenders will go to great lengths to gain access to those they wish to abuse". Quite apart from whether or not a male in a female toilet, for example, has ill intent, their mere presence will make using such spaces impossible for women who have previously suffered abuse (and this is a far greater

demographic than any recorded oppression of trans identifying males) and for many women from cultural backgrounds where privacy from males is essential.

6. There is no precedent for legislating to protect one section's 'rights' when these prevent the protection of another (much larger) section's rights. Women have fought hard for gender equality and attempts to address the gender imbalance e.g. quotas for women on boards, for prizes in the arts and sciences, for sporting achievements, are made a mockery of by the inclusion of biological males

7. It is authoritarian in the extreme to legislate the use of language e.g. in courts, in reporting of crime in newspapers, in government documents etc. such as the use of terms such as 'chest-feeders' and 'people who menstruate'. Women need the use of their own language and eroding that also erodes the ability to express oneself, and also to legislate clearly to protect female rights.

8. It is also legislating to enforce an ideology for which there is absolutely no scientific basis or consensus. Biologically a person cannot change sex. The promotion of this is also harmful to young people and children, as the evidence is growing all the time of the social contagion aspect of this, particularly from the online environment, and with girls. "Trans" is the new self-harm, similar to anorexia or cutting, but now it is teaching young people that they are born in the wrong body and can take experimental drugs and undergo experimental surgeries to 'correct' this. It is 'big pharma' business. So this is the promotion of an agenda led by a lobby group. A lobby group making substantial donations to political parties.

9. So called trans 'charities' have also recently come under far more scrutiny, with medical associations backing away from the idea of trans 'affirmation' being a recommended treatment path. Yet that is what is being promoted here. Governments and organisations overseas are removing support from 'charities' such as Mermaids and organisations like ACON which function as lobby groups.

10. It sets a frightening precedent in falsifying legal documents. The legislation in VIC and proposed here in LQD allows birth certificates to be re-issued with a new 'sex'. There is no mention that the person has changed sex from that recorded at birth. This is heart-breaking (speaking as a parent) for the parents concerned, whose names also appear on the document, and is factually incorrect, so reverse writing of history and removing all legal trace. This also creates the inability of anyone dealing with that person to know that there is a fiction being perpetrated. It removes safeguarding as it is impossible to know of, for example, an applicant for a job is a different actual sex from the documented fiction. So it removes all sex-based rights and legislation. If the person is able to 'pass' as a member of the opposite sex it also makes dating sites and other spaces dangerous, and misleading. In the case of a legal union, it may mean that a person could even marry another person, in good faith, not knowing that that person is in fact a different biological sex. At the very least the change should be openly documented.

11. There is no reason why a different category/categories could not be created, rather than erasing the common and historical use of words relating to actual biological sex. You cannot 'validate' one group by invalidating another.

12. This is such a huge change being brought in 'under the radar' and is not well understood by the electorate. This sort of fundamental change should require a referendum.

Yours sincerely
Dr Christina James