

Canadian Women's Declaration

1 Do you have any comments on the proposal that applicants must live in their acquired gender for at least 3 months before applying for a GRC?

Yes

If yes, please outline these comments.:

- It is impossible for any person to "change sex"; jurisdictions around the world publicly acknowledge that "gender is a social construct" - in other words, nothing more than a set of regressive social stereotypes about 'feminine' girls/women/females and 'masculine' boys/men/males - rendering anyone "living in an acquired gender" nothing more than LARPing (live action role-playing) at being something they're not (and can never possibly be), whether it's 2 years or 3 months.
- To use an analogy: students can obtain a tourist visa to go on a summer vacation in another country with a completely different culture for a mere 3 months - that doesn't make them citizens of their adopted country any more than "living in one's acquired gender" for 3 months makes them the opposite sex (or neither/both). "Living in one's acquired gender" is nothing more than psycho-social tourism. Not much can actually be 'accomplished' in 3 months, and if whatever people seek cannot be accomplished, it makes the entire exercise unnecessary, and redundant.
- Anyone who believes they are "the opposite sex" requires psychological counselling; 2 years is often not enough time for anyone to get to the root of any identity-crisis or understand the cause(s) for their gender-dysphoria/body-dysmorphia, let alone a mere 3 months; conversely, we already know that people are capable of experiencing serious trauma in such a short time period (even a single physical/sexual assault during one short, isolated incident can result in lifelong consequences); by almost all accounts "social transition" is a difficult process, if only because it requires navigating a new world where (often unwilling) others must also affirm the transition; adding endocrine-disruptors like puberty-blockers can result in permanent/irreversible damage.
- If people are genuinely dysphoric and feel psychologically incapable of living as the SEX they are born with they can still "perform" whatever "gender" they like - we used to call that "androgyny" - without enshrining it into law, and forcing unwitting bystanders to legally "affirm" it. Society being accepting of 'feminine boys' and 'masculine girls' is much more "progressive" than the current push to reinforce regressive "gender" stereotypes (or deny they exist). Most people are already functionally "non-binary" or "gender-fluid" - that does not make us "trans" any more that it makes anyone else "trans" - people should be able to wear what they like and express themselves as they see fit without (state-sponsored) deluding themselves into being what they aren't and can never be.
- Most people past a certain age know that "you can't always get what you want"; if a paraplegic person who "feels" able-bodied or an anorexic person who "feels" grossly-overweight or a white person who "feels" black can't receive legal-recognition for their preferred state-of-being, and force everyone else to "affirm" it, neither should we be legally-affirming gender-dysphoric people to "become" something they can not possibly become. For many people it just creates additional psychological damage where none would exist otherwise. Never forget that for many young people this is a social-contagion - a fashionable trend - and aside

from preventing bullying & harassment trends should not be legally-enshrined any more than being "punk" or "goth" should be legally-enshrined.

2 Do you have any comments on the proposal that applicants must go through a period of reflection for at least 3 months before obtaining a GRC?

Yes

If yes, please outline these comments.:

Yes. I think I've already outlined them above. In a nutshell, 3 months is not enough time to "reflect" on much of anything, any more than 6 months would be.

Additionally, without the explicit requirement that this "reflection" be monitored by qualified doctors and mental-healthcare providers, what is the point? People change their minds all the time, constantly, and often only after years of "reflection", not mere months. A 3-month reflection period is useless in allowing anyone enough time to sufficiently experience whatever positive or negative effects/outcomes they might be confronted with, but only 3 years later might profoundly regret decisions they were previously confident about.

3 Should the minimum age at which a person can apply for legal gender recognition be reduced from 18 to 16?

No

If you wish, please give reasons for your view.:

- Again, people change their minds all the time, constantly, and often only after years of "reflection". Teens' brains are still developing and the vast majority of us were/are too emotionally immature to understand the consequences of decisions we made/make in our teens.
- The analogies about not allowing teens to smoke, get a tattoo, consume alcohol or recreational drugs, or consent to sexual intercourse with much older adults are all valid - if we don't allow 16 year olds to do any of the above "for their own good" then we should not allow teens to make a life-altering decision such as "changing their sex" either.
- To be blunt, it is a profoundly stupid proposal. This sort of "affirmation" eschews adults' responsibility to provide concerned guidance to younger/immature kids who can't possibly have enough life-experience to understand the consequences of their decisions, and by enabling teens this sort of self-entitlement to (deludedly) "be whatever they want" fosters selfishness and narcissism. It is dangerous and irresponsible.

4 Do you have any other comments on the provisions of the draft Bill?

Yes

If yes, please outline these comments.:

- Enabling anyone to deny material-reality is psychologically damaging to their sense of self. Short-term, affirmative "fixes" often lead to long-term regrets.
- Legally-enshrining anyone's (perceived) "right" to "change sex" (impossible) also negatively affects others who are now being denied the (actual inalienable) right to our own perceptions - being told that I must regard someone who is obviously a man as a woman (or vice-versa, or neither/both) is state-sponsored gaslighting and denies the vast majority of law-abiding citizens our own right to navigate the world, not only 'as we see fit' but in direct support of objective material reality and biological facts.

• Legally-enshrining anyone's (perceived) "right" to "change sex" (impossible) means that "bad actors" will exploit it. Whereas we already have problems with predatory men (and some boys) using self-identity to gain access to women's & children's vulnerable spaces (such as bathrooms, locker-rooms, refuges/crisis-shelters & sex-segregated prisons), making it even easier for them to access said spaces now turns said vulnerable-people into "human rights violators." Again, it is state-sponsored gaslighting and a profoundly stupid proposal. Does the government really want to be held legally-responsible when predatory men do exploit these new loopholes to gain access to new victims? (Because rest assured, any gov't implementing these irresponsible policies WILL eventually be held-responsible for any negative consequences which WILL result. It is inevitable.) Vulnerable people have every right to set their own boundaries about who they allow into their "personal space" and the gov't is not only making this impossible, it explicitly contradicts any efforts to teach society-at-large about "consent". Most people do not consent to their personal boundaries being crossed (violated) just because a small minority of gender-confused people AND PREDATORS insist their own (perceived) "rights" are being violated. Trans people already have all the same rights as everyone else under existing legislation. Like Bill C-16 in Canada, what the Scottish GRA-reform is proposing is giving a vast minority of people (who use emotional-blackmail to get what they want) special rights over everyone else. Sex-segregation remains a common-sense policy to ensure safeguarding.

• Legally-enshrining anyone's (perceived) "right" to "change sex" (impossible) reinforces negative perceptions of people with internalized homophobia. Telling 'closeted' gay/lesbians that they are really "the opposite sex" not only damages them psychologically by denying their own sexual-orientation, it REINFORCES HOMOPHOBIA. There is nothing more "heteronormative" than "affirming" one member of a gay/lesbian couple that they are the opposite-sex and so the couple is now perceived as "heterosexual"; likewise, there is nothing more "heteronormative" than "affirming" one member of a HETERO couple that they are the opposite-sex and now both members of that 'straight' hetero couple magically becomes members of a historically-oppressed sexual-minority. We did not fight for gay liberation so that straight people could co-opt it and claim gay-oppression. Not only is it actual gay/lesbian erasure but it also supports rape-culture by now telling exclusively same-sex-attracted people that they are bigots for not wanting to engage in sexual relations with anyone of the opposite sex who now incorrectly/erroneously claims they are gay or lesbian. As it relates to sexual-orientation and same-sex-attraction, the entire concept of gender-identity is profoundly homophobic.

• Governments can no longer deny that sexual-paraphilias exist (e.g. "autogynephilia") or that we are changing laws to accommodate men (or an even smaller minority of women) who have them. If we would not change legislation to accommodate any other "sexual kink", we should not be changing laws to accommodate sexually-paraphilic men, at the expense of women & girls ACTUAL "identity" as females or womanhood. The whole exercise is profoundly misogynist, whether reducing females to toxic-feminine-stereotypes, males to toxic-masculine-stereotypes, convincing females they are males (reinforcing self-hating womanhood =

misogyny) or convincing males they are females (reinforcing feminine-stereotypes as girl/womanhood = misogyny). Anyone who wants to BE what they sexually-desire requires psychological help, not state-sponsored “affirmation” that reinforces negative-stereotypes that the rest of us have to relearn how to navigate and/or resist at great personal cost.

5 Do you have any comments on the draft Impact Assessments?

Yes

If yes, please outline these comments.:

There are so many potential negative consequences I don't know where to begin...

- Enormous amounts of money being wasted by businesses and gov't departments trying to accommodate a small minority of people who cannot ever actually “change sex” (e.g. building new washrooms/facilities; those who resist having to undergo costly legal challenges that might ruin their businesses OR make them future targets of lawsuits).

- Children being put on a path to lifelong medicalization with profoundly negative physical and psychological consequences, possibly including the denial of same-sex attraction and thereby denying their full-range of humanity (sexually-dimorphic and sexually-reproductive); “detransitioners” are a growing phenomena, with thousands of young people now realizing (some only a few years later) that the hormonal and surgical changes they insisted on receiving were WRONG and irreversible.

- Negatively impacting women - if we can't DEFINE “what a woman is” we obviously cannot define women's rights, or take legislative measures to support them. Affirmative gender-identity laws are undoing 100+ years of women's hard-fought gains.

- Predatory/exploitative people (mostly men) will ALWAYS take advantage of any loophole they can. Statutory declarations are useless - some people genuinely change their minds months or years later, and others don't care about the law in the first place. Is the gov't really prepared to tell young people who realize they made a mistake that they are now criminally-responsible for making bad decisions when they were teens? Is the gov't really prepared to tell sexual-predators that they have a “human right” to legal-fictions allowing them loopholes to access new victims? (Sexual-predators or anyone convicted of violent crime or criminal-fraud should be entirely prohibited from changing their identity in the first place - serious violators gave up their “right” to change their legal-identities when they chose to violate the law and other law-abiding people.)

- Free-speech, free-expression and the right to free-association are all being undermined by supporting gender-identity nonsense. Not only are governments making “thoughtcrime” a reality, they are making taking away everyone else's inherent right to perceive reality.

- Human are sexually-dimorphic (even intersex people with DSDs - “disorders/differences of sex development”). Without sexual dimorphism there would be

literally no humans (or other mammals!) on the planet. This is an objective FACT, not a subjective “feeling”. No amount of “gender-identity guidance” by well-monied and politically-persuasive gender-lobbyists will ever change this. The gov't either supports a well-informed and emotionally-mature citizenry or it does not. Gov'ts that pass affirmative gender-identity reforms may as well also legislate that transwomen become gestational surrogates for all the good it would do

(which is exactly as ridiculous as it sounds, because everyone knows it's impossible). Even young children understand the differences between girl/woman/female and boy/man/male - any gov't that enables or promotes policies to indoctrinate people into believing otherwise are responsible for the wholesale dumbing-down of the entire population/citizenry, with serious negative consequences. We can support genuinely gender-nonconforming people by affirming their right to present/express how they like without forcing on a path to lifelong (expensive!) medicalization or forcing everyone else to believe or legally-affirm a lie. Promoting actual "diversity" means accepting people as they ARE, not what they want to be in order to conform to regressive stereotypes. The damage being done to people is already unconscionable. Stop this nonsense before things get even worse.