

1. Has the Act reduced or stopped change or suppression practices? Describe any impact you think the Act has had on the occurrence or the nature of change or suppression practices.

Yes, the Act has stopped change or suppression practices. The definition of what a suppression practice is causes more harm than good, as it has stopped parents' ability to support their own children. It has stopped councillors from taking on these cases, and it has stopped individuals from finding differing solutions.

2. To what extent do you think the community is aware of and understands: a. the Act and how it works b. what change or suppression practices are and c. the harm caused by change or suppression practices

The community largely understands the Act and its implications. The Act stops well-meaning people, including parents, from offering support due to the risk of imprisonment. The community is aware that the definition of change or suppression practices, as defined in the Act, is far too broad. I think the community feels the Act causes more harm than so called change or suppression practices.

3. Could the Act's operation and effectiveness be improved? If so, how?

The Act's operation and effectiveness could be improved by protecting children's freedom of choice, so that the affirmative model is not the only option. I have seen the great harm done to families where the parents have been unable to help their children because they do not agree with the affirmative model. The support of a loving parent is valuable, and the Act has allowed the current counsellors to speak negatively of parents who don't agree. This has caused distressed children to be cut off from their main support. Counsellors have been saying inaccurate things to gender distressed children and parents. Such inaccurate statements as "Would you prefer a dead child over a gender changed child?" Many of the current counsellors operating under the Act seem to have a bias towards gender-change. It is not proven that gender change is the only solution for all distressed children. We have seen many people change their minds after a few years of having serious gender-change medications and operations. They have to come to the sad realisation that they listened to the wrong people, and now they have irreversible health problems, including sterility. This should be rectified by allowing free choice of counsellors and removing the penalties.

4. How clear is the Act's definition of what is and what is not a change or suppression practice? If further clarity is needed, what forms of clarification would be most helpful?

The Act, as it is, includes religious practices that are NOT harmful but helpful. This should be changed. The Act's definition is far too broad. There are many beautiful options to help gender-confused individuals, such as [REDACTED]. This is not a harmful and suppressive practice. Individuals have free will to do what they want, but are given other options to weigh up before making a decision that will change their life forever. Allowing different types of clinical counselling gives freedom to the individuals that the Act is trying to help.

5. How clear is the exclusion for health service providers? If further clarity is needed, how could this best be achieved?

In Victoria, the Act is not clear.

The Act limits the provision of good health providers. Evidence-based medical practices are not being followed. Gender transitioned individuals are not given recourse for the irreparable harm done to them.

6. Is greater clarity needed about how people of faith can hold and express their beliefs to support clear understanding and compliance with the Act? What forms of clarification would be most helpful?

Why should people of faith need to be told by people without faith how to respond to the Act? Our democracy has always held to the freedom of religion. Parents have the right to freely teach their children their own sexual ethics. Greater clarity is not needed to be given to people of faith. Gender confused children of faith should have the right to go to counsellors of faith if they so desire. The Act discriminates against people of faith and excludes gender confused individuals of faith from gaining faith based answers.

7. How effective are VEOHRC's awareness and education materials on change or suppression practices? What improvements, if any, could help strengthen community understanding and compliance?

The educational material is biased towards conversion to the opposite sex. It is not representative of medical evidence of the dangers of gender transition. It does not weigh pros and cons, and it does not tell children that castration will mean they are unable to have children in the future. Why is compliance an issue? It seems to me that this Act has done a good job in ensuring that there is no choice but compliance to gender change, no matter how sad the outcome.

If so, please describe what those barriers are.

There are no barriers to reporting.

To my knowledge, there are no barriers to VEOHRC facilitating outcomes. Why should they facilitate outcomes against parental rights?

There are no barriers to my knowledge of VEOHRC conducting investigations.

I see that it is wrong that individuals can report a situation anonymously and not have to explain to the victims why they feel this way. It could be because of huge biases and a desire to cause harm.

9. Are there changes that could help support VEOHRC to carry out its functions or improve the effectiveness of the civil response scheme? If so, please describe any changes.

It would be good for VEOHRC to report regularly on the numbers and outcomes of each anonymous situation. There is currently no transparency. There should not be secrecy in the Act.

10. Are there barriers to reporting, investigating and prosecuting criminal change or suppression offences? If so, what are they?

There are no barriers to reporting, but there are fears regarding this Act, within the faith community, which hinder gender confused individuals from speaking about these issues.

11. Are there other aspects of the criminal offences in the Act that limit their effective operation? If so, what changes or supports could improve their operation?

We don't need laws for every aspect of life. They don't improve life, just bog up the judicial system.

12. Do existing avenues for redress adequately meet the needs of victim-survivors of change or suppression practices? Are there gaps, harms or barriers that require an additional or separate redress mechanism?

I understand victims can gain compensation, but they should have proof of injury.

13. Should a civil cause of action be introduced under the Act? What distinct purpose would it serve compared to existing pathways?

No, this is not necessary.

