

## SCECLB290 Individual

---

Senedd Cymru | Welsh Parliament

Y Pwyllgor Biliau Diwygio | Reform Bill Committee

Bil Senedd Cymru (Rhestrau Ymgeiswyr Etholiadol) | Senedd Cymru (Electoral Candidate Lists) Bill

Ymateb gan Unigolyn | Evidence from Individual

---

### **What are your views on the general principles of the Bill and the need for legislation to deliver the Welsh Government's stated policy objective (to make the Senedd a more effective legislature by ensuring it is broadly representative of the gender make-up of the population)?**

The principle of equality in male/female representation is sound. However, this should be on the basis of biological sex, not self-declared 'gender', which has come to mean something different.

There are an increasing number of middle-aged male transvestites - men who get sexual pleasure from dressing in women's clothes - who are now declaring themselves to actually \*be\* women. Some of these (trans-identified) men are interested for political office in the UK, including Wales.

This is fine - anyone can run for office and wear whatever clothes they like. But they must not be counted as women, which this proposes. Male people however they dress, are not subject to the same structural disadvantages as female people are, because the disadvantages women face are rooted in the fact of their female bodies: sexual objectification, dealing with periods, pregnancy, menopause, childcare, elder care, and health problems associated with the female reproductive system.

All males, however they dress or identify, must be counted as males in all legislation, in order for women - biological females - to retain their rights (to privacy, dignity and safety) and to have a hope of equal treatment and representation. To count men as women on their say-so is to significantly set-back the progress of women and will have a serious negative impact on the largest oppressed group - who have historically suffered the greatest harms, in terms of structural oppression as well as target violence - in the UK.

## **What are your views on the system of enforcement and potential sanctions for non-compliance proposed in the Bill?**

I can make a statement that I am a person of colour. It doesn't make me a person of colour. If I was to make that statement and have it accepted at face value in applying for a position reserved for a person of colour, would that be fair and reasonable? Would it help the cause of racial equality? No, and no. It would have strongly damaging effects on racial equality. It would push out a person of colour and install yet another white person, substituting the oppressed group with a member of the oppressor group.

For that same reason, counting men as women on their self-declaration would be unfair and unreasonable, and have strongly damaging effects on sex equality. Women's unequal representation in society and public life is caused by the consequences of their female bodies (in particular their female reproductive systems) not their clothes, their any self-declared sense of 'femininity'.

If you wish to have equal representation of women, you must ask candidates to produce their birth certificates and record their biological sex as recorded there. This is the only basis on which equality of representation is meaningful. A birth certificate system is simple and easy to enforce, and would have a positive rather than negative impact on women's rights. Your proposed system has a negative impact on women.

## **Are there any potential barriers to the implementation of the Bill's provisions? If so, what are they, and are they adequately taken into account in the Bill and the accompanying Explanatory Memorandum and Regulatory Impact Assessment?**

The barriers to the bill's implementation are numerous, in terms of fairness and common sense. But I also believe it falls foul of the Equality Act 2010, since it potentially discriminates against women (the protected characteristic of sex).

## **Are any unintended consequences likely to arise from the Bill?**

The unintended consequences would be that the Welsh parliament would attract fewer women members (the oppressed group) and more men (the already dominant group). What's more, these additional men would likely be those with sexual fetishes who see women in terms of oppressive gender stereotypes, since the majority of men who identify as women are autogynephiles, men who are sexually attracted to women and sexually turned on by dressing as women and people treating them as if they are women. These men tend to think of women on very sexually reductive terms (see for example the quote about what a woman is from 'Andrea Long Chu'). To install these trans-identified men in the Welsh parliament in the place of women would make a degraded and more sexist work environment for all women working

there, and by gifting them legislative powers, would ensure women rights and concerns across Welsh society and public life - and in fact the UK generally - are minimised and degraded.

### **What are your views on the Welsh Government's assessment of the financial and other impacts of the Bill?**

Non-financial impacts would be the effective destruction of women's rights. When men are counted as women, women's rights as a distinct sex class cease to exist. Male dominance is re-cemented into place. This is hugely damaging for the whole of society.

### **What are your views on the balance between the information contained on the face of the Bill and what is left to subordinate legislation? Are the powers for Welsh Ministers to make subordinate legislation appropriate?**

Any legislation predicated on the basis that a man is a woman on his say-so is destructive and harmful to women, children's safeguarding, and society in general. Men are not an oppressed group.

### **Do you have any views on matters relating to the legislative competence of the Senedd including compatibility with the European Convention on Human Rights?**

It is incompatible with the ECHR as it is destructive to the human rights of women.

### **Do you have any views on matters related to the quality of the legislation, or to the constitutional or other implications of the Bill?**

It is poorly thought out legislation for the reasons already given. Unless the express intention is the further oppression of an already oppressed group, in which case it is very cleverly conceived.

### **Are there any other issues that you would like to raise about the Bill and the accompanying Explanatory Memorandum or any related matters?**

No

### **Anything else?**

No