

Gender identity should NOT be included in bill C-6.

Here's why.

Conversion therapy for homosexuals has nothing in common with what someone might consider to be “conversion therapy” for gender identity.

There is evidence that conversion therapy for homosexuals is harmful and ineffective. More than that, homosexuality does not require invasive and irreversible medical interventions.

Gender identity on the other hand, is the exact opposite, in that children, when not treated with affirmation only, evidence says that more than 80% of children will not go on to transition, but go on to identify with their sexed body (talk to Kenneth Zucker about that).

To deny children access to non affirmative therapy is to deny a child the chance to identify as who they really are. To ban non affirmative care is to tell children their only option is puberty blockers, cross sex hormones and cosmetic surgery, which as time goes by and more information is coming out about such treatments is revealing more and more extremely worrying negative long term health problems, such as bones, internal organs and cognitive abilities not developing properly.

In the UK, a landmark case was decided by the high court that it is unlikely a child would ever have the capacity to consent to such a treatment pathway as puberty blockers, a treatment that has been deemed experimental and not based

on scientific evidence. This cannot be the only option for Canadian children. Canada cannot take tremendous leaps backward from safeguarding children while the UK is showing us what steps forward look like.

Here is a summary on the judgement against the medicalizing of children's bodies.

<https://www.transgendertrend.com/keira-bell-high-court-historic-judgment-protect-vulnerable-children/>

“The reality is that no child can adequately comprehend the consequences of embarking on a path that will almost certainly lead to cross-sex hormones and surgery. Those consequences include likely loss of sexual function and fertility”

& the psychological impact that might have on future relationships. That's on top of the possible long-term effects of ... puberty blockers ...about which there has been a worrying lack of research. As Ms. Bell told the court: “I made a brash decision as a teenager trying to find confidence and happiness, except now the rest of my life will be negatively affected. I cannot reverse any of the physical, mental or legal changes that I went through. Transition was a very temporary, superficial fix for a very complex identity issue”.<https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/the-times-view-on-the-keira-bell-case-fine-judgment-8v5vvwnwm>

A quote from David Lametti from the last standing committee on justice and human rights (found here <https://>

parlvu.parl.gc.ca/Harmony/en/PowerBrowser/PowerBrowserV2/20201201/-1/34420).

“What we’re trying to do is ban conversations that tell you that who you are is wrong and that you have to change.”

I agree with this sentiment, which is why I propose that if you’re going to ban any practise relating to gender identity, you ban the practise of telling children that their bodies are wrong and that they’d be happier being as close an approximation of the opposite sex possible, with the use of puberty blockers and eventually cross sex hormones and cosmetic surgery.

By gender identity ideology’s own rules “gender is fluid and ever changing” why would you ban conversations telling children that their current desire to be the opposite sex might change in the future? How can it be “fluid” and also fixed at a young age, not to be challenged, or questioned by mental health professionals?

Some children, or parents use transition in order to escape homosexuality, as evidenced by whistleblowers from the UK Tavistock gender identity clinic for children (<https://youtu.be/zTRnrp9pXHY>) thus using transition as a new form of conversion therapy for homosexuals. Your conversion therapy bill does not end conversion therapy, it protects transgenderism, a new form conversion therapy.