

Written evidence submitted by Mr Kevin Yates (GRA0007)

- Will the Government's proposed changes meet its aim of making the process "kinder and more straight forward"?

There is so little actual content that this is impossible to ascertain and it also needs to be seen in the round with any proposed changes to other acts and government guidance such as the Equality Act.

- Should a fee for obtaining a Gender Recognition Certificate be removed or retained? Are there other financial burdens on applicants that could be removed or retained?

This should be removed completely as poverty should not be a barrier to someone having a GRC which can have significant impact on someone's mental well being. The current requirement for interviews and assessments also presents a financial burden and any proposed 'gate keeping' should be cost neutral. Economics should not be used as bar to check someone's depth of need for a GRC

- Should the requirement for a diagnosis of gender dysphoria be removed?

Yes, there is now significant empirical evidence that the diagnosis is overkill and countries that have self ID have had no issues that would have been avoided by a clinical diagnosis.

- Should there be changes to the requirement for individuals to have lived in their acquired gender for at least two years?

I subscribe to the Scottish proposal for this. 'Acquired gender'?

- What is your view of the statutory declaration and should any changes have been made to it?

A lack of use and data on its use makes this question impossible to answer other than with anecdotal information and the plural of anecdotes is not data.

- Does the spousal consent provision in the Act need reforming? If so, how? If it needs reforming or removal, is anything else needed to protect any rights of the spouse or civil partner?

It should be removed but the divorce law should be updated to allow transition as an acceptable reason for divorce. People using 'unreasonable' behaviour is demeaning and insulting.

- Should the age limit at which people can apply for a Gender Recognition Certificate (GRC) be lowered?

I believe it should be 17.

- What impact will these proposed changes have on those people applying for a Gender Recognition Certificate, and on trans people more generally?

The current proposed changes? No idea as we haven't actually seen a detailed proposal only aspirations and statements such as "we will make easier". The other proposals around access to treatment (including a vague statement on trans youth which is open to also mean removing current treatments) is not relevant to getting a GRC. In effect, the only proposal regarding GRCs is a possible reduction in cost.... yay.

- What else should the Government have included in its proposals, if anything?

Follow science and medicine, stop allowing political ideology and beliefs interfering in the treatment. Imagine if Christian groups started interfering in young girls having access to birth control, even for acne which is actually much more dangerous than puberty blockers. Let GIDs and the NHS work with international colleagues and develop the best treatments. In years to come, trans people will be able to transition younger and avoid such things as breast removal surgery.

- Does the Scottish Government's proposed Bill offer a more suitable alternative to reforming the Gender Recognition Act 2004?

Yes. Its a good proposal. Like all acts of parliament, law can be tweaked and changed after empirical data is available. Too many 'interest groups' that are ideologically and transgender are involved currently and at the highest levels of government. I am still waiting for an answer to an FOI as to whom the Equalities Minister met in her preparation for the recent announcement.

October 2020