

The Director,

Tasmanian Law Reform Institute

Re: Sexual orientation and gender identity conversion practices issues paper.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this important matter.

I am a parent and concerned citizen. For ten years I have taken a keen interest in the participation of the LGBT+ lobby in what is known as the ‘culture wars’.

I have read quite widely on the issue of ‘gay conversion therapy’ and am confident in making the following statements:

- I have been told that ‘conversion practices’ (such as shock therapy and chemical castration on LGBT+ individuals) have NOT occurred in Australia for decades.
- Everywhere you look in our society, there are pro-LGBT+ messages. In particular, the ‘Safe-schools’ programme tells impressionable teens that homosexuality is a normal variant of sexual behaviour and that gender is purely a social construct. It is hardly surprising then, that a growing number of Tasmanian adolescents believe they have a gender which is different to their biological sex and that this is manifesting itself in requests for hormone treatment and irreversible gender reassignment surgery.
- The available evidence refutes the claim that people are born that way.
- It is therefore not surprising that there are people in Australia who have successfully left the LGBT+ lifestyle. I have met one myself. You can view some of their testimonies below:
 - James Parker (whom I have met)
 - Jeremy Luke Bate
 - Walt Heyer (overseas)
 - Survey of 78 ex-LGBT+ people
- ‘My life, my choice’ is a mantra of our society yet the issues paper suggests preventing people exercising their rights to seek such assistance as they may think necessary. It therefore seems obvious that only politically correct choices are actually allowed in 2021.
- Worse than that, the issues paper raises the spectre of the criminalisation of those people who are asked to help people in need.
- Given the above facts, the only reasonable explanation of the LGBT+ lobby’s insistence that individuals who seek to help hurting and confused individuals should be punished by law, is that they are not motivated by concern for the individuals for whom they claim to speak.

Please abandon this unscientific and ideologically driven agenda. Given the falsehoods exposed above, it would be heartless to proceed.

See page 2 for answers to questions.

Questions and answers

Q1: After considering the background and working definition (see [1.3.23] on page 13), in your opinion, what are and are not ‘sexual orientation and gender identity conversion practices’?

A: Ironically, programmes such as ‘Safe Schools’ are sexual orientation and gender identity conversion programs.

Q2: Should people be allowed to consent to SOGI conversion practices? If so, at what age and under what conditions?

A: Of course. But minors should consult with competent adults who understand that homosexuality is not innate and immutable.

Q3: Have you been involved in or offered, or are you aware of, any forms of SOGI conversion practices in Tasmania? If so, what were the effects on you, or the person exposed to them?

A: No.

Q4: Do you think that Tasmanian law should be changed to address SOGI conversion practices? If so, should this be through comprehensive reform, amendment or both (a hybrid)?

A: No.

Q5: Should some or all forms of SOGI conversion practices be criminalised in Tasmania? If so, which, if any, should be dealt with as serious (indictable) crimes and which, if any, should be dealt with as less serious (summary) offences?

A: No, these are a matter for the individuals to decide.

Q6: Should some or all forms of SOGI conversion practices be made civil wrongs in Tasmania? If so, what sort of practices should people be liable for and how should those subject to such practices be compensated?

A: No, these are a matter for the individuals to decide.

Q7: Should any existing Tasmanian laws (besides criminal laws or the *Civil Liability Act 2002 (Tas)*) be amended to cover SOGI conversion practices? If so, which ones and in what way?

A: No.

Q8: Are there any other models or approaches that are preferable to, or should complement, changing the law?

A: No, as the law shouldn’t be changed.

Q9: Are there any other matters that you consider relevant to this Inquiry and would like to raise?

A: My concerns have already been raised above.

Sincerely,

Martin Webb

[REDACTED]