



# Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

**Kathy Anne Noble**

PO BOX 897

Cleveland

Qld, 4163, Australia

Phone: 61 7 3286 9155

Email: [knoble@inet.net.au](mailto:knoble@inet.net.au)

Website: [www.changelingaspects.com](http://www.changelingaspects.com)



## **UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL Universal Periodic Review – Tenth Session**

### **SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATIONS ON HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES RELATED TO SEXUAL ORIENTATION AND GENDER IDENTITY**

All documents referred to can be found on the respective country pages at:  
<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/Documentation.aspx>.

#### **Summary**

(see detailed interventions below, from page 4)

#### **Submission to the Australian Human Rights Commission and the NSW Crown Solicitor's Office**

The lack of support by Australia for the UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL is symptomatic of the approaches to Trans issues by State and Territory governments. These are outlined in the following report on the commitment, or rather the lack of same, as follows.

The AHRC cites on page three of their letter *“her request was rejected on the basis of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996 (VIC).* May we ask why this has been cited as a precedent, in light of what has since happened in 2009 in the letters from the Federal Attorney-General and supplied in full later in this submission.

*“Under s 9(10) of the SDA, section 22 only operates to the extent that the provision gives effect to CEDAW. A key issue in this case was whether CEDAW extends to discrimination against women on the basis of their marital status”* The last sentence is intriguing. Does it apply to both the Trans woman and the wife?

We understand the section *“And is confined to discrimination against women”* This has just been underlined by the “Sex and Age Discrimination Legislation Amendment Bill 2010 [Provisions] issued in March 2011. It only iterates the existing rights of State and Territory Governments to over rule Commonwealth laws and continue to discriminate against Trans people and their



## Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

wives, spouses and partners. This means that the discrimination is not just directed at Trans women, but natal woman too.

We are still required (Forced) to divorce in order for the Trans person to be allowed to amend their birth certificate. More to follow in the section on **Sex and Age Discrimination Legislation Amendment Bill 2010 [Provisions]**

Later I have enumerated what is considered as happening after sex affirmation surgery at **EFFECT OF REASSIGNMENT OF SEX**

The third paragraph on page 4 states *“that you would need to show that you have been discriminated against by the NSW Registry of Births, Deaths and Marriages ‘in circumstances that are the same or are not materially different’ because you are both a woman and are married in comparison to a man who is married, as opposed to showing that you have been treated less favourably because you are married in comparison to a person who is not married”* We consider that since sex affirmation surgery in 2007, we were deemed to be a same sex couple and therefore lost all of our entitlements under the Marriage Act 1961. This included PBS, Medicare, Centrelink, ATO, defined superannuation (which affected both of us) inheritance and self worth.

This situation was not corrected until 2009 as part of the Same Sex Act July 2009. This is explained in the letter from the Federal Attorney-General’s Office dated 19-01-2009 that follows This purported to return all of our rights under the Marriage Act 1961.

08/775, MC08/17645, MC08/17302  
19 January 2009  
Ms Kathy Anne Noble  
President, Changelings Aspects  
PO BOX 897  
CLEVELAND QLD 4163

Dear Ms Noble,

Thank you for your correspondence of 6 and 12 December 2008 regarding the Australian Government’s same-sex reforms and the issue of a Recognised Details Certificate.

You queried how the Australia Government’s same-sex reforms affect transgender individuals who remain married after surgery. As you may be aware, the same-sex reforms amend 84 Commonwealth laws to remove discrimination against same-sex de facto couples and their families from a wide range of Commonwealth laws and programs.

While the reforms do not expressly address the sex or gender diversity of specific individuals, they ensure that same-sex de facto couples and their families are recognised and have the same entitlements as opposite-sex de facto couples. A transgender individual who remains married after surgery will not be deemed to be no longer married as a result of the reforms. The effect of the reforms is that such an individual will receive the same treatment regardless of whether they are considered to be a member of a same sex or opposite-sex couple.

The Australian Government is aware of the Australian Human Rights Commission project which aims to address some of the difficulties faced by the sex and gender diverse community.



## Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

The Commission has advised that its project will now consider laws and policies that govern the amendment of identity documents and the various ways that private and public organisations use or record information about a person's sex or gender.

The Commission is currently preparing its report of the project which is likely to be released in the coming months. The Australian Government will consider the recommendations made by the Commission.

You also raised particular concern about the lack of a Recognised Details Certificate in Queensland and the impact it has on transgender individuals living in Queensland.

As I explained in my previous correspondence to you (27 October 2008), the Australian Government supports consistent laws relating to transgender recognition across the States and Territories. The implementation of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Amendment Bill 2005 is a matter for the Queensland Government.

The Australian Government cannot legislate for identity documents issued by the States and Territories.

I trust that this information will be of assistance. Thank you for bringing your concerns to the Government's attention.

Yours sincerely  
Peter Arnaudo  
Assistant Secretary  
Human Rights Branch  
Australian Government  
Attorney-General's Department  
Social Inclusion Division

At page 5, paragraph 4 we have attached the full letter from the Federal Attorney-General's Office in concern of this matter.

09/3082, MC09/849, MC09/981, MC09/1292, MC09/1272  
17 March 2009  
Ms Kathy Anne Noble  
President, Changelings Aspects  
PO BOX 897  
CLEVELAND QLD 4163

Dear Ms Noble,

Thank you for your correspondence of 8 January 2009, 12 January 2009, 22 January 2009 and 24 January 2009 in respect of the Government's same-sex reforms and on issues concerning identity documents for transgender people born overseas and the inconsistencies between the technology used by Equal Opportunity Commissions and the Anti Discrimination Commissions.

As you are aware the Australian Government is awaiting the report on the Australian Human Rights Commission's sex and gender diversity project. As mentioned in previous correspondence,



## Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

the Commission is currently preparing its report of the project which is likely to be released shortly.

The Australian Government will consider the recommendations made by the Commission. In relation to your concerns about the inconsistent references to transgender issues in State and Territory laws (raised in your letter of 22 January 2009), I can inform you that a project on the harmonisation of anti-discrimination laws is being progressed through the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General. A Working Group of officials has been established to develop options for Ministers' consideration. It is possible that this type of issue may be examined in that context.

In relation to your letter of 24 January 2009, I would like to clarify the Government's position. I can confirm that the Commonwealth Same-Sex discrimination law reforms will have no effect on the *Marriage Act* 1961. The Marriage Act provides that a marriage must be between a man and a woman. This is consistent with current Government policy and there are no plans to change the Marriage Act to allow for a marriage to be solemnized between same-sex couples.

Gender re-assignment surgery has never, of itself, changed the status of a marriage which was valid at the time of solemnization. It has always been the case that a validly solemnized marriage would continue, irrespective of whether one of the parties subsequently underwent gender re-assignment surgery. The same-sex reforms due to come into force on 1 July 2009 do not change that position.

The legal recognition of the sex of transgender persons is primarily a matter for the States and Territories, as they are responsible for maintaining their respective Registers of Births, Deaths and Marriages. All States and Territories have legislation which enables post-operative transgender persons to obtain either a recognition certificate or an amended Birth Certificate recording their preferred sex in certain circumstances, unless the person is a married person. Again, the same-sex reforms have no impact on this.

The Government's same-sex reforms amend 84 Commonwealth laws to remove discrimination against same-sex couples and their children. They extend to same-sex de facto couples the same entitlements and obligations that apply to opposite-sex de facto couples.

From your correspondence I now understand that you are also asking about the policy positions taken by other Commonwealth departments and agencies, including Centrelink. I understand that those policy issues are currently under review by the relevant departments and agencies.

I trust that this information will be of assistance. Thank you for bringing your concerns to the Government's attention.

John Boersig.  
Assistant Secretary  
Human Rights Branch  
Australian Government  
Attorney-General's Department  
Social Inclusion Division



## Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

### NSW Anti-Discrimination Commission

#### Section 47 Provision of goods and services

Until July 2009, Trans people and their wives, spouses and partners, if remaining married after sex affirmation surgery, were deemed to be a “*same sex couple*” Therefore they lost all rights under the Marriage Act 1961 as this was the situation that applied to all same sex couples at that time. Those rights were returned under the Same Sex Act July 2009 which is outlined in the above letter from the Federal Attorney-General’s Office dated 19-01-2009

After sex affirmation surgery in August 2007, we discovered we had been deemed to be a same sex couple, so lost out on PBS, Medicare, Centrelink, ATO Inheritance and Defined superannuation. I have been subjected to letters being sent to MR, as I cannot amend my birth certificate. I am told that all my details have been amended and new cards issued in my femme name, but still the letters are addressed to MR, even after deeming ceased in July 2009.

Our health is suffering and our self worth has taken a hiding. We are not a lesbian couple, as we still recognise our marriage vows, which we take very seriously. The impact of this on not just our lives, but the family has been extreme. The cost in health will of course over time be passed on to the National health system, and already this is happening.

#### WIVES, SPOUSES AND PARTNERS 17-05-2011

*Much is written and talked about concerning the plight of Trans people who stay married after sex affirmation surgery.*

*However, there is nothing written or talked about concerning the plight of the “wives, spouses and partners” Do they exist? Yes, they certainly do and have suffered intolerably under the legislations that until recently were in force. One is still in force, that being the legislation by all States and Territories requiring the Trans person to divorce.*

*There is no mention of how the Wife, Spouse or Partner is affected in all of these situations if remaining married after sex affirmation surgery of their partner. Surely they are an aggrieved party to this if they wish to remain in the marriage, as many do. Because they were willing to stand by their Trans partner due to their commitment to their marriage vows, they were deemed to be part of a “same sex couple”, thus listing them as lesbian, which they found to be both abhorrent and untrue.*

*They along with their partner were to suffer due to this deeming by way of losing access as a married couple to Medicare, PBS, Centrelink, ATO, defined superannuation, inheritance and self esteem, due to the fact, they felt their lives had been taken away from them.*

*After several years of fighting to have their rights returned as a legally married couple, in January 2009 they were no longer to be deemed to be a “same sex couple” In March 2009, they were recognised by the Federal Attorney-General’s Office as being legally married. This, we understand was part of the “Same Sex Act 2009” provisions. This meant they finally had all rights restored under the Marriage Act 1961.*

*There has never been any attempt at an apology for this gross act of discrimination against wives, spouses and partners. Many now suffer because of the years of being considered as lesbians by the governments of the day.*



## Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

*Several are receiving counselling because of their problems, which include breakdowns of health and deterioration of their well being.*

*Many of my friends in this position are close to breaking point due to the lack of understanding and empathy involved. How much more must they endure in order to have full recognition of what to them is an on going commitment to their marriage and the full recognition of the Trans partner? Their health in many cases is at risk and that will come back to health departments across the Nation.*

*This is destroying couples who have been put through enough over the years due to having to come to terms with a partner's Transsexualism and their change. They are now having a huge burden imposed on them as they wish to remain married, but are looked upon as pariahs by State and Territory governments because they wish to remain married. However, they are still there for their partner and are willing to have thrust on them an abhorrent situation, as they are told that in order for their partner to amend their birth certificate; they are required (FORCED) to divorce.*

*There is no law in Australia that can force them to do this, and to stand up in Court and use the only wording for a divorce in Australia "Irretrievable Breakdown" would be tantamount to performing perjury.*

*There are couples who have been married for 40, 47 and 50 years that have no intention of divorcing because of the above requirements at State and Territory levels. Have the costs involved, not just in monetary terms, but in health and understanding these couples wishes to honour their marriage vows been taken into consideration? The health factor plays an immense part in this scenario, as couples in their 60s and 70s should not be placed in this despicable situation*

*It appears a situation where we have a yes and no approach to this problem, with the federal government understanding their plight, but the States and Territories totally unaware of the harm they are doing, all because they fear setting a precedent for "same sex marriage"*

Kathy Anne Noble  
© Changeling Aspects

The following has come from the January review of Australia's commitment to the UN Human Rights Council. I think that it leaves much to be desired, in order for Australia to put its house in order.

### **Australia:**

**Key Issues/Recommendations:** recommend that Australia: a) enact legislation to prohibit discrimination on grounds including sexual orientation and gender identity, as soon as possible; b) take measures to ensure perpetrators are held accountable for attacks against marginalised communities, including on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity; c) provide education and awareness programmes, including on grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity, to law enforcement, judicial and other authorities; d) take measures to ensure respect for each person's self-defined gender identity, including access to sex reassignment surgery and to official documents that reflect an individual's gender identity, without requirements such as forced sterilization, or that the individual be unmarried; e) take measures to ensure that same-sex couples have access to the same range of relationship options as opposite-sex couples, including marriage for those who choose it; f) apply the *Yogyakarta Principles on the Application of International Human Rights Law in relation to Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity* as a guide to assist in policy development.



## Australia

Date of review: Thursday, 27 January, PM

**Key Issues/Recommendations:** recommend that Australia: a) enact legislation to prohibit discrimination on grounds including sexual orientation and gender identity, as soon as possible; b) take measures to ensure perpetrators are held accountable for attacks against marginalised communities, including on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity; c) provide education and awareness programmes, including on grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity, to law enforcement, judicial and other authorities; d) take measures to ensure respect for each person's self-defined gender identity, including access to sex reassignment surgery and to official documents that reflect an individual's gender identity, without requirements such as forced sterilization, or that the individual be unmarried; e) take measures to ensure that same-sex couples have access to the same range of relationship options as opposite-sex couples, including marriage for those who choose it; f) apply the *Yogyakarta Principles on the Application of International Human Rights Law in relation to Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity* as a guide to assist in policy development.

**Sample Intervention:** We welcome Australia's commitment to introduce legislation to protect against discrimination on the basis of a person's sexual orientation or gender identity and recommend that such legislation be adopted as soon as possible.

We also note that the stakeholders have drawn attention to the prevalence of violence, bullying and harassment, particularly in relation to children, the elderly, people with disability, Indigenous peoples, people from culturally and linguistically diverse communities, people who are gay, lesbian or bisexual, and people who are intersex and sex and/or gender diverse. We therefore recommend that measures be taken to ensure perpetrators are held accountable for attacks against marginalised communities, including on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity, and that education and awareness programmes, including on grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity, be provided to law enforcement, judicial and other authorities.

We also recommend that measures be taken, as suggested by stakeholders, to ensure respect for each person's self-defined gender identity, including access to sex reassignment surgery and to official documents that reflect an individual's gender identity, without requirements such as forced sterilization, or that the individual be unmarried.

In addition, we recommend that measures be taken to ensure that same-sex couples have access to the same range of relationship options as opposite-sex couples, including marriage for those who choose it.

Finally, we recommend that Australia apply the *Yogyakarta Principles on the Application of International Human Rights Law in relation to Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity* as a guide to assist in policy development.

## NATIONAL REPORT

### II. BACKGROUND AND FRAMEWORK

#### C. Institutions

##### 1. Australian Human Rights Commission



# Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

25. The AHRC can also inquire into complaints concerning alleged breaches of human rights by the Australian Government or an Australian Government authority (based on the rights included in the instruments listed), or discrimination in the area of employment on numerous grounds including sexual preference, criminal record, trade union activity, political opinion, religion or social origin.

### **III. PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS**

#### **B. Equality and non-discrimination**

52. The Australian Government is currently harmonising and consolidating Commonwealth anti-discrimination laws by removing unnecessary regulatory overlap, addressing inconsistencies across laws and making the system more user-friendly. The development of a consolidated Act provides an opportunity to examine gaps at the federal level, and review the complaints handling process and the related role and functions of the AHRC. As part of its review and consolidation of federal anti-discrimination laws, the Australian Government has committed to introducing legislation to protect against discrimination on the basis of a person's sexual orientation or gender status.

#### **5. Sexual orientation**

89. People in Australia are entitled to respect, dignity and the opportunity to participate in society and receive the protection of the law regardless of their sexuality. Homosexual activity has been decriminalised in all Australian States and Territories. Recent policy developments focus on ensuring that same-sex couples and their families are recognised and have the same entitlements as opposite-sex de facto couples.

90. As part of its review and consolidation of federal anti-discrimination laws, the Australian Government has committed to introducing legislation to protect against discrimination on the basis of a person's sexual orientation.

91. Extensive legislative reforms were introduced in 2009 to enable same-sex couples and their children to be recognised by Commonwealth law. The reforms affected 85 Commonwealth laws, eliminating discrimination against same-sex couples and their children in a wide range of areas including social security, taxation, health care, veterans' affairs, workers' compensation, educational assistance, superannuation, family law and child support.

92. The Australian Government supports a nationally consistent State-based framework for relationship recognition. A number of States and Territories have established schemes which allow same-sex and opposite-sex de facto couples to register their relationships formally.

### **SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDER INFORMATION**

#### **I. BACKGROUND AND FRAMEWORK**

##### **B. Constitutional and legislative framework**

8. JS1 recommended amending anti-discrimination laws to include "homelessness" or "social status" as prohibited attributes. AHRC recommended that sexuality be included as a ground of discrimination federally; that sex or gender diversity be included as grounds of discrimination in federal laws; and that the Sex Files report be implemented.



### II. PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS ON THE GROUND

#### B. Implementation of human rights obligations

#### 2. Right to life, liberty and security of the person

30. AHRC called for increased attention to the prevalence of violence, bullying and harassment, particularly in relation to children, the elderly, people with disability, Indigenous peoples, people from culturally and linguistically diverse communities, people who were gay, lesbian or bisexual, and people who were intersex and sex and/or gender diverse.

#### 4. Right to privacy, marriage and family life

40. JS2 and AI indicated that same-sex couples cannot legally marry in Australia; same-sex marriages which take place overseas are not recognised domestically; and same-sex couples cannot become adoptive parents, except in ACT, Western Australia and Tasmania. JS2 recommended removing discriminatory language in the Marriage Act 1961 (Cth), including the ban on the recognition of overseas marriage under s 88EA, to allow all couples, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity, the right to marry. Additionally, The Gender Centre Inc. (GCI) recommended the implementation of necessary legislation to allow transgender people to amend their official identity documentation without the requirement for sex reassignment surgery or that they be unmarried.

#### Sex and Age Discrimination Legislation Amendment Bill 2010 [Provisions]

This report was issued in March 2011 and has done nothing to cease discrimination against Trans people, as the following will show.

#### MARRIAGE:

There is no mention of how the Wife, Spouse or Partner is affected in all of these situations if remaining married after sex affirmation surgery of their partner. Surely they are an aggrieved party to this if they wish to remain in the marriage, as many do.

What is there exact standing in all of this, especially as they had to put up with being deemed to be part of a same sex couple if they dared to stay married if their partner underwent sex affirmation surgery? They lost that tag in January 2009 and were told in March 2009 that their marriage was still legal. Has anyone in government taken the time to ask how they feel at first being deemed to be a same sex couple, or what their feelings are in regard to being told their marriage is legal, but their Trans partner cannot amend their birth certificate. Add this to the equation which appeared in the Brisbane Times (part of Fairfax Media) and you might begin to realise their hurt. *"It's a transition that makes Janice and Brenda one of the few legally married homosexual couples in Australia"* I have been informed that this is totally untrue by Australian Human Rights Commission.

All States and Territories require us to be single (Read Divorced) in order to amend our Birth Certificate. I cannot come to terms with this, when the Federal Government sent me this reply; plus answers from the Passport office and Centrelink on this subject. All three are to follow.

- Add to this the fact that we are required to "Alter or remove all reproductive organs in order to be recognised fully in our new sex/gender."



## Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

- We are allowed to “Change our name and driver’s licence before changing our sex/gender”
- Many other areas will allow us to change our details either before or after surgery. We can change the details of utilities, rates, banks on production of the change of name and letter supporting that we are to be considered as male or female from our psychiatrist.

The only sticking points in regard to these issues, comes from the States and Territories namely, being forced to divorce in order to amend our birth certificate.

### ***Letter from the Federal Attorney-General dated 19-01-2009: to me [excerpt]***

While the reforms do not expressly address the sex or gender diversity of specific individuals, they ensure that same-sex de facto couples and their families are recognised and have the same entitlements as opposite-sex de facto couples. A transgender individual who remains married after surgery will not be deemed to be no longer married as a result of the reforms. The effect of the reforms is that such an individual will receive the same treatment regardless of whether they are considered to be a member of a same sex or opposite-sex couple. (My highlighting)

### ***Letter from the Federal Attorney-General dated 17-03-2009: To me [excerpt]***

In relation to your letter of 24 January 2009, I would like to clarify the Government’s position. I can confirm that the Commonwealth Same-Sex discrimination law reforms will have no effect on the *Marriage Act 1961*. The Marriage Act provides that a marriage must be between a man and a woman. This is consistent with current Government policy and there are no plans to change the Marriage Act to allow for a marriage to be solemnized between same-sex couples.

Gender re-assignment surgery has never, of itself, changed the status of a marriage which was valid at the time of solemnization. It has always been the case that a validly solemnized marriage would continue, irrespective of whether one of the parties subsequently underwent gender re-assignment surgery. The same-sex reforms due to come into force on 1 July 2009 do not change that position.

### ***This is from the ‘Sex and Age Discrimination Legislation Amendment Bill 2010 (Provisions)’***

*2.47 This definition is included to complement changes made by item 62 of Schedule I of the Bill, which would amend section 40 of the Sex Discrimination Act. Section 40 sets out exemptions under the Sex Discrimination Act to acts done under statutory authority. The Bill would amend the Sex Discrimination Act to provide that nothing in Division 2 of Part II makes it 'unlawful to refuse to make, issue or alter an official record of a person's sex if a law of a State or Territory requires the refusal because the person is married'.*

### ***Again from the ‘Sex and Age Discrimination Legislation Amendment Bill 2010 (Provisions)’***

*3.81 The Department has advised that 'the amendments to the Sex Discrimination Act in the Bill are primarily intended to implement the accepted recommendations' of the Senate Report. However, providing for these exemptions was not raised in the Senate Report, and the Senate Report explicitly recommended extending the Sex Discrimination Act to protect against discrimination on the basis of either sexual orientation or gender identity.*

*Why were these points not raised in the Senate Report?*



# Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

Again from *the 'Sex and Age Discrimination Legislation Amendment Bill 2010 (Provisions)'*

The following iterates what I was sent from the Federal Attorney-General's Office, as above

*3.82 Given that the Department has advised the committee that 'the Marriage Act 1961 does not prohibit a person who is married from legally changing their sex', it is unclear to the committee why the Sex Discrimination Act would need to be amended to specifically exempt state and territory laws which enable refusals to make or alter official records of the person's sex because the person is married. The Department has failed to explain to the committee how this exemption for these state and territory laws operated prior to its proposed inclusion in the Act, exactly which state and territory laws are being referred to, and, most importantly, what changes to the law the Bill would effect which require these amendments to preserve the existing law.*

*3.83 In particular, the committee expresses concern about the lack of explanation provided in the EM to the Bill in relation to amendments to provide exemptions for official records of a person's sex. Given the opposition to these provisions from a number of submitters, it would have been of assistance to the committee if a more comprehensive explanation was provided in the EM*

*Again, why was there this lack of comprehensive explanation not provided? It is very important data not expanded in the "EM Explanatory Memorandum" WHY???????????*

*3.84 While the committee expresses its concerns about these provisions, since the government is undertaking consultations with the states and territories on the recommendations of the Human Rights Commission's Concluding Paper, the committee endorses the Human Rights Commission's suggestion that these exemption provisions should only be enacted temporarily. Further, the committee strongly encourages the Australian Government to take a leadership role in ensuring that there is a nationally consistent approach to the legal recognition of sex in official records. This is a must!*

*Please explain the above. To what extent are these consultations progressing? What exactly does "Enacted temporarily mean?" How long is temporary? Can we in the Trans community gain access to the EM?*

Add this from the Passport Office, and you begin to understand how confusing we find the legislation. When you get items in the press such as this *"It's a transition that makes Janice and Brenda one of the few legally married homosexual couples in Australia."* Then you can understand why I think that the State and Territory governments are only concerned that out situation in the Trans community will open the flood gates to same sex marriage, as they see it.

Read more: <http://www.brisbanetimes.com.au/entertainment/art-and-design/art-charts-wifes-journey-as-husband-goes-from-brent-to-brenda-20110512-1ekc7.html#ixzz1MNK2B43w>

## **Exceptions – Full validity Passport to be issued in new gender**

### **Married Applicants**

Applicants who claim that they are unable to obtain an amended cardinal document because they are married should provide the following documentation (*note, this only applies to RBDM documents as DIAC will amend its records for married persons*):



## Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

- A statement from the relevant RBDM/Gender Reassignment Board that they have met all requirements for their reassigned gender to be recognised, except that they are married or medical evidence as set down in the relevant state or territory Registry of Births, Deaths and Marriages;
- Evidence of living in the character of the other gender such as driver's licence, Medicare card, Centrelink card, rates notices (or other PIDS documents); (**smacks of non surgery**)
- Original Birth Certificate;
- RBDM name change certificate;
- Marriage certificate;
- Statutory declaration stating that marriage has not been annulled.

Dear Ms Noble, from Centrelink

I refer to your recent enquiry about Centrelink's policy in regard to the introduction of the Government's same-sex reforms.

From 1 July 2009, a couple who are legally married and not living separately and apart from one another on a permanent or indefinite basis, despite one of the members of the couple having undergone gender re-assignment surgery, can be assessed in the same way as any other legally married couple.

I hope that this answers your question. Please contact me if I can be of further assistance in this matter.

Yours Sincerely,

Manager

Cleveland Customer Service Centre

Ph 3383 0130

If the Federal Government state what is in the above letters and are responsible for the Marriage Act 1961, how can this be over ruled at State and Territory level? The spouse was the biggest loser, when we were deemed to be a same sex couple, as they had done nothing, other than stay with their partner. We fought this for over two years, before we arrived at the current situation.

If this is the Federal Government stance on remaining married after sex affirmation surgery, then why are we still required to divorce at State and Territory level, in order to amend our Birth Certificate?

Surely the one law, being the Marriage Act 1961 should be adhered to by the States and Territories, as it is a Federal Law.

The attached gives some idea as to the situation in the EU.

Germany: Forced divorce of Trans people declared unconstitutional by Justus Einfeld

On 23 July 2008, the German Constitutional Court declared the provision in the German Transsexual Law (Transsexuellengesetz TSG) which requires forced divorce of Transsexuals unconstitutional. The TSG requires that Transsexuals who legally want to change their gender marker on their Birth Certificates have to be unmarried (though a registered partnership was no



## Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

hindrance). This part of the law has just been declared unconstitutional and may not be used until the German Government proposes a new solution. The German Government has a deadline of 1 August 2009 to come up with a new law. Earlier the Constitutional Court declared that a retrieval of a legal change of names in the case of a marriage after the name change was also unconstitutional.

This is a major victory for the Trans community in Germany and abroad – as well as for the broader LGBT community. After Austria in 2006, Germany is the second country without same-sex marriage that abolishes the forced divorce rule for Transsexuals.

### CHANGE OF NAME:

**All States** and Territories allow those born in, or resident in that State or Territory to do a change of name. The law has been tightened as per the attached.

*Requirements have been tightened because of legislation amendments. So that if you were born in Australia or born overseas and Adopted in Australia, you must now apply to the State or Territory in which you were born or adopted to do a change of name.*

*This also assists the Registry of Births, Deaths and Marriages where Trans people are concerned, as it is noted on the person's birth registration.*

*If born offshore, then you will need to apply to the State or Territory in which you are a resident in together with evidence of residency. Residency requirements do differ, so you will need to contact your State Registry to ascertain their specific requirements.*

*If a Queensland born/adopted person has legally changed their name interstate they may, if they wish, make application to the Registry Office in Brisbane and have the change of name noted on their birth registration.*

The above has been verified by the Queensland Registry of Births, Deaths and Marriages.

They will allow you to amend your driver's licence, but this would be dependent on the change of name. If born in NSW and have changed your name there, but now reside in Queensland, you must apply for an amended driver's licence in Queensland, if you intend to drive there. Sort that out. It's even more confusing.

We have had the excellent New Zealand Human Rights Commission report "To Be Who I Am" in 2008, with much of it implemented. Also in 2008 in Australia we had consultations with the Australian Human Rights Commission which produced a report in March 2009 "Sex Files, the sex and gender diversity project" Up until today, not one of the 15 recommendations have been implemented.

The Federal Attorney-General's Office keeps talking about it, but nothing eventuates. This is due to the fact that numbers 1 to 9 are to do with State and Territory legislation. Only 10 to 15 are down to the Federal government. To date, it is still on the shelf, with much promised, but nothing originating.

Recently Trans friends have asked me, "Are we treated as humans?" and people in society at large, say "The way you are treated under discrimination, is inhumane." This is because of the



## Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

“Inquiry into the Sex and Age Discrimination Legislation Amendment Bill 2010.” There are many queries regarding this, as the Bill is still only for the binary sexes, so any discrimination that is written into State and Territory laws against Trans people will remain.

The worst is staying married after surgery, as we are “FORCED” to divorce in order to amend our birth certificate, as we consider this to be discrimination of the highest order. There is no law in Australia that can make you divorce, and to even stand in Court and ask for a divorce under the current law, would be laying one open to perjury. We in many cases do not wish to divorce, as we take our vows seriously and rely on each other for love and support. I cannot for the life of me, see how this stacks up in regard to the following.

We now have the situation whereby not just Austria and Germany have declared that the demand for a person applying for legal gender recognition to be unmarried as *unconstitutional*, we now have Sweden wanting to put this in place. Currently it is being stalled by the Minister responsible for legal reform on transgender legislation, in spite of an overwhelming parliamentary majority in favour of law revision.

There are also many, many more Countries who consider sterilization to also be unconstitutional. Is this the sign of the times to come?

May I ask why we do not have a Minister who is responsible for legal reform of transgender legislation? His/her task would be to align all legislation within the nine jurisdictions in Australia.

### **Letter to the Senate Legal and Constitutional Committee**

Committee Secretary  
Senate Legal and Constitutional Committee  
PO Box 6100  
Parliament House  
Canberra ACT 2600  
Australia.  
Letter to the Federal Attorney-General

Dear Sir,

In response to your introduction of the “Sex Act Discrimination Legislation Amendment Bill 2010” I would raise the following points.

In regard to the first dot point, I have been informed by your Office that it is only the ‘Binary sexes, male and female’ that will be affected by any amended legislation. This was in both October and November 2010.

We now have to establish if a Trans woman is fully recognised as a woman, and a Trans man is fully recognised as a man. This should be covered in your first of the “Four key amendments to the Sex Discrimination Act”.

Are we in the Trans community to be accorded the same levels of cover as natal male and female? If not, why not, as we are supposedly granted that sex status after Sex Affirmation Surgery.



## Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

We would expect to be covered equally under the proposed section two amendments, as we are now legally recognised as male and female.

*“Both statements, namely in relation to CSW and the International Day to Eliminate Violence Against Women, were aimed to address the issues, as they pertained to all women in Australia. As I have been addressing these issues at a national level, in neither statement did I aim to identify the specific groups of women that were included, such as Trans women, or Indigenous women, women with disabilities, culturally and linguistically diverse women, among others. You will note a similar approach being taken in my messages around International Women's Day.*

*However, in instances where it is necessary to identify specific groups of affected women, I would of course include Trans women. I recognise that Trans women face significant and disturbing levels of discrimination on the basis of their sex identity and/or gender identity, and the protection of the rights of Trans women is an important that does not often get the visibility that it requires.”*

(MY HIGHLIGHTING)

*Above is an extract from Elizabeth Broderick's Letter to me, Dated 23-03-2011*

Three, at this point in time does not enter into the frame, although many Trans women do produce breast milk.

The fourth and final is the main one where we are concerned, as I have been informed that it does not apply to Trans people, only to natal male and female. If we are fully recognised in our sex now as male or female, surely this is of itself “Discriminatory”

When it comes to young Trans people, they have no legal redress and are open to all of the problems you list, and many more

We are made to jump through hoops to become our true selves, but we are still not legally fully recognised at any level of government in Australia. Therefore it would be nice for all governments to recognise us at law as now being no longer Trans, but man or woman. To this end, this major shift should be noted within the legislative amendments before the senate committee and government.

We also have many problems to face when we grow old. The above recognition would be very helpful in those areas as well.

Finally, in letters to me from your Office, you have cited over 80 pieces of legislation were altered in the “Same Sex Act 2009” My question is this, “ How many pieces of legislation confront Trans people at all levels of Government, their departments and agencies in Australia?

Yours Sincerely, Kathy Anne Noble.  
President, Changeling Aspects  
© Changeling Aspects



# Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

Committee Secretary  
Senate Legal and Constitutional Committee  
PO Box 6100  
Parliament House  
Canberra ACT 2600  
Australia.  
20-01-2011

## **EFFECT OF REASSIGNMENT OF SEX**

I was asked by a Trans friend “are we considered to be human?” We abide by the many laws imposed on the Trans community, only to find that under the “Sex Discrimination Act 1984 Review” we will gain nothing, not even the recognition of male or female after sex affirmation surgery.

This is altogether frightening, scary even, when we look at the statements made by all States and Territories in the laws they have enacted in Australia, that concern us after sex affirmation surgery. We are then considered to be “Anatomically male or female” so why are we treated this way?

All States and Territories in Australia state in their laws, in one form or another, that “A person’s sex is noted under the Act, the person is of the sex stated on their birth certificate or recognition certificate. They are also, but subject to any law, a person of the sex so stated or altered.”

To achieve this outcome, it is required that we have “*Altered or had removed all reproductive organs*” Even if we do this we are still faced with the following, which smacks of having a bet each way. *Still no clear definition as to what are “Reproductive Organs”*

I borrow the words of Noel Pearson, but substitute “Trans Peoples,” for “Indigenous Peoples,” so that it now reads as, “What is still needed is positive recognition of our status as the country’s Trans people, and yet sharing a common citizenship with all Australians.

Are these contradictory principles? I argue they are not. We can recognise the status of Trans peoples without fracturing the principles that all Australians are equal citizens.”

*Noel Pearson is director of the Cape York Institute for Policy and Leadership*

## **QUEENSLAND**

### **Section 24**

1. a person who has had the reassignment of the person’s sex entered into a register maintained under a corresponding law is a person of the sex as reassigned
2. A person who is the subject of a recognition certificate is a person of the sex stated in the recognition certificate. (*do not recognise recognition certificates from the UK or outside of Australia, even then, they may not recognise them from within Australia*)
3. However, the person must comply with section 23 (10) for the reassignment of the person’s sex to be noted under the Act
4. If the reassignment of a person’s sex is noted under this Act, the person is a person of the sex as reassigned.

## **SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

### **Part 3 section 8**



# Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

1. A recognition certificate is conclusive evidence that the person to whom it refers
  - (a) *has undergone a reassignment procedure*
  - (b) *Is of the sex stated in the certificate*
2. An equivalent certificate issued under a corresponding law has the same effect as a recognition certificate under this Act (*Does this include the UK Gender Recognition certificate?*)

## **NEW SOUTH WALES BDMR Act 1995**

### **Section 321**

#### **Effect of alteration of register and interstate recognition certificates**

1. A person the record of whose sex is altered under this part is, for all purposes of, but subject to, any law of NSW, a person of the sex as so altered
2. A person to whom an interstate recognition certificate relates is, for the purposes of, but subject to, any law in NSW, a person of the sex as stated in the certificate (*On shore and off shore?*)
3. An interstate Recognition certificate is a certificate s prescribed by the regulation for the purpose of this section. (*Do they accept from off shore?*)

## **WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

### **Section 16**

#### **Effect of the Recognition Certificate**

1. A recognition certificate is conclusive evidence that the person to whom it refers
  - (a) *Has undergone a reassignment procedure; and*
  - (b) *Is of the sex stated in the certificate*
2. An equivalent certificate issued under a corresponding law has the same effect as a recognition certificate under this Act (*Off shore recognition certificates?*) (*Length of residency status in WA?*)

## **TASMANIA BDMR Act 1999**

### **Section 28G**

#### **Effect of registration of change of sex**

1. Where a person's change of sex is registered under this grant, the person is, for the purposes of, but subject to any law in force in this State, a person of the sex as so changed.
2. A person's change of sex does not affect any relationship of that person arising from consanguinity or by operation of law.

#### **Section 28H Recognition of certificates issued outside of Tasmania**

A person in respect of whom there is a recognition certificate is Taken to be, for the purposes of, but subject to, any law in force in the State, a person of the sex stated in the recognition certificate? . (*Does this include on and off shore certificates?*) (*Any length of residency in Tasmania?*)

## **NORTHERN TERRITORY**

### **Section 28H effect of registration of person's change of sex**

Where a person's change of sex is registered under this part, the person is, for the purposes of (but subject to) any law in force in the Northern Territory, a person of the sex as so changed

#### **Section 28 J Recognition Certificate**

A person in respect of whom there is a recognition certificate is, for the purposes of (but subject to) any law in force in the Territory, a person of the sex stated in the recognition certificate. (*Does this apply to on and off shore certificates?*) (*any length of residency in NT?*)

## **ACT BDMR Act 1997**



# Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

## Section 29 s5

### Effect of certificates issued in relation to transsexual people

1. A birth certificate in relation to a transsexual person is, for the purposes of any territory law, conclusive evidence of the person's sex as stated in the certificate
2. An interstate recognition certificate, for the purposes of any territory law, is evidence that the person mentioned in it is of the sex as stated in the certificate
3. In this section: "Interstate recognition certificate" means a certificate issued, under the law of a State or another Territory prescribed for this section, in relation to a person, who has undergone sex reassignment surgery. (*Does not stipulate if in Australia or off shore certificates are acceptable*)

## VICTORIA

### 30G. Effect of alteration of Register and interstate recognition certificates

(1) If the record of a person's sex in the person's birth registration is altered under this Part the person is a person of the sex as altered.

(2) If an interstate recognition certificate is issued to a person the person is a person of the sex stated in the certificate. (*Off shore not included again?*)

(3) Sub-sections (1) and (2) have effect for the purposes of, but subject to, the law of Victoria

### 30H. Re-issue of interstate birth certificates

To avoid doubt, the validity in Victoria of a certificate that—

(a) is issued under a law of another State or a Territory; and

s. 6

(b) concerns the birth registration of a person—

is not affected merely because it was issued as a result of the person having undergone sex affirmation surgery.'

**Even the DRAFT (prepared by Parliamentary Counsel's Office) BDMR Amendment Bill 2005 looked at these details. Not adopted at the SCAG meeting in July 2005 Division 4.4**

### Effect of certificates issued if change of sex recorded

#### 29c effect of certificates issued if change of sex recorded

1. A certificate issued under section 27(2) or section 29B in relation to a person is, for the purposes of any Territory law, conclusive evidence that the person's sex is as stated in the certificate. *Drafting notes*
2. *Other jurisdictions will need to change the reference to "Territory law" in this section*
3. A certificate issued in relation to a person under a corresponding provision is, for the purpose of Territory law, conclusive evidence that the person's sex is as stated in the certificate
4. In this section: (*corresponding provision*) means a provision of a law of a State or another Territory that substantially corresponds to section 27(2) or section 29B or is declared by regulation to substantially correspond to either section (*again no mention of off shore certificates, but equally, no specific mention within Australia*)

This appears to be the worst form of discrimination, as they purport to recognise us on one hand after surgery as anatomical males or females, but then on the other, still require us to divorce in order to amend our birth certificate. Sorry, this does not make any sense at all to me. Is it because, they are afraid of setting a precedent, for "Same Sex Marriage?"

Discrimination is an awful weapon to use against any part of society, and we certainly receive more than our share. Discrimination is worse than any debilitating disease, as it cannot be cured



# Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

by drugs and care alone. Care and compassion and empathy are what are sadly lacking due to the unwillingness of Governments at all levels through out the World to attack this most insidious of pressures. Pressures that lead to a very debilitating scenario. Depression, frustration, self harm, drug and alcohol abuse and suicidality. If we are not cared for in the initial stages, then in the long term our problems will manifest by having to be cared for by the Government health departments with all that infers, when cost is taken into account

The following is with the full support of Transgender Victoria Group (TVG)

## CONSTITUTION QUERIES-RE SECTION 109

### CONFLICT OF LAWS

If the laws of a state ever conflict with the laws of the Australian Government, the Constitution says that Commonwealth law is to be followed.

The Australian Government judiciary may also have the power to review decisions by a state judiciary

We are in the invidious situation of literally being between a rock and a hard place. Most of the people that we deal with do not understand and need to have explained how the forced Trans divorce situation comes about.

- It is the forced faux "choice " of either having a birth certificate that doesn't match your identity/body and staying married or
- Divorcing (possibly by perjuring yourself because there are no irreconcilable differences) in order to get a birth certificate that reflects who a person truly is.

The explanation for this situation follows on through out this submission. Also the inconsistencies that are involved in these matters.

## Section 109 of the Australian Constitution

---

In Australia, legislative power is held concurrently by the Commonwealth and the States. In the event of inconsistency between Commonwealth and State laws, **section 109 of the [Constitution of Australia](#)** provides that the laws of the Commonwealth shall prevail over those of a State to the extent of any inconsistency.

The meaning of "invalid" in s 109 does not mean that a State law is invalid in the positivist sense that the State Parliament lacks power to pass it. The State law, though enacted with full validity, merely ceases to operate. Hence, in order for s 109 to come into operation at all, there must be a valid State law and a valid Commonwealth law. (*Carter v Egg and Egg Pulp Marketing Board (Vic)*).



# Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

When s 109 takes effect, the State law yields to the Commonwealth law, but remains a valid law of the Parliament which enacted it. The practical significance of this will become apparent if, at some later date, the overriding Commonwealth law ceases to operate.

In the absence of s 109, this function might have been fulfilled by covering clause 5 of the Constitution, which makes Commonwealth laws "binding on the courts, judges and people ... of every part of the Commonwealth".

The evolution of High Court doctrine in s 109 cases has led to three broad approaches to determine when there is inconsistency.

## *Full text*

---

“ When a law of a State is inconsistent with a law of the Commonwealth, the latter shall prevail, and the former shall, to the extent of the inconsistency, be invalid. ”

## [\[edit\]](#) *Direct inconsistency*

---

The first two tests, and in particular the first, are said to involve "direct" inconsistency.

## [\[edit\]](#) **Impossible to obey both laws**

Instances may arise when it is impossible to obey two laws simultaneously. A classical example is [R v Licensing Court of Brisbane; Ex parte Daniell](#). A state referendum on liquor trading hours was fixed by State law for the same day as a federal Senate election. The Commonwealth law provided that a State referendum could not be held on that day.

We in the Trans community find it exceedingly hard to obey the two laws concerning marriage and the Marriage Act 1961 and the State and Territory laws.

The Commonwealth Government state that we are still married after Sex Affirmation Surgery as per the previous letter.

Centrelink  
Australian Government giving you options

Kathy Anne Noble  
PO Box 897  
Cleveland Qld 4163

7 May 2009

Dear Ms Noble,

I refer to your recent enquiry about Centrelink's policy in regard to the introduction of the Government's same-sex reforms. *From 1 July 2009, a couple who are legally married and not living separately and apart from one another on a permanent or indefinite basis, despite one of*



## Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

*the members of the couple having undergone gender re-assignment surgery, can be assessed in the same way as any other legally married couple.*

I hope that this answers your question. Please contact me if I can be of further assistance in this matter.

Yours Sincerely,  
Paula Nightingale  
Manager  
Cleveland Customer Service Centre  
Ph 3383 0130  
giving you options  
[www.centrelink.gov.au](http://www.centrelink.gov.au)

I understand that all Federal government departments and agencies now accept this approach.

Add to this that we are granted the right to amend our passport if remaining married after Sex Affirmation Surgery, as per attached details

### **Exceptions - Full validity passport to be issued in new gender**

#### **Married Applicants**

Applicants who claim that they are unable to obtain an amended cardinal document because they are married should provide the following documentation (note, this only applies to RBDM documents as DIAC will amend its records for married persons):

- A statement from the relevant RBDM/Gender Reassignment Board that they have met all requirements for their reassigned gender to be recognised, except that they are married **or** medical evidence as set down in the relevant state or territory Registry of Births, Deaths and Marriages;
- Evidence of living in the character of the other gender such as driver's licence, medicare card, centrelink card, rates notices (or other PIDS documents);
- Original birth certificate;
- RBDM name change certificate;
- Marriage certificate;
- Statutory declaration stating that marriage has not been annulled.

#### **Applicants who have not completed gender reassignment**

Applications will be considered on a case by case basis by the APO where an applicant claims they are unable to obtain an cardinal document in their preferred gender because they are unable to complete gender reassignment surgery due to a pre-existing medical condition or because the surgery in the applicant's case carries a higher than normal risk, with the result that completion of the surgery in the applicant's case is considered by a relevant medical practitioner to be dangerous or life threatening. The following documentation should accompany the application:



## Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

1. Documentary evidence that the applicant has approached the relevant body in their State or Territory seeking recognition of their change of gender, and the body's written advice as to why it has declined to recognise a change in gender.

2. A statement from the client's medical practitioner providing the following information:

- confirmation that hormone therapy treatment has been on-going for at least two years.
- evidence of any initial surgery completed (e.g. mastectomy)
- details of the pre-existing health condition and advice why surgery carries a higher than normal risk
- confirmation that completion of sexual reassignment surgery would be dangerous or life-threatening for the particular applicant.

3. Documentary evidence from the client confirming that they live in the community in their reassigned gender, e.g. driving licence, Medicare card, credit card.

State and Territory legislation require (*FORCE*) us to divorce in order to amend our birth certificate. My understanding is that there is no law in Australia that can force us to divorce.

**From:** kathy noble [mailto:knoble@iinet.net.au]

**Sent:** Friday, 5 June 2009 4:29 PM

**To:** 'Alan Berman'; Stephen Page; 'Karen Gurney'; 'Yasmin Hunter'

**Subject:** Query

Good evening,

Can you please tell me if there are any laws in the World "Forcing" people to divorce?

Sincerely Kathy

Kathy

I can only speak for Queensland. The answer is "no". People can only divorce in Australia if there has been an *irretrievable breakdown of marriage, which is defined as separation for 12 months.*

Regards

Stephen Page  
Accredited Family Law Specialist  
Partner  
Harrington Family Lawyers

Office: Level 12  
239 George Street  
Brisbane  
Australia  
Phone: 617 3221 9544  
Fax: 617 3221 9969  
Mail: PO Box 12135  
George Street Q 4003



# Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

## Australia

If we were to use this in a Court of Law, we would be committing perjury, as we do not wish to divorce, but we do wish to stay in a marriage in which we have and still do take our vows seriously. We depend on each other for many areas of support within that marriage.

It does raise the question, if this is a Federal Law 'Marriage Act 1961' then how can the States and Territories "FORCE" us to divorce in order to amend documentation?. This appears to be the same situation that the German Government faces after being told by the German Constitutional Court, that they must repeal the Act "FORCING" people to divorce in order to amend documentation, as this is "UNCONSTITUTIONAL" Austria repealed this Act in 2006, Germany in 2009 and now Sweden is doing the same.

### [edit]One law confers a right which the other purports to take away

In some situations, one law may purport to confer a legal right, privilege or entitlement, while another law purports to take away or diminish some right or entitlement. In other words, one law says that you can do X, the other that you cannot do X. For example, the Commonwealth provision in *Colvin v Bradley Brothers Pty Ltd* affirmed that employers in certain industries could employ women to work on certain machines whilst the State provision made it an offence to do so. It was not impossible to obey both laws, since nothing in the Commonwealth law required the employment of females. This type of inconsistency may require a working-out of the actual effect of both laws in an individual case. Because of this, it could require a more subtle analysis than test 1.

[Chief Justice Knox](#) and [Justice Gavan Duffy](#) agreed in [Clyde Engineering Co Ltd v Cowburn](#) that a simple test of logical contradiction was "not sufficient or even appropriate in every case", and enunciated this test.

As above. We were given back our marriage rights after they were taken away by *deeming us to be a same sex couple if we remained married after Sex Affirmation Surgery*. As per the previous letter, dated 19-01-2009

Our right to stay married was stated in the March letter from the Federal Attorney-General's Office as part of the "Same Sex Act 2009" as in previous letter.

Which are we to take as being the over arching law, the Federal Law, or the States and Territories Laws?

Our rights to remain married have been returned (conferred) by the Federal Government, but are then taken away at State and Territory level. Which is correct? Are you having two bob each way?

I find these two areas cover precisely our situation in regard to marriage and one conferring a right and the other purporting to take it away. As per section 109 and inconsistency.

What follows is just one outcome, after my friends here and I have been fighting for over 3 years. Is it any wonder that we suffer from acute frustration, leading to depression and other health issues. Again, I would draw your attention to the fact that these health issues will cost Government Health



## Changeling Aspects

In affiliation with Transbridge Townsville

---

Departments in the future, as the stress related health issues take their inevitable toll on the Trans community, and not just in matters regarding marriage. Do we have any **RIGHTS?**

Dear Kathy ,

Today late, I received Correspondence from AHRC in which they basically stated that their hands were tied because of legislation in their act that precludes action because they relate to actions of a State Government Agency of the State of NSW ,and not the Commonwealth of Australia ! I was given 21 days from 2<sup>nd</sup> of March to respond so I sent a e-mail to Domiec.Vircillo@ humanrights.gov.au requesting an extension of time to contact him per phone on the matter.

Here we go again Pass the buck!!!

Love & Peace.

Yours Sincerely, Kathy Anne Noble.

President, Changeling Aspects

© Changeling Aspects