

The tragi-comedy that was the Victorian Parliament's Upper House debate of sex self-ID



[Posted to Medium 29th August 2019].

[This is a copy of my recent thread for Twitter, covering the debate in the Upper House over the Victorian Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Amendment Bill 2019. I've reorganized it so it tracks the right times and edited lightly to remove confusing time references (for Twitter I started after the dinner break and then went back to the beginning). You can read the full transcript [here](#)[1]].

First up is **Edward O'Donohue**. Coalition opposes the bill. Says that bill goes further than the UK and many other jurisdictions in having simple statutory declaration of belief as test for change of sex. (Rather than e.g. clinical intervention).

Bill states no change can be obtained for fraudulent or improper purposes, but that change can be processed online or over the phone [so how will those processing the application know]. Additional test for sex offenders is welcome, but language ill-defined.

Coalition's issues/concerns: 1) birth certificate is record of sex at birth. History of birth certificates establishes this. Gender identity already protected under Equal Opportunity (EO) Act. Suggests we should be using the EO to protect against discrimination.

2) lack of consultation. Opponents have said bill is similar to 2016 attempt, so has been 'in community' (for consultation!) for three years! [LOL WHAT]. O'Donohue says this is naive — 99.9% of Victorians not aware of bill. Govt. should have consulted women.

Quotes Foley saying feminist concerns are "misplaced and wrong". O'Donohue says this is a 'disappointing' choice to engage *only* with issues that impact trans community. [Well said]. SARC raised issues with Attorney-General (A-G) & got no response.

Says issues raised in submissions to SARC consistent with points made by Louise Staley in the Assembly last sitting week. Bill raises issue of competing rights: govt. has failed to consider rights of women, & impacts of legislation on women. No analysis of impacts.

Congratulates [@unimelb](#) for going ahead with public event a few weeks ago despite public pressure to cancel. Heard there about sport; problem in letting men compete as women w/out physical change. Worried also about bill allowing children to change sex.

Worried too about provisions relating to sex offenders, prisoners, & serious offenders. Not for any reason specific to trans people; just a fact that every group has some “bad apples”. 5,000 offenders on sex offender register; bill outsources decisions to chief commissioner.

Other jurisdictions have “pressed the pause button”: NZ, Scotland. Disappointed that government is simply presenting same bill, with minor exception, defeated 3 years ago. Should have worked for more conservative model with community consensus. Coalition opposes the bill.

Next up is **Harriet Shing**, who announces her pronouns [you’ll never guess them... she’s a woman and a lesbian... go on, just have a wild stab in the dark... YES! “she and her”. I know, I’m shocked too]. I think you can all see what’s coming next.

She asserts that words matter and can “break” people. Describes the bill as providing “a fundamental source of recognition and of dignity and of identity and of respect and of inclusion” [Jesus]. DEVASTATED when bill failed in 2016.

Describes opposition to the bill as “ongoing discrimination”. Opposes O’Donohue citing history of birth certificates on grounds that history has made mistakes: “Times change”. [Proceeds to make a hash of an Orwell reference and then apologize].

[Expounds on marginalization of trans people. Words used include: shame, humiliation, self-loathing, secrecy, violence, deadnaming, weapon, “it”]. Describes opposition to bill as “people who are having trouble adjusting to a different status quo”.

[This is remarkable! Women who want to retain sex-based rights in light of the fact that sex-based discrimination and underrepresentation still exist are just people who are struggling to get with the programme?!]

Gives some suicide stats. (Of course). Apologizes to trans people for ‘reducing’ life experiences to statistics. Asserts that trans people are not criminals. [What?] [Cannot tell if she is caricaturing opposition or she just moves in different circles to me...]

Characterises opposition to bill as buying into slippery slope; making the perfect the enemy of the good; being irrationally driven by fear; being transphobic; being risk-averse to point of paralysis; being blind to suffering [TRIGGER WARNING ABLEISM! secretary for equality] and discrimination. Asserts that “bill does not infringe on the rights of people who are not affected by it directly”. [True, but why don’t you admit that WOMEN ARE AFFECTED BY IT DIRECTLY, SHING? Because they are]. Buzzwords like ‘inclusion’ and ‘connection’ and ‘humanity’.

Commends the bill to the house. [Surprise!]

Next up, **Mr Finn** (I don’t know this guy’s first name), who starts with some LOLZ: “that was what I would describe as a Shing-esque performance”.

Continues with the LOLZ: “there is one thing that I do agree with Ms Shing on”. [One].

Finn says the bill creates problems, and that makes it bad legislation. [How do you say YYYYAAASSSS GIRRRRRL when the person is a man?] Agrees there is gender dysphoria, but says bill does not address that. Why would we want people to be able to change gender as often as yearly?

Bill legalizes the fabrication of official documents. Worries about children on autism spectrum being pushed toward transition. Quotes parent of autistic girl describing her surgery & medicalisation as “a crime not just against women, but particularly against disabled women”.

Says he agrees with Louise Staley. Wants to vote in a way that protects his daughters. Says it is “inevitable” that some “man who claims to be a woman” will use the reform to “molest women”. [He could definitely have articulated this ‘opportunism’ point more carefully!].

[SHIT IS ABOUT TO GET DRAMATIC, LADIES & GERMS!] Finn asserts that “there are two genders. There is male, and there is female”. [Conflating sex and gender, sigh]. Then Catherine Cumming interrupts to disagree and they have a YES! NO! YES! NO! argument.

Finn then gets pretty nasty [I can only see the text so I don’t know what all this looked like on the livestream]. “I have got a fair idea of what Ms Cumming is, but she has got nothing to do with her gender”. [Where is the guy who yells “order” at this point?!]

[This is getting surreal]. Finn insists there are only two genders, gets distracted into taxonomy of ‘inclinations’ — homosexual, paedophilic, “a whole range”. [WTAF is happening].

Slightly more sensible ending. Introduced the ‘pub test’: walk into a random pub & describe the legislation, what would people say? Asserts that people would be appalled. Opposes the bill and urges the house to reject it too.

[This is like [#MAFS](#), parliament version. As in, the drama and the trashiness. I can’t even].

OKAY, on to **Andy Meddick**. Widely known to have a trans child and so be a passionate defender of the bill.

Meddick says the bill “does something fundamentally good and fundamentally right”. Says the bill gives people determination over their own lives. Says VIC is a trailblazer in changing lives of marginalised people. So too with the bill. Denies Finn’s point about two genders.

Tells a true-life story of young person with asperger’s & autism, ostracised at school, isolated. “Hear them as their raw and ripped emotions are voiced in howls of the deepest pain, and cry their tears” [ACTUALLY SAYS THIS SENTENCE IN PARLIAMENT].

Ubiquitous mention of suicide and self-harm rates. Claims arguments opposing the bill are “hate and hysteria”, “closed-mindedness”, “values no longer relevant to a modern world”, “hateful and vitriolic”. Opposes surgery requirement. Quotes (trans) son: ‘Not all of us want our body sculpted to the binary idea of what a man and a woman is’. Ends with quote from *To Kill a Mockingbird*: wants house to vote by considering things from trans person’s point of view.

Next up, **Ms Stitt**. [I should have learned the first names before I started, aye?] “Pride in diversity”. [Sounds like corporate branding statement]. “Document that reflects your identity”. [What *is* this weird obsession with identity? Legal documents do not generally do this].

Denies that the bill is about bathrooms, access to female toilets or change rooms, about women’s space or women’s safety. Says “I find that offensive”. Govt. has an “unshakeable commitment” to ending gendered violence against women. Cites commission into family violence.

Claims that it is “scraping the bottom of the barrel” to “conflate these two issues” (birth certificates, and women’s safety). [WHAT ON EARTH! Like Pulford, another woman pretending that this bill is *only* about birth certificates when it makes it possible for ANY MALE PERSON to become legally female simply by making a statutory declaration. Like what do they think, that he’s just going to become legally female and then NEVER access any female-only spaces or services, ever?]

Says that research shows trans people need supportive & affirming environment or else poor mental health outcomes & risk of self-harm. Therefore “wholehearted support for this bill”.

5.02pm, yesterday time. **Dr Ratnam**. Greens. [So you can guess which direction this will go in...] Admits that the bill is replacing sex with gender identity: “update their birth certificates so that they reflect their gender identity”.

Supports removal of surgery requirement, because major medical procedure, expensive, and “person’s gender identity is not always affirmed by their physical body” [yes, the ghost in the machine is magical that way]. Supports children changing sex, laments parents’ approval needed.

Condemns “attempts to deny the reality of people’s lived experience” [we should be playing SJW bingo, big win here!] Condemns “bigotry, transphobia and hatred”, says that “those spewing hate have lost” [really, “spewing”? Melodramatic much].

Says of opposition “their rhetoric makes no sense and sounds so desperate”. [This is kind of funny, because this is exactly what we say about TRAs]. “Trans rights are human rights”. [Another bingo!] Commends bill to house.

5.09pm [this is going soooo slloooowwwlllyyyy] and we’re at **Bev McArthur**, Liberal Party. Liberal-Nationals oppose the bill on the basis of wide consultation. [Yes! Finally]. Govt. has not done this. [No! It really hasn’t!]

Birth certificates are intended to record biological sex, not gender identity. Sex is science, gender is not. [YYYYAAASSSSS GIRRRLLLLLLL]. Has had many submissions opposing the bill. Mentions Women’s Action Group (WAG). Says WAG was concerned about impacts on women’s rights.

WAG wanted bill deferred for proper consultation, as in NZ and Scotland. McArthur says amazed at govt. failing to consult women and women’s groups. Sporting enthusiasts also oppose the bill. Harms to women injured, or non-competitive against male strength.

Supports removal of surgery requirement, but thinks mere say-so up to once a year is undesirable. Potential impacts on criminal investigations where there has been a change of sex. Checks for working with children or with vulnerable women.

Mentions [Victorian Women’s Guild](#). [Woop! 🙌] Guild concerned about lack of consultation; conflation of sex & gender (incl. confusion over gender, which is a “cultural stipulation that individuals conform to the social norms corresponding to their sex”, not a personal identity); unclarity over ‘fraudulent’ applications; falsification of population data; impacts on women-only spaces; rights & safety of young people, in particular increase in girls being treated for dysphoria.

Mentions Australian Family Association’s submission, which was also concerned about male people in female spaces. Opposes bill because birth certificates are certificates at birth and nothing else.

5.23pm yesterday, and we have **Rob Barton**. Has had hundreds of emails, 200ish over the weekend. Read and consulted.

Wants to read an email out, predicts that he will cry. [FINALLY THE CRYING IS ON THE RECORD!] Reports on a story from parents of a trans girl and what it will mean to her having the right documents and so not have to out herself when applying to uni etc.

[This move is really weird, and is happening on repeat. You can already change your passport, easily. You can do everything you need to do with a passport. No one uses their birth certificate for anything, except people who don’t have passports.]

Barton actually reads aloud the bit of the email where the parent admits the daughter can “already... alter the gender mark on her passport, her Medicare card and with Centrelink”. [It’s almost as if they want the birth certificate for another reason entirely... 🤔]

[Ooooooh! RADFEMS get a mention...] (Remember he’s still just reading out some dude’s email) “the negativity of these messages that some politicians, some religious leaders, some radical feminists [hollaaahhh 🤔] and elements of the media are putting out there”.

[@Bernard Lane I think you might be “elements” there 🙌]. Parent asserts that birth certificate reform “will not open the floodgates for paedophiles, for violent perpetrators invading women’s toilets, for stalking, for unfair sporting practices, or impact our prison systems”.

[I love how people just *assert* these things. Like... the bill changes what it takes to be legally female, and legal females can use female-only services, so... please explain to us how this *will not* impact bathrooms or sports or prison systems? Oh right, you can’t].

Supports the bill. [He must have been stoked that he got an email and didn’t have to prepare a speech]. [Although Hansard says he did not verify it so maybe he just wanted the rhetorical flourish of “a parent says...”].

Jane Garrett, 5.29pm. Says “we must see the people that we are making decisions about. Most importantly, we must hear the people and then we must act”. [Don’t get your hopes up, SHE DOESN’T MEAN WOMEN!]

Treat people with respect... compassion... understanding... God... “lifting people up to enjoy the same rights as everybody else”... precious... [very long boring story about her name having a ‘y’ in it and problems with her identity documents because]. Commends bill to house.

Stuart Grimley, Justice Party. 5.36pm. While “Justice Party has a long history of supporting equal rights for all Australians”, “I am unable to support this bill in its current form”. [FINALLY!] Insufficient consultation on this bill. [DAMN STRAIGHT].

“Our party believes in protecting the vulnerable, and this means protecting women in domestic crisis centres who are fleeing their violent husbands. These women just want to be in a safe place and may only want to be surrounded by other women and not biological men who identify as women”. [THANK FUCKING GOD FOR THIS GUY 🙌]. Says that trans people face high rates of sexual and family violence too, but “this bill achieves [absolute equality] at the expense of [protection of the vulnerable]”. Correspondence from mothers worried about daughters in public spaces, and women concerned about safety in changing rooms. Single-sex spaces meant to protect privacy and dignity. [YES!] Concerns from constituents about males identifying as females being in female prisons. Cultural groups that sex-segregate. Many concerns.

Closes by saying “should this bill pass, it needs to be implemented in a way that respects biological women and ensures their safety at all times”.

Gavin Jennings [are you so pleased I looked up their names] 5.42pm.

“...life is far more diverse, far more complicated than what those who rely on chromosomes and the cosmos may believe”. [MISTER JENNINGS WHAT ON EARTH ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT]. Talks about “extraordinary leaps of logic” like “chromosomes” [🤔] and “criminal activity” [🤔] and says it “is beyond belief that it could be connected to what we are doing in this piece of legislation”. [LOL DUDE ARE YOU DRUNK?]

“There is not one person on the planet who will be adversely affected by this piece of legislation, but there will be thousands of people now and in years to come who will be the beneficiaries of this law”.

[Cough... hello... is this thing on? Women. Hello? We're here. Women.]

[Every woman who is beaten by a male in her sport is adversely affected. Every woman who has to deal with a male in her shelter or refuge is adversely affected. Every teenage lesbian who is told she's probably a boy is adversely affected. Every girl who overcomes the denigration of female people and boldly graffiti's a clitoris somewhere or makes vulva-icing cupcakes and then is yelled at by transactivists because “not all females have clitorises!” or “not all females have vulvas!” IS ADVERSELY AFFECTED, MISTER JENNINGS].

David Limbrick, 5.46pm. Says that for Liberal Democrats, the core question is “does this proposal increase liberty?” Complex questions and concerns. Asserts that not understanding terminology of modern gender politics doesn't make someone a hateful bigot; having concerns about bill's interaction with human rights legislation or other aspects of society doesn't make someone a hateful transphobe. “The government has done a poor job of selling this legislation to the broader community, and the arrogance of aspects of the authoritarian left that want to shut down all discussion about these important issues is unhelpful at best and downright nasty at other times”. [A'woman to this, mate]. Final judgement is that because the bill allows people to gain documents that reflect their identity, it increases choice. Therefore supports.

[There is a weird bit just before the end of his comment where he says that the bill will allow someone to ‘opt out’ of legislation that discriminates on the basis of gender, and this also increases choice. If legislation *allows* discrimination though, it's probably for good reason, so why would we want someone to be able to ‘opt out’? I mean, isn't this just exactly what we've been trying to oppose — that male people can ‘opt out’ of being legally male, and opt into female-only spaces/services? That ‘increases choice’ for males *at the expense* of females. I really don't get his reasoning here. Either he's just not thinking about women, or he actually is anti- all and any sex segregation, and so thinks opting in/out is a good way to break them down a bit...]

Jenny Mikakos. Labour. [Shall we play bingo?] 17.50pm.

Supports bill. Comments on “ugly, uninformed contributions being made” by others. Birth certificates should reflect who people truly are [✓]. Suicide [✓] and mental health [✓] issues high for trans community.

Claims that newspaper is “waging war — absolutely waging war — on trans and gender-diverse children”. [Wow. Not immediately affirming/medicalising kids who might instead by gay or autistic or just experimenting with their sense of self is WAR.]

Says that it is “mind-boggling” that people are worried about safety in toilets and other public facilities. [I guess she hasn't read the article about crime rates in unisex changing rooms]. Doesn't stop there [embarrassing for her, when she eventually finds the evidence...], saying “It is just absolutely mind-boggling to me that people are making these claims, and it really defies any logic whatsoever”.

[LET US REMEMBER ALL THE POLITICIANS WHO MADE THESE KINDS OF CLAIMS, SO THAT THEY ARE HELD TO ACCOUNT WHEN THE PROBLEMS START].

6.01pm, **Fiona Patten**, Reason Party. Starts by talking about the “vileness” of what was said in 2016 when the bill failed. Asks “what would Jesus do”? [What? I feel like things are about to get weird again 🤪]. Supports the legislation because “the right thing to do”.

Says birth certificates should be a description of who we are. [Yeah totally, like our name, sex, and DOB. Our gender essence? Not so much. Our gender essence in place of our sex? NO].

Says she spoke to some of those who oppose the bill [she did, I was one of them] but that she did not think what they said was correct “because I actually spoke to the experts, and that was our trans and gender-diverse friends and family. Those are the experts on this bill”. [What?!]

[This is so weird. Supporter after supporter of the bill is making the same completely false assumption, either explicitly or implicitly, that the only stakeholders in this bill are trans people. Even though this bill GIVES MALE PEOPLE the LEGAL RIGHT to BECOME FEMALE. Who is legally female matters for all the spaces, services, and provisions which exist for female people alone. Like women’s gyms, or women’s writing prizes, or women’s hiring shortlists, or women’s festivals. WOMEN ARE STAKEHOLDERS IN WHO IS A WOMEN. FOR FUCK’S SAKE.]

[Cough. *Pulls at collar*. Sorry. Back to the regular broadcast].

6.07pm. **Tim Quilty**. [Guy who will later propose amendment for no sex on birth certificates, so that sex is ‘opt-in’ rather than ‘opt-out’].

Says government has managed the bill and the concern from the community very badly.

“Instead of addressing concerns and bringing the community with them, they wave their arms around and cry ‘bigot’ at those who do not share their views”. Disapproves of treating concerns about women’s safety as offensive.

Says “whether someone calls themselves a man or woman does not affect me”. [No kidding, Tim. It affects women]. [Brings a bit of LOLZ back to parliament when he says, about prisons not being co-ed, that: “I am confident that the government will stuff this up regardless”.]

[Becomes the millionth person in this session to claim something along the lines of] “all we are doing here is allowing an identity document to conform to a person’s preference regarding a personal matter”. [It’s almost getting to the point that I’m starting to believe them...]

Catherine Cumming, 6.09pm. Supports bill. Says trans is one of the most vulnerable communities. Incorrect documents force people to ‘out’ themselves. Says “too much of the debate has focused on a premise of fear”. [Yes, why don’t women just shut up?!]

Raises completely valid concern about male prisoners changing their sex to female so they can transfer into the female prison, then doesn’t answer her own concern, saying instead “people are not required to provide evidence of their gender to enter a single-gender toilet”.

Says Corrections Victoria has a comprehensive policy re: trans prisoners & that change of sex marker won’t automatically mean a move. [I hope this is true]. Compares refugees arriving without documents, with trans people having documents with birth sex. [I don’t know why].

Makes a *sort* of sex/gender distinction... then says that having gender identity on documents (as opposed to sex) may actually be more accurate, because a better reflection of how the person appears and what pronouns they use.

“This debate is effectively positioning the human rights of people as being up for debate”. [Since when is it a human right to have your gender essence recorded on a legal document?! Since when is it a human right to throw the concept of biological sex out the window?!]

Gives some different and much more dramatic suicide statistics than others who have cited these earlier in the day. Claims that not affirming gender leads to increased risks. Says she has “felt violated” by some of what she’s heard during the day.

Says that she personally feels very safe around trans people and the drag community, “have never felt unsafe around a person who feels that way or dresses a certain way”. Commends the bill.

Clifford Hayes, 6.25pm. [Final speaker before the dinner break, then we are all caught up!] Commends quality of debate. Critical of government re: bill, not enough consultation, and impression that if people opposed or questioned anything seen as unreasonable / transphobic.

Says he was going to speak about concerns about possible amendments. “I was not worried about violence in toilets or people being shocked at being asked to do depilation in beauty clinics... I was worried about fraud and people being mischievous”. [Another man asserting that *he* isn’t worried about violence, that *he* thinks the waxing issue is trivial... could it be because he hasn’t experienced being a woman feeling threatened by a man before? Or taken the perspective of an immigrant woman being faced with Jonthan Yaniv’s penis? Eurgh].

He thought that getting rid of the surgery requirement was good, but going all the way to zero gatekeeping was bad. But because “hearing the debate today has just been fantastic”, decides to support the bill.

Explicitly reasons that “rather than looking after the fears of people [WOMEN] about what might happen in the future — could well happen in the future — it is more important to support our transgender community”. There are always chances, he says. [The problems with sex self-id are already happening in other countries that have it, like Canada, and in institutions / companies that have it in practice informally, like some sports, some bodies dependant on public funding. This is not some vague future possibility that may never materialize...]

[Dinner break].

Jaala Pulford, Minister for Roads.

Denies that abuses of self-ID elsewhere in the world ‘relate’ to VIC. ‘Mortified’ by feminist arguments that are not about equality. Says Bill won’t affect most Victorians. [Right... only half of them, i.e. the 50% who are women].

Legal documents to reflect “true identity” a truly wonderful thing. [What?]. Addresses O’Donahue’s question about consultation. Says debated in parliament; claims broad consultation by AHRC in ‘Sex Files’ report [false: this was with sex & gender diverse communities].

[Which doesn’t really answer the question, which is why not a broad public consultation like other countries e.g. the UK have done; why not consultation with women or women’s groups]. Addresses comments about interaction with other law e.g. Equal Opportunity Act. Says trans people can *already* access opposite sex’s spaces, according to commissioner. [Not clear this is true; I have asked commissioner for clarification and not heard back]. Claims some of the words in the parliament debate the most “hateful & hurtful” in 12 years.

Commends bill to the house.

Now they’re ringing the bells and a vote will be taken.

THE HISTORIC MOMENT IN WHICH VICTORIA DECIDED TO HAVE NO GATEKEEPING REQUIREMENTS AT ALL ON A MALE PERSON’S RIGHT TO BECOME LEGALLY FEMALE AND ACCESS ALL/ANY PROVISIONS THAT EXIST FOR FEMALE PEOPLE... mere minutes away, ladies, gentlemen, & non-binaries... so suspenseful...

AYES: 26

NOS: 14

“Therefore the Second Reading has passed”.

Dude whose name I didn't catch — Quilty? — proposes amendment to make sex optional on birth certificates, like Tasmania has done. [Quilty claims that birth certificates currently list gender. THEY DON'T THEY LIST SEX. He randomly conflates the two throughout his speech].

Oh yes, Tim Quilty. [Thanks, screen]. He says we should have an opt-in model for sex, not an opt-out model. The government shouldn't care about your genitals! He says. [I can't tell you how not-surprised I am to hear a man take a sex-blind approach. His has probably never affected him negatively].

O'Donahue supports Quilty's right to have his amendment considered at the next stage of the process.

The bill will now be considered in the Committee of the Whole (Legislative Council).

Pulford has the audacity to say we shouldn't move forward with Quilty's amendment *without consulting with the community*!!!!!!!!!!

O'Donahue (less hypocritically, given that he consistently opposed the bill, on the grounds of lack of consultation among other things) also says we should not move forward with that amendment. Catherine Cumming supports Quilty's amendment because doctors don't have x-ray vision and can't detect the baby's feelings [perhaps she's talking about gender identity]. She says we're all just humans, not genders.

David Limbrick says birth certificates can *already* be produced without sex on them, the amendment just changes what the default is. This does not affect data collection. [That is a helpful intervention].

Pulford comes back on behalf of the government and says that there's not enough understanding of the Tasmanian reform. Admirable motives in those who support the amendment but wants to get on with the bill in its current form.

O'Donahue said some of his questions were answered during the Minister's summation. Doesn't necessarily agree with the government but doesn't wish to take up more time.

Craig Ondarchie brings some questions from his constituents. If brief of evidence contains gender information and a person changes his sex before prosecution, does that make the brief invalid?

Pulford says it doesn't. She does some virtue-signalling about how we shouldn't be talking about crime in relation to this bill. [What on earth? Does she think that *no trans person could possibly commit a crime*?]

Ondarchie then asks about female sports. [THANK GOD FOR THIS GUY]. Pulford says there are no sporting related consequences. This is just about not requiring people to have an operation before they change their sex on their birth certificates.

Pulford [looking increasingly furious] says this is beyond the scope of this bill.

David Limbrick asks if the original and correct record of births will be released after some period of time e.g. 90 years. Pulford says the period is 100 years, and yes, the records will be *able* to be released after this period.

No one else has questions, so all the remaining clauses of the bill stand. The AYES have it; the committee is now concluded and the bill will be reported to the house.

Minister moves that the bill be read a third time and pass; there is disagreement so a division is called. The bells are rung again.

MORE SUSPENSE...

(not really, i think we know what's going to happen)

AYES: 26

NOS: 14

Third Reading has passed. Bill returns to assembly; committee has agreed to bill without amendments. People in the gallery clap and cheer.

WOMEN EVERYWHERE SHAKE THEIR HEADS IN DISBELIEF.

Those who voted no (14):

Atkinson, Bath, Bourman, Crozier, David, Finn, Grimley, Lovell, Maxwell, McArthur, O'Donohue, Ondarchie, Rich-Phillips, Wooldridge.

[The end].

Links:

[1] <https://beta.parliament.vic.gov.au/parliamentary-debates/Hansard/HANSARD-974425065-3129/>