

1) S. Jothimani from INC opposed the Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Amendment Bill, 2026, speaking as a Congress representative and emphasizing justice, dignity, and constitutional morality. She argued that the bill had been introduced without proper consultation with transgender persons and stakeholders, reflecting a lack of sensitivity and inclusiveness.

She stressed that identity is not a certificate and dignity should not be subject to verification, highlighting that transgender individuals are being forced into scrutiny to prove who they are. She raised concerns about the introduction of medical boards and multi-layered certification processes, stating that these create unnecessary bureaucratic barriers and shift citizens from holders of rights to seekers of permission.

She pointed to the lived realities of transgender persons, including social exclusion, lack of opportunities, and survival struggles, and criticized the bill for narrowing the definition of transgender identities while excluding several groups. She also questioned the government's intent, noting low and underutilized welfare funding while increasing control over identity.

- Criticized lack of consultation and called it undemocratic
- Opposed medical certification and bureaucratic hurdles for identity recognition
- Highlighted social and economic marginalization of transgender persons
- Raised concerns about exclusionary definitions in the bill
- Questioned increased state control despite poor welfare delivery
- She further warned that certain provisions could be misused, especially those related to criminalization, and could harm families, communities, and support systems.

She argued that mandatory reporting of gender-affirming procedures violated privacy, bodily autonomy, and fundamental rights, and could create fear among individuals.

Warned about misuse of criminal provisions and increased police powers

- Said privacy and personal autonomy would be violated
- Argued the bill could create fear and mistrust of the state
- Highlighted risks to those already recognized under existing law

She also expressed concern that the bill undermined progressive efforts by states like Tamil Nadu and raised institutional issues by being introduced while related matters were under judicial consideration. She described the process as a “monologue of power” rather than a democratic exercise.

In conclusion, she maintained that dignity was a constitutional right and not something granted by the state, and urged the government to withdraw the bill and refer it to a standing committee for detailed and inclusive consultation with the transgender community and other stakeholders.

- Called for withdrawal of the bill
- Recommended referral to a standing committee
- Emphasized need for inclusive consultation and protection of rights

2) Anand Bhaduria, a MP from the Samajwadi Party (Uttar Pradesh), opposed the amendment bill and argued that the transgender community had historically faced exploitation, marginalization, and exclusion from mainstream society, often relying on their own communities for safety and dignity. He stated that the bill threatened to take away even these limited protections and spaces. He referred to cultural and historical recognition, mentioning figures like Shikhandi from the Mahabharata, and mentioning Trans people’s existence in Ramayanam, and questioned why society and the government were now turning against the transgender community.

He raised concerns about provisions that criminalize “forcing someone to present as transgender,” stating that these were vague and open to misuse. He warned that instead of targeting actual offenders, such provisions could end up criminalizing the entire community, along with families, NGOs, and support systems that assist them. He emphasized that anti-discrimination and welfare laws should not include punitive measures that harm the very people they aim to protect.

He criticized the introduction of a medical board system, where identity certification would depend on recommendations and approval by district authorities, and questioned why excessive powers were being given to district magistrates. He described this as a concerning trend that could weaken democratic functioning and increase bureaucratic control. He also highlighted that the bill had been introduced without meaningful consultation with the transgender community and other stakeholders.

He expressed concern about the impact on individuals who had already obtained legal identity under the 2019 Act, stating that the proposed amendments could create legal and social uncertainty and even risk reversing their recognized identity. He warned that this could affect their jobs, documentation, and access to basic services. He further argued that the bill could push people toward unsafe and unregulated medical options, while mandatory reporting and increased scrutiny would invade privacy and restrict access to healthcare.

He noted that the bill replaced the simpler process under the 2019 Act with a more complex multi-step system, despite earlier warnings from the standing committee. He argued that such an approach wrongly treated transgender identity as a medical condition and was not aligned with constitutional values or international human rights standards.

He also raised broader social concerns, questioning why the government focused on issues like begging instead of addressing root causes such as poverty and lack of opportunities. In conclusion, he urged the government to withdraw the bill or refer it to a committee for further review, and emphasized that his party would continue to advocate for the rights, dignity, representation, and inclusion of the transgender community.

=====

3) Dr. T. Sumathy, a Member of Parliament from the DMK (Tamil Nadu), opposed the amendment bill, stating she spoke “with heavy hearts, deep pain and a great concern” for the transgender community. She framed the issue not just as a legislative matter but as one of “human rights” and “survival of a community with dignity.” She argued that the bill promotes a dangerous idea, that the state can decide identity, saying she opposed “an idea that identity must be verified before dignity is granted... that rights are conditional upon certification.”

She quoted a poem to highlight the lived pain of transgender persons, emphasizing that their voices have long gone unheard. Referring to the Supreme Court’s NALSA judgment, she stated that self-identified gender is a fundamental right, and criticized the bill for undermining this principle. She described the bill as “not a technical correction... it’s a constitutional regression,” arguing that it narrows identity, expands surveillance, and increases state control.

She questioned the logic of requiring certification, asking “has any cis person been asked to identify themselves through a medical board?” and accused the government of inconsistency, pointing out that identity cards have already been issued to thousands earlier. She asked, “what changed? Was the identity real then and inconvenient now?” and raised concerns about contradictions in government statements and the fate of those already granted legal identity.

She strongly criticized the lack of consultation, stating that even the National Council for Transgender Persons has not been meaningfully involved, and called the amendments “draconian.” She also warned of a broader pattern of state overreach into personal lives, asserting, “you cannot certify a human soul through a medical board.”

Highlighting Tamil Nadu’s model under the DMK, she described policies such as transgender welfare boards, inclusive terminology, healthcare access, and self-identification without mandatory medical certification. She argued that the Union government should learn from this model rather than undermine it.

She challenged the bill’s criteria around “biological” and “severe” exclusion, asking who has the authority to define such terms and stating, “oppression is not a laboratory category... it’s a lived reality.” She criticized the removal of self-identification rights and warned that the bill effectively tells transgender persons: “show us, tell us, prove to us who you are, and then we will decide whether to believe it or not.”

She further argued that the bill violates privacy rights and excludes several identities by imposing rigid classifications. She warned that it pushes transgender persons further to the margins, weakens support systems, and creates insecurity under the guise of protection.

In conclusion, she stated that the bill reflects a pattern where rights are being reframed as privileges and strongly rejected it, urging the government to withdraw it or at least refer it to a parliamentary standing committee. She ended by asserting that a nation is judged by how it treats its most marginalized, calling the bill “draconian” and a threat to dignity, equality, and inclusion.

=====

4) June Maliah, a Member of Parliament from the AITC (West Bengal), opposed the amendment bill, stating she rose to speak as both a representative and a supporter of transgender, intersex, and gender diverse persons. She said, “this bill does not protect... it excludes. It does not empower... it controls,” and argued that it weakens the Constitution.

She referred to the Supreme Court’s NALSA judgment and stated that the right to self-identify gender is a fundamental right, describing it as recognition of dignity, autonomy, and personhood. She noted that the 2019 Act was based on self-identification, simple administrative processes, and recognition of non-binary identities, and said the current bill dismantles these principles.

She highlighted that although the 2011 Census recorded nearly 4.9 lakh transgender persons, only about 35,000 applications for identity certificates have been filed, pointing to continued exclusion from education, employment, healthcare, and housing. She argued that instead of addressing these issues, the bill focuses on restricting identity.

She opposed the removal of self-identification, explaining that earlier individuals could define their identity and the state was required to respect it, but now the bill requires people to fit into limited categories and prove identity through biological criteria. She questioned how such identities can be defined rigidly and emphasized that they are rooted in lived experience and social belonging, stating “this is not inclusion... this is exclusion by design.”

She criticized the requirement for medical processes and approvals, saying “this is not protection... it is control,” and emphasized that gender identity cannot be certified through medical tests. She raised concerns that forced disclosure could expose individuals to harm and stated that mandatory medical certification violates privacy and fundamental rights.

She also raised concerns about criminal provisions, noting that even friends, NGOs, or support groups helping transgender persons could face punishment, and said such provisions “create fear not safety.” She described the bill as taking away previously recognized rights, stating “this is not reform... this is a rollback.”

She further argued that the bill narrows the definition of transgender persons and conflates intersex and transgender identities, warning that “we are not just amending a law... we are erasing people from it.”

Highlighting West Bengal’s initiatives under Mamata Banerjee, she pointed to policies supporting recognition and welfare, and referenced lived experiences showing dignity in practice. She questioned why national law should move backward when states are progressing.

In conclusion, she urged the House to reject the bill or refer it to a select committee with proper consultation, emphasizing that no law about a community should be made without involving that community, and called for upholding dignity, equality, and justice.

=====

5) Dr. Byreddy Shabari, a Member of Parliament from the TDP (Andhra Pradesh), supported the amendment bill, stating that after reviewing concerns from the transgender community, she found that “the transgender community have been little misunderstood about this bill.” She described it as “a historic bill that gives identity and justice also to the transgender community.”

She began with a reference to the Ramayana, recounting a story to emphasize that transgender persons have long been part of Indian culture and tradition. She said that from that time, they became “the integral part of our culture,” and added that the transgender community in her district is “very close to my heart.”

She addressed concerns raised by the opposition, particularly around the definition of transgender persons, and argued that the bill includes both sociocultural identities and biological aspects. She emphasized the need for a structured system of identification, stating that every individual has a birth certificate determining their sex and asked, “why can’t a transgender have identification?”

She raised concerns about misuse, saying that “fake cases... who are posing as transgenders... have been increasing,” and claimed that members of the transgender community themselves had reported such issues to her. She argued that such cases create challenges for genuine members of the community and supported the bill’s provisions to address this.

She highlighted provisions allowing individuals to change their name and sex in birth certificates and said the bill ensures legal recognition of gender identity as male, female, or third gender. She supported the role of medical boards in this process, describing it as “very much easy,” and emphasized that transgender persons have historically faced discrimination in education, employment, and society.

She also supported the stricter penalties introduced under Section 18, noting punishments for exploitation, forced procedures, and harm, including “strict punishment of fourteen years” for serious offenses. She said these provisions are important for protecting the community.

She further pointed to existing government efforts such as the SMILE scheme, Ayushman Bharat health insurance, and rehabilitation initiatives, and highlighted that Andhra Pradesh has a large transgender population and provides pensions and support, including distribution of autos and financial assistance.

In conclusion, she requested the government to consider concerns raised by the community but expressed confidence that justice would be delivered, stating that the bill “will give true justice to the transgender community,” and affirmed her support for it.

=====

6) Supriya Sule, a Member of Parliament from the NCP (Maharashtra), opposed the amendment bill and stated that she was speaking on behalf of her party against it. She said she was “a little taken aback” by earlier remarks claiming that previous governments had done nothing for transgender persons, and emphasized that governance is continuous and that multiple governments had contributed to protecting rights.

She challenged the idea of identifying gender at birth, stating clearly that “nobody can identify a transgender 100% at birth,” and urged that the discussion remain grounded in facts. While she appreciated the government for bringing the bill, she questioned whether it truly upheld dignity and inclusion.

She raised concerns about the urgency of introducing the bill, stating “there is no urgency to bring in this bill,” and argued that more pressing national and global issues deserved attention. She reiterated the opposition’s demand that the bill be sent to a committee for further discussion.

She criticized the definition of transgender in the bill as narrow and exclusionary, noting that it leaves out identities recognized under the 2019 Act and the NALSA judgment. She emphasized that the right to choose one’s gender identity is linked to dignity and life under the Constitution.

She strongly objected to provisions requiring reporting of medical procedures, calling them invasive and questioning why authorities should be involved in personal decisions. She asked, “why should a magistrate or a collector need to know?” and described such provisions as an intrusion into privacy. She added that not all transgender persons may want state intervention or benefits, and such choices should remain personal.

She also raised concerns about criminal provisions in the bill, warning that vague language could lead to misuse. She gave examples where support from NGOs or friends could be wrongly interpreted as criminal acts, especially in cases where transgender individuals face rejection or harassment. She highlighted the risk of misuse by law enforcement, noting instances of discrimination and mistreatment, and questioned whether the bill would truly ensure dignity.

She emphasized that the transgender community had not been adequately consulted, stating that they are key stakeholders and should have a voice in shaping such laws. She suggested that if the government is serious about inclusion, it should consider stronger measures like reservations and representation.

In conclusion, she urged the government to reconsider the bill, send it to a standing committee, and engage in wider consultation. She stated that her party was willing to support efforts that genuinely improve the lives of transgender persons, but emphasized the need to ensure respect, dignity, and inclusion for all.

=====

7) Pratap Chandra Sarangi, a Member of Parliament from the BJP (Odisha), supported the amendment bill and described it as “a revolutionary amendment” based on a “very scientific approach” aimed at giving transgender persons protection and a dignified life. He stated that the intention of the bill is to prevent misuse and strengthen punishment for violations, and argued that concerns raised by the opposition were incorrect.

He emphasized that gender determination under the bill should be based on medical scrutiny, stating that it should be decided “through a medical scrutiny by a medical board”, and framed this as a scientific and fair approach. He argued that the bill does not discriminate and instead guarantees equal opportunity while providing protection to vulnerable groups.

He acknowledged that transgender persons have faced social discrimination and hardship, and said “they are all human beings” who deserve dignity, respect, and honor. He expressed admiration for the community, stating that stigma must be removed and that they possess significant talent and potential.

He argued that identity is not a matter of personal choice, stating “whether you will be a transgender, a male or female is not out of choice,” and emphasized that excellence and achievement are within individual control. He also referred to historical and cultural examples to highlight the presence and contributions of transgender persons.

He supported stricter penal provisions in the bill, noting that earlier penalties were minimal and that the amendment introduces stronger punishments for offenses such as coercion, impersonation, and harm. He highlighted provisions that impose imprisonment and fines for those exploiting or harming transgender persons, arguing that these measures are necessary for protection.

He also raised concerns about misuse of self-identification, suggesting that without verification, individuals who are not transgender could claim benefits meant for the community. He presented the bill’s framework as a way to prevent such misuse and ensure that protections reach the intended beneficiaries.

In conclusion, he stated that the bill is intended for the betterment of the transgender community and praised the government’s intent, urging all members to support it. He appealed to the opposition to back the bill, asserting that it would help ensure dignity, protection, and justice for transgender persons.

=====

8) Arvind Ganpat Sawant, a Member of Parliament from the Shiv Sena (Maharashtra), opposed the amendment bill and emphasized at the outset that “the transgender is a human... it is a human being” and should not be humiliated. He questioned the urgency of introducing the bill, asking “what is the necessity or urgency for the government to introduce such bill and get it passed right now?” and argued that there was no immediate need for it.

He referred to constitutional protections under Articles 14, 15, 19, and 21, and the Supreme Court’s NALSA judgment, stating that transgender persons already have recognized rights to equality, dignity, and self-determination. He argued that the existing 2019 Act is a strong anti-discrimination and welfare legislation, and questioned why the amendment seeks to change it.

He criticized the bill for narrowing the definition of transgender persons and excluding several identities, including trans men, trans women, and gender-diverse individuals, stating that all such identities are constitutionally protected under the broader umbrella of transgender persons. He argued that this exclusion lacks constitutional basis and risks further marginalization.

He strongly opposed the removal of self-identification, calling it a violation of fundamental rights and stating that it amounts to denying personal autonomy and dignity. He said the bill effectively undermines the right to live as one’s true self.

He also raised concerns about criminal provisions, stating that they could criminalize transgender persons and their support systems, and compared such provisions to past laws that targeted marginalized communities. He warned that these measures could create fear rather than protection.

He criticized the proposal for medical boards and mandatory reporting of gender-affirming procedures, calling them invasive and a violation of the right to privacy. He referred to the Supreme Court’s privacy judgment and argued that such provisions undermine bodily autonomy and dignity.

He highlighted the lack of consultation with stakeholders, stating that members of the transgender community themselves had approached him expressing concerns and were not included in the process. He also noted that existing legal challenges relate to implementation issues, not the definition itself, and argued that the bill introduces unnecessary changes without addressing real concerns.

In conclusion, he urged the government to withdraw the bill or refer it to a standing committee for further discussion, reiterating that there is no urgency and expressing willingness to support a revised version that respects constitutional rights and dignity.

=====

9) Alok Kumar Suman, a Member of Parliament from the JDU, supported the amendment bill and stated that it was not merely a legislative change but connected to constitutional guarantees of equality, freedom, and dignity. He referred to Articles 14, 15, and 21, and acknowledged that although these rights exist, transgender persons have not fully experienced them in practice.

He pointed out that the 2011 Census recorded around 4.9 lakh transgender persons, though the actual number is likely much higher, and noted that earlier efforts faced practical challenges, particularly in ensuring that government benefits reached the intended beneficiaries due to lack of clear identification.

He emphasized that the bill aims to make the identification process more transparent and reliable, arguing that a structured system would ensure that benefits reach genuine beneficiaries and prevent misuse. In this context, he compared it to existing systems, noting that SC, ST, OBC, and persons with disabilities require certification to access benefits, and questioned why a similar verification process should be seen as problematic here.

He supported the creation of a medical board for certification, stating that verification is necessary for proper implementation of welfare schemes and to avoid misuse. He argued that transparency and accountability are essential for effective governance.

He also referred to global and regional examples, mentioning that in Thailand transgender persons are socially recognized as “ladyboys” and are present across sectors, and cited Argentina’s policies and Karnataka’s reservation efforts as examples of structured recognition and inclusion. He used these examples to argue that India should adopt a balanced and structured approach.

He stated that the bill aligns with the spirit of the NALSA judgment and helps ensure that rights are effectively delivered, and also pointed to rising crimes against the transgender community as a reason for strengthening legal protections.

In conclusion, he argued that the bill is not meant to restrict identity but to provide a secure, recognized, and dignified framework for it, ensuring that benefits reach the right individuals, and expressed his support for the bill.

=====

10) Naresh Ganpat Mhaske, a Member of Parliament from the Shiv Sena (Maharashtra), supported the amendment bill and stated that it is intended to provide a secure and dignified identity to transgender persons rather than limit it. He expressed full support on behalf of his party and leadership, including Eknath Shinde, and described the bill as a continuation of efforts to strengthen the 2019 law.

He highlighted the work done by the Maharashtra government, stating that the Maharashtra Transgender Policy 2024 was approved as a significant step toward inclusion. He pointed out that the state had worked to ensure that eligible transgender persons receive access to government schemes, and described this as an effort to align the entire administrative system toward supporting a marginalized community. He also referred to earlier initiatives such as financial assistance through corporations, noting that transgender individuals were provided annual support and that Maharashtra was among the first to introduce such measures.

He emphasized the challenges faced by transgender persons in accessing basic documentation, explaining that many previously struggled to obtain ration cards due to lack of residence or identity proof. He stated that the state government introduced relaxations in documentation requirements, enabling transgender persons to obtain ration cards and access welfare benefits.

In supporting the bill, he argued that the amendment addresses gaps in the 2019 Act and strengthens protections. He specifically pointed to provisions that prohibit forcing transgender persons to leave their homes or villages, stating that such actions would now be treated as offenses. He also noted that denying transgender persons access to public spaces would be punishable, and argued that these provisions would reduce social exclusion and allow individuals to live with dignity within their families and communities.

He highlighted provisions related to forced labor and exploitation, stating that compelling transgender persons into labor or subjecting them to physical, sexual, verbal, or emotional abuse is explicitly criminalized under the bill. He noted that penalties include imprisonment ranging from six months to two years along with fines, and presented these as measures to ensure protection from abuse.

He also referred to broader institutional measures, including the establishment of the National Council for Transgender Persons and initiatives by bodies like the National Medical Commission to improve access to healthcare. He mentioned digital systems and portals that make certification and access to schemes more transparent and accessible.

He emphasized that transgender persons are not separate from society, describing them as an integral part of it, and acknowledged that they have historically been pushed into marginal roles such as begging due to lack of opportunities. He framed the bill as part of a broader vision of inclusive development, stating that true progress requires ensuring dignity and respect for all sections of society.

In conclusion, he argued that by introducing stricter protections against exploitation and improving access to welfare, the bill would help ensure equality and dignity for transgender persons, and reaffirmed his support for it.

=====

11) Gowaal Kagada Padavi, a Member of Parliament from the INC (Maharashtra), opposed the amendment bill and began by referencing multiple cultural and mythological examples, including Lord Vishnu's Mohini form, Arjuna's transformation, and the Aravan tradition, to argue that gender diversity has long been recognized in Indian civilization. He also cited the temple in Tamil Nadu dedicated to Aravan, noting that people across the country visit it, emphasizing that transgender identities have historical and cultural legitimacy.

He framed the issue as not merely legislative but constitutional, moral, and civilizational, and argued that while the government presents the bill as an administrative correction, it actually rolls back hard-won constitutional rights of the transgender community. He stated that the debate is fundamentally about dignity and constitutional guarantees.

He referred to the NALSA judgment and highlighted that the Supreme Court recognized transgender persons as a third gender with full protection under Articles 14, 19, and 21, and affirmed the right to self-identification. He emphasized that the Court had clearly stated that individuals should not be forced to undergo medical procedures to prove their gender identity, and questioned whether the bill goes against this principle, asking if the government is legislating against the spirit of the Supreme Court.

He argued that dignity is inherent and not something granted through certification, stating that constitutional rights such as equality, freedom of expression, and personal liberty already include the right to express one's gender identity. He warned that by introducing bureaucratic verification, the bill converts a constitutional right into an administrative privilege.

He also placed the issue in an international context, noting that several countries recognize gender identity based on self-declaration rather than medical certification, and argued that India, which had once led in recognizing transgender rights through the NALSA judgment, is now moving backward with this amendment.

He highlighted the historical marginalization of transgender persons across sectors such as education, employment, healthcare, and housing, and stated that while the 2019 Act aimed to remove barriers, the current bill creates new ones. He pointed out that the transgender population is already undercounted and questioned the logic of further restricting recognition.

He raised a broader concern about state overreach, asking what happens if the state begins deciding which identities are legitimate, and warned of the implications for other forms of identity. He also pointed out procedural concerns, stating that an expert committee should have been constituted before introducing such amendments, and questioned the intent behind bringing the bill without it.

In conclusion, he clarified that the opposition is not against reform or stronger protections, but insisted that any changes must preserve the principle of self-identification, simplify administrative processes, avoid excessive control, and involve proper consultation with the transgender community and civil society. He urged the government to uphold constitutional values and the spirit of the NALSA judgment.

=====

12) Abhay Kumar Sinha, a Member of Parliament from the RJD (Bihar), opposed the amendment bill and stated that it undermines the rights of transgender persons, describing it as an attack on constitutional values. He argued that the bill suppresses identity and constitutes injustice against a marginalized community.

He referred to the NALSA judgment and stated that it recognized the right to self-identification under Articles 14, 15, 19, and 21, but said the amendment removes this right. He criticized the bill for introducing excessive powers for district authorities and medical boards, arguing that it creates a new bureaucratic structure that could lead to exploitation.

He also raised concerns about the lack of consultation, stating that even the National Council for Transgender Persons was not consulted before introducing the bill. He warned that instead of addressing existing marginalization and social exclusion, the bill could push the community further to the margins.

He pointed out that the financial memorandum of the bill does not allocate additional expenditure, arguing that this reflects a lack of commitment to the welfare of transgender persons. He said that promises made under the 2019 Act in areas such as education, healthcare, and employment have not been effectively implemented.

He highlighted the situation in Bihar, stating that many transgender persons remain disconnected from employment and skill development opportunities and have not received meaningful benefits. He argued that the bill does not address these economic and social challenges and instead leaves the community vulnerable.

He also criticized the broader policy approach, stating that the bill reflects centralization and lacks provisions such as reservation, dedicated budgets, or effective welfare schemes. He mentioned that even existing welfare boards are not functioning effectively.

In conclusion, he urged the government to withdraw the bill and refer it to a standing committee, restore the right to self-identification, introduce horizontal reservation in education and government jobs, and strengthen welfare mechanisms with proper resources, while expressing his opposition to the bill.

=====

13) Shyamkumar Daulat Barve, a Member of Parliament from the INC (Maharashtra), opposed the amendment bill and argued that instead of promoting equality, it imposes restrictions on the freedom of transgender persons. He stated that the Constitution guarantees equality to all citizens, but the bill appears to move in the opposite direction by limiting rights rather than expanding them.

He emphasized that the measure of any society lies in how it treats its most marginalized sections and argued that the bill fails this test. Referring to constitutional principles and court judgments, he stated that transgender persons are entitled to equality and protection under Articles 14, 15, and 16, and that limiting their rights goes against these guarantees.

He specifically criticized the change in definition under the bill, stating that it narrows the concept of transgender identity by focusing on biological and medical criteria while excluding self-perceived identity and sexual orientation. He argued that this disregards individual identity and excludes the broader LGBTQ community, and pointed out that courts have already recognized sexual orientation as a fundamental right.

He also raised concerns about the lack of focus on real issues affecting the community, such as employment, housing, and social inclusion. He noted that transgender persons continue to face discrimination in accessing jobs and housing, and said the bill does not address these challenges or provide solutions for improving their living conditions.

He stressed the need for inclusion rather than segregation, arguing that transgender persons should be integrated into society with dignity and respect rather than treated as separate. He also pointed out that social stigma and mockery faced by the community need to be addressed, but the bill does not meaningfully tackle these issues.

He emphasized that transgender persons are human beings who deserve the right to live with dignity, and questioned why stronger protections exist in other areas while similar attention is not given to their rights.

In conclusion, he urged the government to rethink the approach, ensure equal opportunities, and treat transgender persons with dignity and humanity, reiterating his opposition to the bill.

=====

14) Balwant Wankhade, a Member of Parliament from the INC (Maharashtra), opposed the amendment bill and argued that it undermines equality and restricts the freedoms of transgender persons. He stated that while the Constitution guarantees equal rights to all citizens, the bill appears to move in the opposite direction by placing controls on their autonomy rather than addressing their needs.

He emphasized that society should be judged by how it treats its most marginalized sections and argued that the bill fails to uphold that standard. Referring to constitutional provisions and judicial precedents, he pointed out that transgender persons are entitled to equality and protection under Articles 14, 15, and 16, and that limiting their rights goes against these guarantees.

He criticized the change in the definition of transgender persons in the bill, stating that it narrows identity by focusing on biological and medical criteria while excluding self-perceived identity and sexual orientation. He argued that this denies individuals recognition of their own identity and excludes the broader LGBTQ community, despite court rulings recognizing sexual orientation as a fundamental right.

He also highlighted the lack of focus on real issues such as employment, housing, and social integration. He stated that transgender persons continue to face discrimination in accessing jobs and housing, and questioned what the bill offers in terms of improving their livelihoods or living conditions.

He stressed the need for inclusion, saying transgender persons should be brought into the mainstream rather than treated as separate. He pointed out that social stigma and mockery faced by the community are serious concerns that need attention, but are not addressed in the bill.

He emphasized that transgender persons are human beings and deserve the right to live with dignity, questioning why stronger protections exist in other areas while their rights remain inadequately addressed.

In conclusion, he urged the government to reconsider the bill, focus on equality and inclusion, and ensure that transgender persons are treated with dignity and given equal opportunities, reiterating his opposition.

=====

15) K. Sudha R., a Member of Parliament from the INC (Tamil Nadu), opposed the amendment bill and stated that she rose not only to oppose it but to challenge its intent, direction, and consequences. She argued that although the bill is presented as a reform, it is actually a retreat from constitutional morality, judicial guidance, and the rights of a marginalized community.

She emphasized that transgender persons in India have historically faced exclusion, stigma, and violence, and said any law claiming to protect them must be inclusive and dignity-based. She identified the most serious concern as the change in definition, stating that the bill removes key aspects of the earlier law and excludes persons based on sexual orientation and self-perceived identity. She argued that this narrows the scope of recognition and leaves out trans men, trans women, and gender-diverse individuals.

She criticized the introduction of medical boards and administrative certification, explaining that identity is rooted in personal feelings and lived experience. She questioned how a medical board could assess something as internal as gender identity, asking “which medical degree teaches these doctors to identify feelings?” and argued that the bill reflects a lack of understanding of transgender experiences.

She also raised practical concerns about implementation, noting that district collectors and medical systems are already overburdened, and warned that people may have to wait long periods for certification. She argued that this creates barriers rather than enabling access to rights.

She opposed provisions requiring medical institutions to report gender-affirming procedures to authorities, stating that such measures interfere with personal autonomy and privacy. She emphasized that the bill places excessive control in the hands of administrative and medical authorities.

She warned that the bill risks harming individuals rather than protecting them, stating that decisions taken in Parliament will have long-term consequences on people’s lives.

In conclusion, she urged the government to withdraw the bill or refer it to a parliamentary standing committee for detailed examination and wider consultation, emphasizing the need to align the law with constitutional principles and judicial precedents.

=====

16) Dr. Virendra Kumar, Minister of Social Justice & Empowerment, responded to the debate by addressing concerns raised by multiple members and defending the intent of the amendment bill. He said the government is committed to inclusion under the vision of “सबका साथ, सबका विकास, सबका विश्वास”, and emphasized that over the past years, efforts have been made to build a more inclusive and compassionate society.

He stated that the 2019 law was brought to provide protection and welfare to transgender persons, and that this amendment is being introduced to refine it by focusing on those who face “गंभीर सामाजिक बहिष्कार” due to their biological condition. He said the objective is to ensure that legal recognition and protection reach those who genuinely need it.

He acknowledged that transgender persons have historically faced discrimination and social exclusion, and said the government’s effort is to ensure they receive legal recognition and live with dignity. He emphasized that the Constitution guarantees equality, freedom, and dignity, and that the bill is aligned with these principles.

He highlighted examples to show inclusion efforts, mentioning that transgender persons were invited to national events and given recognition, and referred to initiatives like transgender-run facilities such as canteens. He used these examples to show that the government is working toward social inclusion beyond legislation.

He also referred to broader welfare schemes such as housing, sanitation, financial inclusion, and health insurance, stating that these initiatives have reached large numbers of people and reflect the government’s commitment to marginalized communities.

He defended stricter penal provisions in the bill, stating that they are necessary to prevent exploitation, coercion, and harm, especially in cases involving children. He pointed out that offenses like forcing or exploiting individuals are now punishable with stronger penalties, including long-term imprisonment and fines.

He emphasized that social inclusion is key and said that real change will come when transgender persons are accepted in everyday spaces like schools, workplaces, and public life. He concluded by stating that the bill aims to bring administrative clarity, legal recognition, and protection, and urged the House to pass it unanimously.

Following his response, the bill was put to vote and passed by the House.

Doc Made by Hyderabad Against Trans Erasure

Special Thanks to Picnic (Any Pronouns)