

To: Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee

This proposed Bill is factually the most dangerous part of the defunct Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012, which threatened to abolish our basic rights and freedom, in particular freedom of speech.

Claims by proponents of the Bill to "rights" and "equality" are patently fallacious. To identify privileged groups, which are supposedly "vulnerable", is an abrogation of the democratic principle of equality before the law, by making such groups "more equal than others".

The Australian Human Rights Commission, in common with other "Human Rights" Commissions internationally, is an unelected bureaucracy funded by the taxpayer and unaccountable to the people. Granting a privileged status to some specified groups is condescendingly patronising. Such groups are segregated from other Australians, apparently on an assumption that they are incapable of a responsible role of citizenship without government "help", i.e. government control.

For decades radical activists have been attempting to impose on humanity world wide recognition of any form of sexuality outside of biological science. There is overwhelming evidence that, wherever same-sex "marriage" legislation has been imposed, citizens have suffered severe legal penalties as a result of exercising a right to free speech by daring to disagree. To state that every child has a right to a mother and a father is labelled as "hate speech". Likewise penalties have been imposed on any who decline to participate in "gay weddings", seeking to exercise a right of freedom of conscience, for religious or any other reason. Same-sex couples are already free to celebrate commitment ceremonies in which no one is coerced into participation.

Another consequence of such legislation is that parental rights have been abolished, by imposing compulsory homosexual indoctrination on school children. Even in kindergarten they are taught (a lie) that some have "two mummies or two daddies". This is a severe threat to the natural psychological development of children. Incidentally there is zero evidence to suggest that a majority of homosexual persons desire legalisation of SSM, and some of their number have spoken out against it.

While proposed SSM legislation was decisively defeated, a Sex Discrimination Amendment Act would result in identical dire consequences. "Sexual orientation/ gender diversity" covers an amorphous group of persons who are supposedly "victimised".

The acronym LGBTI comprises lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex. There is no relationship among these categories.

Intersex is a condition medically defined as an abnormality of chromosomal origin.

Transgender is a psychological condition, which has been defined as gender identity disorder. The American Psychological Association has considered making changes to a Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, but, instead of removing the condition as a mental illness, has reclassified it as dysphoria, which means “emotional distress.”

Every human being is entitled to respectful recognition of human dignity, and persons who experience any physical or psychological disorder have a right to whatever care is needed. Such persons should not suffer the indignity of being used by ideological activists to enforce an agenda which deprives other citizens of authentic rights. This has happened in Canada, where men, claiming to be transgendered, but having undergone no “sex change” surgery, have been admitted to women’s bathrooms.

Additional letters have been added to LGBTI, and further categories may be supplied indefinitely. Once such a grossly flawed law has been passed, it would become legally permissible to add all manner of depravity and serious crimes. In some countries steps have already been taken to decriminalise paedophilia, defining paedophiles as “minor attracted persons”, a form of sexual orientation.

Introduction of proposed “rights” for newly protected attributes, violate longstanding authentic rights which are enshrined the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948. (UDHR)

<http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml>

The following rights would clearly be violated by the proposed Sex Discrimination Amendment Bill 2013.

Freedom of speech. Article 19

Freedom of thought, conscience and religion. Article 18

The family, as the natural and fundamental group unit of society, is entitled to protection. Article 16

Parental rights. Article 26

It is recommended that the proposed Sex Discrimination Amendment (Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Intersex Status) Bill of 2013 be rejected in entirety. Further it is recommended that the Australian Human Rights Commission be abolished, and replaced by a Ministry of Human Rights under the control of an elected representative of the people.

Such a Ministry would be committed to protecting the rights of every Australian, irrespective of whether he or she belongs to the majority or to any minority group. This is the only means of securing equal justice for all.

Thank you for an opportunity to participate.

This form letter, and variations to the form letter, was received from the following submitters:

Mr Hugh Cushing

Mr Warren James

Ms Moira Kirkwood

Mr and Mrs Mary and Michael Walsh