

# **David Perrin**

18 April 2013

Committee Secretary,  
Senate Standing Committee on Legal & Constitutional Affairs,  
[LegCon.Sen@aph.gov.au](mailto:LegCon.Sen@aph.gov.au)

Dear Secretary,  
**SUBMISSION ON SEX DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT  
(SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY & INTERSEX  
STATUS) BILL 2013**

I write as a former Member of Parliament to express my opposition to the proposals contained in the above bill.

With long experience of involvement with anti-discrimination legislation I believe this bill needs to be opposed and I urge your committee to recommend that this bill be defeated by the Senate.

My main concerns are-

1. The bill confuses the orientation, identity and status of individuals with relationship. Whilst individuals may identify various attributes regarding their self-defined identity or their self-defined orientation this has nothing to do with their relationship with others. This confusion of law suggests that the bill is flawed.
2. What exactly is gender identity? Is it fluid? How could others know a person's self-defined gender identity? With these weak understandings how can another person be held to discriminate? On these grounds alone the bill is flawed.
3. The bill contravenes the Marriage Act by attempting to alter the marital relationship away from one man and one woman.
4. The bill attempts to alter a de facto relationship to mimic marriage by using the word spouse which is clearly identified

- within the context of marriage. I point out that a de facto relationship can include more than two people.
5. The committee should reject the bill on the effect it will have in its practical application. What effect it will have on the provision of toilets, change facilities and single sex organisations like health clubs who may wish to legitimately restrict the provision of their services?
  6. The removal of man and woman from the law will confuse people who may be impacted by the bill. The understanding of these terms is widespread in the community. Man and woman are well understood terms and have a long history of acceptance. The small proportion of those with confused genders does not support the change of laws with regard to clearly defined terms like man and woman. These new terms in the bill represent some form of social engineering. Please support the retention of the terms man and woman reject them from being removed from the law.

I believe that your committee should report to the Senate and therefore to the wider community, that this bill should be opposed.

I would be happy to provide any further information that your committee may require.

Yours Sincerely,

David Perrin