

When individuals and/or groups in society attempt to alter inherent, long-established, and widely accepted meanings of words to suit their own agendas or unnatural lifestyles, society is subjected to confusion. This is what has been happening and will increase at an even greater pace if our law equates "sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status" with "marital status". For millenia societies worldwide have generally recognised and accepted the unique distinction of genders in the sense that a 'man' has the gender identity of a 'male' from his very first moment of existence and likewise a woman has the 'gender identity' of a 'female' at the start. No amount of verbal or semantic gymnastics can alter this reality. Simply 'legalising' a practice doesn't automatically make it right, good or proper for a society or, for that matter, an individual.

The current push to legalise various sexual relationships and claimed identities through the "Sex-Discrimination Amendment (Sexual orientation, Gender Identity and Intersex Status) Bill 2013" is essentially a move to change, modify, cloud and even destroy the intrinsic meaning and purpose of marriage. Language games appear in the use of the term "different sex" to replace "opposite sex". The latter clearly means two sexes (male and female) whereas the former could mean more than two sexes. It is widely recognised that "sexual orientation" is interpreted as being attracted to the same sex. This conflicts with the term "different sex" stated in the Act, thus showing the proponents of change to be confused in their own concept of "different sex". This happens when people try to change biological realities.

Even more confusing is the term "gender identity". There has been no clarification of how this is actually defined. How does the casual observer recognise a person's "gender identity" if it can be changed and not made immediately obvious? One cannot know if he/she contravenes the Act by being unaware of someone's "gender identity". It becomes even more confusing when a person wants to distinguish between two or more people who claim to have a different "gender identity" which is not at once recognisable. The Act leaves itself open to all kinds of unnecessary, burdensome legal complications.

"Intersex status" and "relationship status" are also nebulous terms that conflict with "marital status". Clearly they imply "same-sex" relationship and therefore geared towards legalising same-sex relationships. The subtle though direct aim is to treat these as equivalent to or the same as marriage. Such a move is contrary to the already defined Marriage Act which states "marriage" as that only between a man and a woman. Furthermore, the confusing connection between "marital status" and "marital or relationship status" could be interpreted as opening up the path to same-sex marriage legislation, whereas this very legislation in recent months was voted down by federal parliament.

In conclusion, in the Objects Clause dealing with the proposed amendment of Section 3(b), it is meaningless to identify "relationship status" with "marital status". These should be treated in entirely distinct and separate ways.

Peter Phillips,