December 14, 2012

Committee Secretary
Senate Standing Committees on Legal and Constitutional Affairs
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600
Australia

Honourable Senators,

Re. Draft Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012

The presumption that one is presumed guilty before their case is heard simply because they have been accused is unnatural, unjust and an affront to centuries of common law, let alone commonsense. My Church suffered four years of frivolous and vexatious litigation before the Federal Court in a case that was eventually dismissed.

The legislation under which we were charged was crafted by a Jewish San Francisco attorney named Joseph Ribakoff to win a nation-wide US competition organized by the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith (ADL) for law students to draft anti-hate legislation for minority groups. His paper suggests that not only should state-agencies monitor and restrict free speech in general, but they should also censor all films that criticize identifiable groups. Ribakoff asserted that the truth is to be no defence in court.

Ribakoff was subsequently suspended for defrauding his clients but his winning entry in the ADL’s competition has since become the basis of oppressive and unnecessary legislation prejudicial to the majority in once free democratic nations worldwide.

God has placed everyone on the basis of free moral agency with liberty to express their thoughts without fear.

We submit that new grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity be removed from the proposed Bill.

We also want religion, political opinion, and marital or relationship status removed from the proposed Bill.

We want the Bill SEVERELY RESTRICTED to areas (such as employment) - not to ALL ‘public life’.

We recommend Section 19 (2) (b) be REMOVED. Remove the words "(b) other conduct that offends, insults or intimidates the other person."

Note that the exceptions as listed in the proposed law are VERY VAGUE and extremely broad (e.g. Section 23, page 40) If the law is to exist it should cover narrow grounds with clear and defined exceptions.
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We recommend that under Section 33 religious bodies have a BROAD RANGING EXCEPTION similar to that of Section 32, wherein ALL conduct attracts an exception.

We submit that Section 33, 3 be excised, that is,

(3) The exception in subsection (2) does not apply if:

(a) the discrimination is connected with the provision, by the first person, of Commonwealth-funded aged care; and (b) the discrimination is not connected with the employment of persons to provide that aged care.

We recommend that Section 124 be DELETED/REMOVED in its entirety. My Church has already spent four years defending itself against frivolous and vexatious litigation where the onus was upon us to prove our innocence. This is UNAUSTRALIAN and UNJUST.

We submit that Section 51 (Page 63), relating to the prohibition of racial vilification, be removed and smitten from the proposed law.

Yours sincerely in the love and service of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Your brother-in-Christ,

Anthony Grigor-Scott
MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL