

To: The Attorney General's Department

Commonwealth Anti-Discrimination Laws : Submission

My contribution is directed in particular to strong opposition to introducing new protections against sexual orientation and gender identity discrimination.

Firstly attention is drawn to the new Constitution of Hungary:

http://www.euractiv.com/sites/all/euractiv/files/CONSTITUTION_in_English_DRAFT.pdf which states that "the family, based upon marriage of a man and a woman, whose mission is fulfilled by raising children, is an "autonomous community ... established before the emergence of law and the State" and that the State must respect it as a matter of national survival"

This is in accordance with the *UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, Article 16:
Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family....

The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.

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

Amnesty international has claimed that the article defining marriage "may pave the way to the introduction of an explicit ban on same-sex marriages which contravenes international and European anti-discrimination standards...enshrined by Article 23 of the ICCPR [the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights]."

<http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/EUR27/006/2011/en/b528abb2-32a6-4615-858a-5eef13f369f/eur270062011en.html>

Human Rights Watch likewise expressed concern that the non-discrimination clause for "race, color, sex, disability, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, wealth, birth or any other circumstance whatsoever" excludes reference to sexual orientation or gender identity which they said was guaranteed in the ICCPR.

International legal experts have dismissed the claims of the human rights groups, saying Hungary has the right to pass a constitution without interference. They point out that no UN treaty even mentions sexual orientation or gender identity, and that the UN General Assembly has never accepted such redefinitions

<http://www.c-fam.org/fridayfax/volume-15/hungary-defies-critics-with-new-family-law.html>

There is very serious concern internationally that NGOs, "Human Rights" Commissions, and other non-elected bureaucracies in various national governments have long been working under the radar in an attempt to impose new legislation in violation of authentic rights protected in the

UN Universal Declaration. For this purpose false claims are being made, which are factually misleading and outright deceptive.

In Australia former injustices against homosexual persons have been rectified, giving same-sex couples the same benefits as heterosexual couples. There is nothing to prevent

any same-sex couple from making a commitment in the presence of invited guests. No new legislation is required. There is abundant evidence that in countries where SSM and Civil Unions have been imposed, freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, and parental rights (all of which are included in the UN Universal Declaration) have been abolished. In those places where the people have been permitted to vote in a referendum, the result, to date without exception, has been for marriage between one man and one woman.

Proponents of SSM have no warrant to speak for the homosexual community. Please see attachment of an excellent article written by a homosexual, which clearly demonstrates that he and others oppose same-sex "marriage". Radical activists of any persuasion must be carefully distinguished from those groups whom they claim to represent, be it Aborigines, women, homosexuals, or any other group.

Those who seek to abolish the family and subvert basic sexual ethics, (which have been recognised by all cultures of various religious backgrounds) will never be satisfied. Decriminalisation of paedophilia is already rearing its ugly head.

In Greece, paedophilia has been added to a list of "disabilities". Paedophiles in Greece may now qualify for government-funded disability pay.

http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/outrage-as-greece-adds-pedophilia-to-list-of-disabilities?utm_source=LifeSiteNews.com+Daily+Newsletter&utm_campaign=c9b74296cc-LifeSiteNews.com_Intl_Headlines-01_14_2012&utm_medium=email

Moves to introduce protection of paedophiles are not new. The Dutch Court, for instance, has approved a Paedophile Party.

<http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/archive/ldn/2006/jul/06071705>

It is also exemplified by US legislation in 2009. In response to an outcry, Rep. Alcee Hastings, D-Fla, stated on the House floor:

"This bill addresses our resolve to end violence based on prejudice and to guarantee that all Americans regardless of race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, or disability or all of these 'philiias' and fetishes and 'isms' that were put forward need not live in fear because of who they are. I urge my colleagues to vote in favour of this rule".

<http://chalcedon.edu/research/articles/lesbian-legislator-promotes-pedophile-protection-act-in-california-schwarzenegger-presented-bill-for/>

<http://politicalpistachio.blogspot.com/2009/05/senate-bill-s-909-pedophile-protection.html>

We may ask whether the next group to be protected "because of who they are" may be serial killers. Rather is the whole community to live in fear because of what they do. The consequences are mind-boggling!

"Sexual diversity" is being pushed by the Australian Human Rights Commission

http://www.hreoc.gov.au/genderdiversity/sex_files2009.html

If this "reasoning" is followed to its ultimate conclusion, "sexual diversity" must include

paedophilia.

Those who experience disorders of any kind are entitled to psychiatric help. But it is unbelievable that they are not only being encouraged in disorders, but are given protection to pursue their inclinations irrespective of the consequences for innocent victims!

Law is based on morality -- all societies, regardless of religion or culture, acknowledge that murder, robbery and violence, for instance, are criminal. Although private morality does not fall within a role of government, it is certainly a prior role of government to protect its citizens from crime.

Please reject a suggestion to introduce new protections against sexual orientation and gender identity discrimination. Any recognition of such claims is a direct threat to our democratic freedoms, in particular freedom of speech. We can not ignore what the consequences have been in other parts of the world, where democracy has virtually been superseded by a "human rights" dictatorship. There is no place in Australia for "hate crime" legislation. No one is capable of reading the mind of another person to determine whether or not expression of an opinion is motivated by hatred. I would not presume to make such a judgement. From all appearances, however, it would appear that hatred derives from the radicals.

Thank you for an opportunity to participate in this discussion paper. It is regrettable, however, that it has not been widely advertised. I had not heard of it until this evening, and it is likely that this applies to many others who would want to make a submission.

Anne M. Kirkwood,
[Address removed]