

To: Assistant Secretary
International Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Branch
Attorney-General's Department
Via email to antidiscrimination@ag.gov.au

I submit that ***discrimination on matters of personal preference are a natural human right, and that we do not need more laws that restrict our freedom.***

Some examples where we should be free to discriminate are:

1. **Political opinion:** it is natural and proper for political parties and people to discriminate in their associations and employment
2. **Sporting allegiance:** it is natural and proper for sporting bodies and people to discriminate in their associations and employment
3. **Religious belief:** it is natural and proper for religious bodies and people to discriminate in their associations and employment
4. **Sexual Identity:** it is natural and proper for people to discriminate in their associations and employment based on sex. We should be free to take into account the differences between males and females, bearing in mind that no law can change the common sense observation that males and females, boys and girls, men and women, are different and can have different needs and aspirations where it is natural to discriminate in meeting those needs and aspirations.

Freedom demands the right to discuss, debate and discriminate based on the common sense observations, reinforced by millennia of experience and by hundreds of studies in the social sciences, showing that:

- A. Marriage, that is a publicly recognised commitment between one man and one woman, is, on average, proven to give the best outcomes for the couple, for any children they have, and for society,
- B. Defacto relationships are less stable and less beneficial, on average, in all respects,
- C. Same sex relationships perform lower still.

These facts, proven by the social sciences, justify discriminating in favour of marriage as a reward or payment for the positive benefits it brings to society via happier healthier people and lower social welfare costs. It is also just cause for refusing to give marriage-like status to relationships that are clearly inferior to marriage.

Note that sexual preference, while overwhelmingly determined by sex, can sometimes go awry from nature's norm. In addition, there is no creditable evidence that any genetic factor mandates same-sex attraction. Identical twin studies confirm this: as does the fact that same-sex attracted people can and do choose to become heterosexual. This demonstrates that homosexual and lesbian attractions are choices rather than immutable attributes like race or colour in which a person has no choice.

So discrimination must remain legal in politics, sporting allegiance, religion, sexual preference, and marriage; but, only where there is no choice, as in race or colour, then discrimination should be limited by law.

There are hundreds of relevant references, backing up the claim made above, in:
<http://www.familyfirst.org.au/files/21-Reasons-Why-Marriage-Matters.pdf>,
<http://ultimo167.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/21-reasons-why-gender-matters-2007.pdf> and

Strained Relations: The Challenge Of Homosexuality, by Bill Muehlenberg

Peter Newland