

I am opposed to any extension of anti-discrimination laws not solely because of the difficulty of separating deed from doer.

There are many 'deeds' against which there is rightly & desirably discrimination. We should not tolerate under any circumstances child molestation, burning of widows, female genital mutilation, unauthorised lighting of bush fires, drunken drivers or drunken pilots to name but a few. How we treat the perpetrators of such deeds should be comparable, irrespective of any group to which the doer might claim to belong, either philosophically, racially , religiously or politically.

Most deeds are the result of choice; thus 'anti-discrimination' lauds one choice over another; and legal decree establishes what conduct is 'permissible'. To try to illustrate. IF an invitee insists on placing his feet in bobnailed boots on my coffee table, I am unlikely to invite him again to my home- irrespective of his beliefs, colour, creed or nationality; or whether he belongs to "The Society for placing boots on coffee tables". To that extent I am discriminating however often I entertain him elsewhere.

In other words, how will legislation protect the defendant against discrimination; against personal enmity; against any who believe such claim might bring financial gain or favourable publicity?

We are all fallen creatures in a fallen world; and victimisation has already become a lucrative field for some legal experts & minority groups. Theoretically all are equal in the eyes of the Law- provided one can afford a sufficiently eminent Q.C. That we are all sinners in the eyes of a righteous God seems of very little concern; but therein lies the only true equality. Discrimination legislation has more appeal to those seeking power than to the average citizen; and 'rights' without 'responsibility' amount to licence. Please 'leave well alone', even if not perfect.

A.W.Hartwig      27/1/12