14th December, 2012

Committee Secretary
Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee

Re: Proposed Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am greatly offended by the proposed Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012 on a number of very fundamental grounds:-

1. The bill makes no provision for the fact that homosexuality and other behaviours are, in themselves, considered immoral and offensive by a huge proportion of the Australian public. This is in stark contrast to being of a certain race or gender which is not. The bill accepts the unverified and untrue claims of the homosexual lobby as given, with no actual verification of any factual basis for those claims. The proposed bill is clearly another attempt to force acceptance of immoral behaviours onto the Australian public by use of the law. This is a completely unacceptable and immoral use of the laws of this country.
2. The bill muddies the delineation between discrimination and acknowledgement of factual and verifiable problems with certain behaviour. It makes no distinction between behavioural issues and those of one's physical makeup. Clearly behavioural issues that are likely to be detrimental to individuals and those around them, are ones society can and should reasonably attempt to address. This legislation prevents that.
3. The bill gives no credence to the basic right of people to have a say in the moral behaviour of those who are guests on their property. This is a basic an accepted right that has existed for millennia and must not be relinquished without just cause. The promotion of immoral behaviour, such as homosexuality, which is considered immoral by the vast majority of the world's population, is not a legitimate cause.
4. The bill cements the basic principle of secret hearings outside public scrutiny. These are reminiscent of those held in totalitarian states. The hearings are not subject to correct processes and the results are delivered to a public hearing which is then, apparently, expected to rubber stamp the findings of the Commissioner or Party Official, in a show trial. This amounts to an almost complete bypassing of acceptable judicial methods and public scrutiny. The Commission delivers its findings to the open court in a fundamentally biased and prejudicial form. In the guise of conciliation the bill actually places an additional legal burden which aids in the effectiveness of vexatious claims. It seems clear that this and the shutting down of free and constructive speech, is what is actually being promoted here.
5. The bill makes no attempt to provide any sort of balance in the makeup of Commissioners and thereby leaves the system completely open for corruption by not being available for any form of scrutiny whatsoever.
6. The bill attempts to use strong arm tactics to force charity groups to accept the immoral position of the government by withholding funds, even when those funds have nothing to do with the matter at hand. This amounts to extortion and is an example of one level of corruption leading to additional forms.

7. The bill contradicts itself in saying that conduct is “justifiable” when engaged in to achieve a “legitimate aim” while concurrently trying to force immoral behaviour onto the Australian public. It gives little indication of what a “legitimate aim” might be considered to be but telegraphs the bills intent to prevent the very legitimate aim of opposing and correcting immorality and corruption in this nation. The very act of saying that homosexuality is “immoral” is likely to result in a vexatious claim of “offense” or “intimidation” that the Commissioner would deem as proved and leave the accused in the essentially, impossible position of trying to prove that the statement did not cause offense or was a justifiable, “legitimate aim.” This makes an absolute mockery of justice, decency and free speech especially when you consider the “strict liability” provision.
8. The bill reverses the long accepted onus of proof and gives priority and bias to the accuser. This is fundamentally contra to very basic principles of justice and will also, obviously, result in the promotion of vexation claims and unjust results.
9. The bill attempts to make anything certain, prescribed individuals might find offensive illegal while completely ignoring matters that those who are not prescribed, find offensive. This is discriminatory, fundamentally immoral and unjust. Saying it is not so in the legislation does not make it actually not so, in reality.
10. The bill enshrines a patent attempt to force religious groups to compromise their morals and accept, without complaint, the immoral position of the government. This is a clear breech of religious and other freedoms and processes, for the express purpose of promoting immoral behaviour.

I am sure there are numerous other faults in this proposed legislation but these are some of the more obvious and unacceptable ones.

Yours faithfully,

Michael Weeks