

Mark Latham: Same-Sex yes vote will open a can of worms –

(Google: “*Mark Latham Report on Safe Schools*”)

Mark Latham, *The Daily Telegraph*, August 29, 2017 12:00am

Editor’s Note: This article by Mark Latham shows the minefield that the legislation of “any two people” getting married will unleash on the children and the families of Australia.

THERE is a widely held expectation in Australian politics that once the result of the same-sex marriage postal vote is announced on November 15, the matter will be resolved, once and for all. According to opinion polls, a Yes vote looks likely, clearing the way for amendments to the Marriage Act. But perhaps there’s one more twist in this long-running, vexed issue. I hate to say it, but it might run for a good while yet. By now, we have all heard the Australian Bureau of Statistics advertisements, encouraging people to vote on “**whether Australian marriage laws should be changed to allow same-sex couples to marry**”. If the proposition is carried, the average voter would expect extra clauses to be added to the Marriage Act, widening the scope of wedlock to include homosexuality.

Marriage is currently defined as “between a man and a woman”. One would logically expect the new legislation to read: “*Marriage is a union between: a) A man and a woman; or b) Two gay men; or c) Two lesbian women.*” But this is not what our parliamentarians have been proposing. Opposition leader Bill Shorten sought to define marriage as ‘a union between two people’.

When Bill Shorten introduced his private members’ Marriage Amendment (Marriage Equality) Bill in 2015, its purpose was to “allow Australians to marry regardless of their sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or intersex status.” **He sought to define marriage as “a union between two people” - meaning that all Australian adults were eligible:** heterosexuals, homosexuals and people of any other gender or sexuality. In the Liberal party-room, whenever private members’ bills have been proposed to amend the Marriage Act, they too have followed the Shorten formula. That is, marriage as a union between any two people of any gender or sexuality. This raises an immediate contradiction. **The current postal vote is asking about “same-sex couples”.** But where is the question covering other possibilities — the various sexual orientations, gender identities and intersex statuses allowed for in both the Labor and Liberal private members’ bills? This is no small matter. Left wing activists claim to have identified up to 250 gender and sexual categories. **These include the well-known LGBTI designations, lesbian, homosexual, bisexual, transgender and intersex, plus a bewildering array of other terminology.**

Apparently, it is now possible to be genderqueer, demi sexual, two spirit, asexual, pansexual, polyamorous, fluid, femme, gender-binary, gynophilic, SAAB, MSM/WSW,

sociosexual, agender, Intrasexual, bicurious, cisgender, demiromantic, down low, FtM/F2M and MtF/M2F. I swear those last two featured in one of the Star Wars movies. Clearly Labor and Liberals have in mind a far broader definition of marriage.

It won't be restricted to heterosexuals and homosexuals. It will include the multitude of categories listed above - most of which I've got no idea what they are talking about. I mean, what does the legalisation of polyamorous, sociosexual and two spirit marriage involve? Why is the postal vote question asking about same-sex (the LGB component) but not the other 247 types of marriage being promoted by the left? And why won't the government release the amended Marriage Act it has in mind so we can understand what a YES vote will mean in practice? A big part of the problem has been the left's strategy of mission creep: using this debate to constantly broaden the definition of marriage. Fifteen years ago, they advocated "gay marriage". Then the mantra became "same-sex marriage" and finally, "marriage equality." Most of us thought this was a marketing ploy, an exercise in semantics. But it actually had a serious intent. **Marriage equality is not just for gay couples. It involves a sweeping redefinition of marriage, extending to the other 247 gender/sexual categories. My advice to people would be: if you really don't understand the proposal, don't vote for it. I won't be.**

I'm also worried about the way in which marriage between any "two people" legitimises the notion of gender fluidity. Through neo-Marxist programs like Safe Schools and Respectful Relationships, radicals have infiltrated our education system. They are trying to convince young people of the possibilities of gender fluidity: that at any time, boys can be girls and girls can be boys. Prior to the fall of the Berlin Wall, Marxists tried to create political anxiety and rebellion through the economic system. Now they are trying to manipulate the identity and feelings of school students, to convince them nothing is fixed in this world, such as biological science. **They want young Australians to believe that "capitalist hegemony" is suppressing their true gender and sexuality - a new source of social unrest. We must resist this propaganda at any cost.**

With a majority of parents saying they don't want radical queer theory in the school curriculum via Safe Schools, why would we want it in the Marriage Act? Marriage equality has become a wolf in sheep's clothing. What does this mean for Parliament post-November 15? If the public votes Yes, conservative MPs in the Coalition party room will be entitled to limit the scope of any new marriage statute to the mandate of the people.

This means writing into law a specific provision for marriage between same-sex couples. But no more than that. The postal vote process has made no mention of the other 247 categories. **If the public hasn't approved marriage beyond heterosexual and homosexual couples, how can the Parliament proceed with a broad, "two people" definition? Malcolm Turnbull's political nightmare with gay marriage is a long way from ending.**

WHAT'S CHANGED IN BRITAIN SINCE SAME-SEX MARRIAGE WAS LEGALISED FOUR YEARS AGO

by David Sergeant, Political Research Contributor at The Bow Group

Four years ago, amid much uncertainty, 400 British members of parliament voted to redefine marriage in the United Kingdom. Then Prime Minister David Cameron announced that, despite having made no mention of the issue in his party's pre-election manifesto, it would be MP's who decided the fate of marriage. **Now, it's Australia's turn to choose.** There's one key difference. Unlike in Britain, **it will be the people who decide. This will be a decision of enormous significance.** Therefore, it is sensible to analyse the consequences of the potential change, within nations in which redefinition has previously been carried out. **In the United Kingdom, it has become abundantly clear that redefinition has now affected many people. Across many spheres. At first glance, these spheres appeared distinct from marriage redefinition. However, subsequent changes, have proved that they are entirely intertwined.**

Current Conservative Prime Minister, Theresa May, has revealed proposals to abolish the need for any medical consultation before gender reassignment. **Simply filling out an official form will be sufficient** A 'Ministry of Equalities' press release, explicitly announced, that the proposals were designed to: 'build on the progress' of same-sex marriage. Guardian journalist Roz Kaveney **boasted that changing your gender is now: 'Almost as simple as changing your name by statutory declaration'.** Manifestations of the 'British gender revolution' are not difficult to find. Transport for London, have prohibited the use of the 'heteronormative' words, such as ladies and gentlemen. **Meanwhile, universities across the nation are threatening to 'mark down' students, who continue to use the words 'he' and 'she'. Instead, 'gender neutral pronouns' such as 'ze', must be uniformly applied. Such gender-theory radicalism has delighted the UK's LGBT lobby.** Their tagline: 'Acceptance without exception', can be seen on posters and adverts. Politicians, attempt to 'out-radical' one another

in the next emancipatory front of 'Trans-rights'. Much was made in the UK, about supposed exemptions, designed to ensure that believers would always be allowed to stay true to their convictions. Four years later, the very same people who made 'heartfelt promises', now work tirelessly to undermine them. Equalities minister Justine Greening, has insisted that churches must be made to: 'Keep up with modern attitudes'. Likewise, the Speaker of the House of Commons had this to say: "I feel we'll only have proper equal marriage when you can get married in a church if you want to do so, without having to fight the church for the equality that should be your right".

It became clear, during this year's general election, just how militant the LGBT lobby have become, following marriage redefinition. The primary target was Tim Farron, leader of England's third largest political party, the Liberal Democrats. High-profile journalists had heard that Farron was a practising Christian. In every single interview thereafter, they demanded to know. Did he personally believe homosexual sex to be a sin? He practically begged the commentaries', to allow him to keep his personal faith and legislative convictions separate. For decades, he pointed out, he had vocally and legislatively supported the LGBT Lobby. Likewise, he had long backed same-sex marriage, voting for it enthusiastically. This simply was no longer enough.

Shortly after the election campaign, Farron resigned. He stated that it was now impossible, for a believing Christian to hold a prominent position in British politics. **In a heartbreaking development and in spite of Britain's 'foster crisis', aspiring foster parents who identify as religious, each now do face interrogation. Those who are deemed unlikely to 'celebrate' homosexuality, have had their dreams of parenthood scuppered. This month, Britain's High Court, ruled that a Pentecostal couple were ineligible parents. While the court recognised their successful and loving record of adoption, they decreed that above all else: 'The equality provisions concerning sexual orientation should take precedence,'**

How has Great Britain become so twisted? Practicing Jews, Muslims, Christians and Sikhs, who want to stay true to their religious teachings, can no longer adopt children.

In the lead-up to the Parliamentary vote, we had witnessed what was almost incomprehensible bullying. David Burrows MP, a mild-mannered supporter of the 'Coalition for Marriage', had excrement thrown at his house. **His children received death threats and their school address was published online.** Similarly, 'Conservative' broadcaster Iain Dale promised to, 'publicly out' gay MP's, who did not vote for redefinition. **Many hardworking Brits have lost their jobs. Consider Adrian Smith, sacked by a Manchester Housing Trust, for suggesting that the State “shouldn't impose its rules on places of faith and conscience.” Or Richard Page, fired for gross misconduct after articulating, that children might enjoy better outcomes, were they to be adopted by heterosexual couples.**

Simultaneously, contrary to 'steadfast' government assurances, small businesses have been consistently targeted. Courts in Northern Ireland ruled that the Asher's Family bakery had acted unlawfully. What crime committed by this tiny business? Politely declining to decorate a cake with a political message in support of same-sex marriage. The courts maintained that business owners must be compelled to promote the LGBT cause, irrespective of personal convictions. **Even the National Trust, a British institution with over 4.2 million members, has decided to join the bullying LGBT crusade.** A message went out. Each of the Trust's 62,000 volunteers, would be required to wear a compulsory same-sex rainbow badge. Those who said they'd rather not were told they would be 'moved out of sight' until they were prepared to publicly demonstrate inclusive tolerance.

In retrospect, the silent majority in Britain remained silent for too long. Reflecting on redefinition, Ben Harris-Quinney, Chairman of the Bow Group think tank pondered that: **'Same-sex marriage was promoted in the UK, as an issue of supposed tolerance and equality. What we have seen, is the most unequal and intolerant outcomes of any political issue in recent history'.** Across the UK, 'sex education' has been transformed and disfigured. TV programmes, aimed at children as young as three, promote 'gender fluidity' as an enabler of thoughtfulness and individuality. At the same time, Ministers have denied worried parents the right to withdraw their children from

primary school classes. Meanwhile, 'outside educators' teach children about sex positions, 'satisfying' pornography consumption and how to masturbate.

Concerns regarding promiscuity, are derided as 'old-fashioned'. Independent religious schools are under intense scrutiny. Dame Louise Casey, a senior government advisor, has insisted that it is now: 'Not Ok for Catholic schools to be homophobic and anti-gay marriage'. Ofsted, the body responsible for school-assessment, has been wildly politicised. In 2013, prior to the redefinition of marriage, Ofsted visited Vishnitz Jewish Girls School. They passed the school with flying colours going out of their way to highlight the committed and attentive approach to student welfare and development. **Four years later, Ofsted returned. This time, they failed the school on one issue alone, the inadequate promotion of homosexuality and gender reassignment. As such, it was failing to ensure: 'a full understanding of fundamental British values'. It is one of an initial seven faith schools that face closure.**

When I mentioned to a good friend in the Conservative Party, that I was writing this article he expressed his genuine concern. **Had I not considered the consequences? LGBT progress is an unstoppable tide. He assured me, that it was ok for me to 'privately' believe that marriage was between one man and one woman. He even privately agreed, that the stuff being taught in primary schools was too much. But to say it out loud? To actually have it in print? It would blight my career and my personal relationships.** How much more important the institution of marriage and I do freedom of thought, religion and speech. How much more important the future of our children, than any naive career ambitions I might harbour.

I urge every Aussie to examine the evidence, analysis the results and be clear about what you're voting for. If it was solely marriage, it would worth preserving. It's infinitely more than that.

Source: by David Sergeant

<https://www.spectator.com.au/2017/09/whats-changed-in-britain-since-same-sex-marriage/>

Replacement Survey Form

Details Below

Australian Marriage Law Postal Survey

13–25 SEP	25 SEP– 20 OCT	27 OCT
Look out for your survey and do it today	Requests for replacement forms	Post your survey back – time's running out
		

For more information:

 marriagesurvey.abs.gov.au

 1800 572 113



KEY DATES

Friday, 20 October 2017 (6pm local time) - Final day for requesting or picking up replacement survey forms, or for requesting a Secure Access Code to access telephone and online response options.

Friday, 27 October 2017 - Please mail your form back to the ABS by this date to make sure it counts.

Tuesday, 7 November 2017 (6pm local time) - The survey closes. If your survey is received after this, it will not be counted.

Wednesday, 15 November 2017 - Survey results published on the ABS website. The Australian Statistician will publish a statement on the quality and integrity of the survey.

<https://marriagesurvey.abs.gov.au/key-dates>

People in aged care facilities

If you are in an aged care facility, you may complete the survey independently through the postal service, by requesting the assistance of someone you trust, or through a paperless response. Like all eligible Australians, survey materials will be posted to aged care facility residents' addresses on the Electoral Roll or to an alternative address advised to the ABS.

Online or telephone response:

If you are in an aged care facility, you can request a can request a Secure Access Code up until **6pm (local time) 20 October 2017**, to respond to the survey online or by phone.

To request a Secure Access Code, complete the online request form or call the Information Line. An email or SMS, including a unique 16-digit Secure Access Code will be sent to your nominated email address or mobile.

Complete the survey online, call the automated telephone service or contact the ABS Customer Assistance Team to provide an anonymous survey response

Nominate a trusted person to respond on your behalf

If you cannot complete your survey form, you can authorise a trusted person to assist you with your survey, or to complete the survey form on your behalf.

People from multicultural backgrounds

There is range of support available for people who have limited or no ability to read or speak English to help them participate in the survey.

You can complete the survey independently by following the instructions provided with your survey materials or by calling the Translating and Interpreting Services (TIS National) for help in your language.

TIS National: Call 131 450