A state newsletter of

FamilyVoice AUSTRALIA

VoxLink

Victoria/Tasmania

August 2018

Death drug not yet finalised

The State Labor Government is one step away from making euthanasia an 'option' as it looks to secure a drug that will compensate for an otherwise painful process

Voluntary euthanasia will be available in Victoria from June 19, next year. However, while new laws will allow terminally ill people to access lethal drugs to end their lives, the drug to be used in the process still needs to be finalised.

The Victorian government has sought advice on access to two particular drugs, including the drug Nembutal, in an attempt to discover if it can legally provide access.

"Euthanasia in Victoria can't be implemented until a so-called 'good' killing drug is finalized," said FamilyVoice Victoria branch chairman Brad Rumble.

"Nembutal is prohibited under federal law, and alternative drugs may cause a long, painful, protracted death."

It is hoped that the November 2018 election will see pro-life candidates elected who will throw out the euthanasia legislation.

The Victorian government estimates that 200 people will request the lethal drugs in the first year. A subsequent estimate is unknown.

The foolishness of having laws that directly contradict attempts to lower suicide rates in Victoria seems utterly lost on the government.

And the association is not overdrawn; euthanasia's slippery slope has been well proven in Europe. In 2014, Belgium allowed euthanasia without age limit, just 12 years after the practice was legalised. Over there the popularity of euthanasia has risen sharply from 235 in 2003 to 4,337 in 2016 and 2017. In the Netherlands' RTE Euthanasie Code 2018, hearing loss, incontinence and blindness now all qualify as the 'unbearable' suffering requisite to access euthanasia.



The canary in the coal mine

As Australian pastor Mark Powell noted in a *Spectator* article outlining the Belgian slippery slope, "If all of this does not cause politicians... [and media] in Australia to stop and consider what a likely 'bracket creep' will look like if euthanasia laws in this country are adopted, then I don't know what will. Like a canary in the mineshaft, this should act as a wakeup call as to where things will quickly lead".

'They Day' government push

A major Victorian government department is promoting the first Wednesday of every month as 'They Day'.

The Victorian Health Department is asking its 10,000 employees to avoid using "gendered" language and instead refer to others using neutral pronouns like "they" or "them".

The "They Day" campaign video featuring taxpayer-funded employees was filmed on taxpayer-funded premises and produced on behalf of the Victorian Department of Health and Human Services Pride Network.

A memo emailed to staff said, 'They Day' is promoted as a "new recurring calendar event" that aims to raise awareness of "gendered pronouns." *Non-binary identities are just as valid as binary gender identities… Names don't always correspond to a person's gender. There may be gaps between a person's gender identity and your perception of their gender identity. Saying 'they' is more flowing and inclusive than saying 'he' or 'she.'*

FamilyVoice representative Darryl Budge said, "People with gender dysphoria have a condition we acknowledge and we must not be dismissive of probable prejudice, but normalising this dysphoria, as the powers behind this ideology are aiming to do, will only make the problem worse.

"Language should reflect the fact that almost everyone self-identifies as male or female."

School anti-bullying plan announced

The Victoria State Opposition has adopted a "zero tolerance" stance on school bullying by foreshadowing a $15.3 million scheme.

Serial school bullies would be held accountable for their actions under a four-point plan launched by Opposition Leader Matthew Guy who has pledged to implement this plan if his party is elected in November.

The $15.3 million scheme includes:

- A rollout of the Alannah & Madeline Foundation's anti-bullying program in all public schools, with independent schools able to opt in;
- A three-strike system of disciplinary hearings where serial bullies face their school principal, parents and the parents of their victims;
- A ban on the state Education Department overturning principals' rights to expel serious bullies; and,
- A reward system for students who are nominated by their schools for standing up to bullies as "up-standers and not bystanders."



Mr Guy said Victoria could not afford to keep school bullying in the "too hard basket".

"Everyone deserves to be treated with equal respect regardless of age, gender, sexuality, religion, ethnicity or appearance and I think that's a really important value to teach kids," he said.

"If kids learn from an early age about respect and equality, they will carry these values throughout their life."

FamilyVoice Victoria Chairman Brad Rumble welcomed the scheme: "We are all very aware of the lasting damage done to those who are bullied in our schools, and so we are encouraged by any proposal that aims to tackle the whole problem rather than only one form of bullying.

"In particular we support the reward system because we know that there are so many of our children and young people who do defend those who are bullied."

‘Language madness’ restarts in Defence Force

The Australian Defence Force Academy (ADFA) LGBTI guide may intrude on the military preparedness of its 80,000 personnel.

ADFA is reportedly using the guide to educate officers in training about ‘correct pronouns’ for LGBTI members of the military, and advocates the use of gender-neutral language. Former Australian Prime Minister John Howard labelled this as “madness”. “You don’t protect a minority by rubbishing a majority,” he said.

The guide outlines the importance of being “mindful of respectful and disrespectful behaviours or language in relation to LGBTI members”. This includes “avoiding stereotyping” and making use of “the correct pronouns and preferred name of sex or gender diverse members wherever possible”. In addition, members are to use “gender neutral language when referring to relationships or gender identities”.

One statement insists that “misgendering” often expresses “non-acceptance of that person’s identity”. This may indicate that Defence members are expected to remember and use the practically unlimited gender identities that members of the military may construct for themselves, even during war situations.



How to birth a pro-life culture

The powerful ‘LOVE’ approach was presented by Michelle Macormic, a keynote speaker at Perth’s Love Them Both rally this year. Changing social acceptance of abortion takes more than just changing the law. This approach, first developed by Heartbeat International, helps us to understand why a woman might consider abortion and how to help her make a better decision.

If we are to see less abortions, we need to compassionately, generously and creatively offer to meet the needs of women considering abortion. It is a movement of LOVE. It is hard work. It is expensive – it takes time, money and vulnerability. It takes a society who are willing to stop arguing and start listening.

L is for Listen and Learn

Please give her the gift of a listening heart. Lean in and give her reassuring eye contact. Please resist telling her what you think she should do. Keep it about her.



Be gentle, but ask good questions. What is she most worried about? She may have concerns that are physical, emotional, practical or spiritual. She may have issues in her past that are shaping her reaction to her present situation.

Ask her about her strengths, and listen for signs of them as she tells her story. She is so brave for talking to you, and by admitting she needs help, she has shown she is humble and wise.

What are her beliefs, her values, her dreams and plans? If she is very upset, it may help her if you suggest she think outside her current predicament. How did she feel about her future before she was in this situation? If she was helping a friend in a similar situation, what would she advise her to do? By helping her step outside her distress and panic, you are helping her to think clearly and feel safe to keep working through her tears.

O is for Open Options

Use what you have learned from her to share in a loving and caring, non-judgemental way about her different options – find out what she knows, offer factual information and correct misunderstandings.

Be objective rather than emotional: avoid shocking her, respect her boundaries. Suggest she consider the immediate and long term benefits and consequences of each choice. Focus on her life – you cannot help her or her baby without her permission, and if you help her, you are helping both!

V is for Vision and Value

Help her to see herself differently: that she is beautiful, valuable, unique, strong, worth fighting for, deserving of hope, peace, joy and love, created in the image of our wise and loving Father who sent His Son to redeem her (but wait to share about Him until she asks!)

Awaken a vision in her for a healthier, healed, whole life. Help her to see that she deserves better than abortion, abuse, abandonment, being used, coercion etc. Demonstrate that she is capable of making choices that honour herself and the little life that she carries.

E is for Extend and Empower

Explain that you will be there for her as long as she needs your help. Offer personal and additional support available through services that you are aware of that are relevant to her needs. Help her to find support through her family, friends and community. Empower her to start solving her own problems. Remind her that she is never alone. Come up with a plan – what does she need to do next? What do you need to do for her? If you don’t have all the answers, admit you’re unsure, but offer to find out so you can learn together. Arrange follow up care. Make promises you can keep, and keep them. Because when you love the woman, you love them both!

PUBLISHER:

FamilyVoice Australia
GPO Box 9894, Melbourne VIC 3001
phone: 1300 365 965 fax: 08 8223 5850
email: office@fava.org.au www.fava.org.au

PUBLISHED:

March, May, August, November

EDITOR:

Charles Newington

EXTRACTS:

Articles or extracts from VoxLink may be used for other publications, provided that the reprint includes the following notice:
“Reprinted from VoxLink by permission of FamilyVoice Australia, www.fava.org.au.”

Call for positive religious freedom protections

Two members of the Turnbull government are pushing for positive protections for religious expression in the public square.

Social Services minister Dan Tehan demanded the Turnbull government do more to protect religious freedom in Australia during a speech he gave in Canberra in June. His comments followed those by Victorian senator James Paterson who, though choosing to vote 'yes' during the same-sex marriage debate, supported increasing protections for religious freedom at the same time.

Recent comments by Father Frank Brennan (of the Ruddock review panel) could indicate that the Ruddock review may not lead to clear, positive protections for religious freedom in Australia, such as a Religious Freedom Act might afford. Instead, Brennan stated that laws may only need "tweaking" to shore up protections for the exercise of religious belief after the passage of same-sex marriage laws.

Tehan's speech could act as a warning to the Prime Minister that members of the parliamentary party are expecting robust provisions for religious freedom.

"There is another threat to religious freedom," Tehan argued. "It comes from what former Prime Minister John Howard calls 'minority fundamentalism', which he describes as 'the assumption that long-held custom, practices and beliefs represent or imply an attack on those who do not support (them)'.

"The liberal political virtue of tolerance does not legislate for morality. Instead, it separates law from morality and allows for freedom of conscience and actions, yet Australia has reached an unusual point where the tools of oppression — sowing the seeds of division, conquest, manipulation and cultural division — are being wielded by the minority against the majority. We now live in a society where tolerance is subjective."

Amnesty International's submission to the Ruddock review called for the removal of religious exemptions in anti-discrimination legislation where religious groups are recipients of government funding for public services. Schools are currently free to employ only people who conform to faith based ethics and ideals around sexuality or gender. Amnesty International asserted that government funds should not "contribute to discrimination".


The human rights organisation has called for a federal human rights act, but strangely enough, aware that parliament will not support that move, is willing to support a religious freedom act.

"It's a funny position for Amnesty to find itself in to be in furious agreement with conservative politicians, but we do believe that a lack of a religious freedoms act is the obvious gap in our human rights architecture … We've got freedom from racial discrimination but not on religion. While Australia is a secular society it's an international human right that should be protected," a spokeswoman said.

Exemptions currently represent the only clear line of defence for religious organisations against accusations of discrimination, especially in relation to Biblical views about gender and sexuality, and in a lot of ways even exemptions represent inadequate protection.

Opt-out filters aren't censorship

By Charles Newington



Some activities are permitted by authorities that are frankly indefensible. Exposing children to violent and depraved pornography is certainly one of them. We are not talking about something relatively inoffensive. Children may access shocking images and video that corrupts their imagination and stay with them for life, affecting how they think about sexuality and human intimacy generally.

Proposing opt-out child-safe internet filters is not censorship by stealth. It is limiting the corruption of our children that is occurring by stealth. Many parents are blithely unaware of what their children are exposed to.

Opt-out filters remove porn websites out of the general internet feed offered by the Internet Service Providers (ISPs). To access porn, a person would have to show an Over 18 ID and opt in to access porn websites. Accidental discovery, as happens often with children, would be greatly reduced.

A mandatory child-safe opt-out internet filter is a careful step towards minimising the harm of porn on minors. It is comparable to the existing ban on any online site from offering alcohol for sale to a minor. A website offering to send alcohol to minors would be charged with an offence. Legislating fines against websites who illegally provide sexually explicit material to minors is no different.

Internet websites are proprietors, and some online bottle-shops get around the "credit card" block by offering their product freely (to later gain paying customers). The government currently holds the bottle shop responsible, but not an internet porn website proprietor.

Some might say "the problem is too big". Yet this argument doesn't stop most Australians from supporting a ban on bottle shops selling to minors, even though underage drinking is a serious problem.

Help FamilyVoice campaign for sensible internet filters by signing our Open Letter to the PM and by supporting this campaign financially. Go to ***Cleanfeed.fava.org.au***.

This really is nation-building stuff – allowing children a safe online childhood, protecting their imagination and changing how they relate to others for the good. That's the Australia every decent person wants.



- New Cleanfeed Campaign launches
- Pray as the Religious Freedom Review results draw near
- Spreading the word!

+FavaOrgAu /familyvoiceaustralia

☐ I would like to subscribe to *FamilyVoice* publications ($66 per year, $33/yr conc.). Please find enclosed cheque or debit my credit card:

☐ Mastercard ☐ Visa

Expiry /

Cardholder:

Signature:

Name:

Address:

P/code:

Phone:

Email:

Please return to: **FamilyVoice Australia**
GPO Box 9894, Melbourne VIC 3001

Why the Lord's Prayer matters



The Greens are again seeking removal of a daily Scriptural verse from the Australian Senate.

Greens Senator Lee Rhiannon has instigated a Senate inquiry into removing the Lord's Prayer from the beginning of Senate sittings, and has proposed a new mantra: "Senators, let us in silence pray or reflect upon our responsibilities to all people of Australia and to future generations".

FamilyVoice SA State Director David d'Lima in a written submission to the inquiry noted: "The recommendation that Parliament abandon its custom of opening with Christian prayers, in effect, is a rejection of the fundamental or foundational role of Christian wisdom".

NSW Christian Democrats MP Paul Green has argued that the Lord's Prayer "simply highlights the values that we as politicians and we as citizens of this great nation should seek to embody in our everyday life. We are not in total control of our destiny and we should always seek to forgive, serve and love those around us".

The prayer is also an important signpost pointing to the Christian foundations of Australian law and common law.

Tony Abbott recently argued, "Our society is unimaginable without a deep sense of the dignity of every person; without the conviction that we should do to others as we would have them do to us; and without an ingrained sense of our duty to protect the weak while encouraging the capable. All these have a Christian inspiration" (*The Spectator Australia*, 4/8/18).

A humorous, tongue-in-cheek response by Queensland pastor James Macpherson was published in *The Australian* (4/7/18):

The words of Jesus are dangerous and politicians should be protected from hearing them lest they startle the country by governing with wisdom and humility.

*'**Our Father who art in heaven**' is a shocking acknowledgment that the highest office bearers in the land may not be the highest office bearers in the universe. Should politicians realise this, they may start acting with humility and become completely unrecognisable to their own electorates.*

*'**Hallowed be thy name**' is the dangerous admission that we must live for something bigger than our own name or self-aggrandisement. '**Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven**' could cause politicians to consider if perhaps they ought to act according to noble convictions rather than simple convenience. This would throw the public service into significant confusion.*

*'**Forgive us our sins**' is a self-esteem-sapping admission that none of us are perfect. This is a dangerous idea that our MPs should never under any circumstances be allowed to contemplate lest they stop thinking of themselves as our betters.*

*'**But deliver us from evil**' is the foolishly outdated idea that evil exists when we know the problem is really structural issues that can be fixed by constant government interference in the affairs of free men.*

*'**For thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory**' is an insidious idea that may lead politicians to wonder if perhaps building monuments to themselves is mere vanity.*

We don't want MPs thinking there is a cause greater than their own name or political stripe, lest they begin to work together for a greater good; and then where would we be?

Constitutional challenge to "safe access" speech ban

John Young summarises the submission made by a pro-life campaigner's legal team to the High Court of Australia

In 2017, Kathy Clubb was found guilty in the Melbourne Magistrate's Court of breaking the law when she offered a leaflet to a couple about to enter the Wellington Parade abortion facility. The magistrate stated: "There is no evidence of duress or violence of any kind. The engagement between the Accused and the couple is brief and appears polite."

Despite this, the magistrate found her guilty and fined her $5000. In their submission for an ongoing High Court appeal, Kathy's barristers have outlined a number of reasons why the verdict should be overturned, the principal one being that Kathy's action was political in character and is safeguarded by the right to political discourse guaranteed by the Australian Constitution.



Defining Personhood (By CaldronPool.com)

The barristers argue, "To change one's mind on the ethics of abortion is apt to change the person's mind on the politics of abortion. Further… protest on the topic of abortion outside abortion facilities is also inherently political, particularly when 20 police officers are present."

The law is also criticised for its vagueness.

"It is inherently difficult to predict whether conduct is apt to cause distress or anxiety, particularly once those concepts extend to mere discomfort," they add.

"There is no bright line between communications which are in relation to abortion and those which are not. Is a communication seeking a vote for a political party the speaker knows to be pro-life a communication in relation to abortions?"

The limits of the "Safe Access" are inherently unclear. For example, if abortions are provided at a large hospital or at a university or shopping complex, does the 150 metres extend beyond the limits of the hospital or just the building or room where the abortions are provided?

The submission gives a series of prohibitions under this law which burden the freedom of political communication.

The prohibition applies:

- To any communication relating to abortion that is able to be seen or heard (whether or not it is in fact seen or heard);
- Whether or not the recipient consents.
- Where abortions are administered by way of a drug, which includes private residences;
- Whether or not distress or anxiety is in fact caused, or intended;
- To communications by Members of Parliament and during election periods and referendums;
- Where the communicator is seeking to discourage a person from obtaining an unlawful abortion.

Kathy's barristers ultimately argue: "What the law does, in fact, is to burden one side of the abortion debate more than the other. It discriminates, and it distorts political communication. And it does so to a viewpoint that is properly described as a minority viewpoint."