

An Act to constitute the Commonwealth of Australia

[9th July 1900]

WHEREAS the people of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Queensland, and Tasmania, humbly relying on the blessing of Almighty God, have agreed to unite in one indissoluble Federal Commonwealth under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and under the Constitution hereby established:

This is a true statement of "Equality" Our nation has truly been blessed by Almighty God.

Christianity is the most diverse faith in the whole world, a faith that truly does not discriminate against anyone. There are citizens from every nation that worships Christ.

Australia, according to the 2016 census, 52% of the population classify as Christian, that's over 13 million citizens that "humbly rely on the blessing of Almighty God". Although all Australians receive that blessing (because God does not discriminate) only 52% acknowledge his blessings.

Without a doubt Christians are the majority in this country. God bless us all.

To the Director, Legal Policy

Department of the Attorney-General & Justice.

In regards to the Modernisation of the Anti- Discrimination Act, I would like to share my response to the discussion paper.

I started this letter with the Preamble from the Australian Constitution, followed by some statistics in regards to Christianity.

I did this to remind the readers of this letter that the Almighty God does exist, because the Constitution of Australia is a true and legally binding Act. Also 52% of Australians can't be wrong.

On the [REDACTED] I sat in on a meeting with the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I would like to thank the ladies present, the meeting was a very interesting experience for me as I've never been in a situation like that defending my Faith and opinion.

I thank you all for the curtesy and respect given to me by all those present.

Anyway!

I would like to start with the modernising language.

20. Should definitions of "man" and "woman be repealed?

I say "NO!"

Removing these definitions is a serious insult,

Men want to be respected and acknowledged as men, and women want to be respected and acknowledged as women. I can't speak for Trans or Gender natural because I am a man. I speak for women because my wife is a woman, and I speak for my wife.

I don't understand why these definitions want to be repelled, to allow the Act to be more flexible to accommodate a changing society, If you want more flexibility wouldn't it be more appropriate to leave the existing definitions and add to them, that way you will be respecting and acknowledging every one of their biological and/or imaginary sex.

21. Should the term "parenthood" be replaced with "carer responsibilities?"

Carers are incredible people, they sacrifice their daily lives and needs for others, they should be acknowledged with extinction, they should without any hesitation be provided with protection.

"But!" Carers are not Parents, carers can walk away from their responsibilities, unfortunately so do some parents.

My wife and I are "Parents" we are not carers, there is no greater love then that of a Parent has for their children. And the love I have for my children is unfathomable.

Its important to have more flexibility in today's society and be more diverse.

The need to acknowledge Parenthood and Carer Responsibilities would be respectful and considerate to the majority.

22. "Marital status" could be replaced with the term "relationship status"

I truly love my wife, she is an extension of me. We are one in everything we do. The blessing of Almighty God united us in Holy Matrimony.

Not once have I ever described my wife as partner, she is my wife, I'm not in a relationship, I'm Married for better or worse, (it's always been better)

There is nothing misleading about my marital status.

You say the protection is broader than married couples.

I don't doubt that.

Again I say, you want more flexibility, Add to the Act to protect the needs of others, just don't remove the traditional definitions.

If the traditional definitions are removed all it will be doing is creating division and alienating those whom it represents.

Man, Woman, Parenthood and Marital status, am I reading between the lines, because I can see the writing on the wall, it seems to me in the name of diversity and equality that the author for modernising the Anti-Discrimination Act is encouraging the destruction of traditional values.

Removing content that enshrines discrimination

14. Should any exemptions for religious or cultural bodies be removed?

I only speak on behalf of my beliefs and rights for my children to receive a Christian education.

In regards to section 30(2) that permits religious schools to exclude prospective students who are not of that religion.

Removing section 30(2) has no consequence as it is already stated in school policy "not to refuse an education to **ANY** Child".

As far as that goes you can shred section 30(2), although I do not speak for Islamic schools.

In regards to section 37A that permits religious schools to discriminate against employees on the grounds of religious beliefs.

The reason section 37A exist is to avoid offending the sensitivities of people of a particular faith.

The reason you want this exemption removed, so you say, would make the system fairer by ensuring people of certain attributes would have opportunities under the Act, So you also say, it would ensure that cultural and religious bodies more accountable for their actions .

There are already religious schools that employ people of certain attributes.

There are schools that only employ teachers of a particular faith to suit the educational requirements of the school.

I know that my child's school uses contractors to do the cleaning, property maintenance and gardening, these contractors are employed through tenders, and their belief or orientation had no impact on the tender. Even religious schools like to save money.

Removing section 37A it actually has nothing to do with the schools, it's the parents that will be discriminated against. Parents have a right for their children to receive a Christian education, or an Islamic education, or a Buddhist education or a Hindu education, or whatever faith parents may be, by teachers of the respective faith.

So you want to hold religious education to account. I hold the modernisation of the Anti-Discrimination Act in contempt.

Is not the Anti- Discrimination Act which you are also discussing to change to "Equal Opportunity Commissioner" designed to protect "Everyone", It sounds like you only want to protect people of certain attributes.

Obviously you must be, and I can prove it.

In regards to section 40(2A) 40(3) that permits religious educational authorities as accommodation providers, it sounds to me that its intended for boarding schools, again "not to refuse an education to **ANY** Child", or accommodation.

Section 43 in regards to religious sites, you can shred that as well because **"Everyone"** is welcome to church.

Please note that my comments on section 40(2A), 40(3) and 43, are my opinion of how I interpreted what those sections meant.

In regards to certain clubs. "Exemptions are permitted if the club is of a type only suitable to one particular sex." That sounds like it "Enshrines Discrimination."

I will be honest, I may even sound bigoted, I seriously believe in equal opportunity. Everyone has a right to achieve what their heart desires, But! There is a time and place for everything.

Gay people have no place teaching in a religious school, it's a contradiction and a conflict of interest, and if it's forced on to religious educators by legislators, it would prove our rights have no interest by those who govern.

Destroy the family, you destroy the country.
Vladimir Lenin.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the discussion on changing the Anti- Discrimination Act.

