

Hello,

Discussion on the Modernisation of the Anti-Discrimination Act.

I have a few questions (from the discussion paper) I would like to comment on;

Question: Is updating the term sexuality to sexual orientation without labels appropriate?

No. I think updating the term sexuality to sexual orientation without labels is **NOT APPROPRIATE**. I do believe you are born male or female, its biological XX or XY chromosomes. I do recognise there are people born with both genitalia, however this is more rare than common place. To me, Mannerisms, appearance, their name and outward social markers is something of a choice and not a biological fact.

Question: Should any exemptions for religious or cultural bodies be removed?

I think removing the existing exemptions for religious bodies should **NOT** be removed. The removal of these exemptions is inappropriate.

Where is the evidence from the community that there is an issue with the existing exemption?

Christian schools have and continue to serve the community. Parents have a right to choose how and where they educate. Our families can have the confidence that our curriculum and culture is distinctly Christian.

All staff share a common set of beliefs to contribute to the vision and mission of the College. This sets us apart.

If you remove the exemptions you would prevent our school (Marrara Christian College. Indeed all Christian Colleges) from ensuring that our/their families can have the confidence that our/their curriculum and culture is distinctly Christian. To have the ability to exclusively employ Christian staff, who have Christian values, morals, Christ's compassion is the heart of who we are. This is our point of difference. Basically, families can vote with their feet. If they do not like, or disagree with how our faith intertwines with our education teaching they will simply choose to just not send their children to our school. Christianity is not something you just do on a Sunday, its interwoven into our everyday life and this extends to education and daily learning.

E.g. If you had a football coach, why would you employ a hockey coach to coach them? That would be insane. Well, they are both qualified coaches. This is the same with Christian teachers. You may say 'well a Maths teacher is a maths teacher', but not to us. We believe faith impacts EVERY area of life...yes, this includes teaching Maths.

Question: Should a representative complaint model process be introduced into the Act?

No- I do not believe a complaint model process should be introduced into the Act. This ability opens the floor for multiple vexatious complaints against those in whose opinion the interest group finds offensive. This potentially can be very dangerous for the protection of freedom of religion.

Question: Should vilification provisions be included in the Act?

There is an important distinction between discrimination and disagreement. The discussion paper states that "Providing appropriate exemptions recognises that we live in a free and democratic society with a right to voice opinions in a respectful manner (page 12). It is essential to protect the freedom to express religious views. The words 'offend' and 'insult' set too low a threshold and could cause people to bring forward a complaint without much basis. Words like 'extreme' or 'pervasive' are helpful, but 'hurt, anger and anxiety' are also too subjective. It is my opinion that these provisions need to be very carefully considered to ensure sensible balance is maintained.

Question: Should the Term 'parenthood' be replaced with eh 'carer responsibilities' ?

There are parents and there are carers. They both do an amazing job with their children. Why can we not have both terms or include other terms, but please do not remove the words parenthood. Don't diminish parents. Include other terms by all means, but not at the expense of 'parenthood'. Suggestion, add the word 'carer responsibilities' without removing the word 'parenthood'.

Gender identity, inter sex status and definition of man and woman. Why repeal the definition of man and woman? I believe these should remain and NOT be repealed. Include alternative terms, but please do not do away with the definition of a man and woman.

Please look to countries that have gone down a road of redefining these terms and taking away exemptions. They have opened themselves up to insane law suits, taken away freedom of speech, beliefs and corroded at the very foundations the nations were built on.

PS. Can the response to the paper please be released to the public.

Thank you for your time.



305



005

