

[REDACTED]

**From:** Bruce Chapman (BCA) [REDACTED] 045  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 14 November 2017 5:53 PM  
**To:** Policy AGD  
**Subject:** Discussion Paper Modernisation of the Anti-Discrimination Act September 2017

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Director, Legal Policy  
Department of the Attorney-General and Justice  
GPO Box 1722 DARWIN NT 0801

I am a priest in the Anglican Church of Australia working in the NT Diocese predominately with youth. I am also a husband and father of four children.

Firstly I would like to commend you on the overall positive nature of the changes and hard work being recommended in the modernisation of the ADA. In particular recognition of vulnerable people such as in family or domestic violence situations.

However, I am concerned by a number proposed changes.

1. Firstly, the lower bar being proposed in Question 4. I totally agree that there should be legislation against "extreme and pervasive vilification". This is an appropriate standard. However, I am currently "offended" and "insulted" almost daily by remarks made against Christianity in the media, by comedians, and on popular TV. As hurtful as it can be, I don't believe this sort of discrimination should be legislated against. To make "offend" and "insult" the standard will potentially bring numerous and frivolous cases before a court system already overwhelmed.
2. Q14 is about exemptions. What is currently in place should NOT be removed. Why should the government decide someone else's values and what is appropriate for their religion? Should the Liberal party be forced to employ a Labor voter so there is no discrimination. As a parent I am already concerned by the introduction into schools of programs that go against my families religious beliefs (egg Safe Schools Program). I should be able to make a free choice about this without government intervention. I should be able to veto my child from any program that goes against my beliefs religious, philosophical, cultural, etc.
3. Modernisation of language is important but much of the legislation is based around key longstanding concepts of biological distinctives (e.g. man and woman). This is the overwhelming majority and although I agree we shouldn't discriminate against the very small minority who don't fit those categories, nevertheless that doesn't negate them and so I'm AGAINST these terms being repealed. However, I'm in favour of other inclusive terms being added. Also "parenthood" is a key term/definition. I understand that "carer" again allows for a minority of cases – I would urge the keeping of "parenthood" with "carer" as an added category with appropriate legislation.
4. Finally, I'm disturbed that there will be NO public report from the comment period. This is disturbing when our politicians should be representative of their constituents NOT just putting their own ideas/worldviews into practice. As part of a democratic process I would have thought for transparency and accountability that the result should be published in a public report available freely.

Thank you once again for the work being done and the opportunity to be involved in the process.

Yours sincerely,

Rev Bruce Chapman  
Youth Minister NT Diocese & St Peter's Nightcliff

Mobile: [REDACTED] 045

42  
Mail: PO Box 255, NIGHTCLIFF NT 0814 Web: [www.ntanglican.org.au](http://www.ntanglican.org.au); [www.stpetersnightcliff.org](http://www.stpetersnightcliff.org)



## Diocese of the Northern Territory

---

*Growing churches that celebrate, talk about and demonstrate the saving work of Jesus Christ in the communities around us.*