

Dear Sir / Madam,

I write in relation to the anti-discrimination discussion paper you have recently made available.

As a Christian, my worldview is largely shaped by the Bible, as such, I have grave reservations as to the ability of HR Anti discrimination laws that adopt a one size fits all approach. This inadequate approach is a criticism I would level towards current moves to consolidate HR A-D laws.

The assumption of sexual orientation is one area of tension I have with the paper. "Sexual preference" might be a more useful and medically accurate term to use in reference to minority sex preference groups alluded to throughout.

The religious exemptions offered to organisations such as churches and religious schools are merely temporary, and I wonder why that is the case? Given these organisations most likely will not change their policies based on religious convictions, it would seem that a biased approach is being built in to the very mechanism seeking to avoid discriminatory practice. In other words, freedom of choice for Christians to not adopt inclusive policies for sex preference groups is eroded by the approach being presented in this discussion paper. Recent examples of the homosexual lobby group taking Christians to task over their beliefs demonstrate a disturbing willingness for such organisations to actively target Christians with, dare I say it, discriminatory behavior. The recent CYC Camps in Victoria problem represents a clear example of the intent of pro-homosexual groups to actively use loose laws to promote their own particular forms of discrimination towards Christians.

Human rights should apply to all humans, but Anti-Discrimination laws in Australia which are currently in place and further promulgated in this discussion paper, simply don't cover all sectors of the community and are therefore bad law.

Yours sincerely,

Rob Clements.