

Reference paragraph 23: A Human Right of Protection of Public Health should rather direct that homosexual activity should not be encouraged or endorsed.

Reference paragraph 28: 'No human right may be invoked to destroy another human right' supports that any imputed freedom of sexual orientation in the wider population should not undermine parents' rights to determine the sexual ethics by which their children are educated and modelled.

Proposition A, point 3, introduces a Trojan Horse, whereby pro – LGBTQ+ propaganda could be incorporated into Curricula by secular authorities and thereby force a religious school to inculcate students with an agenda that conflicts with the religious, moral and health sensibilities of the school.

Reference paragraph 48. Deferring to overseas jurisdictions may be hazardous in this day and age as many Western countries are losing their moral compass.

In the Example: What could it mean in practice? To Proposition A, a school has to defer to accreditation and curriculum requirements, which again may be set by secular authorities who do not understand, appreciate or care about the religious sensibilities concerning LGBTQ+ propaganda.

In the same example, the required accommodation of Transgender or gender diverse students does not indicate any appreciation that children and youths predominantly identify with and become comfortable with their biological gender by their mid to late twenties, if they are given pastoral care and acceptance along the way but without forced affirmation of temporary dysphoria.

Reference paragraph 52: De facto relationships, while socially acceptable today, do not conform with Biblical ideals and religious schools should retain a right to require staff to be married, if they are in a sexual relationship.

In the Example: What could it mean in practice? to Proposition B, a school would be unable to rebuke or dismiss a gay or lesbian staff member if they openly model or promote homosexual behaviour. Further still, a subsequent point allows LGBTQ+ propaganda to be given even though it is euphemistically dressed up as "objective information about alternative viewpoints if they wished". With these sorts of sentences in the Consultation Paper, the ALRC seems to have no real intention to protect the rights of religious schools or of parents who have entrusted their children with them.

Reference paragraph 55: The ALRC again reveals its inherent bias in the Consultation Paper in:

- 1) asserting a preliminary view that Proposition B would be consistent with Australia's international human rights, when it is arguably not the case, and
- 2) omitting the conjunction '**yet**' which tacitly belongs before the first dot point: i.e. "... yet, the proposed reform has the potential to interfere with institutional autonomy connected to the right of individuals to manifest religion or belief in community with others, parents' freedoms in relation to their children's religious education, and freedoms of expression and association of those connected with religious educational institutions."

In the Example: What could it mean in practice? to Proposition C, a teacher with views contrary to the school's ethical and official position is allowed to promulgate those views to schoolchildren. Again, propaganda may well become dressed up as 'objective' content.

In the Example: What could it mean in practice? to Proposition D, the allowance that the ALRC would make for a staff member of a religious school to attend a Pride rally, suggests that the ALRC has shifted its moral compass to that of secular culture.