

The ALRC document is flawed with respect to its neglect of the binding relationship between parents and child – and thus of the International covenants to which it subscribes.

Parents are the first and primary teachers responsible for their children’s education; their choice to register their child in a religious school is based on trust, mutually and reciprocally negotiated and accountable, that the education it offers – and the ethos by which it achieves this - is academically, religiously and pastorally sound.

Article 16 (3) of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)* sets out the State’s role in supporting the family in this regard: “the family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State”.

The ICCPR Article 18 (4) takes this further: “The State parties to the present Covenant undertake to have respect for the liberty of parents and, when applicable, legal guardians, to ensure the religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions”.

In its paragraph 24, the Proposal treats of ICCPR’s Article 18 as relevant to its case but ignores this critical subparagraph 4) in relation to parents.

Paragraph 49 furthermore, also fails to recognise that the primary role in the education of the child belongs to parents, not the State. The cited notions of necessity and proportionality in the document blurb the claim for holistic treatment as presented in its Principal 3.