

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Anti Discrimination Law](#)
Subject: Enquiry into Religious Educational Institutions
Date: Wednesday, 15 February 2023 1:10:34 AM

To Whom It May Concern,

I would like to comment on the Enquiry into Religions Institutions and Anti-discrimination Laws.

Considering the terms of reference:

1. I taught at religious schools for nearly 30 years and no student was ever discriminated against on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity. (We never had a married or pregnant student)
2. It is a totally different thing to have a member of staff living a lifestyle at odds with the teaching of the school. Religious schools (certainly Christian Schools) teach sexual purity, fidelity and traditional marriage. This is totally at odds with the moral code that society is pushing in 2023. There is no middle ground. If the school pushes one message, and a member of staff practises homosexuality, promiscuity, sex before marriage and/or gender dysphoria the whole point of the institution is destroyed. Further, if a staff member is not to be discriminated against for sexual orientation then a staff member with a sexual orientation for children (We called them paedophiles) cannot be discriminated against being hired in schools by the very wording in the terms of reference.
3. It's all very well to say that the school can give preference to selecting staff of the same religion, but we are facing a time, very soon, when there is going to be a teacher shortage. In the case of a shortage of teachers the institution may not be able to easily find teachers of the same religion. They are then forced by the anti-discrimination laws into the situation just described in point 2.

These laws (anti-discrimination etc) effectively are taking sides. On the one side are conservative, traditional Christians who are trying to conserve traditional values of sexual constraint, traditional marriage, faithfulness in marriage and similar ideas.

These values have supported western civilisations for centuries. The other side wants to overturn and destroy these very things.

Take for example gender dysphoria. Look at the history. In 1959 or 1960 the first gender clinic was opened in John Hopkins University. Then a study was done in 1979 by that University, looking at all the data collected in 20 years of operation and the conclusion in 1980 was that "gender dysphoria was a mental illness". They closed the clinic.

In the next 30 years the American Medical Association brought out 6 different versions of their "Standards of Care for trans persons". The 2011 Standards of Care version 7 expressed the idea that people with gender dysphoria should be AFFIRMED and since then puberty blockers and re-assignment surgery has taken off all over the world. But, the data 3 decades before showed it was a psychiatric phenomenon, and this medical intervention was harmful. And it is. Puberty blockers cause lifelong damage, as does surgery.

Thousands of transgender youth in the UK have taken out a class action to sue the Tavistock gender clinic for the damage done to them and caused it to be closed. For example, if you remove a boy's scrotum you permanently damage his immune system, his ability to ever have children, his ability to enjoy sex, he has to take artificial hormones for the rest of his life and permanently has difficulty urinating. In our own gender clinic at Westmead hospital in April 2021, the doctors there asked for an in-depth study (physio-psycho-social study) into the children presenting at the clinic because they were concerned that there were a high percentage of children presenting with background issues such as trauma, undiagnosed autism etc. These doctors suspected similar findings to John Hopkins' findings 41 years before.

Take homosexual marriage. Canada has had homosexual marriage for longer than Australia. They found when marriage was allowed between men that the rate of domestic violence increased to the point where they had to greatly increase the number of judges in the family court. For a male-only couple you have to use a surrogate in order to have children. This divorces a child from its biological mother.

I could site many other reasons why choosing to promote this sexually liberal experiment on society will destroy its fabric. It's not new, many civilisations have gone down the same path and gone into oblivion.

Please don't write me off as a fanatic. I am genuinely concerned that to keep Australia balanced we need to maintain respect for our religious institutions (flawed as they might be) and not allow them to be consigned into history by creating laws that prevent them to function.

There are these narratives that "the church" is full of paedophiles and hypocrites. I am not Catholic, but the assumption in society is that the Catholic Church is full of priestly paedophiles. I attended a workshop run by a policewoman on child protection in churches. It opened my eyes when she quoted that the Catholic Church was responsible for one-third of cases of child sexual abuse (in the 50s and 60s I think it was) but was caring for two-thirds of the orphans. The state run Institutions had almost as many cases of child sexual abuse but was caring for less than half what the Catholic Church was. This means that the RATE of abuse in the state run institutions was almost double that of the Catholic Church. I'm not trying to downplay paedophilia in the church or anywhere, but it showed me that there is an anti-church bias in the media that distorts the narrative. They make great noise about church-based sexual misconduct and say nought about non-church misconduct to balance the ledger thereby giving truthful perspective.

I urge you to discount the strong push by the media to destroy religious schools and to maintain independent thought in this matter.

Thank you for the chance to have input in this discussion.

Yours Sincerely,
Janice Panton

Tassociatiin brought out 6 different versions of t

from my Galaxy