

**Submission
No 5**

ANTI-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT (RELIGIOUS FREEDOMS AND EQUALITY) BILL 2020

Organisation: Australian Christian Alliance (ACA)

Date Received: 15 August 2020

**SUBMISSION BY AUSTRALIAN CHRISTIAN ALLIANCE NSW LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
STANDING COMMITTEE.**

**REGARDING: [Anti Discrimination Amendment (Religious Freedom and Equality) 2020
sponsored by the Hon Mark Latham, MLC]**

DATE: 15th August 2020

WHO ARE WE?

- The Australian Christian Alliance is a 'grass-roots' movement of people who both value their Christian faith and appreciate the value of faith in general. We at the ACA have notice the increasing hostility to people who publicly live out their faith in NSW.
- We have noticed that people of faith are being persecuted for simply trying to live out their lives according to the teachings of their faith. Many of the supporters of the ACA are from middle eastern backgrounds who fled the countries of their birth because of persecution on religious grounds.
- They have seen that this trend of persecution has followed them here to Australia. The only difference is that the persecution is via courts, tribunals and codes of conduct rather than by weapons. One such individual remarked..'*we've fled the Middle East because Christians were persecuted by the sword..now they're being persecuted by the courts*'
- In effect what has happened for these people is that they have exchanged 'warfare' for 'lawfare'. These people are now rightly concerned for their rights to live and raise their children according to their faith. Many are not fluent in English and do not feel that they have a voice in these debates.
- There is much talk in Australia of the need to protect the rights of minorities who cannot speak for themselves. Well, what about the significant minority of people from non-English speaking backgrounds who cannot directly participate in this debate. It is for this 'silent minority' that the ACA is campaigning. It is on behalf of this 'silent minority' that the ACA makes the following submission.

WHAT WE WANT

- People of NSW do NOT want special treatment we want EQUAL treatment.
- Despite being an integral part of many NSW resident's lives, religion is currently NOT protected by NSW antidiscrimination law. We have laws preventing discrimination based on age, sex, disability and race, but not religion.
- This means that someone can be refused service in a restaurant purely for being a Catholic or a Muslim or a Jew, and they have NO LEGAL recourse under NSW law
- This was recognised by the expert committee on religious freedom chaired by Phillip Ruddock, which recommended that NSW rectify this situation.
- Despite this being recommended by an 'elder statesman' of the Liberal Party, the Liberal government of NSW has done nothing about this situation.
- The Religious Discrimination bill proposed by the Federal Attorney General following the last election did NOT address the situation in NSW as it specifically did not override state laws.
- We already have a 'two-tiered' system of anti-discrimination legislation with race, sex, disability and age being covered by BOTH state and federal laws, but religion is not a protected attribute in every state.
- In recent years we have seen more and more people who are being dragged before tribunals and courts for commenting on their issues such as abortion, same sex marriage, and transgenderism based on their religious beliefs. The vast majority of these are happening at the STATE LEVEL.
- The Ruddock report was submitted to the government more than two years ago yet nothing has been done about the deficiencies in NSW law. This is a TRAVESTY and the people of NSW have waited long enough
- This is why the Bill proposed by the Hon Mark Latham MLC is long overdue. This bill is good for the people of NSW because it is founded on good principles and is good in practice.
- The following points will illustrate why the bill will provide the people of NSW with ROBUST protection for their religious freedom.

THE BILL IS GOOD IN PRINCIPLE

It is based on a Good Foundation

- The bill uses the Siracusa principles to resolve competing rights. These principles are internationally recognised and were indeed recommended by the Ruddock report to be used to balance competing rights.

It has the Right definitions

- The Bill bases whether or not a belief is 'reasonable' by whether or not it is sincerely held, not whether someone ELSE thinks it is reasonable. This avoids the situation where a court or a judge determines whether someone's private beliefs are indeed genuine.

'The 'sincerity test' (genuinely believes) gives effect to the approach consistently adopted by the highest courts in Australia (specifically in Church of the New Faith v Commissioner for Payroll Tax (Vic)), the United Kingdom, United States and Canada as a means to avoid courts determining matters of religious doctrine or disputation. '

The bill gives Widespread coverage

- For many people their religion and religious activities are not just limited to what happens on a particular day in a place of worship.
- Their religion influences how they live their lives EVERY DAY and in EVERY WAY. Their religious activities are WIDESPREAD.
- So any true protection of religious freedom in law must be just as widespread.

Accordingly, the bill extends the meaning of what is a 'religious activity' to cover a wide range of expressions of religious belief. It is not just limited to 'sacraments' and 'rituals' that happen in a place of worship.

1. At Section 22K(1), the definition of 'religious activity' is intended to include:

(a) engaging in religious activity of worship, observance, practice or teaching;
and

(b) conduct, refusal (including refraining from participating in activities that are inconsistent with religious beliefs), omission, expression, and association carried out in accordance with, in connection with, based upon, constitutive of, supportive of or a corollary of a religious belief; and
(c) teaching, writing, issuing and disseminating relevant publications, to establish and maintain communications with individuals and communities in matters of religion or belief at the national and international levels ; and

(d) seeking, receiving and imparting religious beliefs either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art or through any other media; and

(e) any activity or manifestation motivated by a religious belief, whether in public or in private, and whether individually or in community with others.

The examples make clear that the proposed Part does not intend to protect solely 'sacred acts' or acts in the performance of a 'religious ritual'. It is necessary to clarify in anti-discrimination law that, for many religious believers, religious convictions that impact on or motivate behaviour can extend to the whole of their personal values and lived experience.

The Bill is 'self-contained' and will not require changes to other laws to function.

- The proposed additions to the anti discrimination law are of a 'stand alone' nature and do not impact other protections in law. The bill does not override existing protections but provides a protection where there is NO current existing protection.
- Most reasonable people would agree that discrimination on religious grounds is NOT reasonable and should be unlawful. At present however, discrimination on religious grounds is NOT unlawful. Therefore the bill only seeks to make unlawful what is now not unlawful but should be unlawful.
- This means that whatever is unlawful under anti discrimination law BEFORE this bill will continue to remain unlawful AFTER the bill.

The bill Provides RIGHT KIND of protection (cl22M, ENp3)

In contrast to current protections for religious organisations in laws such as the sex discrimination act, this Bill Provides protections by EXCEPTIONS rather than EXEMPTIONS. Why is this important?

- The problem with exemptions is that they tacitly admit that someone actually IS discriminating but that it is 'acceptable' under a certain set of circumstances. The person is given an EXEMPTION from the consequences of this breaking the law under these circumstances.
- Thus, technically speaking, the person/ body IS breaking the law, but that this breaking the law is somehow protected because the law says they are exempt from the consequences
- This protection only remains as long as a future government does not REMOVE these exemptions.
- They are not, in general, a good way to define what is and is not discrimination and we are already seeing moves to remove current exemptions for religious schools in the federal sex discrimination law via the Australian Law Reform Commissions.
- Exceptions however say that under a certain set of circumstances the behaviour or action is an EXCEPTION to the action of discrimination. In effect they say that a person or body IS NOT discriminating and therefore IS NOT actually breaking the law. This provides far better protection

Proposed section 22M provides that a religious ethos organisation is taken not to discriminate if it engages in conduct that is required because of the religious susceptibilities of the adherents of the religion, or that is consistent with, or furthers or aids the organisation in acting in accordance with, the doctrines, tenets, beliefs or teachings of the religion (for example, giving preference to persons of the same religion as the religion of the organisation). Importantly, this is an exception, not an exemption. The provision says that when a religious institution acts in accordance with its beliefs, this is not discrimination, as technically described at law. This brings NSW into line with international practice. In part, General Comment 18 of the United Nations Human Rights Committee recognises that "not every differentiation of treatment will constitute discrimination, if the criteria for such differentiation are reasonable and objective and if the aim is to achieve a purpose which is legitimate" under the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights.

Provides right kind of protection for everyone

It is important that any good religious discrimination laws provide ROBUST protection to both INDIVIDUALS and INSTITUTIONS. Good laws need BOTH to be protected because:

- On the one hand, individuals grow and are strengthened by the institution and cannot flourish unless the institution is protected.
- On the other hand and institutions are made of individuals and cannot survive unless individuals are protected.

This bill actually does provide good protection for individuals and institutions

THE BILL IS GOOD IN PRACTICE

PROTECTIONS FOR INDIVIDUALS

Statements of belief by individuals are protected.

This applies to statements of belief made by someone both at work and on their own time, provided they do not directly criticise or harm the employer. This means that respectful dialogue is not threatened or shut down.

The bill specifically states that secondary boycotts or loss of sponsorship of the kind allegedly threatened by Qantas against rugby Australia DO NOT constitute this kind of harm. This will prevent a repetition of the Israel Folau situation.

22N Discrimination against applicants and employees

- (1) *It is unlawful for an employer to discriminate against a person on the ground of religious beliefs or religious activities—*
- (a) *in the arrangements the employer makes for the purpose of determining who should be offered employment, or*
 - (b) *in determining who should be offered employment, or*
 - (c) *in the terms on which the employer offers employment.*
- (2) *It is unlawful for an employer to discriminate against an employee on the ground of religious beliefs or religious activities—*
- (a) *in the terms or conditions of employment which the employer affords the employee, or*
 - (b) *by denying the employee access, or limiting the employee's access, to opportunities for promotion, transfer or training, or to any other benefits associated with employment, or*
 - (c) *by dismissing the employee or subjecting the employee to any other detriment.*
- (3) *Without limiting subsection (1) and (2), it is unlawful for an employer to—*
- (a) *restrict, limit, prohibit or otherwise prevent an employee from engaging in a protected activity, or*
 - (b) *punish or sanction an employee:*
 - (i) *for engaging in a protected activity, or*
 - (ii) *because an associate of the employee engaged in a protected activity.*
- (4) *In subsection (3), protected activity means—*
- (a) *a religious activity performed by the employee that:*
 - (i) *occurs at a time other than when the employee is performing work and at a place other than the employer's place of work, and*
 - (ii) *does not include any direct criticism of, or attack on, or does not cause any direct and material financial detriment to, the employer.*
 - (b) *a religious activity performed by an associate of the employee that does not include any direct criticism of, or attack on, or does not cause any direct and material financial detriment to, the employer.*
- (5) *For the avoidance of doubt, the following do not constitute direct and material financial detriment to an employer for the purposes of subsection 4(a) and 4(b)—*
- (a) *any boycott or secondary boycott of the employer by other persons because of the employee's protected activity, or the protected activity of their associate, or*
 - (b) *the withdrawal of sponsorship or other financial or corporate support for the employer because of the employee's protected activity, or the protected activity of their associate.*

The following examples are given in the explanatory notes.

Example 3: An employee is demoted for expressing her religious belief on social media that faith-based aged care providers should not be forced to participate in voluntary euthanasia. The expression of her view does not include any direct criticism of, or attack on, or does not cause any direct and material financial detriment to her employer. The employer has breached Section 22N(3). Section 22N(1) and (2) may also apply.

Example 4: An airline has created a new staff policy celebrating same-sex marriage, requiring its on-flight stewards to wear a commitment ring in support of the policy while also banning Christian crosses in staff jewelry, given the Christian commitment to male-female marriage. The requirement to wear a commitment ring breaches Section 22N(1)(c) and the ban on crosses breaches 22N(6) and possibly 22N(1)(c).

The bill also protects students making statements on their own time from being censured or punished by university or qualifying body. This prevents the Felix Ngole situation where a UK university student was refused to be allowed to finish his degree for articulating that the Bible did not support homosexual practise.

Education and Qualifying bodies

Example 3: On his Facebook page, a university social work student declares his support for traditional Christian views of marriage, between a man and a woman. This causes a controversy on campus but initially, university management stays out of it. The student declares publicly that while he is a committed Christian, as a future social worker he will readily look after people of all

religions, sexuality and married type. But this is not good enough for the national social worker accreditation body, which says the student will not be admitted to the profession when he graduates. The university buckles under this edict and suspends the student from his course. The accreditation body has breached Section 22S, while the university has breached both sections 22S and 22V.

22S Qualifying bodies

(1)

It is unlawful for an authority or a body which is empowered to confer, renew or extend an authorisation or a qualification that is needed for or facilitates the practice of a profession, the carrying on of a trade or the engaging in of an occupation (qualifying body) to discriminate against a person on the ground of religious beliefs or religious activities—

(a) by refusing or failing to confer, renew or extend the authorisation or qualification, or

(b) in the terms on which it is prepared to confer the authorisation or qualification or to renew or extend the authorisation or qualification, or

(c) by withdrawing the authorisation or qualification or varying the terms or conditions upon which it is held.

Without limiting subsection (1), it is unlawful for a qualifying body to –

(a) restrict, limit, prohibit or otherwise prevent a person from engaging in a protected activity, or

(b) punish or sanction a person:

(i) for engaging in a protected activity, or

(ii) because an associate of the person engaged in a protected activity.

In subsection (2), protected activity means:

(a) a religious activity performed by the person that:

(i) occurs at a time other than when the person is performing work and at a place other than the person's place of work, and

(ii) does not include any direct criticism of, or attack on, or does not cause any direct and material financial detriment to, the qualifying body or the person's employer.

(b) a religious activity performed by an associate of the person that does not include any direct criticism of, or attack on, or does not cause any direct and material financial detriment to, the qualifying body or the person's employer.

For the avoidance of doubt, the following do not constitute direct and material financial detriment to a qualifying body or the person's employer for the purposes of subsections 3(a) and 3(b)—

(a) any boycott or secondary boycott of the qualifying body or the person's employer by other persons because of the person's activity, or the activity of their associate, or

(b) the withdrawal of sponsorship or other financial or corporate support for the qualifying body or the person's employer because of the person's activity, or the activity of their associate.

Individuals rights to conscientious objection (CI 22L, EN p 5)

- There have been cases where individuals are required by their employer to be involved in activities that violate their religious beliefs but are not an integral part of their job or that could have been performed by someone who did not have such an objection.
- Workers who refuse such activities based on their conscience may face penalties or sanctions
- The Bill protects the right of an individual to object to activities at work that conflict with their religious views but that are not an essential part of the job, to object to such activities.

As for the remaining provisions of the Act, Section 22L must be interpreted in accordance with new Section 3, Principles of Act. In particular, the Siracusa Principles apply the requirement that limitations on religious manifestation must 'pursue a legitimate aim and be proportionate to that aim'. The following example assists in clarifying this intended operation.

Example: A Satanist requests that a publisher print materials that promote the teachings of Satanism. A Jewish employee of the publisher requests that she not be required to facilitate the order. Having fundamental regard to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Siracusa Principles on the Limitation and Derogation Provisions in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, it would not be necessary or proportionate, for the employer to require her involvement in the order where alternative employees who do not have a genuine

religious objection are available to facilitate the order. Similarly, it would not be necessary or proportionate for the employer to require her involvement in the order where alternative publishers are reasonably available to facilitate the order. In both of these cases, for the employer to require her involvement in the order would use 'more restrictive means than are required'. In addition, to require such conduct would not be compatible with the international instruments stated at section

The bill Protects rights of workers to wear religious dress provided it is in accordance with other workplace laws and reasonable codes of practice (CI 22N, EN p6)

- The issue of the right to wear religious symbols and religious dress at work is important for many people and needs clarification.
- Common sense would dictate that while a religious person has a right to their dress, if their job requires wearing of protective equipment that their religious dress would prevent them wearing and that this would expose them or other to serious injury, that they should either not do the job or not wear the religious dress.
- Most would see that this is a reasonable compromise that respects the rights of the individual and the safety of other.

This bill makes it unlawful for an employer to refuse an employee permission to wear religious symbols or clothing during work hours unless it affects workplace safety, communications and industry standards. Thus it allows a customer service officer who is interacting face to face with customers to wear a head covering but not a full face covering.

Effectively this Bill the bill provide a reasonable balance between the individuals right to wear religious symbols and religious dress on the one hand and the requirement of the individual to comply with industry standards and the requirements of the job on the other.

(6)

It is unlawful for an employer to discriminate against a person on the ground of religious beliefs or religious activities by refusing the employee permission to wear any religious symbol or any religious clothing during work hours, but only if—

(a) the symbol or item of clothing is of a kind recognised as necessary or desirable by persons with the same religious beliefs or who engage in the same religious activities as that of the employee, and

(b) wearing the symbol or item of clothing during working hours is reasonable having regard to the circumstances of the employment, including—

(i) the workplace safety, productivity, communications and customer service requirements of that employment, and

(ii) the industry standards of that employment.

For example

*A bank employs tellers who wear the Islamic hijab, consistent with its requirement that customers need to be able to see the faces of staff. An Islamic woman who wears a full- face covering applies for a vacant position as a bank teller. The bank interviews her for the position but then rejects her application, due to the customer service and communications problems the full-face covering would cause, including with reference to applicable industry standards and practices. No discrimination occurs, as per the provisions of 22N(6). This is a similar principle to the UK court ruling in *Azmi v Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council (2007) ICR 1154*, which found that the dismissal of a school's bilingual support worker was justified as the educator's face needed to be visible to pupils.*

The Bill protects the rights of individuals when seeking Accommodation.

The bill makes it illegal for anyone to refuse to rent premises to someone else ONLY on the basis of their religion.

Example 1: R refuses to rent a flat to C because C is a member of the Sikh religion and R doesn't like Sikh people.

Example 2: C's friend, B, is a Sikh and R doesn't like Sikh people, and refusal is made on that basis.

Example 3: R believes that Sikh people are unreliable tenants, so refusal is made. In each case, R discriminates against C.

PROTECTIONS FOR INSTITUTIONS

Conduct that is engaged in furtherance of religion protected by exceptions (CI 22M, EN p5-6)

As noted above, the bill explicitly states that that when a religious institution is engaged in conduct that is for the furtherance of that religion, then it is NOT DISCRIMINATING regardless of whether or not someone else objects that conduct or feels that they have been treated differently. The bill provides protection on the one hand but also places the burden of proof on the institution to show that they are a religious institution.

Let's look at an example.

- many parents object to same sex marriage and homosexuality on religious grounds and do not want their children taught about it.
- For this reason, they choose to send their children to religious schools and expect such schools to only employ teachers who will uphold the values of the religion while doing their job.
- As such, most reasonable people would agree that the school should have the right to refuse employment to a teacher who is openly homosexual or who is in a same sex marriage.
- This Bill would give the school protection from any claim of discrimination.
- The school however should have these principles on their website. If their religion only affirms male/female marriage, they should state this and state that children will be educated in accordance with this view.

Again, the bill strikes the right balance by putting the burden of proof on the institution to prove that they are a religious institution and that they are acting in accordance with their religious principles. The explanatory notes recommend that the institution place these principles in the public domain eg on website to ensure that members of the public are aware of these principles and that the institution operates according to these principles.

Under Section 22M, Religious Ethos Organisations (REO) are taken not to discriminate if they are operating in a manner consistent with the doctrines, tenets, beliefs, teachings or susceptibilities of their religious beliefs, or seeking to further the interests of their organisation in this manner. The onus is on the organisation to prove its REO status. The following example demonstrates how this might be done:

Example: A conference/accommodation centre owned and run by a major church group receives a booking request from an organisation seeking to hold a two-day seminar on pagan religious rituals. The request is refused because the REO considers that to allow this event on its property would be inconsistent with its beliefs. The seminar organisers lodge a discrimination complaint. The centre seeks to prove its REO status. If it has been operating its commercial conference/accommodation facilities without regard to religious principles (that is, like any other non-religious business), it will fail to provide the necessary proof. It will only succeed if it has been functioning according to clear, consistent religious tenets. That it has done this could be evidenced, for example, through the adoption of practices that are consistent with its beliefs, or a statement of its beliefs prominently displayed on its bookings webpage and in its staff and workplace practices manual.

Employing a person of a particular faith in a job that requires this faith is not discrimination (Sec 22U, EN p7)

- There are certain jobs eg Muslim clerics, Christian chaplains etc that require the applicants to be adherents of that faith.
- To allow someone who was not of this faith to claim that they were discriminated against if they were not employed in this role is not reasonable.

- To allow non-religious organisations to discriminate against people of a particular religion for roles that are not inherently religious would not be acceptable

Accordingly, the Bill also clarifies that:

- it is not discrimination to only employ people of a certain faith in a job where it is a genuine occupational requirement to be a person of particular faith.
- An non-religious organisation cannot exclude people of a particular faith for a role that is not inherently religious simply because of the whims of the leadership

8. *In the interests of providing clarity as to what comprises a 'genuine occupational qualification' at Section 22U, the following examples are provided:*

Example 1: A public hospital advertises for a Muslim chaplain and requires that the chaplain be a person who both holds and acts in conformity with the Islamic faith. The hospital has applied a genuine occupational requirement for the purposes of section 22U(a). This example clarifies that section 22U would apply to chaplains in religious hospitals or public schools. This clarifies that the exception at section 22U(a) applies to chaplaincy roles that are employed by non-religious employers (such as in hospitals, prisons or schools) or where being a religious adherent is an actual requirement of the role. Section 22U(d) may also apply.

Example 2: A sporting association requires that its employees refrain from making statements or acting in a way that it considers is inconsistent with its secular ethos. Applying this policy, the association suspends a competitor on the ground of the religious activity of the competitor. The sporting association has not imposed a genuine occupational qualification under Section 22U. There is nothing particular about the playing of this sport that requires religious or non-religious customs, rituals, artistic performances, cultural practices or welfare. Therefore the competitor has grounds for reinstatement to the sporting association.

religious institutions and their staff (cl22M, ENp3)

- Many religious institutions prefer to employ people of the same religion to ensure the organisation is able to function according to the teachings and practises of this religion.
- The rights of religious institutions to preference the employment of people of a certain faith/ religion is protected
- Again, the onus is on the organisation to prove that it is conducted based on tenets of and for the furtherance of religion.

22M Religious ethos organisations taken not to discriminate in certain circumstances

(1)

(2) (3)

For the purposes of this Part, a religious ethos organisation is taken not to discriminate against another person on the ground of the person's religious beliefs or religious activities by engaging in conduct if the organisation genuinely believes the conduct—

(a) is consistent with the doctrines, tenets, beliefs or teachings of the religion of the organisation, or

(b) is required because of the religious susceptibilities of the adherents of the religion of the organisation, or

(c) furthers or aids the organisation in acting in accordance with the doctrines, tenets, beliefs or teachings of the religion of the organisation.

Without limiting subsection (1), conduct referred to in that subsection includes giving preference to persons of the same religion as the religion of the religious ethos organisation.

Nothing in this section, or any provision of this Act that refers to a religious ethos organisation, affects the operation of section 56 (Religious bodies).

The Explanatory note states:

Proposed section 22M provides that a religious ethos organisation is taken not to discriminate if it engages in conduct that is required because of the religious susceptibilities of the adherents of the religion, or that is consistent with, or furthers or aids the organisation in acting in accordance with, the doctrines, tenets, beliefs or teachings of the religion (for example, giving preference to persons of the same religion as the religion of the organisation). Importantly, this is an exception, not an

exemption. The provision says that when a religious institution acts in accordance with its beliefs, this is not discrimination, as technically described at law. This brings NSW into line with international practice. In part, General Comment 18 of the United Nations Human Rights Committee recognises that “not every differentiation of treatment will constitute discrimination, if the criteria for such differentiation are reasonable and objective and if the aim is to achieve a purpose which is legitimate” under the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights.

Religious organisations cannot be discriminated against in provision of goods and services (Sec 22W, EN p7-8)

- Religious organisations cannot be refused service or access to goods and services purely based on their religion.
- A service provider cannot place conditions on a religious organisation that are based on the religion and that limit the organisation from fulfilling its practises and teachings.

Example 1: An unincorporated association of Hindus is refused to hire a public school hall or private meeting room because of the religious beliefs and activities of its members. The school has discriminated on the basis of the religious beliefs and activities of the association’s members.

Example 2: The hire of a public school hall or private meeting room is made to an incorporated association of Jews on the condition that the body does not teach its religious beliefs concerning marriage. The school has discriminated against the association on the basis of the religious beliefs and activities of the association’s members.

CONCLUSION

- Having carefully reviewed the ‘Anti discrimination Amendment (Religious Freedoms and Equality)’ proposed by the Hon Mark Latham MLC we at the ACA believe that the bill strikes the right balance between protecting the rights of people of faith on the one hand and not impinging on other human rights on the other.
- We believe that it provides the RIGHT kind of protection for BOTH individuals and institutions.
- We believe that the bill provides ROBUST protection for the right people.
- We are not looking for any special rights over and above the rights of others. We are simply looking for EQUAL RIGHT. The Bill corrects a fundament inequality of rights that must not be allowed to continue
- We believe the Bill should be passed by **both** Houses of Parliament ***without any significant amendment.***
- We will be closely observing the position of the various political parties on the bill and will be informing all of our supporters in all electorates with large ethnic populations. It is quite likely that these positions will play a part in how they vote in upcoming local council, state and federal elections.

Yours faithfully
Dr Con Kafataris
President and Founder
Australian Christian Alliance