Dear Senate Committee,

I'm not an Australian citizen (I'm permanent resident here) so I'm not sure how much say I have in Australian affairs, if any. Nonetheless, regarding the draft Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012 (http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate_Committees?url=legcon_ctte/anti_discrimination_2012/info.htm), let me just make a statement.

1. At one level, it is laudable to consolidate and streamline the various anti-discrimination legislations that presently exist.

2. All the same, when I read the proposal I am disgusted with what seems to be subtle attacks on religious freedoms. In particular the proposed legislation says that religious age care facilities cannot discriminate, particularly in the case of residents that are homosexual. Excuse me, but what about other residents of such a facility that share a belief that homosexuality is wrong? Why are they being ignored or dare I say, discriminated against? It's their home, isn't it?

3. Furthermore, if the religious exemption for aged-care facilities is being removed, shall we expect that the remaining religious freedoms can also be removed, particularly since religious freedoms are to be reviewed every three years? Enough. No attacks on any religious freedoms should be permitted. It is religious freedom that should be protected, not sexual orientation and gender identity. With that in mind, the religious exemptions should not just be exemptions at all, but full rights in themselves. Religion for many is not just a private thing. It is a full-fledged lifestyle that includes rules and regulations on how to live, how to conduct themselves, do business etc. This cannot be allowed to be attacked by anti-discrimination law. Central to religious freedom is the right not to be attacked on the basis of that religion.

4. Why isn't religious freedom being defended more? It's right there on Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: "Everyone has the **right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion**; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and **freedom**, either alone or in community with others and i**n public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance** (emphasis mine)". If anything it's the religious that are being deliberately targeted by homosexual activists, such as with the NSW Wesley Mission case and the CYC camp at Phillip Island. Indeed these two cases demonstrate that homosexual activists will use anti-discrimination laws to deliberately target and persecute religious people and organisations.

5. Why exactly is sexual orientation and gender identity being defended? Many say homosexual behaviour is morally wrong. Why then should the immoral be defended? And what happens if paedophilia and rapists is regarded as another form of sexual orientation? Will they be defended as well? Lest you think this is just scaremongering, be aware that some Canadian experts are saying that paedophilia is just another sexual orientation (http://www.medicaldaily.com/articles/11988/20120907/science-pedophilia-sexual-orientation.htm) and then there is a study by researchers Craig Palmer

and Randy Thornhill that claims rape is just another natural, biological phenomenon.

6. In short, it is religious freedom that should be defended to the utmost. Either amend the legislation to fully defend religious freedom, remove the inclusion of sexual orientation and gender identity as protected attributes or throw out the whole legislation altogether. Anti-discrimination law that restricts religious freedoms should be thrown out. Indeed, one may point out the irony that this anti-discrimination legislation, in its present form of removing the religious exemption from age-care facilities and maybe more to come, is generating discrimination and hatred against the religious.

Yours sincerely,