

The Senate

Legal and Constitutional Affairs
Legislation Committee

Sex Discrimination Amendment
(Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity
and Intersex Status) Bill 2013 [Provisions]

June 2013

© Commonwealth of Australia

ISBN: 978-1-74229-856-6

This document was produced by the Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee secretariat and printed by the Senate Printing Unit, Department of the Senate, Parliament House, Canberra.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Members

Senator Patricia Crossin, **Chair**, ALP, NT

Senator Gary Humphries, **Deputy Chair**, LP, ACT

Senator Sue Boyce, LP, QLD

Senator Mark Furner, ALP, QLD

Senator Louise Pratt, ALP, WA

Senator Penny Wright, AG, SA

Secretariat

Ms Julie Dennett	Committee Secretary
Mr CJ Sautelle	Senior Research Officer
Ms Elise Williamson	Administrative Officer

Suite S1.61	Telephone: (02) 6277 3560
Parliament House	Fax: (02) 6277 5794
CANBERRA ACT 2600	Email: legcon.sen@aph.gov.au

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE	iii
RECOMMENDATIONS	vii
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1
Purpose of the Bill	1
Background.....	2
Conduct of the inquiry	5
Acknowledgement	5
CHAPTER 2	7
KEY PROVISIONS OF THE BILL	7
Definitions of key terms	7
Definition of discrimination for the proposed new grounds	9
Areas of public life covered	10
Exemptions to discrimination prohibitions	10
Amendments to other Acts	13
Proposed government amendments	13
CHAPTER 3	15
KEY ISSUES	15
Support for the Bill	15
Key definitions in the Bill	15
Exemptions	17
Other issues.....	25
Committee view.....	29
MINORITY REPORT BY COALITION SENATORS	35
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY THE AUSTRALIAN GREENS	37
Religious exemptions	37
Exemption for data collection	38
APPENDIX 1	39
SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED	39

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

3.66 The committee recommends that the Bill be amended to provide that religious exemptions in section 37 of the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* do not apply in respect of sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status in connection with the provision of Commonwealth-funded aged care services.

Recommendation 2

3.72 The committee recommends that the *Fair Work Act 2009*, the *Fair Work (Registered Organisations) Act 2009* and the *Broadcasting Services Act 1992* be amended to replace references to 'sexual preference' with 'sexual orientation', and to include the new protected grounds of 'gender identity' and 'intersex status'.

Recommendation 3

3.73 The committee recommends that the Australian Human Rights Commission Regulations 1989 be amended to replace references to 'sexual preference' with 'sexual orientation', and to include the new protected grounds of 'gender identity' and 'intersex status'.

Recommendation 4

3.74 Subject to Recommendation 1, and after due consideration of Recommendations 2 and 3, the committee recommends that the Senate pass the Bill.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 On 21 March 2013, the Sex Discrimination Amendment (Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Intersex Status) Bill 2013 (Bill) was introduced into the House of Representatives by the Attorney-General, the Hon Mark Dreyfus QC MP (Attorney-General).¹ On the same day, the Senate referred the provisions of the Bill to the Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee (committee), for inquiry and report by 17 June 2013.² To assist the parliament's timely consideration of the Bill, the committee decided to present its report on 14 June 2013.

Purpose of the Bill

1.2 The Bill seeks to amend the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Cth) (SDA) in order to:

- extend protection from discrimination to the new grounds of sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status; and
- extend the existing ground of 'marital status' to 'marital or relationship status' to provide discrimination protection for same-sex de facto couples.³

1.3 The Explanatory Memorandum to the Bill (EM) states:

There is substantial evidence demonstrating that discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) people occurs in the community. This discrimination occurs in a range of areas of public life, including work, accommodation and the provision of goods and services. This range of conduct is highly detrimental to LGBTI people, manifesting in barriers to how they carry out their day-to-day lives.

The purpose of the Bill is to foster a more inclusive society by prohibiting unlawful discrimination against LGBTI people and promoting attitudinal change in Australia.⁴

1 *House of Representatives Votes and Proceedings*, No. 160—21 March 2013, p. 2198.

2 *Journals of the Senate*, No. 143—21 March 2013, p. 3866.

3 Explanatory Memorandum (EM), p. 2.

4 EM, p. 4.

Background

1.4 The Bill would add to the number of grounds already protected under the SDA, which currently provides protection for individuals against discrimination on the basis of: sex; marital status; pregnancy or potential pregnancy; breastfeeding; and family responsibilities.⁵

1.5 The introduction of the Bill comes in the context of a broader proposed reform project relating to Commonwealth anti-discrimination law and previous committee inquiries into anti-discrimination law, including the SDA.

Commitment to extend discrimination protection

1.6 Introducing protection against discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity implements a 2010 election commitment by the government.⁶ In bringing the Bill before the parliament, the Attorney-General stated:

Members of Australia's lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex communities continue to experience high levels of discrimination. However, there is currently little protection in federal law from discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.

That is why this government [has] committed to introduce sexual orientation and gender identity as protected grounds of discrimination at the federal level. This bill honours that long-standing Labor commitment.⁷

Proposed consolidation of Commonwealth anti-discrimination laws

1.7 The government has committed to consolidate the five Commonwealth Acts which deal with anti-discrimination matters⁸ into a single Act. The project to consolidate Commonwealth anti-discrimination legislation was announced in 2010 as part of the Australian Government's Human Rights Framework.⁹

5 *Sex Discrimination Act 1984*, sections 5-7A.

6 See: Attorney-General's Department, *Consolidation of Commonwealth Anti-Discrimination Laws: Discussion Paper*, September 2011, p. 21.

7 The Hon Mark Dreyfus QC MP, *House of Representatives Hansard*, 21 March 2013, p. 2893.

8 The existing Commonwealth Acts are: the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975*; the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984*; the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992*; the *Age Discrimination Act 2004*; and the *Australian Human Rights Commission Act 1986*.

9 Attorney-General's Department, *Australia's Human Rights Framework*, <http://www.ag.gov.au/RightsAndProtections/HumanRights/HumanRightsFramework/Pages/default.aspx> (accessed 26 March 2013).

Exposure Draft legislation and recent inquiry by this committee

1.8 Following a discussion paper and consultation process, the government released a draft consolidation bill on 20 November 2012: the Exposure Draft of the Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012 (Exposure Draft).¹⁰ One of the proposals contained in the Exposure Draft was the introduction of protection against discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity.

1.9 This committee conducted an inquiry into the Exposure Draft, and tabled its report in February 2013.¹¹ The report included 12 targeted recommendations regarding various aspects of the Bill, and also directed the Attorney-General's Department (Department) to consider additional issues raised by submitters during the formulation of the final legislation before its introduction into the parliament.¹²

1.10 Two of the committee's recommendations related to the proposed introduction of anti-discrimination protection on the basis of gender identity. The committee recommended, first, that the definition of 'gender identity' in the Exposure Draft be amended to read:

gender identity means the gender-related identity, appearance or mannerisms or other gender-related characteristics of an individual (whether by way of medical intervention or not), with or without regard to the individual's designated sex at birth, and includes transsexualism and transgenderism.¹³

1.11 The committee also recommended that 'intersex status' be included as a stand-alone protected attribute (rather than being encompassed within the concept of 'gender identity'), with the term 'intersex' being defined as follows:

intersex means the status of having physical, hormonal or genetic features that are:

- (a) neither wholly female nor wholly male; or
- (b) a combination of female and male; or

10 The Hon Nicola Roxon MP, Attorney-General, and Senator the Hon Penny Wong, Minister for Finance and Deregulation, 'Clearer, simpler, stronger anti-discrimination laws', Joint Media Release, 20 November 2012, <http://pandora.nla.gov.au/pan/132822/20130204-0704/www.attorneygeneral.gov.au/Media-releases/Pages/2012/Fourth%20Quarter/20November2012-Clearersimplerstrongerantidiscriminationlaws.html> (accessed 25 March 2013).

11 Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee, *Exposure Draft of the Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012*, 21 February 2013.

12 Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee, *Exposure Draft of the Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012*, 21 February 2013, pp ix-x and 99.

13 Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee, *Exposure Draft of the Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012*, 21 February 2013, p. 85.

(c) neither female nor male.¹⁴

Announcement to delay the consolidation project and introduce the Bill

1.12 On 20 March 2013, the Attorney-General announced that the introduction of the final version of the consolidation bill had been delayed to allow for further consideration to be given to the final drafting of the legislation.¹⁵ The Attorney-General subsequently stated:

[The consolidation] is a worthy but complex project, and it is important that we get it right. That means taking the time to carefully consider the many recommendations put forward by the committee and submitters to the inquiry, developing a comprehensive government response, drafting a final bill and fully debating it in this place.¹⁶

1.13 The Attorney-General explained further that, while the broader consolidation project was being put on hold, the government had decided to proceed in initiating protection against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity, through the introduction of separate and specific legislation:

[Such a] reform is long overdue and too important to be delayed any further. The Government will proceed immediately with the new protection while detailed work continues on consolidating Australia's anti-discrimination laws.¹⁷

2008 committee inquiry into the Sex Discrimination Act 1984

1.14 In 2008, the Senate Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs conducted an inquiry into the effectiveness of the SDA in eliminating discrimination and promoting gender equality. The committee's final report, released in December 2008, made 43 recommendations, including over 25 recommendations advocating amendments to the SDA.¹⁸

14 Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee, *Exposure Draft of the Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012*, 21 February 2013, p. 86.

15 The Hon Mark Dreyfus QC MP, Attorney-General, and Senator the Hon Penny Wong, Minister for Finance and Deregulation, 'New anti-discrimination laws to cover sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status', Media Release, 20 March 2013, <http://www.attorneygeneral.gov.au/Mediareleases/Pages/2013/First%20quarter/20March2013-Newantidiscriminationlawstocoversexualorientationgenderidentityandintersexstatus.aspx> (accessed 26 March 2013).

16 The Hon Mark Dreyfus QC MP, *House of Representatives Hansard*, 21 March 2013, p. 2893.

17 The Hon Mark Dreyfus QC MP, Attorney-General, and Senator the Hon Penny Wong, Minister for Finance and Deregulation, 'New anti-discrimination laws to cover sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status', Media Release, 20 March 2013.

18 Senate Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, *Effectiveness of the Sex Discrimination Act 1984 in eliminating discrimination and promoting gender equality*, December 2008, pp xiii-xviii.

1.15 The government subsequently introduced legislation to implement eight recommendations concerned directly with sex discrimination.¹⁹ The remaining recommendations were noted by the government, with the government response stating that '[t]hose recommendations with wider implications for federal anti-discrimination laws will be considered by the Government in light of its broader commitment to streamline and harmonise Commonwealth anti-discrimination legislation'.²⁰

Conduct of the inquiry

1.16 The committee advertised its inquiry in *The Australian* on 27 March 2013. Details of the inquiry, including links to the Bill and associated documents, were placed on the committee's website at www.aph.gov.au/senate_legalcon. The committee also wrote to 83 organisations and individuals, inviting submissions by 26 April 2013. Submissions continued to be accepted after that date.

1.17 The committee received 128 submissions to the inquiry. For administrative purposes, 38 of these submissions were categorised as 'form letters' (or variations of form letters).²¹ All of the 'form letter' submissions expressed opposition to the Bill.

1.18 The committee published examples of each type of form letter on the committee's website, along with all other public submissions received from organisations and individuals. The submissions published on the committee's website are listed at Appendix 1 to this report.

1.19 The committee did not hold any public hearings for this inquiry due to its detailed examination and consideration of broad-ranging anti-discrimination policy matters during the recent inquiry into the Exposure Draft of the Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012.

Acknowledgement

1.20 The committee thanks those organisations and individuals who made submissions.

19 Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee, *Sex and Age Discrimination Legislation Amendment Bill 2010*, March 2011, p. 1.

20 Government Response, Senate Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, *Effectiveness of the Sex Discrimination Act 1984 in eliminating discrimination and promoting gender equality*, May 2010, p. 1.

21 A submission was categorised as a form letter where it contained a specific, or easily identifiable, template of words. A submission was included as a variation to a particular form letter where the template of words was modified but could still be identified as having derived from a form letter, or where the template was supplemented with additional material.

CHAPTER 2

KEY PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

2.1 The Bill contains one Schedule, consisting of three Parts. Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Bill deals with amendments to the SDA.

Definitions of key terms

2.2 Items 4, 6, 7, 9, 12 and 13 of Schedule 1 would insert new definitions in subsection 4(1) of the SDA, including definitions of the new protected grounds introduced in the Bill.

Gender identity

2.3 Item 6 of Schedule 1 provides for a definition of 'gender identity' for the purposes of the SDA, as follows:

gender identity means the gender-related identity, appearance or mannerisms or other gender-related characteristics of a person (whether by way of medical intervention or not), with or without regard to the person's designated sex at birth.

2.4 The EM notes that the definition adopted in the Bill is based on the definition use in the Tasmanian Anti-Discrimination Amendment Bill 2012:

This definition provides maximum protection for gender diverse people. It includes the way a person expresses or presents their gender and recognises that a person may not identify as either male or female. This acknowledges that it is often the discord between a person's gender presentation and their identity which is the cause of the discrimination.¹

Intersex status

2.5 Item 7 of Schedule 1 provides for a definition of 'intersex status':

intersex status means the status of having physical, hormonal or genetic features that are:

- (i) neither wholly female nor wholly male; or
- (ii) a combination of female and male; or
- (iii) neither female nor male.

2.6 This definition is also based on the definition used in the Tasmanian Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012.² According to the EM:

The definition recognises that being intersex is a biological condition, not a gender identity. It does not require a person who is intersex to identify as either male or female in order to access protections under the SDA. The

1 EM, p. 12.

2 EM, p. 12.

definition is not intended to create a third sex in any sense. It does, however, recognise that sex is not a binary concept and that an intersex person may have the biological attributes of both sexes, or lack some of the biological attributes considered necessary to be defined as one or other sex.³

Marital or relationship status

2.7 Items 9-10 of Schedule 1 would repeal the current definition of 'marital status' and replace it with a new definition of 'marital or relationship status'. This definition incorporates the previous components of the definition of 'marital status'; and includes new additional paragraphs covering de facto partners, to include both same-sex and opposite-sex de facto couples.⁴

Sexual orientation

2.8 Item 12 of Schedule 1 provides for a definition of the term 'sexual orientation' as follows:

sexual orientation means a person's sexual orientation towards:

- (a) persons of the same sex; or
- (b) persons of a different sex; or
- (c) persons of the same sex and persons of a different sex.

2.9 The EM states:

The definition does not use labels, such as homosexuality, lesbianism, bisexuality or heterosexuality, which some people find offensive and can be inaccurate. However, it is intended that the definition covers each of these sexual orientations. The definition, along with other provisions in the Bill, uses the terminology 'different sex', instead of 'opposite sex' as is currently used in the SDA. This is consistent with the protection of gender identity and intersex status, which recognises that a person may be, or identify as, neither male nor female.⁵

2.10 The EM also notes that, while the Bill introduces discrimination protection on the basis of 'sexual orientation' for the first time in Commonwealth law, 'sexual orientation' is already protected in all other Australian state and territory anti-discrimination legislation.⁶

3 EM, p. 12.

4 EM, p. 13.

5 EM, p. 14.

6 EM, p. 13.

Definition of discrimination for the proposed new grounds

2.11 Rather than provide a unified definition of discriminatory behaviour, the SDA sets out separate provisions detailing what constitutes discrimination for each of the protected grounds. There are also separate provisions prohibiting sexual harassment.⁷

2.12 Item 17 of Schedule 1 would insert three new tests for discrimination into the SDA, for the new protected grounds of 'sexual orientation' (proposed new section 5A), 'gender identity' (proposed new section 5B) and 'intersex status' (proposed new section 5C) respectively. Each of these proposed new sections is framed in identical terms, modelled on existing section 6 of the SDA (which provides the definition of discrimination on the ground of marital status).⁸

2.13 Each of these proposed new sections contains tests both for 'direct' and 'indirect' discrimination. The provisions relating to direct discrimination provide that a person (the discriminator) discriminates against another person (the aggrieved person) if, on the basis of the aggrieved person's protected characteristic, they treat that person less favourably than they would treat someone without that protected ground in the same circumstances.⁹ The EM gives possible examples of this kind of discrimination, including that it would likely constitute discrimination if:

- a hotel refused accommodation to a person on the basis of their sexual orientation;
- an employer refused to employ a transgender man on the basis of his gender identity; or
- a bank teller refused to serve an intersex person because the person's biological characteristics made the bank teller uncomfortable.¹⁰

2.14 The proposed new tests for 'indirect' discrimination provide that the discriminator commits unlawful discrimination against an aggrieved person if the discriminator imposes a condition, requirement or practice that has, or is likely to have, the effect of disadvantaging persons with the particular protected characteristic.¹¹

7 *Sex Discrimination Act 1984*, sections 28A-28L.

8 EM, pp 14, 15 and 16.

9 These are: proposed new subsection 5A(1) in relation to sexual orientation; proposed new subsection 5B(1) in relation to gender identity; and proposed new subsection 5C(1) in relation to intersex status. This construction is used throughout the Sex Discrimination Act, and is known as the 'comparator test' because it involves comparing the treatment of the aggrieved person with that of others who lack their protected attribute. See: Attorney-General's Department, *Consolidation of Commonwealth Anti-Discrimination Laws: Discussion Paper*, September 2011, p. 10.

10 EM, pp 14, 15 and 16.

11 See: proposed new subsection 5A(2) in relation to sexual orientation; proposed new subsection 5B(2) in relation to gender identity; and proposed new subsection 5C(2) in relation to intersex status.

Areas of public life covered

2.15 The SDA prohibits discrimination and sexual harassment in specified areas of public life.¹² The Bill proposes to make discrimination on the grounds of 'sexual orientation', 'gender identity', 'intersex status' and 'marital or relationship status' unlawful in each of the areas of public life currently covered under the SDA in relation to the existing protected grounds.

2.16 Items 27 and 29-34 of Schedule 1 seek to amend sections 14-20 of the SDA in order to make discrimination on the new protected grounds unlawful in work-related areas.¹³ Discrimination on the basis of the new protected grounds would also be made unlawful in the areas of: education;¹⁴ the provision of goods, services and facilities;¹⁵ accommodation;¹⁶ land;¹⁷ clubs;¹⁸ and the administration of Commonwealth laws and programs.¹⁹

Exemptions to discrimination prohibitions

2.17 The SDA contains several exemptions from discrimination prohibitions. The Bill would extend several of these exemptions to cover some or all of the new protected grounds included in the Bill. The Bill also seeks to introduce two new exemptions in relation to the interaction between the SDA and other Commonwealth, and state and territory laws.

Religious organisations

2.18 Sections 37-38 of the SDA deal with exemptions for religious organisations.

2.19 Section 37 provides that certain activities conducted by religious bodies do not constitute unlawful discrimination for the purposes of the SDA. These activities include: the ordination or appointment of ministers; the selection or appointment of persons to perform religious duties or functions; and any other act or practice of a religious body that 'conforms to the doctrines, tenets or beliefs of that religion or is necessary to avoid injury to the religious susceptibilities of adherents of that religion'.²⁰

12 *Sex Discrimination Act 1984*, sections 14-26 and 28B-28L.

13 These areas include: employment and superannuation; commission agents; contract workers; partnerships; qualifying bodies; registered organisations under the *Fair Work Act 2009*; and employment agencies.

14 Item 35 of Schedule 1 (proposed new subsections 21(1)-(2)).

15 Item 37 of Schedule 1 (proposed new subsection 22(1)).

16 Items 38-39 of Schedule 1 (proposed new subsections 23(1)-(2) and proposed new paragraph 23(3)(c)).

17 Item 40 of Schedule 1 (proposed new subsection 24(1)).

18 Item 41 of Schedule 1 (proposed new subsections 25(1)-(2)).

19 Item 43 of Schedule 1 (proposed new subsection 26(1)).

20 SDA, paragraph 37(d).

2.20 The exemption in section 37 currently applies to all grounds protected under the SDA, and will encompass the new grounds introduced by the Bill.²¹

2.21 Section 38 of the SDA contains an exemption for religious educational institutions, which provides that it is not unlawful for such institutions to discriminate in matters of employment (subsections 38(1)-(2)), or the provision of education and training (subsection 38(3)), if the discrimination is undertaken 'in good faith in order to avoid injury to the religious susceptibilities of adherents of that religion or creed'.

2.22 The exemption in section 38 currently applies to the protected grounds of sex, marital status or pregnancy in relation to employment, and sex or marital status in relation to the provision of education or training. Under item 50 of Schedule 1 of the Bill (proposed new subsections 38(1)-(3)), the current exemption in section 38 will also apply to the new grounds of 'sexual orientation', 'gender identity' and 'marital or relationship status'. It will not apply to the new attribute of 'intersex status'. The EM notes:

During consultation, religious bodies raised doctrinal concerns about the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity. However, no such concerns were raised in relation to 'intersex status'. As a physical characteristic, intersex status is seen as conceptually different. No religious organisation identified how intersex status could cause injury to the religious susceptibilities of its adherents.²²

Voluntary bodies

2.23 Item 51 of Schedule 1 (proposed new section 39) extends the current exemption in relation to voluntary bodies to the new protected grounds introduced by the Bill. Section 39 of the SDA exempts voluntary bodies from discrimination prohibitions in relation to admission into membership and the provision of benefits, facilities or services to members of such bodies.

Acts done under statutory authority

2.24 Section 40 of the SDA provides for exemptions for acts done in accordance with specified statutory authority, Commonwealth Acts and other statutory schemes. Item 52 of Schedule 1 (proposed new subsections 40(2A) and 40(2B)) would introduce two new exemptions into this section of the SDA.

2.25 The first new exemption (proposed new subsection 40(2A)) provides that prohibitions against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status do not apply to anything done by a person in direct compliance with the *Marriage Act 1961* (Cth). The EM states:

The purpose of this provision is to make clear that introducing protections against discrimination on these grounds does not affect current Government policy on same-sex marriage. It will apply to persons such as

21 EM, p. 8.

22 EM, p. 9.

Commonwealth-registered marriage celebrants, as well as statutory bodies such as the registers of births, deaths and marriages.²³

2.26 The second new exemption (proposed new subsection 40(2B)) provides that prohibitions against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status do not apply to any acts done by a person in direct compliance with a Commonwealth, or state or territory law prescribed by regulations. According to the EM, this provision reflects an existing exemption in the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* (Cth), and 'recognises that there may be laws which appropriately make distinctions on [the grounds of sexual orientation, gender identity or intersex status]'.²⁴ Further, the EM states that initial consideration of laws which may be prescribed under this exemption will occur prior to the commencement of the Bill, in consultation with state and territory governments.²⁵

Competitive sport

2.27 Section 42 of the SDA provides that it is not unlawful discrimination to exclude persons of one sex from participation in any competitive sporting activity in which the strength, stamina or physique of the competitors is relevant. Item 59 of Schedule 1 (proposed new subsection 42(1)) would extend this exemption to the protected grounds of gender identity and intersex status. The EM states:

It is legitimate to recognise that biological differences between men and women are relevant to competitive sporting activities. Limiting this exemption to situations in which strength, stamina or physique are relevant is a proportionate means of achieving this objective...

This amendment is necessary to preserve existing policy in relation to this exemption, restricting competitive sporting events to people who can effectively compete.²⁶

Exemption relating to data collection

2.28 Item 60 of Schedule 1 introduces a new exemption relating to requests for information. This exemption provides that it is lawful to request information, or keep records, that do not allow for identification of individuals as being neither male nor female (that is, allowing individuals only to be identified as 'male' or 'female'). The EM states:

The intention of these exemptions is to ensure that the new protections for gender identity and intersex status do not require a person or organisation to provide an alternative to male and female in any data collection or personal record. It will ensure that there is no requirement to amend forms as part of the new protections for gender identity and intersex status, which may be an onerous exercise for organisations.

23 EM, p. 21.

24 EM, p. 21.

25 EM, p. 21.

26 EM, pp 6 and 22.

The need for these exemptions may be reconsidered in the future, if organisations (both government and private sector) have revised their data collection and record keeping practices to allow for a person to identify as neither male nor female.²⁷

Amendments to other Acts

2.29 Part 2 of Schedule 1 of the Bill provides for two minor amendments to the *Migration Act 1958* (Cth) (Migration Act), in order to update references to 'marital status' in section 507 of the Migration Act to 'marital or relationship status', consistent with the re-naming of this ground in the Bill.²⁸

Proposed government amendments

2.30 On 30 May 2013 the Attorney-General, the Hon Mark Dreyfus QC MP, announced that the government had circulated proposed amendments to the Bill, to be introduced in the Senate.²⁹ The proposed amendments would provide for a limitation on religious exemptions in the SDA in relation to Commonwealth-funded aged care provisions, and would also update terminology in several other Commonwealth Acts to bring them into line with the language used in the Bill.

Limitation on religious exemptions for Commonwealth-funded aged care services

2.31 The proposed amendments would insert new items 3A and 39A into Schedule 1 of the Bill, in order to introduce a limitation on the exemption in section 37 of the SDA in respect of religious organisations providing Commonwealth-funded aged care services.³⁰ This means that faith-based aged care providers would not be able to discriminate on any grounds protected by the SDA in the provision of aged care services, except in matters relating to employment by those organisations. In relation to these proposed amendments, the Minister for Ageing, the Hon Mark Butler MP, stated:

While most aged care service providers are accepting of residents regardless of sexual orientation, gender identity or intersex status, we think there should be legal protection that ensures such discrimination cannot occur...When such services are provided with tax payer dollars, it is not appropriate for providers to discriminate in the provision of those services.³¹

27 EM, p. 22.

28 EM, p. 22.

29 *House of Representatives Hansard*, 30 May 2013, pp 85-86.

30 Sex Discrimination Amendment (Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Intersex Status) Bill 2013, Proposed Government Amendments [Sheet AG264], 23 May 2013, pp 1-2, http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Bills_Legislation/Bills_Search_Results/Result?bId=r5026 (accessed 31 May 2013).

31 The Hon Mark Dreyfus QC MP and The Hon Mark Butler MP, 'New protections for sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex people pass the house', Media Release, 30 May 2013.

2.32 This measure was previously included in the Exposure Draft of the Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012.³²

Updating terminology in other Commonwealth legislation

2.33 The proposed government amendments also seek to insert new items into Part 2 of Schedule 1 of the Bill, in order to replace references to 'sexual preference' in the *Broadcasting Services Act 1992*, the *Fair Work Act 2009*, and the *Fair Work (Registered Organisations) Act 2009* with the term 'sexual orientation'.³³ This would make the terminology relating to sexual orientation consistent across the SDA and these other Commonwealth Acts; it would not, however, include 'gender identity' or 'intersex status' in those other Acts.

32 Exposure Draft Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012, subclause 33(3).

33 Sex Discrimination Amendment (Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Intersex Status) Bill 2013, Proposed Government Amendments [Sheet AG264], 23 May 2013, pp 2-3, http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Bills_Legislation/Bills_Search_Results/Result?bId=r5026 (accessed 31 May 2013)

CHAPTER 3

KEY ISSUES

3.1 Submitters to the inquiry raised various issues in relation to the scope and proposed operation of the discrimination protections included in the Bill. In particular, the exemptions from discrimination protection maintained or introduced by the Bill received much attention.

Support for the Bill

3.2 Many submitters expressed support for the Bill and its objective of introducing anti-discrimination protections for the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) community in Australia.¹ The Victorian Gay and Lesbian Rights Lobby stated that the Bill 'represents a significant advance for the LGBTI community and brings Australia closer to fulfilling its international human rights obligations in relation to the human rights of LGBTI people'.² The National Association of Community Legal Centres commended the Bill as 'an imperative preliminary measure to address the significant gap in protection for [LGBTI] people from discrimination'.³

Key definitions in the Bill

3.3 Submitters offered strong support for the formulation of the key definitions of 'sexual orientation', 'gender identity' and 'intersex status' used in the Bill.⁴ The Australian Human Rights Commission (AHRC) noted that these definitions 'are best practice in Australia and are consistent with the most recently considered proposed discrimination legislation'.⁵

1 See, for example: Law Council of Australia, *Submission 17*, p. 4; Australian Human Rights Commission (AHRC), *Submission 9*, p. 3; Organisation Intersex International Australia, *Submission 8*, p. 3; NSW Gay and Lesbian Rights Lobby, *Submission 29*, p. 2; Equality Rights Alliance, *Submission 21*, p. 1; Australian Council of Trade Unions, *Submission 28*, p. 2; Anti-Discrimination Board of NSW, *Submission 81*, p. 1.

2 *Submission 83*, p. 10.

3 *Submission 82*, p. 3.

4 See, for example: Dr Tiffany Jones, *Submission 1*, p. 8; ACT Human Rights Commission, *Submission 10*, p. 2; Castan Centre for Human Rights Law, *Submission 12*, p. 6; ACON, *Submission 18*, p. 1; Public Interest Law Clearing House (PILCH), *Submission 25*, p. 2; Public Interest Advocacy Centre (PIAC), *Submission 50*, p. 10; Transgender Victoria, *Submission 27*, p. 1; National LGBTI Health Alliance, *Submission 76*, p. 1.

5 *Submission 9*, p. 5.

3.4 In relation to the definition of 'gender identity', the NSW Gay and Lesbian Rights Lobby stated that this definition will ensure that the 'full spectrum' of peoples' gender identities can be respected.⁶

3.5 Regarding the definition of 'intersex status', Organisation Intersex International Australia (OII Australia) commented:

[T]he Bill will introduce a new ground of discrimination on the basis of intersex status, recognising that intersex is a biological characteristic. We agree that this is the correct approach to recognising intersex. The approach positions intersex as distinct from gender identity, as intersex is an innate biological phenomenon. It also positions intersex as distinct from sex, as intersex is not an arbitrary third sex.⁷

Definition of unlawful discrimination for the proposed new grounds

3.6 Some submitters provided commentary on the way discrimination is defined for the proposed new grounds in the Bill. Submitters put forward a variety of suggested changes in relation to the way unlawful discrimination is defined, including suggestions to:

- remove the 'comparator test' in the definitions of direct discrimination for the new protected grounds in the Bill;⁸
- include discrimination protection for someone who associates with a person covered by a protected ground;⁹
- include discrimination protection for people who previously possessed a protected attribute or are incorrectly assumed to possess a protected attribute;¹⁰ and
- extend the application of protection on the basis of 'family responsibilities' to indirect discrimination, and broaden the definition of this term to include caring responsibilities.¹¹

6 *Submission 29*, p. 5.

7 *Submission 8*, p. 3.

8 See, for example: Equal Rights Trust, *Submission 7*, p. 6; ACT Human Rights Commission, *Submission 10*, p. 5; Anti-Discrimination Commissioner of Tasmania, *Submission 49*, pp 7-8.

9 See, for example: Equal Rights Trust, *Submission 7*, pp 6-7; Victorian Gay and Lesbian Rights Lobby, *Submission 83*, pp 16-17.

10 Human Rights Law Centre, *Submission 70*, p. 15.

11 See, for example: Australian Human Rights Commission, *Submission 9*, p. 10; Australian Council of Trade Unions, *Submission 28*, p. 3, NSW Gay and Lesbian Rights Lobby, *Submission 29*, p. 9.

3.7 The Explanatory Memorandum to the Bill notes that the definitions contained in the Bill are modelled on existing section 6 of the SDA.¹² In relation to the 'comparator test', the Department explained further:

The purpose of this Bill is to fulfil the Government's election commitment to introduce protections on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status. It is not a general reform of the SDA or anti-discrimination law more broadly.

Accordingly, this Bill does not include any broader policy changes beyond introducing the new grounds of protection...Broader reforms to discrimination law, including changes to the 'comparator test', are more appropriately implemented through the [consolidated Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination] Bill, to ensure they apply to the entirety of Commonwealth anti-discrimination law.¹³

3.8 The Department gave similar explanations in relation to the introduction of protection against 'associate discrimination', and the possibility of broadening coverage of protection on the basis of family responsibilities.¹⁴

Exemptions

3.9 Submitters commented extensively on how various exemptions in the SDA would apply to the new protected grounds of sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status included in the Bill. Submitters also discussed the two new exemptions to be introduced into the SDA by the Bill.

Exemptions for religious organisations

3.10 Submitters to the inquiry put forward a range of views regarding the proposed amendments to the current religious exemptions in the SDA. Some submitters argued that the current exemptions for religious organisations in the SDA should not apply at all in relation to the new protected grounds to be introduced by the Bill, or should be significantly narrowed in respect of the new protected grounds.¹⁵

12 EM, pp 14, 15 and 16.

13 Responses to questions on notice provided by the Attorney-General's Department on 21 May 2013, p. 2.

14 Responses to questions on notice provided by the Attorney-General's Department on 21 May 2013, pp 2 and 3.

15 See, for example: Professor Margaret Thornton, *Submission 6*, pp 1-2; Equal Rights Trust, *Submission 7*, p. 8; ACT Human Rights Commission, *Submission 10*, p. 3; Castan Centre for Human Rights Law, *Submission 12*, pp 7-8; Rainbow Families Council, *Submission 14*, pp 5-6; ACON, *Submission 18*, pp 1-2; Kingsford Legal Centre, *Submission 19*, [p. 6]; The AIDS Council of South Australia, *Submission 23*, pp 9 and 11; PILCH, *Submission 25*, pp 3-4; National Association of Community Legal Centres, *Submission 82*, p. 8; Human Rights Law Centre, *Submission 70*, pp 19-21; Job Watch, *Submission 34*, pp 7-8.

3.11 For example, the Castan Centre for Human Rights Law argued:

[T]he Government is directly supporting practices which it admits would be discriminatory but for exceptions, such as that in [section] 38 of the SDA. This goes beyond 'striking a balance' between the right to freedom of religion and freedom from discrimination. It is unacceptable in a secular society governed on the basis of respect for human rights.¹⁶

3.12 These submitters proposed several possible amendments designed to narrow the religious exemptions in sections 37-38 of the SDA, or increase transparency in the operation of those exemptions.¹⁷

3.13 Other submitters expressed support for the retention of exemptions for religious organisations, or proposed changes to further strengthen religious exemptions in the SDA.¹⁸

Treatment of intersex status in the religious exemptions

3.14 As noted in Chapter 1, the general exemption for religious organisations in section 37 of the SDA will apply to each of the new protected grounds to be introduced by the Bill, while the exemptions for religious educational institutions in section 38 of the SDA will apply to the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity, but not intersex status.

3.15 Several submitters expressed support for the exclusion of 'intersex status' from the exemptions for religious educational institutions in section 38 of the SDA.¹⁹ Some argued, however, that the broader religious exemption in paragraph 37(d) should also not apply to 'intersex status'. For example, the AHRC observed:

The omission of intersex status from the exemption in [section] 38 is welcomed and contributes towards a better balancing of the rights of non-discrimination and freedom of religion.

However, the application of [paragraph] 37(d) to intersex status is contrary to this. [Paragraph] 37(d) provides a broad exemption for religious bodies

16 *Submission 12*, p. 8.

17 These proposed changes included: limiting the exemptions for organisations delivering services to the public; adopting more limited religious exemptions in line with those found in some state anti-discrimination laws; and introducing a requirement for religious organisations to provide public notification of their intention to utilise religious exemptions. See, for example: Ms Anne Hewitt and Dr Laura Grenfell, Adelaide Law School, *Submission 4*, p. 4; ACON, *Submission 18*, pp 1-2; National LGBTI Health Alliance, *Submission 76*, p. 2.

18 These proposed changes included introducing a broader protection for individuals undertaking activities in accordance with their religious beliefs or principles. See, for example: Freedom 4 Faith, *Submission 16*, pp 3-5; Australian Christian Lobby, *Submission 26*, pp 2 and 3-5; Catholic Women's League Australia, *Submission 15*, [pp 3-4].

19 See, for example: Law Council of Australia, *Submission 17*, pp 29-30; Organisation Intersex International Australia, *Submission 8*, pp 9-10.

and arguably encompasses any act referred to in [section] 38. If intersex is not excluded from the operation of [paragraph] 37(d) then the policy intent of the Government will potentially be undermined.²⁰

3.16 The Department responded to this argument, as follows:

The general exception in paragraph 37(d) only applies to conduct which 'conforms to the doctrines, tenets or beliefs of that religion or is necessary to avoid injury to the religious susceptibilities of adherents of that religion'. It is, by its terms, limited in application to attributes to which there are doctrinal reasons or religious susceptibilities justifying the conduct... [T]he Government has not been informed of any religious doctrines which require discrimination on the ground of intersex status, which would have the effect that the exemption, in practical terms, would not excuse otherwise discriminatory conduct.²¹

Exemptions for religious aged care providers

3.17 As noted in Chapter 1, recently announced proposed government amendments to the Bill would introduce a limitation on the religious exemption in section 37 of the SDA in respect of the provision of Commonwealth-funded aged care services, a measure that was previously included in the Exposure Draft of the Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012 (Exposure Draft).

3.18 Prior to the announcement of the proposed government amendments, some submitters argued for the inclusion of this limitation in the Bill, in order to provide protection for LGBTI individuals receiving aged care services.²² For example, COTA Australia contended:

Older LGBTI people have suffered a lifetime of social and legal discrimination. Many LGBTI people of senior age have lived for most of their life with homosexuality being illegal, with social norms ostracizing LGBTI people, and with physical and verbal abuse much more common occurrences compared with today. It is therefore appropriate that the Government introduces these protections with a careful consideration of the proposed impact on older cohorts of LGBTI Australians...COTA's very strong preference is that the legislation does not allow religious organisations to be able to claim justification for discrimination against people because of sexual orientation, gender identity or intersex status.²³

20 *Submission 9*, p. 7.

21 *Submission 75*, p. 3.

22 See, for example: Professor Margaret Thornton, *Submission 6*, p. 2; AHRC, *Submission 9*, pp 5-6; ACT Human Rights Commission, *Submission 10*, p. 3; PIAC, *Submission 50*, pp 21-22; Law Council of Australia, *Submission 17*, pp 40-41; Northern Territory Anti-Discrimination Commission, *Submission 20*, pp 1-2; Combined Pensioners and Superannuants Association of NSW, *Submission 52*, pp 3-4.

23 *Submission 71*, pp 1-2.

3.19 Some submitters also noted public statements from several major faith-based aged care providers, clarifying that those organisations do not currently discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity or intersex status in the provision of aged care services.²⁴

3.20 Conversely, several religious groups that submitted to the inquiry argued that aged care providers should be able to offer services in accordance with their religious values, and that the exemptions for religious aged care providers should be maintained.²⁵

Exemption for competitive sport

3.21 A number of submitters raised concerns about the extension of the current exemption in the SDA relating to competitive sport to the new protected grounds of gender identity and intersex status provided for in the Bill. This exemption would make it lawful to exclude intersex or transgender people from competitive sporting activities where the strength, stamina or physique of competitors is relevant.

3.22 The Anti-Discrimination Board of NSW argued that intersex people should not be included in this exemption:

[T]he effect of the exemption is too broad, and applies indiscriminately to all intersex people, whether or not their particular intersex variation is capable of affecting sporting performance...[T]here are many different variations in intersex, which may include physical, chromosomal and/or hormonal differences. Clearly, some of these, such as unusually high levels of testosterone or muscle mass, may affect sporting performance. Other attributes, such as physical variations in reproductive organs, may have no such effect. Yet the proposed exemption would allow the exclusion of any individual known to be intersex from competitive sport.²⁶

3.23 Transgender Victoria also contended that the exemption is too broad in its application, arguing that transgender individuals may not necessarily carry a competitive advantage in sporting competitions. Transgender Victoria suggested that the exemption should allow for assessment of athletes on a case-by-case basis.²⁷

24 See, for example: COTA Australia, *Submission 71*, p. 2; Liberty Victoria, *Submission 32*, pp 3-4; National LGBTI Health Alliance, *Submission 76*, pp 3-4.

25 See, for example: Freedom 4 Faith, *Submission 16*, pp 2-3; Australian Christian Lobby, *Submission 26*, p. 3; Catholic Women's League Australia, *Submission 15*, [p. 4].

26 *Submission 81*, p. 2.

27 *Submission 27*, pp 1-2.

3.24 OII Australia argued that the SDA should allow intersex people to compete according to their legal sex:

A blanket exemption applying to intersex people is disproportionate, and might broadly limit our access to sporting activities, with adverse consequences for our health and well-being.

Intersex people at all levels of sporting activity should be encouraged through access to sporting activities. Exemptions should not be used to justify excluding intersex people from sporting activities...It is far more appropriate to enable people to compete on the basis of their legal sex. An exemption on grounds of intersex status or gender identity is not needed to achieve this.²⁸

3.25 OII Australia noted that excluding competitors on the basis of intersex status or gender identity is inconsistent with frameworks developed by the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and the International Association of Athletic Federations (IAAF) for the participation of transgender and intersex people in competitive sport. These frameworks are not based on strength, stamina or physique, but are currently determined by the testosterone levels of competitors.²⁹

Departmental response

3.26 The Department clarified that sporting organisers will still have the ability to assess individuals on a case-by-case basis when deciding the eligibility of competitors:

The Bill amends the existing exemption for competitive sport in the SDA to include gender identity and intersex status. The Government considers this is necessary to preserve existing policy in relation to this exemption, ensuring fair competition in competitive sporting events. The drafting mirrors the approach taken in...the [Exposure Draft] Bill and State and Territory anti-discrimination laws.

The Department understands the operation of the exemption in State and Territory law will often involve a case-by-case assessment of individual circumstances. That is, the exemption is not intended to operate to require sporting competitions to have policies which automatically exclude people who are intersex, or people with a gender identity which does not match their birth sex. Instead, it is to provide reassurance that organisers are able to make decisions to guarantee fair competition in sporting events.³⁰

28 *Submission 8*, p. 7. See also: Kingsford Legal Centre, *Submission 19*, [p. 8]; National LGBTI Health Alliance, *Submission 76*, p. 6; National Association of Community Legal Centres, *Submission 82*, pp 8-9.

29 *Submission 8*, p. 4.

30 Responses to questions on notice provided by the Attorney-General's Department on 21 May 2013, p. 4.

Exemption for data collection

3.27 The exemption allowing individuals and organisations to request information, or make or keep records, in a way that does not allow for a person to be identified as being neither male nor female, attracted some commentary from submitters.

3.28 It was noted that the government has recently released guidelines on the recognition of sex and gender in Commonwealth records, which allow for the identification of individuals as neither male nor female. These guidelines, entitled 'Australian Government Guidelines on the Recognition of Sex and Gender', will be fully implemented for Commonwealth agencies by July 2016.³¹ Several submitters argued that the exemption in the Bill should be subject to some form of time limitation, either in the form of a sunset clause or through a statutory requirement for the exemption to be reviewed within three years.³²

3.29 The Public Interest Advocacy Centre also argued that the Australian Government, through the AHRC or the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner, should assist organisations in updating practices for data collection and record keeping, allowing over time for the identification of individuals as being neither male nor female.³³

Departmental response

3.30 In relation to including a sunset clause on the exemption for data collection, including one to coincide with the implementation of the proposed Australian Government Guidelines on the Recognition of Sex and Gender, the Department stated:

The inclusion of a sunset clause on the exemption would have the effect of requiring...changes to be made [to data collection practices], while providing a grace period in which to do so. The Government has not yet assessed any potential regulatory impact of such a change, even with a grace period. Accordingly, it has made a policy decision to include the exemption to ensure that the Bill does not have this effect...

[The] Guidelines...will only [apply] to Commonwealth Government agencies, not State or Territory agencies or the private sector, and do not include an enforceable complaints mechanism if the...Guidelines are not

31 Attorney-General's Department, 'Australian Government Guidelines on the Recognition of Sex and Gender', <http://www.ag.gov.au/Publications/Pages/AustralianGovernmentGuidelinesontheRecognitionofSexandGender.aspx> (accessed 14 June 2013). See also: OII Australia, *Submission 8*, pp 8-9.

32 See, for example: PIAC, *Submission 50*, p. 12; Human Rights Law Centre, *Submission 70*, pp 24-25; National Association of Community Legal Centres, *Submission 82*, p. 9; OII Australia, *Submission 8*, p. 9; AHRC, *Submission 9*, pp 8-9; Law Council of Australia, *Submission 17*, p. 39; Anti-Discrimination Commission Queensland, *Submission 85*, p. 5.

33 *Submission 50*, p. 12.

complied with. Including a sunset clause in the Bill could have a significantly greater regulatory impact.³⁴

3.31 Regarding a statutory review period for this exemption, the Department commented:

The need for this exemption could be reconsidered in the future...It is not clear when the best time to reconsider this exemption would be. Requiring a statutory review at a particular time may lead to this exemption being reconsidered prematurely, without the benefit of the Government's experiences in relation to the...Australian Government Guidelines on Sex and Gender.³⁵

Exemptions for conduct in direct compliance with prescribed laws

3.32 Some submitters expressed concern at the proposed new exemption for acts done in direct compliance with a Commonwealth, or a state or territory law prescribed by regulations. For example, the Human Rights Law Centre recommended that this exemption be removed:

[T]his provision...does not require any consideration of whether the relevant discriminatory provisions in inconsistent laws are reasonable and justified in accordance with Australia's international human rights obligations. If there are inconsistent laws that are proposed to be exempted, it is more appropriate that this be done by legislative amendment and consequent parliamentary scrutiny, rather than by regulation.³⁶

3.33 The Law Council questioned why such an exemption is necessary in relation to the new protected grounds of sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status, when no similar exemption currently exists for the other protected grounds in the SDA.³⁷

Departmental response

3.34 The Department explained the reasons for the inclusion of this exemption as follows:

Any laws to utilise this exemption will be prescribed by regulation and will therefore be subject to Parliamentary scrutiny, including the requirement for a Statement of Compatibility in accordance with the *Human Rights (Parliamentary Scrutiny) Act 2011*.

34 *Submission 75*, pp 3-4.

35 Responses to questions on notice provided by the Attorney-General's Department on 21 May 2013, p. 6.

36 *Submission 70*, p. 23. See also: The Equal Rights Trust, *Submission 7*, p. 11; AHRC, *Submission 9*, pp 9-10; PIAC, *Submission 50*, pp 12-16.

37 *Submission 17*, pp 36-37.

The Government considers this approach strikes the right balance between the flexibility to protect the operation of laws which appropriately make distinctions on these grounds, or which might be matters which are the responsibility of the States and Territories, and accountability to the Commonwealth Parliament.³⁸

3.35 In relation to why this exemption will not cover the other protected grounds currently in the SDA, the Department commented:

This Bill does not include any broader policy changes beyond introducing the new grounds of protection and therefore does not include a similar exemption for the existing protected grounds in the SDA.³⁹

Operation of exemptions for single-sex clubs and educational institutions

3.36 Items 36 and 42 of Schedule 1 of the Bill would replace the phrase 'opposite sex' with 'different sex', in relation to exemptions for single-sex educational institutions and clubs. Some submitters contended that this wording would mean that people who are intersex could be legitimately excluded from admission to such an institution or club, and that, similarly, people could be excluded on the basis of their gender identity.⁴⁰

Departmental response

3.37 The Department explained how this exemption is intended to operate:

These amendments are not intended to exclude intersex people from protections under the Bill. The intention of the exemptions in subsections 21(3) and 25(3) is that educational institutions or clubs established for people of a particular sex can lawfully exclude people who are not of that sex. This may include people who are intersex and do not identify as the relevant sex or identify as neither sex.

However, exclusion of an intersex child who identifies as male from a boys school could constitute intersex status discrimination. Similarly, exclusion of a trans woman from a female only club could constitute gender identity discrimination. The Department considers the current drafting will achieve this intention.⁴¹

38 *Submission 75*, p. 4.

39 Responses to questions on notice provided by the Attorney-General's Department on 21 May 2013, p. 6.

40 See, for example: Anti-Discrimination Commissioner of Tasmania, *Submission 49*, p. 15; Law Council of Australia, *Submission 17*, p. 44; Anti-Discrimination Commission Queensland, *Submission 85*, pp 3-4.

41 Responses to questions on notice provided by the Attorney-General's Department on 21 May 2013, p. 5.

Other issues

3.38 Submitters raised several other issues in relation to the Bill and its implementation, including: recognition in the SDA for international instruments relating to LGBTI issues; the interaction between the Bill and state and territory laws; possible consequential amendments to other Commonwealth Acts; and broader reforms to the SDA.

International instruments recognised in the Sex Discrimination Act

3.39 Paragraph 3(a) of the SDA provides that one of the objects of the SDA is to give effect to provisions of 'relevant international instruments'. These instruments are listed in subsection 4(1).⁴²

3.40 Several submitters called for the Bill to recognise international instruments relevant to the rights of LGBTI people, either through their inclusion in the list of 'relevant international instruments' in subsection 4(1) of the SDA, or through recognition in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Bill.⁴³ More specifically, submitters called for the 'Yogyakarta Principles' to be referenced. For example, the Human Rights Law Centre argued:

The Yogyakarta Principles, developed by a group of academic and UN human rights experts in 2006, provide important guidance on the application of international human rights obligations to sexual orientation and gender identity. The principles reflect the existing state of international human rights law in relation to issues of sexual orientation and gender identity and 'affirm binding international legal standards with which all States must comply.' The Yogyakarta Principles have been referred to in Australian jurisprudence...[T]hey develop inclusive, internationally accepted definitions of sexual orientation and gender identity and establish recommended actions to address the ongoing challenge of achieving human rights protection for [LGBTI] individuals worldwide.⁴⁴

42 The instruments listed are: the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women; the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; the Convention on the Rights of the Child; and four ILO Convention (Nos. 100, 111, 156 and 158) relating to relevant employment matters.

43 See, for example: Law Council of Australia, *Submission 17*, pp 33 and 49; PIAC, *Submission 50*, pp 7-10; Women's Legal Services NSW, *Submission 78*, pp 4-5; Victorian Gay and Lesbian Rights Lobby, *Submission 83*, p. 13.

44 *Submission 70*, pp 8-9.

Departmental response

3.41 The Department noted that the treaties currently listed in subsection 4(1) of the SDA are United Nations and International Labour Organization treaties which impose legal obligations on Australia; however:

...[T]he Yogyakarta Principles have no legal force either internationally or within Australia. They were developed by a group of human rights experts, rather than being an agreement between States.⁴⁵

Resourcing of the AHRC

3.42 The AHRC submitted that it may require additional resources in order to deal with the additional workload it expects to carry as a result of the introduction of the Bill:

The proposed new grounds in the SDA will almost certainly lead to new, and a higher volume of, enquiries and complaints. In addition, the [AHRC]'s other functions in relation to research, education and awareness raising will also be enlivened by the inclusion of these new attributes. There will also be a higher expectation from the community that the [AHRC] will seek to proactively address systemic issues facing LGBTI communities, as opposed to purely relying upon its complaints processes to remedy situations of discrimination and breaches of human rights. Consideration should be given to the resourcing impact of these new provisions. To more effectively perform these functions the [AHRC] would be aided by appropriate additional resources.⁴⁶

3.43 Several other submitters went further, arguing for the appointment of a permanent Commissioner within the AHRC to deal specifically with LGBTI issues. For example, the NSW Gay and Lesbian Rights Lobby argued:

[S]ignificant issues of homophobia, bi-phobia, transphobia and anti-intersex prejudice exist in Australian society and would be usefully served by having a dedicated [C]ommissioner to deal with complaints on these grounds. A specific...Commissioner would also enable the AHRC to more effectively discharge its education and compliance-related roles and reduce the workload of existing Commissioners...[I]t would send a strong message to the broader Australian community of the importance of non-discrimination concerning sexual orientation or gender identity.⁴⁷

45 Responses to questions on notice provided by the Attorney-General's Department on 21 May 2013, p. 8.

46 *Submission 9*, p. 7.

47 *Submission 29*, pp 9-10. See also: National Association of Community Legal Centres, *Submission 82*, p. 9; Victorian Gay and Lesbian Rights Lobby, *Submission 83*, p. 36; Law Council of Australia, *Submission 17*, p. 46.

Departmental response

3.44 The Department commented on the issue of resourcing for the AHRC:

The [AHRC] already performs some advocacy work in relation to these new grounds, through its general human rights functions. The Government believes that in the current fiscal climate, it is appropriate that the [AHRC] absorb these new responsibilities within current resources.

The [AHRC] was provided with additional funding under Australia's Human Rights Framework, which included funding associated with reforms to anti-discrimination law.⁴⁸

3.45 In relation to the proposal for a specific Commissioner to deal with LGBTI issues, the Department responded:

The Bill does not establish a new Commissioner for the new protected attributes of sexual orientation, gender identity or intersex status. This Bill does not include a Budget proposal for any new resources for a new Commissioner.

The Bill provides the [AHRC] with functions relating to the new attributes. As with all of its responsibilities, how it apportions responsibility for these functions is a matter for the [AHRC]...The Government does not propose to interfere with the [AHRC]'s independence in this regard by requiring a particular Commissioner, whether the President or anyone else, to take responsibility for sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status matters.⁴⁹

Interaction with state and territory laws

3.46 Submissions from state and territory bodies raised issues relating to the interaction between the Bill and state and territory laws.

3.47 The New South Wales Government expressed concern that certain conduct in relation to the new protected grounds to be introduced by the Bill, which is lawful in New South Wales under exemptions in the *Anti-Discrimination Act 1977* (NSW), will not be lawful under the new exemptions in the SDA proposed by the Bill.⁵⁰ It recommended that the Bill be amended to provide an exemption for 'action that is not unlawful under any anti-discrimination law in force in the place where the action is taken'.⁵¹

48 Responses to questions on notice provided by the Attorney-General's Department on 21 May 2013, p. 8.

49 *Submission 75*, p. 5.

50 *Submission 87*, p. 2.

51 *Submission 87*, p. 3 (see also discussion on p. 4).

3.48 Conversely, the Anti-Discrimination Commissioner of Tasmania expressed concern that activity which is currently unlawful under the *Anti-Discrimination Act 1998* (Tas), would be lawful under the proposed new exemptions in the SDA, creating broader exemptions in Commonwealth law which effectively override Tasmanian law. The Commissioner recommended that the Bill 'clearly state that any broader exemptions in the legislation are not intended to interfere with protections against discrimination under state or territory anti-discrimination laws'.⁵²

Departmental response

3.49 The Department provided the following observations in relation to the interaction between exemptions in the SDA and state and territory anti-discrimination laws:

There are already inconsistencies between the exemptions in existing Commonwealth, State and Territory anti-discrimination laws. This Bill does not alter this position. There is no evidence that such inconsistencies prohibit these anti-discrimination laws from operating concurrently, particularly given the Commonwealth Acts explicitly preserve such concurrent operation.

The effect of inconsistent exemptions is that conduct which is covered by an exemption under one law but not the other law would not be unlawful under the former law but would be under the latter. This means a person could not sustain a complaint under the former law, but may be able to under the latter law. The same principle applies whether it is the Commonwealth or State law which has the narrower exemption.⁵³

Consequential amendments to other Commonwealth legislation

3.50 Submitters expressed support for the suggestion, now incorporated in the government's proposed amendments to the Bill, which would update terminology in other Commonwealth laws, including the *Fair Work Act 2009* (Fair Work Act), to replace references to 'sexual preference' with 'sexual orientation'.⁵⁴ These submitters recommended that 'gender identity' and 'intersex status' should also be included in the list of attributes covered in section 351 of the Fair Work Act.⁵⁵

52 *Submission 49*, pp 16-17.

53 Responses to questions on notice provided by the Attorney-General's Department on 21 May 2013, p. 11.

54 See, for example: Law Council of Australia, *Submission 17*, p. 45; Kingsford Legal Centre, *Submission 19*, [p. 6]; NSW Gay and lesbian Rights Lobby, *Submission 29*, pp 10-11; Human Rights Law Centre, *Submission 70*, pp 18-19; National Association of Community Legal Centres, *Submission 82*, p. 6.

55 Section 351 of the Fair Work Act provides protection against discrimination in matters relating to employment, on the basis of a range of protected attributes.

3.51 Some submitters recommended that the term 'marital status' should also be updated to 'marital or relationship status' throughout the Fair Work Act.⁵⁶ In addition, the Law Council recommended that the terms 'sexual preference' and 'marital status' in the Australian Human Rights Commission Regulations 1989 also be updated to reflect the terminology used in the Bill.⁵⁷

3.52 In relation to changes in the Fair Work Act other than updating 'sexual preference' to 'sexual orientation', the Department stated:

While the Government is considering whether achieving consistency of terminology is achievable as part of this Bill, any broader amendments for consistency between anti-discrimination law and the Fair Work Act are outside the scope of this Bill and more appropriately considered in conjunction with the broader [Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination] Bill.⁵⁸

Committee view

3.53 The committee welcomes the introduction of legislative protection against discrimination for individuals on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status through the Bill. This is the first time such protection has been afforded at a Commonwealth level, and the committee considers that this is an historic reform that is long overdue. Accordingly, the committee expresses its strong support for this legislation.

3.54 The committee recently considered a broad range of issues relating to anti-discrimination protection for LGBTI individuals, as part of its inquiry into the Exposure Draft of the Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012 (Exposure Draft). The committee notes that many submitters to the current inquiry expressed disappointment at the government's decision not to proceed immediately with the finalised form of the legislation to consolidate the Commonwealth's five existing Acts that deal with anti-discrimination matters.

3.55 The committee remains of the view that a single consolidated anti-discrimination Act is preferable to the current regime of Commonwealth anti-discrimination laws, which are inconsistent and in need of simplification and clarification. The committee notes the government's commitment to this broader consolidation project, and accepts that the Bill under consideration in this inquiry is designed to introduce discrimination protection for LGBTI Australians as a matter of high priority, while work on the broader consolidation project continues.

56 See, for example: Human Rights Law Centre, *Submission 70*, pp 18-19; Women's Legal Services NSW, *Submission 78*, p. 2.

57 *Submission 17*, p. 45.

58 Responses to questions on notice provided by the Attorney-General's Department on 21 May 2013, p. 9.

3.56 Turning to the Bill at hand, the committee has comments in relation to the key definitions used in the Bill, the exemptions introduced or broadened in the Bill, and some of the other issues raised by submitters to the inquiry.

Key definitions

3.57 In its report on the Exposure Draft, the committee made two recommendations in relation to the proposed definition of 'gender identity'. The committee is pleased that these recommendations, including introducing 'intersex status' as a standalone protected ground, have been incorporated into the Bill. The committee notes the strong support from submitters for the key definitions of 'sexual orientation', 'gender identity' and 'intersex status' in the Bill.

3.58 Some submitters to the inquiry commented that the definition of discrimination introduced for the new protected grounds in the Bill is out-dated and should be improved, including by removing the 'comparator test'. The committee has consistently recognised the need to remove the comparator test from the SDA;⁵⁹ however, the committee also recognises that it is important for the definitions incorporated in the Bill for the new protected grounds to be consistent with the existing definitions for the other protected grounds in the SDA. For this reason, the committee accepts the Department's rationale that the Bill will introduce protections for the new protected grounds on the same terms as the other protected grounds in the SDA, and welcomes the fact that further changes will be made as part of the broader project to consolidate the Commonwealth's anti-discrimination laws.

Religious exemptions

3.59 In its recent report into the Exposure Draft the committee recommended that religious organisations should not be allowed to discriminate against individuals in the provision of services, where that discrimination would otherwise be unlawful. The committee also recommended that religious organisations seeking to rely on exemptions in providing services should be required to provide public notice of that intention.⁶⁰ The committee has not changed its view that this is the optimal arrangement for the operation of religious exemptions in Commonwealth anti-discrimination law.

3.60 As already noted, the committee understands that the government is still committed to bringing forward finalised consolidation legislation to unify Commonwealth anti-discrimination law into a single statute. The committee stands by its recommendations in the inquiry into the Exposure Draft in relation to religious

59 See: Senate Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, *Effectiveness of the Sex Discrimination Act 1984 in eliminating discrimination and promoting gender equality*, December 2008, p. xxiii (Recommendation 5).

60 Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee, *Exposure Draft of the Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012*, February 2013, p. 97.

exemptions, and urges the government to implement those recommendations in the final form of the consolidation legislation.

3.61 Having said this, the committee recognises that the Bill at hand does not deal comprehensively with the issue of religious exemptions across all Commonwealth anti-discrimination law; rather, it is concerned with exemptions applying to a limited number of protected grounds under the SDA. The government has clearly stated that the Bill is designed as an interim measure to introduce discrimination protection for LGBTI individuals immediately while the broader anti-discrimination consolidation project is being finalised, and that larger changes to the overall structure of the SDA are being considered as part of the consolidation project.

3.62 The committee also recognises the need for the Bill to be passed as quickly as possible, in order to ensure that discrimination protection for LGBTI individuals can be enacted without further delay.

3.63 With these factors in mind, the committee is not recommending extensive changes to the religious exemptions in the SDA.

Commonwealth-funded aged care services

3.64 While not recommending major changes to the religious exemptions proposed in the SDA, the committee strongly considers that it is prudent to make some minor adjustments to the religious exemptions in one area as proposed in the Bill, in relation to aged care services. The introduction of a limitation on religious exemptions in respect of Commonwealth-funded aged care services has broad stakeholder support and would provide important legislative protection for older LGBTI Australians. This measure was previously included in the Exposure Draft, and is now included in proposed government amendments to the Bill. It is also consistent with the current practice of several of the major religious aged care providers, which have stated publicly that they already provide services on a non-discriminatory basis.

3.65 In light of this, the committee is recommending that the Bill be amended to introduce this limitation into the SDA. This amendment will ensure that discrimination protections for older LGBTI Australians are not less than was proposed in the Exposure Draft. Further, the previous detailed examination by the committee of this specific proposal, through its inclusion in the Exposure Draft, will ensure that it can be considered by the parliament in a timely manner, allowing for the Bill to be debated and passed as soon as possible.

Recommendation 1

3.66 The committee recommends that the Bill be amended to provide that religious exemptions in section 37 of the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* do not apply in respect of sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status in connection with the provision of Commonwealth-funded aged care services.

Other exemptions

3.67 On the whole, the committee agrees with the balance struck by the other exemptions to be amended or introduced into the SDA by the Bill.

Data collection

3.68 The committee accepts the government's rationale that the exemption relating to data collection and record keeping is required at the present time, and that it may be open to review in the future. While the committee is not recommending a specific timeframe for any such review, it is important that in the first instance the government promote awareness of this issue in order to encourage organisations to make necessary changes to data collection systems over time.

Conduct in compliance with other prescribed laws

3.69 The committee notes concerns from submitters that this exemption may result in laws being prescribed which inappropriately limit the discrimination protections afforded to LGBTI people under the Bill. The committee notes that any legislation prescribed under the exemption will still be subject to parliamentary scrutiny, and considers that additional certainty could be provided by the government consulting with representatives of the LGBTI community in Australia prior to any laws being prescribed under this exemption.

Competitive sport

3.70 In relation to the exemption for competitive sporting activities, the committee notes the Department's response that similar exemptions in state and territory laws allow for competitors to be considered on a case-by-case basis. The committee considers that this exemption should be reviewed if it becomes apparent that intersex individuals or persons with a particular gender identity are being subject to blanket exclusion from particular competitive sporting activities, rather than the merits of each competitor being assessed on an individual basis.

Updating terminology in other Commonwealth legislation

3.71 On the issue of updating other Commonwealth legislation to reflect the terminology used in the Bill, the committee notes that the Bill already seeks to amend the *Migration Act 1958* to implement an updated definition of 'marital or relationship status'. Submitters argued that the term 'sexual preference', where found in other Commonwealth Acts and regulations (including the *Fair Work Act 2009* and the Australian Human Rights Commission Regulations 1989), should be replaced with the term 'sexual orientation', and that the terms 'gender identity' and 'intersex status' should be included in the relevant provisions of these laws, to bring them in line with the terminology used in the Bill. The committee considers that these changes can easily be implemented and would provide welcome consistency across Commonwealth legislation in this regard.

Recommendation 2

3.72 The committee recommends that the *Fair Work Act 2009*, the *Fair Work (Registered Organisations) Act 2009* and the *Broadcasting Services Act 1992* be amended to replace references to 'sexual preference' with 'sexual orientation', and to include the new protected grounds of 'gender identity' and 'intersex status'.

Recommendation 3

3.73 The committee recommends that the Australian Human Rights Commission Regulations 1989 be amended to replace references to 'sexual preference' with 'sexual orientation', and to include the new protected grounds of 'gender identity' and 'intersex status'.

Recommendation 4

3.74 Subject to Recommendation 1, and after due consideration of Recommendations 2 and 3, the committee recommends that the Senate pass the Bill.

Senator Trish Crossin
Chair

MINORITY REPORT

BY COALITION SENATORS

1.1 Coalition senators are broadly supportive of the provisions of the Sex Discrimination Amendment (Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Intersex Status) Bill 2013. They acknowledge that discrimination on the grounds of sexuality or sexual orientation runs counter to the essential tolerance and inclusiveness which characterise Australian society today. They also acknowledge that there are conspicuous gaps in the present array of federal human rights legislation in dealing with the sometimes complex issue of a person's sexual identity. Broadly speaking, the present bill addresses those gaps.

1.2 However, Coalition senators cannot support the committee majority's Recommendation 1 in the report. Recommendation 1 proposes that religious organisations not be entitled to an exemption in respect of sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status in connection with the provision of Commonwealth-funded aged care services. In the opinion of Coalition senators, the removal of such an exemption could compromise the capacity of some religious organisations to operate aged care facilities in accordance with the principles which underpin and define their existence.

1.3 It is acknowledged that Commonwealth-funded religious organisations presently providing aged care took a variety of positions during this inquiry on the suitability of this exemption, and that some such organisations felt no need for the protection such an exemption might afford them. Equally, other religious organisations argue for the maintenance of this exemption in order to preserve the ethos and values of their faith systems.

1.4 The Australian Christian Lobby argued for the exemption in these terms:

[R]eligious organisations do not seek to discriminate by exercising their freedom of religion. Rather they seek to employ staff most able to contribute to the religious ethos of the organisation, or to act consistently with their aims as an organisation and with their beliefs as an individual.¹

1.5 The Catholic Women's League Australia points out that:

In seeking to protect a range of human rights, it is essential that anti-discrimination laws also respect and protect the fundamental right to manifest one's religion, beliefs and conscientious convictions in the public square.²

1 Australian Christian Lobby, *Submission 26*, p. 1.

2 Catholic Women's League Australia, *Submission 15*, p. 3.

1.6 They go on to quote Catholic Health Australia as follows:

Catholic hospitals and aged care services today care for any person of any faith or none, race, gender, or sexual orientation who seeks services to be provided to them in a way that is consistent with Catholic teaching. Catholic hospitals and aged care services in this regard do not discriminate against anyone, and do not need protection of blanket exceptions from discrimination laws. That said, Catholic hospitals and aged care services do not provide services that are inconsistent with Catholic teaching. To not provide a service on grounds of Catholic teaching is not to discriminate, rather it is a simple limiting of services that Catholic organisations chose to offer as fulfilment of their religious belief.³

1.7 Coalition senators do not believe the committee majority has adequately addressed the operational concerns of some religious bodies operating faith-centred services. Further, it is hard to understand why such operational considerations would be taken into account and exempted under legislation in respect of the operation of educational or health facilities, but not in relation to aged care facilities, where nearly identical concerns arise.

1.8 This legislation presents an opportunity for multipartisan reform of the laws as they affect discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex people. The inclusion of Recommendation 1 in the majority report, however, fails to acknowledge the strong differences of view presented to the committee on the question of aged care services, and thus undermines the opportunity for a multipartisan approach.

1.9 Accordingly, Coalition senators recommend as follows:

Recommendation

1.10 That the Sex Discrimination Amendment (Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Intersex Status) Bill 2013 stand as presented, i.e. that it continue to provide that religious exemptions in section 37 of the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* apply in respect of sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status in connection with the provision of Commonwealth-funded aged care services.

Senator Gary Humphries
Deputy Chair

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY THE AUSTRALIAN GREENS

1.1 The Australian Greens believe in equality for all. Equality is about ensuring that individuals and groups are treated fairly and equally so that everyone can access opportunities and essential standards of living, such as access to adequate health, education and housing, to participate fully in society and live life to their full potential. We believe that this is not only right but it is good for all of us.

1.2 Equality means treating all people with dignity and respect and not distinguishing or treating people unfavourably because of their background or personal characteristics such as sex, race, age, sexual orientation, disability, religion, housing or social status.

1.3 And so, having long championed protection from discrimination on the basis of a person's sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status, as well as protections against discrimination for same-sex de facto couples, the Australian Greens welcome the Sex Discrimination Amendment (Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Intersex Status) Bill 2013 (the Bill), for establishing those protections.

1.4 However, this Bill is equally significant in what it fails to protect, and we consider that the Bill should abolish the provisions of the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Sex Discrimination Act) that exempt religious bodies from anti-discrimination law.

1.5 Further, we believe the new exemption, stating it is lawful to request information or keep records that allows an individual only to be identified as 'male' or 'female', should be subject to a sunset clause after 3 years.

Religious exemptions

1.6 Freedom of religion is an important human right, but religious bodies should not have a blanket exemption from anti-discrimination law. The present sections 37 and 38 of the Sex Discrimination Act provide broad exemptions from anti-discrimination law for religious bodies, and educational institutions set up for religious purposes, respectively. These exemptions offend against the principle that people should be treated equally, with dignity and respect, so that they can access opportunities and services such as health, education and housing.

1.7 Submissions to this inquiry raised issues about the practical impact of these exemptions. The Public Interest Law Clearing House's submission noted they mean a religious hospital can refuse to employ a gay doctor, a religious school can refuse to enrol a bisexual student or hire a lesbian administrator and a faith-based homelessness shelter can refuse to accept a transgender resident. The submission of Dr Tiffany Jones cited research showing there are students with protected attributes in every education system in Australia, including religious educational institutions, and that these students continue to experience homophobic abuse. Systemic discrimination makes it much harder for a tolerant, rights-oriented culture to flourish. The religious

exemptions in the Sex Discrimination Act do not strike the right balance between freedom of religion and protection from arbitrary discrimination.

Recommendation 1

1.8 The Bill should remove the exemptions in the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* from anti-discrimination law for religious bodies, and religious educational institutions.

Exemption for data collection

1.9 The Australian Greens oppose Item 60 of Schedule 1, allowing a request for information, or the keeping of records, to require that a person be identified as either male or female. Submissions to this inquiry noted the difficulties people face in employment, housing, credit and welfare matters because the associated requests for information, and records kept, do not accommodate their sexual identity.

1.10 The Australian Human Rights Commission's 2009 report about the legal recognition of sex in documents and government records recommended that where possible, sex or gender should be removed from government forms and documents.¹ A further recommendation, that the federal government should develop national guidelines concerning the collection of sex and gender information from individuals, has been implemented, and we understand that the draft 'Australian Government Guidelines on the Recognition of Sex and Gender' will be adopted, commencing from 1 July 2013, envisaging that all agencies will progressively align their business practices accordingly by 1 July 2016. Accordingly, instead of an enduring exemption for all organisations who wish to require any individual to identify as male or female, the Australian Greens would suggest that this exemption be subject to a sunset clause, ending on 30 June 2016.

Recommendation 2

1.11 Item 60 of Schedule 1, introducing an enduring exemption allowing requests or maintenance of information to require that a person be identified as either male or female, should be subject to a sunset clause, ending on 30 June 2016.

**Senator Penny Wright
Australian Greens**

1 See: <http://www.humanrights.gov.au/sex-files-legal-recognition-concluding-paper-sex-and-gender-2009>.

APPENDIX 1

SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

Submission Number	Submitter
1	Dr Tiffany Jones
2	Mr Daniel Black
3	FamilyVoice Australia
4	Ms Anne Hewitt and Dr Laura Grenfell, Adelaide Law School
5	Mr Alastair Lawrie
6	Professor Margaret Thornton
7	The Equal Rights Trust
8	Organisation Intersex International Australia
9	Australian Human Rights Commission
10	ACT Human Rights Commission
11	Catholic Women's League of Victoria and Wagga Wagga
12	Castan Centre for Human Rights Law
13	Name Withheld
14	Rainbow Families Council
15	Catholic Women's League Australia

16	Freedom 4 Faith
17	Law Council of Australia
18	ACON
19	Kingsford Legal Centre
20	Northern Territory Anti-Discrimination Commission
21	Equality Rights Alliance
22	Salt Shakers
23	The AIDS Council of South Australia
24	Australian Family Association
25	Public Interest Law Clearing House
26	Australian Christian Lobby
27	TransGender Victoria
28	Australian Council of Trade Unions
29	NSW Gay and Lesbian Rights Lobby
30	Australian Association of Christian Schools
31	The Wilberforce Foundation
32	Liberty Victoria
33	Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry

- 34 Job Watch
- 35 Mr David Hutchison
- 36 Name Withheld
- 37 Brighter Journey Counselling Agency
- 38 Name Withheld
- 39 Ms Ruth Hainsworth
- 40 Mr Kenneth Lewis
- 41 Mr David Perrin
- 42 Drs Nick and Natalie Blismas
- 43 Mr Michael Sobb
- 44 Ms Sylvia Huxham
- 45 Mr Stephen Hatton
- 46 Mr Peter Donald
- 47 Mr Leon Voesenek
- 48 Mr Doug Pollard
- 49 Anti-Discrimination Commissioner of Tasmania
- 50 Public Interest Advocacy Centre
- 51 Mr Matthew Aldous

52	Combined Pensioners and Superannuants Association of NSW
53	Mr James Hanrahan
54	Name Withheld
55	Ms Margaret Wallace
56	South Australian Commissioner for Equal Opportunity
57	Mr Christopher McNicol
58	Mr Malcolm Eglinton
59	Jack and Nanette Blair
60	Ms Susan Kirk
61	Desmond and Josephine Kenneally
62	Mr Allan Choveaux
63	Ms Fran Taylor
64	Mr Peter Phillips
65	Mr Bayne MacGregor
66	Ms Karen Dobby
67	Mr Peter Murray
68	Australian Family Association (WA)
69	Mr Klaus Clapinski

70	Human Rights Law Centre
71	COTA Australia
72	Lesbian and Gay Solidarity (Melbourne)
73	Dr Eliana Miller
74	Confidential
75	Attorney-General's Department
76	National LGBTI Health Alliance
77	Australian Federation of AIDS Organisations
78	Women's Legal Services NSW
79	Women's Legal Services Australia
80	Inner City Legal Centre
81	Anti-Discrimination Board of NSW
82	National Association of Community Legal Centres
83	Victorian Gay and Lesbian Rights Lobby
84	New South Wales Council for Civil Liberties
85	Anti-Discrimination Commission Queensland
86	Mr Tamsin "Thomas" White
87	New South Wales Government

88 Victoria Legal Aid

89 Mission Australia

90 Mr Daniel Joseph

FORM LETTERS RECEIVED

1 Form Letter 1 received from 34 submitters (this number includes variations of the form letter)

2 Form Letter 2 received from 4 submitters (this number includes variations of the form letter)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RECEIVED

1 Responses to questions on notice provided by the Attorney-General's Department on 21 May 2013