

Submission for Human Rights

I would like to thank the committee for this opportunity to address with submission the Human Rights Bill 2018 in accordance with the Parliamentary process. As the Parliamentary process is not mandatory, I thank you for this opportunity to write a submission for my human rights.

This Human Rights Bill was first mentioned and brought in for a need against a draconian law called the Vicious Lawless Association Disestablishment Act 2013, which was found to be a disgusting act against the people (Humans) rights of Queensland. An act that as off the 9th of December this year is repealed. As we found out that a Government that has the majority can be a dictatorship.

What I read in the Human Rights Bill 2018 that is being proposed I am in agreement of the Human Rights part you have put forward, but to see it has conditions attached is an insult to the Humans it is meant to protect from a government we the people have voted into place.

We are all humans and as such we are all intitled to the HUMAN RIGHT, and is for everyone unconditionally. We are supposed to all be EQUAL under the law. As a government, if you are unable to write legislation that embraces human rights, if said legislation takes away human rights it is the wrong legislation.

A human rights bill is not to make the legislatures jobs easier. It is a boundary you the government must work within for the protection of the people are representing. You the Government state you are all for human rights for the people of Queensland well good leave it at that, Unconditionally.

Part 2 Human Rights in Queensland, all in that section says we have rights but it also says you the government can take it away or ride rough shod over our rights anytime you feel within your RIGHTS to do so.

S14 Human rights are protected

Nothing in this Act gives any person or other entity a right to limit to a greater extent than is provided for under this Act, or destroy, a human right of any person.

In answer to the above:- You say unless the government sees fit, that should not be allowed... We need unconditional rights. Not a privilege you the government can apply when you feel like it.

Division 2 Civil and political rights

15 Recognition and equality before the law

- (1) Every person has the right to recognition as a person before the law.
- (2) Every person has the right to enjoy the person's human rights without discrimination.
- (3) Every person is equal before the law and is entitled to the equal protection of the law without discrimination.
- (4) Every person has the right to equal and effective protection against discrimination.
- (5) Measures taken for the purpose of assisting or advancing persons or groups of persons disadvantaged because of discrimination do not constitute discrimination.

This above you have broken many times and will again without protection for the people by the introduction of an unconditional bill of rights.

You say you the government can put conditions onto legislation and we have seen you do this just recently in the Serious and Organised Crime Amendments Act when you say publicly

that many parts of that Act are taking the rights and liberties off the people but you the government believe that is alright to do that. All law should be written for all people as we are all equal under said law. That cant happen if the law is directed at certain groups.

So, which is it as if you are writing a Bill of Rights for the people, do it and with no conditions. What I am seeing is a great magic trick of giving with one hand yet taking away with the other.

You seem to want to limit our human rights why? If you limit or put conditions on a human right it is no longer a right but a privilege you provide the people not a right of the person. By doing this you show you the Government believe you are above the people.

Divison 1 11 Who has Human Rights (1) All individuals in Queensland have human rights.

Then in 13 Human Rights may be limited. So, which is it? All I see is that magic slide of hand. Surely you can write legislation to abide by boundaries of a human rights act.

Sect 22 Peaceful assembly and freedom of association...

Sect 22 of the bill calls for the right of every person peaceful assembly and freedom of association

(1) Every person has the right of peaceful assembly.

(2) Every person has the **right to freedom of association with others**, including the right to form and join trade unions.

This is one of the main objectives that the VLAD law failed at. The government has banned association so it will again unless this Bill of Rights is unconditional. I might add, why is it looked at lawful to associate with the named trade union. Why is a trade union even mentioned? Do I have the right to associate with an existing or start an association, a religion, a club, a group etc and if so why are they not all listed.

Once again, all this should be unconditional.

Sect 25 Privacy and reputation A person has the right

(a) not to have the person's privacy, family, home or correspondence unlawfully or arbitrarily interfered with; and

(b) not to have the person's reputation unlawfully attacked.

This has caused many great stresses when abused by the Government, it has been abused and can be shown with evidence if needed. As it stands it is a great human right but not if the government can put conditions on it. This state has made people criminals with bad law without a day in court, so again if you are to introduce human rights make sure it protects the people it is meant to protect. **ALL of the people all of the time**, should have unconditional human rights. **Your motto should be "I may not agree with what you say or do, but I will fight for your right to do it...."**

Sect 32 Rights in criminal proceedings

(1) A person charged with a criminal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law.

This needs to stay in place as our laws foundations are based on this principle. But again it cannot remain a foundation if the Government has the power to dismiss this right. The government has many times recently changed the onus of proof, again that goes against our system of law, and the Rights Of The People.

What is the government so afraid of ? Surely you can write law to abide by a Human Rights Act.

It is my understanding if you break a law and have been found guilty by a court of law, you have given up most of your rights and are treated accordingly, still with humanity.

Why does it seem you are taking an each way bet? It has been proven the Government can, has and will again write bad law contravening Human Rights and this shows it in black and white. We the people need the protection from the legislators of bad law. Our politicians from decades gone by never put these protections into law for the people such as a bill of rights, as they must have believed no government could write law that would take away a right of the people.

So, if you are going to continue down this track then we need protection from the court not some sudo government department. If a politician and/or party introduces a law that contravenes a Huma Right allow the highest court to decide whether a it should or shouldn't be allowed as law before the law is accented. We the people need this protection, as it has happened many times where government has not had the best of interests for the people at the fore front of what they are trying to achieve.

I ask as with all politicians it should be asked, are they experts in this area of HUMAN RIGHTS. If that answer is no. Then experts in that area should be listened to and their expert recommendation upheld. I mention this as any times I have witnessed expert recommendation thrown aside for the politician to do what they like without any expertise in the area at hand.

Steve Clancy

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]