

Youth Justice (Boot Camp  
Orders) & Other Legislation  
Amendment Bill 2012  
Submission 018

From:

Charles Heston Te Wheoro

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

To:

Research Director

Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee

Parliament House

George Street

Brisbane Qld 4000

7 November 2012

Dear Sir/Madam

Please consider this submission in your report on the Youth Justice (Boot Camp Orders) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2012. Clause 50, Insertion of section 106C into the Anti-discrimination Act 1991

The following is my submission in relation to proposed amendments to the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991, introduced to Parliament in the Youth Justice (Boot Camp Orders) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2012. (1 November 2012).

I object to this legislation amendment as I believe that is unfair to name only sex workers as the only business people that can be freely refused, removed and treated unfavourably by accommodation providers.

If accommodation providers refuse accommodation to one class of business people, they should refuse accommodations to all classes of business people. To select one business is blatantly discriminatory.

If motels and hotels are the major issue here – then the words motels and hotels should be used as the specific type of accommodation that wishes to reserve the right to refuse to rent a room to sex workers.

By using the term “accommodation providers” in this legislation amendment doesn’t limit to motels and hotels, which is where this whole issue began - motels wanting to be able to throw out sex workers without recrimination and to avoid anti-discrimination action from a person who they exercised discrimination against. The term opens the door for all types of rented accommodation providers to refuse, remove or treat unfavourably all sex workers.

Accommodation providers do not seem to be objecting to other business people who work from their rented accommodation – such as Sales Consultants, Photographers who hire rooms to perform photo shoots, Politicians who run campaigns from their motel rooms when on the road and Celebrities who use motel rooms for interviews – all people who use rented accommodations for business when away from their usual place of business. But these accommodation providers object to sex workers. Is this more a moral objection than an objection from a business perspective?

Writing into a legislation amendment a directive that it is not unlawful to discriminate against a person based on their occupation is beyond belief in this day and age.

Refusing to supply accommodation, evicting a person and treating a person unfavourably is not a positive step towards solving the issue between accommodation providers and sex workers in Queensland. There are surely alternatives than to endorse legal discrimination?

Consideration must be carefully undertaken by politicians when it comes to this amendment and hopefully common sense will prevail and an alternative legislation can be negotiated.

In closing and once again – I object to this legislation amendment.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'CHT' or similar, written in a cursive style.

Charles.H.Te Wheoro