

January 8, 2013

Committee Secretary
Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee

Dear Committee,

Re Exposure Draft of Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012

Thankyou for your input into this proposal.

Please ensure that the language chosen clearly describes the intent without ambiguity.

Please note that DISCRIMINATION has two meanings, and is ambiguous.

There is scientific and research usage of discrimination, which relates to genuine review of differences.

There is a mischievous usage of discrimination, which relates to bullying and torture.

So we should find different words for these ideas, so as to minimise ambiguity.

Please choose HARASSMENT to describe mischievous bullying and torture.

.....
Also, to minimise the risk of spurious claims,

- please ensure that the complainant shall provide proof of offence,
- please describe the offence as CONTINUING harassment, rather than an isolated or accidental unintended case
- please require a minimum of FOUR alleged occurrences – either as various entities being involved in an aggregation of resentful actions towards another entity, or a single entity being involved in several resentful actions.

With these prerequisites, only the more serious cases need come before the courts.

Other cases should be referred to neighbourhood dispute resolution mechanisms.

.....
Other claims of unfair behaviour may relate to UNEQUAL OPPORTUNITY. These should be treated separately from HARASSMENT.

It is unlikely that all these various claims can fit under just ONE label. It is like trying to write the same TRAVEL RULES to simultaneously cover pilots and drivers of ships, aeroplanes, trains, trucks, busses, cars. It is probable that EACH GROUP needs separate rules.

Yours faithfully,
Peter Vincent Dixon,

Peter Dixon