I Andris Blums last year was first made aware of the Charter of Human Rights and find it an interesting piece of legislation. In the first instance it conflicted with other processes and the issue on review was resolved in the negative and I accepted the outcome.

The other issue involved the City of Yarra (planning) and I am still awaiting a resolution. But suffice it to say that the issue was not for the legislation my avenues for redress would be severely limited due to cost factors.

Some of you may be aware of my current activities in the area of Builders Warranty Insurance were it is demonstrable that many of my contemporaries, baby boomers on the cusp of retiring or just retired are not armoured with the nanny state that are little known or appreciated in the general community and are if known generally unenforceable due to cost factors.

The Charter has the virtue of codifying those rights in part and providing a more general mechanism not only for the individual but for the decision maker the has the power to adversely affect the applicant and /or a discretion that should be exercised with care.

In my view the Charter should strengthen and expand the codification of basic human rights so that decision makers practical due to cost or other institutional barriers.

Prior to the Charter, some were more equal than others to paraphrase George Orwell’s Animal Farm.

That is still the case, but at least the pendulum is not as tilted as before.

The charter as is is in a small way a step in the right direction to redress this social in equality in that decision making is now more equitable and accessible mechanism for review that can be availed of.

This can only result in a better and more equitable outcome for those individuals involved and society as a whole and as a form of corruption if not in fact in process.

I can acknowledge the view that some say the Charter creates uncertainty but this in my view is not valid. As with all consequence are debugged.

The end result of the Charter as is will be in my view more transparent decision making and accountability is the law should be given in further promoting human rights by appropriate government sponsored mechanisms.

As I recall there were naysayers who opposed the introduction of the Freedom of Information Act and some would agree to access to FOI it has been, from free initially to fee based now, neutered.

Are we such an imperfect society that we cannot afford for Members of Parliament to have access to information Charter of Human Rights if the issues there constituents face are amenable to resolution by such mechanisms.

The government has promised a independent corruption commission which I whole heartedly support. I would put it to compliance and procedures by which those decision makers with the authority to effect individual lives and social goals.

To argue that is already the case is correct but a right that one has no access to and/or is un enforceable is of no value strengthen the legislation as a community benefit and another weapon in the armour of redressing the balance against applicants lack of knowledge or appreciation of the issues and processes.

Yours Andris Blums
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