

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 7:39:20 PM

---

Dear Mr. Hodgeman,

I write to you in regard to the Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

I believe the bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Abbey Lack

---

This email was sent by Abbey Lack via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Abbey provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Abbey Lack at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 7:25:46 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. Shutting down the right to peaceful protest is undemocratic.

Yours sincerely,

Adam Koutsoukos

Upper Natone, Tasmania, 7321, Australia

---

This email was sent by Adam Koutsoukos via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Adam provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Adam Koutsoukos at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 11:07:01 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

To whom it may concern,

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Adolfo Cruzado

Bondi Beach, New South Wales, 2026, Australia

---

This email was sent by Adolfo Cruzado via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Adolfo provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Adolfo Cruzado at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 12:19:34 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you because democracy has an essential requirement, the capacity for citizens to peacefully protest policy, proposals, and activities of the governing bodies and businesses whose actions are perceived as detrimental to humans and to the natural environment. This includes the liveability of our towns and cities. This also includes the protected public wilderness and the seas that surround our island.

Therefore :

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Adrienne Godsmark

Mount Nelson, Tasmania, 7007, Australia

---

This email was sent by Adrienne Godsmark via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Adrienne provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Adrienne Godsmark at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 10:28:46 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Although I do not live in Tasmania I think this Bill is a blatant attempt to stop people exercising our democratic right to protest and if passed in Tasmania it may well be attempted by other states or territories.

Yours sincerely,

Alan Bryan

---

This email was sent by Alan Bryan via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Alan provided an email address [\[REDACTED\]](mailto:) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Alan Bryan at [\[REDACTED\]](mailto:)

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 11:13:35 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

It is time for you to listen to the people

Yours sincerely,

Alan Gill

Kettering, Tasmania, 7155, Australia

---

This email was sent by Alan Gill via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Alan provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Alan Gill at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 9:08:06 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference. This would disallow the right to voice opinion on a business's ethic and moral business choices without any actual business impeding action occurring.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Alastair Robertson

Claremont, Tasmania, 7011, Australia

---

This email was sent by Alastair Robertson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Alastair provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Alastair Robertson at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 7:19:18 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. Quite obviously paves the way towards increased corruption.

Regards

Alex Hartshorne

Lutana, Tasmania, 7009, Australia

---

This email was sent by Alex Hartshorne via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Alex provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Alex Hartshorne at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 8:29:17 AM

---

Hello, this bill should not be allowed to go through. It disrupts citizen rights with regards to protesting business malpractice. Police should be allowed to determine what 'threatening' means, which will lead to a dangerous freedom to arrest citizens. This bill will pave the way for totalitarianism, not democracy.

Yours sincerely,  
Alex Last

---

This email was sent by Alex Last via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Alex provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Alex Last at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)  
To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 3:28:13 PM

---

We are meant to live in a democracy ! Get the dirty government fingers out of the industry pie ! Don't want to live in a corrupt society.

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Alex Wylie

Boomer Bay, Tasmania, 7177, Australia

---

This email was sent by Alex Wylie via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Alex provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Alex Wylie at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 9:37:57 AM

---

Dear Premier Hodgman.

I write to you in regards to the Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Alice Pace

---

This email was sent by Alice Pace via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Alice provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Alice Pace at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 3:06:55 PM

---

Dear Premier Hodgman,

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Alice Wesley-Smith

Bondi Beach, New South Wales, 2026, Australia

---

This email was sent by Alice Wesley-Smith via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Alice provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Alice Wesley-Smith at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 4:16:54 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

First and foremost, I have the right to protest.

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Allegra Biggs Dale

South Bruny, Tasmania, 7150, Australia

---

This email was sent by Allegra Biggs Dale via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Allegra provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Allegra Biggs Dale at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 8:09:29 PM

---

This is ridiculous! The right to protest needs to be protected! Not businesses, right when the planet needs people to be able to speak up for the environment!

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Amanda Cowell

Frankston South, Victoria, 3199, Australia

---

This email was sent by Amanda Cowell via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Amanda provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Amanda Cowell at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 4:53:05 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

This draconian bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

This proposed law is far too sweeping and should be reconsidered.

Yours sincerely,

Amanda Rasmussen-Huang

---

This email was sent by Amanda Rasmussen-Huang via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you

regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Amanda provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Amanda Rasmussen-Huang at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 8:17:23 PM

---

To whom it may concern

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Amelia Johnston

New Town, Tasmania, 7008, Australia

---

This email was sent by Amelia Johnston via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Amelia provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Amelia Johnston at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 12:02:59 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

**THE RIGHT TO PROTEST IS A FUNDAMENTAL HUMAN RIGHT!**

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Amazing Harlib

---

This email was sent by Amy Harlib via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Amy provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Amy Harlib at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 4:26:54 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

Stop corrupting democracy with your draconian attempts to silence upstanding citizens. The Liberals have failed Tasmania and failed Australia in their role as representatives of the people. The only thing they represent is big corporations and themselves. Since our government is incompetent it falls on the general public to protect our people and our planet. Back off and shut-up. Let democracy speak!

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Andrea Weichelt

---

This email was sent by Andrea Weichelt via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Andrea provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Andrea Weichelt at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 11:33:34 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Bakonyi

South Hobart, Tasmania, 7004, Australia

---

This email was sent by Andrew Bakonyi via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Andrew provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Andrew Bakonyi at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 11:40:25 PM

---

WE ALL HAVE AN INHERENT RIGHT TO PROTEST. DO NOT TRY AND TAKE THIS AWAY FROM US.

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Cole

---

This email was sent by Andrew Cole via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Andrew provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Andrew Cole at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Friday, 1 March 2019 8:34:37 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The more technical arguments are outlined below, but fundamentally, this proposed bill is an assault on what is right and fair and the Australian way of life that ensures that the rights of otherwise powerless individuals are not trampled by the rich and the powerful. While not a Tasmanian, I am a regular visitor: from rafting the Franklin, hiking the walls of Jerusalem, enjoying the Taste of Tasmania, as an Australian, I can and will have a say (just remember why the Frankin dam never got built).

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Johnston

Killara, New South Wales, 2071, Australia

---

This email was sent by Andrew Johnston via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Andrew provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Andrew Johnston at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 10:06:10 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Protesting is a basic human right!

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Kellett

Southwest, Tasmania, 7139, Australia

---

This email was sent by Andrew Kellett via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Andrew provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Andrew Kellett at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 2:02:12 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. The bill is immoral.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Pattison

Ranelagh, Tasmania, 7109, Australia

---

This email was sent by Andrew Pattison via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Andrew provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Andrew Pattison at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 1:50:49 AM

---

I stand by the submission below which seeks to abandon the proposed bill regarding Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

This bill is a threat to our democratic system as the right peacefully protest is sometimes the only way to express opposition to projects and practices which are seen as wrong or unfair.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Woodruff

Lindisfarne, Tasmania, 7015, Australia

---

This email was sent by Andrew Woodruff via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Andrew provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Andrew Woodruff at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 9:46:39 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

I would like to add my opinion as to why the bill should be unnecessary and NO time or tax payers money should be wasted on amendments :

The bill criminalises the right of citizen's to peacefully object to environmental destruction carried out by forestry business malpractice

The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.

Therefore any further amendments or revisions to the bill are not necessary - what is of the utmost necessity is to create as many National Parks as possible to protect Tasmania's most valuable resource - the old growth forests.

Yours sincerely,  
Anna Cleverley  
Lapoinya, Tasmania, 7325, Australia

---

This email was sent by Anna Cleverley via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Anna provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Anna Cleverley at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)  
To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 9:43:18 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Please allow individuals the freedom to express themselves and be heard.

Yours sincerely,

Annabel McLisky

---

This email was sent by Annabel McLisky via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Annabel provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Annabel McLisky at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 9:13:04 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

Lordy lordy what did our parents and grand parents fight for if not our freedom to express our civil concerns?

Who is the government representing when it seeks to shut down its citizens?

Consider all peoples rights to be heard and to challenge, that is democracy (when working well).

The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,  
Anne McGuinness

---

This email was sent by Anne McGuinness via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Anne provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Anne McGuinness at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 4:23:36 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

In short, Australian citizens should be allowed to express themselves without fear of jail or fines.

Yours sincerely,  
annette erdtsieck

---

This email was sent by annette erdtsieck via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however annette provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to annette erdtsieck at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 3:36:16 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. We're living in a democracy and this is a democratic right.

Yours sincerely,

Arimbi Winoto

Boomer Bay, Tasmania, 7177, Australia

---

This email was sent by Arimbi Winoto via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Arimbi provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Arimbi Winoto at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 9:27:05 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. The bill elevates the rights of business above those of private citizens creating the worrying impression that profits are more important than people.
8. The bill of passed may serve to radicalise dissenters, as peaceful public protest is often the only relief valve for those wishing to express their frustration at disagreeable business practices.
9. Whilst the scope of this bill is deliberately wide in reality there are very few businesses in Tasmania affected by these types of protests and it is disingenious for the bill not to address this situation directly.

10. Peaceful objection to business or government practice has historically benefited Tasmania financially and socially. Such protests directly and indirectly promote brand Tasmania as a natural paradise resulting in the fantastic growth of our tourism sector which has by far eclipsed any benefit other business sectors have ever produced.

Yours sincerely,

Ashika Gray

---

This email was sent by Ashika Gray via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Ashika provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Ashika Gray at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 5:42:09 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely

Audrey Robinson

Bulleen, Victoria, 3105, Australia

---

This email was sent by Audrey Robinson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Audrey provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Audrey Robinson at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 6:12:28 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. What are you so scared of?

Yours sincerely,

Avril Brown

South Launceston, Tasmania, 7249, Australia

---

This email was sent by Avril Brown via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Avril provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Avril Brown at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 8:32:50 AM

---

This proposed bill puts the rights of business above community needs and interests. Larger businesses often have their management (and decision makers) interstate or overseas which can make the local factors a minimal consideration in their planning and operations.

Also see below

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Barbara Ireland

Whittlesea, Victoria, 3757, Australia

---

This email was sent by Barbara Ireland via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Barbara provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Barbara Ireland at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 4:28:12 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

Everybody should have the right to peaceful protest. This right needs to be upheld to protect the weak and those who cannot speak out from exploitation.

Yours sincerely,  
Barbara Nanshe  
Islington, New South Wales, 2296, Australia

---

This email was sent by Barbara Nanshe via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Barbara provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Barbara Nanshe at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 12:29:45 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

Hi,

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Bastiaan van Dalen

Bundagen, New South Wales, 2454, Australia

---

This email was sent by Bastiaan van Dalen via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Bastiaan provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Bastiaan van Dalen at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 9:25:39 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

I want to live in a country that respects its citizens right to protest and protect what is important.

Yours sincerely,

Bel Mcmillen

Bangalow, New South Wales, 2479, Australia

---

This email was sent by Bel Mcmillen via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Bel provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Bel Mcmillen at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 10:33:52 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

Hello,

This bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Citizen rights - please

Yours sincerely,

Bev Cowan

Fish Creek, Victoria, 3959, Australia

---

This email was sent by Bev Cowan via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Bev provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Bev Cowan at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Friday, 1 March 2019 9:07:56 PM

---

I urge you to stand up for important civil rights all Tasmanians care about.

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Bill Bates

Rose Bay, Tasmania, 7015, Australia

---

This email was sent by Bill Bates via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Bill provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Bill Bates at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** The Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 10:43:52 PM

---

For the following six reasons the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019 Ought to be abandoned. It is unnecessary,, unworkable and poses a dangerous risk to free speech.

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Bridie Mcentee

Mount Stuart, Tasmania, 7000, Australia

---

This email was sent by Bridie Mcentee via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this

email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Bridie provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Bridie Mcentee at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 12:44:53 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice..
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Bowl Lipson

Derwent Park, Tasmania, 7009, Australia

---

This email was sent by Bowl Lipson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Bowl provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Bowl Lipson at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 1:03:44 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Freedom of speech is a fundamental human right in any civil and modern society.

Yours sincerely,

Brad Homewood

Williamstown, Victoria, 3016, Australia

---

This email was sent by Brad Homewood via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Brad provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Brad Homewood at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Friday, 1 March 2019 9:12:07 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because:

It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.

The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.

Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.

The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.

Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.

The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Brent Duggan

Ulverstone, Tasmania, 7315, Australia

---

This email was sent by brent duggan via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however brent provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to brent duggan at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 12:12:04 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

AMEN

Yours sincerely,

Bronte Brooks

West Hobart, Tasmania, 7000, Australia

---

This email was sent by Bronte Brooks via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Bronte provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Bronte Brooks at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 10:21:15 PM

---

I support the following submission as in many cases, especially environmental, business and government are shortsighted and are not willing to recognise the value of our precious natural resources as they are, not harvested. Secondly individuals in our democracy should have the right to protest.

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Bronwyn Fielder

Kettering, Tasmania, 7155, Australia

---

This email was sent by Bronwyn Fielder via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Bronwyn provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Bronwyn Fielder at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Friday, 1 March 2019 8:07:55 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

It's just not good enough Mr. Hodgman, once again you are working against the interests of Tasmanians. The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Cara Clark

---

This email was sent by Cara Clark via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Cara provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Cara Clark at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 8:01:25 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

This is a bully tactic by the government with only yourselves and the companies buying you to benefit.

Yours sincerely,

Cara Lovell

South Hobart, Tasmania, 7004, Australia

---

This email was sent by Cara Lovell via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Cara provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Cara Lovell at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 7:40:40 PM

---

## Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill

The right to protest is an essential way that common people can send important and meaningful messages to our politicians and to stand up to power.

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Carey Shaw

Waterloo, Tasmania, 7109, Australia

---

This email was sent by Carey Shaw via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Carey provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Carey Shaw at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 8:38:02 PM

---

The rights of corporations should not override the rights of citizens to express themselves peacefully.

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Carla Moorhead

---

This email was sent by Carla Moorhead via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Carla provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Carla Moorhead at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 3:31:43 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

This bill is a violation of the basic right to protest and as such should not be passed.

Yours sincerely,

Carmel Buchtmann

---

This email was sent by Carmel Buchtmann via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you

regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Carmel provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Carmel Buchtman at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 11:51:20 AM

---

The Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019 should be abandoned for the following reasons:

1. The Bill compounds the very confused nature of the original Act. The bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and it is therefore unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (i.e. to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. Throughout history, those opposing unjust practices have been found to be retrospectively correct in what they did for our benefit, i.e. their future generations. I have great respect for our ancestors who stood up to injustice and made the world a better place for us and I see no reason why I should stand by and see these improvements thrown aside for profit by (mostly foreign) corporations not acting in the interests of nature, people and future generations.

Yours sincerely,

Carol Clethero

Macedon, Victoria, 3440, Australia

---

This email was sent by Carol Clethero via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Carol provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Carol Clethero at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 12:45:41 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

Australians should have the right to fair and open free speech. At this time when we need to promote the health and happiness of the planet, environment and peoples, we all need to stand up and be counted on the right side of history.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Carol Khan

Tarragindi, Queensland, 4121, Australia

---

This email was sent by Carol Khan via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Carol provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Carol Khan at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 8:18:04 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. It puts business first. The people should be first, before business. The people need to be heard and have the right to be heard.

Yours sincerely,

Caroline Sutton

Acton Park, Tasmania, 7170, Australia

---

This email was sent by Caroline Sutton via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Caroline provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Caroline Sutton at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 12:39:51 PM

---

I am writing regarding the Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Carolyn Raby

---

This email was sent by Carolyn Raby via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Carolyn provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Carolyn Raby at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Monday, 4 March 2019 6:28:01 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, stand-alone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Catherine Lewis

Clifton Hill, Victoria, 3068, Australia

---

This email was sent by Cate Lewis via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Cate provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Cate Lewis at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 10:12:25 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because the right to protest should be protected not destroyed. Laws already protect people from individuals who become violent towards others and/or their property. Do not attack a great social action based on the bad behaviour of a few.

---

This email was sent by Catherine Gellatly via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Catherine provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Catherine Gellatly at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 10:56:08 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

This bill abuses the rights of individuals while making business into autocrats. It is not healthy for civil right, freedom and democracy.

Yours sincerely,

Catherine Hearse

Windsor, Victoria, 3181, Australia

---

This email was sent by Catherine Hearse via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Catherine provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Catherine Hearse at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 4:54:44 PM

---

Dear Premier

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

I believe the bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Catherine Ralston

---

This email was sent by Catherine Ralston via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Catherine provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Catherine Ralston at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 9:30:32 PM

---

Hi Premier Hodgeman,

Please abandon this draconian era bill because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Charlie Edis

Binalong Bay, Tasmania, Australia

---

This email was sent by Charlie Edis via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Charlie provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Charlie Edis at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 10:07:22 PM

---

Dear Sir / Madam,

Please see below my submission.

I feel the bill in its current form is birth unworkable and unreasonable.

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Chris Holden

West Hobart, Tasmania, 7000, Australia

---

This email was sent by Chris Holden via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Chris provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Chris Holden at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 10:17:18 PM

---

Protest is a fundamental democratic right. This bill will undermine our constitutional right to protest.

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Chris Thompson

---

This email was sent by Chris Thompson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Chris provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Chris Thompson at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 1:36:07 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The intent to stifle freedom of speech is disturbing. Creating laws to punish those who threaten those in power is a very quick slide away from democracy. Beware the unintended consequences of abusing your position.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Chris Webb

Bar Beach, New South Wales, 2300, Australia

---

This email was sent by Chris Webb via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Chris provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Chris Webb at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Friday, 1 March 2019 9:13:39 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely

Christel Leyendecker

Forestville, New South Wales, 2087, Australia

---

This email was sent by Christel Leyendecker via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Christel provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Christel Leyendecker at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Friday, 1 March 2019 8:57:55 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit. Police are servants of the public and members of the public, and should not be placed in this invidious position.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Christine Carlisle

---

This email was sent by Christine Carlisle via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Christine provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Christine Carlisle at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 11:30:55 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. We have a basic right to be able to peacefully protest against acts and policies that are unpopular

Yours sincerely,

Christine Chiavassa

---

This email was sent by Christine Chiavassa via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Christine provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Christine Chiavassa at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 3:04:48 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit
- 4 . The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Christine Farmer

Battery Point, Tasmania, 7004, Australia

---

This email was sent by Christine Farmer via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Christine provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Christine Farmer at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 8:56:00 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

I am very concerned about the amendment bill, and I fervently believed that it should be abandoned for all of the following reasons;

1. It is very poorly drafted. The bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.

2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice.

The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.

Such legislative intent is contrary to the democratic freedoms which have been hard fought for in this whole country and any attempt to

eliminate rights to protest, and certainly to oppose commercial interests must be struck down.

3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit. It is not fair to put police in this position or to make them vulnerable to political pressure. We in Queensland paid the price for that in the 1970s and 1980s.

4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.

5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.

6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Christine Jones

Maroochydore, Queensland, 4558, Australia

---

This email was sent by Christine Jones via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Christine provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Christine Jones at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 9:47:13 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

0. Peaceful protest by the community should not be outlawed. We are so fortunate to live in a peaceful place with an engaged community who should be able to protest when they feel that this way of life is at risk. I understand that non-peaceful protesting, trespassing etc are a crime under existing laws. There is no need for this new Bill.

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.

2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.

3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.

4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.

5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.

6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Claire Brett

---

This email was sent by Claire Brett via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Claire provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Claire Brett at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 10:11:25 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

I would like the bill abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Claire Fernandez

Randwick, New South Wales, 2031, Australia

---

This email was sent by Claire Fernandez via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Claire provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Claire Fernandez at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 8:37:06 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Please listen to the people for once

Yours sincerely,

Clare Houston

Clifton Beach, Tasmania, 7020, Australia

---

This email was sent by Clare Houston via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Clare provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Clare Houston at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 11:52:20 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

Activism is a democratic right . This is as yet not a fascist State

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Colene Hutchinson

---

This email was sent by Colene Hutchinson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Colene provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Colene Hutchinson at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 1:10:46 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

It's un-Australian. Everyone should have the right to protest in a non-violent way. Draconian laws like this only drop the veil on obvious association between big business and government, whether this is political donations or subsidies for a failing, outdated industry.

It has become obvious to the Australian public that the government (who forget they are public servants) no longer serve us, but only the interests of big business. The veil has dropped and no longer do we have faith in you as your constituents.

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Craig Martin

Point Vernon, Queensland, 4655, Australia

---

This email was sent by Craig Martin via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Craig provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Craig Martin at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 7:55:58 PM

---

Premier Hodgman,

I never believed that my human right to speak would be challenged in a country like Australia. It is shocking in the extreme to me that a bill such as this could ever be considered in 2019.

It brings shame to our country.

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Crystal Davis

Campania, Tasmania, 7026, Australia

---

This email was sent by Crystal Davis via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Crystal provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Crystal Davis at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 9:32:23 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned for many reasons most notably because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Dan Broun

Coningham, Tasmania, 7054, Australia

---

This email was sent by Dan Broun via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Dan provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Dan Broun at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 4:12:10 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

I believe this bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Dana Flahavin

Boolarra, Victoria, 3870, Australia

---

This email was sent by Dana Flahavin via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Dana provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Dana Flahavin at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Monday, 4 March 2019 12:30:45 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

I represent that the bill as it stands should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Daniel Panek

Sandy Bay, Tasmania, 7005, Australia

---

This email was sent by Daniel Panek via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Daniel provided an email address

[REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Daniel Panek at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 9:18:16 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

Dear Premier Hodgman

I grew up in Tasmania and lived there until "migrating" to the "mainland" however I love my home state and wish to see it as a beacon of fairness and progressive thinking in the world, not a benighted and retrograde former colonial outpost.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Please stop trying to stifle protest and halt progress. Make Tasmania an enlightened and free society.

Yours sincerely,

Daniela Tymms

Bayswater, Victoria, 3153, Australia

---

This email was sent by Daniela Tymms via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Daniela provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Daniela Tymms at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 11:47:07 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

As someone born in Tasmania I'm appalled. The spirit I have witnessed from protesters campaigning against draconian homosexuality laws, and against the destruction of precious rainforests should be protected.

Yours sincerely,

Danielle Heaven

Richmond, Victoria, 3121, Australia

---

This email was sent by Danielle Heaven via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Danielle provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Danielle Heaven at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Darcie Huisman - Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 6:52:48 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

Hi,

I am a Tasmanian that currently resides in NSW. I will always consider myself Tasmanian because I am so proud of the irreplaceable wilderness and natural beauty that belongs there. I love that state and would do anything to protect it. I believe Tasmanians should have the right to take action and voice their concern when and if an agency wants to misuse its power and cash in on its unique resources. History has proven that people-power is needed to check the decisions being made about the future of the state.

Please consider the carefully considered requests of the citizens below:

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Darcie Huisman

Camperdown, New South Wales, 2050, Australia

---

This email was sent by Darcie Huisman via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Darcie provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Darcie Huisman at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 10:59:52 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because it is not right, proper or doing good for anyone, full stop.

Yours sincerely,  
Darrell Priest  
Harford, Tasmania, 7307, Australia

---

This email was sent by Darrell Priest via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Darrell provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Darrell Priest at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 3:13:27 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Protest is necessary for many reasons I.i. when self interested politicians make laws like this one in particular. Another example is the law made for one development; the mt Wellington cable car act. This law will be a waste of taxpayer money that will further erode the basic right to make it clear that you oppose the actions of a business.

Yours sincerely,

David Holman

South Hobart, Tasmania, 7004, Australia

---

This email was sent by David Holman via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however David provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to David Holman at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 8:48:33 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

To who it may concern,

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

David Kirkwood

---

This email was sent by David Kirkwood via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding

issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however David provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to David Kirkwood at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 8:24:26 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit. It also places too much faith in the judgement of individuals or one specific body when the need for clarity over the wider population is more key.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

David Loring

---

This email was sent by David Loring via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however David provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to David Loring at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 11:48:04 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

History won't look kindly on the erosion of our free and just society by our conservative governments who, ironically, are anti-conservation.

Protecting business rights over the rights of citizens is one of the hallmarks of fascism.

Yours sincerely,

David Rea

---

This email was sent by David Rea via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however David provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to David Rea at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 1:04:30 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because we don't need it.

Yours sincerely,

David Shepherd

Lutana, Tasmania, 7009, Australia

---

This email was sent by David Shepherd via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@gooder.do](mailto:campaigns@gooder.do), however David provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to David Shepherd at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Friday, 1 March 2019 10:31:37 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. If this bill is passed it will be the start of living in a police state.

Yours sincerely,

David Baird

---

This email was sent by David Baird via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues

they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however David provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to David Baird at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 5:03:06 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

Because big business already has too much power over the individual and the environment. How will the vulnerable be protected? The aged, the disabled, the poor and the muddled? I cannot believe people are trying to get this passed. .

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Dawn Shipley

---

This email was sent by Dawn Shipley via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Dawn provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Dawn Shipley at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 8:21:23 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Ordinary people who feel powerless in the face of poor Govt. decisions pandering to wealthy vested interests, must be free to express their concern through protest. This is a human right.

Yours sincerely,

Deborah Wace

South Hobart, Tasmania, 7004, Australia

---

This email was sent by Deborah Wace via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Deborah provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Deborah Wace at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Democracy  
**Date:** Friday, 1 March 2019 9:44:23 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

This bill and the previous version were designed to limit the freedom of being in a democracy in which every person has a right to speak his mind in a way that does not impinge on the freedoms of others.

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Dennis Nickell

---

This email was sent by Dennis Nickell via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Dennis provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Dennis Nickell at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 9:45:52 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Diana Quilliam

Tyenna, Tasmania, 7140, Australia

---

This email was sent by Diana Quilliam via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Diana provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Diana Quilliam at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 9:56:40 PM

---

Premier Hodgeman,

I own land in Tasmania and I understand that it is difficult to balance both land conservation and industry. This is yours and the governments challenge, it is your job. However taking away our ability to peacefully protest is not the solution and it will only lead to more issues. Australia is not a dictatorship.

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Dionette Sakova

Fremantle, Western Australia, 6160, Australia

---

This email was sent by Dionette Sakova via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Dionette provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Dionette Sakova at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 9:12:56 PM

---

This is with regard to the Governments Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Dipika Delmenico

West Ulverstone, Tasmania, 7315, Australia

---

This email was sent by Dipika Delmenico via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Dipika provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Dipika Delmenico at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 10:41:35 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

The new bill should be dumped because it blocks the right for citizens to protest against corrupt governments flaunting their power to destroy the natural environment without citizens permission.

Yours sincerely,

Winsome Dockter

Roleystone, Western Australia, 6111, Australia

---

This email was sent by Winsome Dockter via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Winsome provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Winsome Dockter at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 8:33:59 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned for several reasons, mainly because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act: This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable; it is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. This bill leaves the police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means, this is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Of grave concern is the implication that this bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. This bill criminalizes the democratic right to demonstrate, and if the demonstration is against a business that clearly involves harm to populations and environments, this is the population's democratic right.
8. This bill does not take into account the mounting evidence that retaining and maintaining the health of the natural environment matters to both human and economic health. that the current state of politics needs to hear the people's voice on a matter so important and such matters should not be determined by corporations that underwrite politicians.

Yours sincerely,

Dr K McKenzie

Northbridge, Western Australia, 6003, Australia

---

This email was sent by Dr K McKenzie via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Dr K provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Dr K McKenzie at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 1:51:57 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.

Yours sincerely,  
Dylan Nazer-lamb  
Tura Beach, New South Wales, 2548, Australia

---

This email was sent by Dylan Nazer-lamb via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Dylan provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Dylan Nazer-lamb at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 12:09:54 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Edward Jacobs

Thornbury, Victoria, 3071, Australia

---

This email was sent by Edward Jacobs via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Edward provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Edward Jacobs at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 6:51:22 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

I am a 65 year old woman who has believed in the power of protest as my fundamental right. I can't believe this bill is being considered by parliament. It's intent is against everything I was raised to believe about Australians freedom of expression.

It also compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.

The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.

3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.

4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.

5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.

6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Eleanor Coombe

Franklin, Tasmania, 7113, Australia

---

This email was sent by Eleanor Coombe via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Eleanor provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Eleanor Coombe at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 10:53:12 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Thank you for taking the above into consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Eleanor Laud

South Hobart, Tasmania, 7004, Australia

---

This email was sent by Eleanor Laud via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Eleanor provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Eleanor Laud at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 3:06:02 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

All of the above

Yours sincerely,

Elisabeth Bell

Katoomba, New South Wales, 2780, Australia

---

This email was sent by Elisabeth Bell via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Elisabeth provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Elisabeth Bell at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 11:13:59 PM

---

This bill is reckless and has been thrown out before. People need the freedom of expression.

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Elizabeth Hill

Forestville, New South Wales, 2087, Australia

---

This email was sent by Elizabeth Hill via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Elizabeth provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Elizabeth Hill at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 9:48:42 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose<sup>7</sup>.

It is a human right in a democracy, to peacefully state your opinion

Yours sincerely,

Elizabeth McCracken

Barwon Heads, Victoria, 3227, Australia

---

This email was sent by Elizabeth McCracken via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Elizabeth provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Elizabeth McCracken at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Friday, 1 March 2019 8:28:09 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

I have always seen Australia as a country that allows its citizens to protest against changes to the natural environment that compromises the natural unique flora and fauna of our country. I see the Protection from Protesters Amendment Bill 2019 as a way of curtailing free speech. Australia (and that includes Tasmania!) is a democracy where people can freely protest against actions that might destroy the natural world. Many people who travel to Tasmania do so to enjoy nature, so allowing it to be logged or otherwise destroyed may well destroy a profitable business sector.

I live in inner Melbourne and I like bushwalking: the exercise is healthy, I also enjoy observing all of our fabulous native plants and watching birds and animals in Australia's unique natural places. I go to natural places and surrounding areas and country and interstate areas to enjoy nature.

I find when I return home from such places I feel invigorated and more centered mentally and emotionally. It is definitely a restorative experience. I want others to be able to do the same, now and in the future.

Australia is one of seventeen countries described as being 'megadiverse'. This group of countries has less than 10% of the global surface, but support more than 70% of the biological diversity on earth. These 17 countries represent more than two-thirds of all (known) life forms (Australia is listed first for vertebrates). Australia is home to between 600,000 and 700,000 species, many of which are endemic - that is they are found nowhere else in the world.

Yours sincerely,

Elspeth Ferguson

Saint Kilda, Victoria, 3182, Australia

---

This email was sent by Elspeth Ferguson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Elspeth provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Elspeth Ferguson at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 10:50:32 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. This bill does not clarify the original act but makes it more confusing and open to interpretation. It will make it harder for the public and police who are expected to enforce it.
2. Citizens should have the right to peacefully protest any business malpractice or business that is causing harm to people or society. The bill makes this human right a criminal offense.
3. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
4. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
5. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Emily Connors

Islington, New South Wales, 2296, Australia

---

This email was sent by Emily Connors via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Emily provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Emily Connors at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 6:55:10 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. Tasmania is a state that prides its self on a strong history of public activism. No one could say that the Franklin/Gordon protestors are not held in high regard for protecting what is one of the jewels in the state's crown. To unfairly silence the voices of passionate Tasmanians who care deeply about this state, simply for the purpose of protecting the interests of business is unacceptable and not an underpinning value that many Tasmanians would be proud.

Yours sincerely,

Emily Keeling

Glenorchy, Tasmania, 7010, Australia

---

This email was sent by Emily Keeling via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Emily provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Emily Keeling at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 8:53:25 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. The strength of the Australian democracy is the result of freedom to critique government. Without the right to protest, elections are redundant. The democratic system then ultimately fails: it cuts out the population (the resource, the conscience) and puts all power in the hands of a few who are above consequence (politicians, businesses, media). Removing the right to protest removes the need to represent the people/the voters. It gives politicians free reign. A government who seek to do this are not aligned with the democratic processes and values which saw them elected. Narrowing the scope of power to a few is not utilitarian but rather a Machiavellian and damaging approach to leadership.

Yours sincerely,

Emily Rudling

Hawley Beach, Tasmania, 7307, Australia

---

This email was sent by Emily Rudling via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Emily provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Emily Rudling at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 12:20:16 AM

---

Please listen! Listen to our younger generation, we need to be heard & putting forward a bill like this disenables us!

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Emma Shanahan

Risdon Vale, Tasmania, 7016, Australia

---

This email was sent by Emma Shanahan via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Emma provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Emma Shanahan at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 9:39:25 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

You have to be kidding Will, this is the worst revamp of an unconstitutional piece of crap. Listen to the high court and abandon this bill.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Eric Tierney

South Hobart, Tasmania, 7004, Australia

---

This email was sent by Eric Tierney via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Eric provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Eric Tierney at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 2:51:59 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

Kill the Bill

This is an insane and outrageous assault on every Australian's right to protest, and constitutional free speech.

In no way should democracy as it stands be eroded to the point of submission through fear of consequence.

The bill should be abandoned.

An absolute farce. How sincerely disgusting it is that the Government can propose such barbaric acts of inhumane violence to our people, the land and environment, and to the rights of every person it represents, yet forbid them a voice to defend themselves.

This bill compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.

2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.

3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.

4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.

5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.

6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Kill The Bill

Yours sincerely,

Erik Hayward

---

This email was sent by Erik Hayward via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Erik provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Erik Hayward at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 7:58:06 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because all citizens should have to right to speak freely and voice concerns without fear of criminal consequence. Also;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Erin Crummy

Roches Beach, Tasmania, 7170, Australia

---

This email was sent by Erin Crummy via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Erin provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Erin Crummy at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 12:07:29 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours Sincerely,

Evelyn Sherman

Balmain, New South Wales, 2041, Australia

---

This email was sent by Evelyn Sherman via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Evelyn provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Evelyn Sherman at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 8:36:53 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because (it it an abused of government power);

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Fairlie Francis

Glen Iris, Victoria, 3146, Australia

---

This email was sent by Fairlie Francis via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Fairlie provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Fairlie Francis at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 6:36:12 PM

---

Please abandon the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Fiona Beer

Mount Stuart, Tasmania, 7000, Australia

---

This email was sent by Fiona Beer via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues

they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Fiona provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Fiona Beer at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 3:14:49 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Everyone must be able to speak freely. Peaceful protests are often the only way to gain public attention for support for those who cannot speak loudly enough to be heard on their own. Confusing laws put innocent people at risk because none but the most expensive lawyers will be able to use them to manipulate and silence victims.

Build bridges, not fences and drains!!!

Yours sincerely,

Fiona Dundas

---

This email was sent by Fiona Dundas via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Fiona provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Fiona Dundas at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Monday, 4 March 2019 9:05:54 AM

---

Dear Premier Hodgman

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Fiona Vaughan

Blackheath, New South Wales, 2785, Australia

---

This email was sent by Fiona Vaughan via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Fiona provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Fiona Vaughan at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 7:41:15 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because:

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Frances Butler

Glebe, Tasmania, 7000, Australia

---

This email was sent by Frances Butler via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Frances provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Frances Butler at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 6:32:58 PM

---

Dear Premier Hodgman,

I cannot believe that you are and your government are persisting with this disgusting attack against the civil rights of all Tasmanians. Below are the reasons why this bill is wrong and should be abandoned:

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

You and your government have a responsibility to protect the civil rights of Tasmanians and this includes the basic right to protest against decisions made by business which directly undermine and harm Tasmania and it's citizens.

I hope common sense will prevail and you will remove this bill.

Yours sincerely,

Francois Lockwood

---

This email was sent by Francois Lockwood via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Francois provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Francois Lockwood at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Friday, 1 March 2019 9:44:53 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because:

a. Business do not have a right to take untrammelled action to pursue their goals. One of the ways of helping ensure there are social limits on the actions if business is protest by individuals or groups. Such protest may at times unintentionally impact the business's ability to function as it normally does. This may well be because the function is unethical or damaging to the environment. If we do not draw attention to such activities, our society as a whole is worse off.

b. The phrase "interference" is too vague and could penalize many activities which do not affect the businesses ability to function.

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.

2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.

3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.

4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.

5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.

6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not

reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Fred Tropp-Asher

---

This email was sent by Fred Tropp-Asher via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Fred provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Fred Tropp-Asher at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 10:17:11 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Gabriel Comerford

West Launceston, Tasmania, 7250, Australia

---

This email was sent by Gabriel Comerford via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Gabriel provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Gabriel Comerford at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Monday, 4 March 2019 5:18:55 AM

---

To Whom It May Concern:

This is very troubling.

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Gail Allen

---

This email was sent by Gail Allen via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Gail provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Gail Allen at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 9:44:18 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. This bill would be a tool for for multinationals to strip us of OUR resources. It would help companies like Adani bully anyone in their way, like they are now.

Our constitution was created to protect the Australian people fairly, this bill manipulates the law and the constitution for the benefit of business.

Yours sincerely,  
Gareth Gunn  
Tewantin, Queensland, 4565, Australia

---

This email was sent by Gareth Gunn via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Gareth provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Gareth Gunn at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 8:12:46 PM

---

You are becoming a dictatorship, you have no right to stop free peaceful speech and action will continue.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Garry Larden

---

This email was sent by Garry Larden via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding

issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Garry provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Garry Larden at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 6:58:12 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. The bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Geoff Capper

Chudleigh, Tasmania, 7304, Australia

---

This email was sent by Geoff Capper via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Geoff provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Geoff Capper at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 2:36:22 PM

---

Dear Mr Hodgman,

I am a professional full time worker and I believe everyone has the right to protest...

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Geordie Duncan

---

This email was sent by Geordie Duncan via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Geordie provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Geordie Duncan at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 1:14:37 PM

---

To whom it may concern,

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

I feel the bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Georgia King

---

This email was sent by Georgia King via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Georgia provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Georgia King at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 9:04:21 AM

---

I can't believe that as an Australian citizen I even have to write an email like this.

Free speech is a human right. Protesting is too.

Get real. Allow the Australian people to speak and fight for what they believe in.

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Georgia Morgan

Mount Stuart, Tasmania, 7000, Australia

---

This email was sent by Georgia Morgan via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Georgia provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Georgia Morgan at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 7:25:13 AM

---

We want the freedom to be unhappy with the status quo. This is not a fascist state... or is it Dodgey Hodge?

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Gigi Lynn

Huonville, Tasmania, 7109, Australia

---

This email was sent by Gigi Lynn via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Gigi provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Gigi Lynn at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 6:56:09 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.  
  
Uses the police as an oppressive army.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Gillian Williamson

Bonnie Doon, Victoria, 3720, Australia

---

This email was sent by Gillian Williamson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Gillian provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Gillian Williamson at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 8:49:41 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. As far as I am concerned, if people cannot protest, we are living in a dictatorship. Is this what Australians want for our children? I certainly don't.
  
2. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
  
3. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
  
4. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
  
5. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
  
6. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
  
7. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Glenda Stasse

Geeveston, Tasmania, 7116, Australia

---

This email was sent by Glenda Stasse via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Glenda provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Glenda Stasse at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 1:07:21 AM

---

Mr.Hodgman, I am not a radical, just an ordinary Tasmanian and I believe this Bill is totally wrong it is a human right to be able to protest peacefully .....Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Glenn Driscoll

Charlotte Cove, Tasmania, 7112, Australia

---

This email was sent by Glenn Driscoll via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Glenn provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Glenn Driscoll at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 11:44:12 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

I am deeply concerned that this Bill is confused, and seriously threatens individual rights and freedoms.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Glenn Sanders

Lymington, Tasmania, 7109, Australia

---

This email was sent by Glenn Sanders via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Glenn provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Glenn Sanders at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 11:37:55 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.

2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.

This bill represents an erosion of our democratic rights.

3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.

4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.

5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.

6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Grant Morgan

Seventeen Mile Rocks, Queensland, 4073, Australia

---

This email was sent by Grant Morgan via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Grant provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Grant Morgan at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 5:10:38 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because:

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Greg Faulk

[REDACTED]

Old Beach, Tasmania, 7017, Australia

---

This email was sent by Greg Faull via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Greg provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Greg Faull at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 8:44:01 PM

---

Although I live in Melbourne , I have property in tasmania and visit regularly.

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Haley Gravenall

Doreen, Victoria, 3754, Australia

---

This email was sent by Haley Gravenall via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Haley provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Haley Gravenall at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 4:41:39 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

In addition to the points outlined below i would like to add that the proposed bill in my mind has the dangerous scent of the totalitarian about it and in my mind we should always be repelled by this scent and seek to do all within our power to repel totalitarian empowerment both now and especially for our future generations whose political representatives may seek to exploit to unclear potentialities of legislation such as this in the future. We have a duty to keep George Orwells fiction exactly that.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Hamish Stevenson

Lenah Valley, Tasmania, 7008, Australia

---

This email was sent by Hamish Stevenson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Hamish provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Hamish Stevenson at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 12:00:48 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. I have been an environmental activist for most of my life and have never come across a law that prevents protests. Without protests we would be living in a world where no human rights exist, since protests have given us our freedoms. Freedom of expression is one of them.

Yours sincerely,

Hans Sipsma

---

This email was sent by Hans Sipsma via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Hans provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Hans Sipsma at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 11:47:07 PM

---

To whom it may concern, Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Hayley Platts

Howrah, Tasmania, 7018, Australia

---

This email was sent by Hayley Platts via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Hayley provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Hayley Platts at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 4:49:35 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. I am a citizen, not a minion.

Yours sincerely,

Heinz Schwiemann

---

This email was sent by Heinz Schwiemann via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you

regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Heinz provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Heinz Schwiemann at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 3:42:20 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. In my view the right to protest is fundamental in a free democratic society. To restrict this is to head towards totalitarianism.

Yours sincerely,

Helem Kvelde

Wingham, New South Wales, 2429, Australia

---

This email was sent by Helem Kvelde via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Helem provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Helem Kvelde at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 7:26:43 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

I am writing to urge you to abandon the bill cited above for reason which I believe are critical to a fair and just society. These are:

1. The bill is unnecessary.,

As found by the High Court, there are other Tasmanian laws that deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests. The bill duplicates offences so making it unconstitutional as it is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

2. By criminalising protest, the bill places business malpractice above the rights of ordinary Australians to protest that malpractice. It would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This dangerously sets up parameters for regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.

3. It creates of leaving it up to police to decide on the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) so is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.

4. In all, this bill would make the original Act. far more confused than its original format so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.

Yours sincerely,

Helene Zampetakis

Randwick, New South Wales, 2031, Australia

---

This email was sent by Helene Zampetakis via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Helene provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Helene Zampetakis at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 10:55:16 AM

---

I'm Herbie I'm 28, and I'm a Kalkadoon man and I live Darwin, I just want you to think about the lives you may ruin when you pass a bill that puts people's livelihoods at risk for expressing the political views, and essentially the most proactive and morally righteous people will be at risk, thats not how we get better,,

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Herbert Valentine

Wagaman, Northern Territory, 0810, Australia

---

This email was sent by Herbert Valentine via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Herbert provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Herbert Valentine at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 12:15:21 AM

---

Dear Premier,

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Horst Thiele

---

This email was sent by Horst Thiele via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Horst provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Horst Thiele at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 7:33:03 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because everyone must have a right to protest against what they see as unfair and the law must not prevent this;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Ian Edwards

---

This email was sent by Ian Edwards via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Ian provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Ian Edwards at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 6:26:31 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The ability to peacefully and safely protest is a hallmark of a healthy democracy. It is therefore my belief that this bill is incompatible with a fair society that values a robust democracy, and only serves to remove the rights of people to peacefully object to business malpractice and to cut back the ability of the public to have meaningful input into how our society operates. In addition, this bill would criminalise 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether any interference occurs. A law that does this can be dangerously used to limit public expression, and is a blatant attack on freedom of expression.

This bill prioritises business and profit over people, and in doing so puts disproportionate power into the hands of those who already have the wealth and influence to operate businesses that in many cases the majority may oppose. I believe society needs to focus its values on fairness, respect and equality for all, not on creating profit for the few.

Everyone has the right to go to work and do their job safely, but Tasmania already has sufficient laws to protect workers from criminal or destructive behaviour. This bill is unnecessary and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

For these reasons I believe that the bill is unjust, has no place in a fair Tasmania, and needs to be abandoned.

Yours sincerely,  
Inala Swart

---

This email was sent by Inala Swart via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Inala provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Inala Swart at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 5:11:48 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so it is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Isabel Goodfellow

---

This email was sent by Isabel Goodfellow via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding

issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Isabel provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Isabel Goodfellow at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 4:11:39 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Actively legislating against the community's ability to voice concern and express differing opinion to industry seems to indicate the Government is prioritising business over community. Any Government that doesn't put people's interest in the heart of it's agenda doesn't have my vote.

Yours sincerely,

Jackie Atkin

---

This email was sent by Jackie Atkin via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jackie provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jackie Atkin at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 6:28:09 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. Governments make mistakes on a regular basis, these mistakes may be manifest in allowance of incorrect practices, such as old growth logging, fossil fuel extraction, large scale pollution, locking up refugees on Manus Island. These mistakes become legislation through vested interest and powerful corporations that buy our politicians. It remains up to society to protest and stand up for what is right, it is our democratic right to interfere if necessary (through peaceful protest) to help expose practices which cause harm and are scientifically wrong. This new anti-protest legislation is undemocratic and protects business over decency, over science and over common sense.

Yours sincerely,

James Bracken

---

This email was sent by James Bracken via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however James provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to James Bracken at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 9:33:19 AM

---

“Protest beyond the law is not a departure from democracy, but absolutely essential to it.”

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term ‘threatening’ (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of ‘threatening’ to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

James Roberts

New Town, Tasmania, 7008, Australia

---

This email was sent by James Roberts via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however James provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to James Roberts at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 1:41:00 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. I attended the High Court for the previous case. It was quite clear that the public should have the right of protest. Don't go down that road again, please.

Yours sincerely,

Jane Lazaroff

Cradoc, Tasmania, 7109, Australia

---

This email was sent by Jane Lazaroff via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jane provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jane Lazaroff at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 5:38:17 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
2. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
3. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
4. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.

Yours sincerely,

Jane Long

Mount Nelson, Tasmania, 7007, Australia

---

This email was sent by Jane Long via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jane provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jane Long at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 12:26:40 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

I am writing to express my extreme concern about the proposal to make it illegal for citizens to peacefully protest against corporations/businesses where there is clear and legitimate malpractice.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Jane Rafe

Jan Juc, Victoria, 3228, Australia

---

This email was sent by Jane Rafe via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jane provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jane Rafe at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 7:58:40 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

Dear Mr Hodgman,

I am shocked at a liberal government trying to curtail freedom of speech and control the market. This Bill is unnecessary red tape.

It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.

This Bill cuts down the long-held right of citizens to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of ALL TASMANIANS to object to business malpractice.

We already have laws to deal with this: the High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests. Why make restrictive new laws and introduce more red tape and more confusion for police?

Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.

The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Please have another think about this. Tasmania is a good place to do business, and a good place to speak your mind about what bothers you. Let's not wreck it with additional bureaucracy.

Yours sincerely,

Jane Rawson

---

This email was sent by Jane Rawson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jane provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jane Rawson at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 1:19:15 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. This bill fails makes the Act even more confusing. This is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.

2. The bill criminalises the long-held right of all citizens to peacefully object to business malpractice in any field, not just in the environmental arena

3. I am very concerned that the bill would create a new, stand-alone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests

4. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Jane Unwin

---

This email was sent by Jane Unwin via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jane provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jane Unwin at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 10:59:25 PM

---

Make Australia safe and great again! Allow people to express their views, peacefully without being harassed by those in power. This is for democracy to operate well.

.Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Janet Glover

---

This email was sent by Janet Glover via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Janet provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Janet Glover at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 6:34:44 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It confuses the nature of the original Act. This bill clearly fails to make the Act easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

---

This email was sent by janice LOQUET WESTLAKE via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however janice provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to janice LOQUET WESTLAKE at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 5:50:27 PM

---

People have a right to protest. This bill risks filling courts and prisons with people who simply express an opposition to a development. It sounds like something that belongs in communist China.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Jarrah Vercoe

South Hobart, Tasmania, 7004, Australia

---

This email was sent by Jarrah Vercoe via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jarrah provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jarrah Vercoe at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Jason Thatcher Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 6:54:29 AM

---

Because you bastards need no more powers

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Jason Thatcher

Briagolong, Victoria, 3860, Australia

---

This email was sent by Jason Thatcher via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jason provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jason Thatcher at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 9:54:40 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. The passage of the bill will not stop people from protesting. It will just put greater strain on the courts and prison resources.

Yours sincerely,

Jason Turvey

Kingston, Tasmania, 7050, Australia

---

This email was sent by Jason Turvey via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jason provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jason Turvey at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 10:04:07 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Australia is a country of a fair go and the right to complain without consequence. Why would anyone want to change this?

Yours sincerely,

Jayke Burgess

Katoomba, New South Wales, 2780, Australia

---

This email was sent by Jayke Burgess via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jayke provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jayke Burgess at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 3:08:21 PM

---

Dear Premier Hodgman,

Re : the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Jeanne Wills

Abels Bay, Tasmania, 7112, Australia

---

This email was sent by Jeanne Wills via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jeanne provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jeanne Wills at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 12:12:11 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. You as an elected government should be trying to regain the trust of the people you represent instead of being the self serving cowboys that you have turned into. I used to respect you but after too many selling Tassie's beautiful environment to fatcat developers all connected to yourselves in some backdoor way and many other backtracking on your word for greed I don't anymore. You have family and friends in the community who once believed in you making a difference for the right reason not for the wrong reason.

Yours sincerely,

Jenni Bradley

Battery Point, Tasmania, 7004, Australia

---

This email was sent by Jenni Bradley via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jenni provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jenni Bradley at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 5:31:20 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

I think The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Jennifer Miles

Beaumaris, Victoria, 3193, Australia

---

This email was sent by Jennifer Miles via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jennifer provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jennifer Miles at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Monday, 4 March 2019 8:54:28 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

I object to any government interfering with my right to protest. If I feel that something is going to harm our environment, wildlife or our standards of living, I have the right to voice my opinion without fear of reprisal.

Yours sincerely,

Jennifer Mines

---

This email was sent by Jennifer Mines via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jennifer provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jennifer Mines at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 12:20:11 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;  
it has been deemed to be too vague and too open to interpretation.

it works against the power of ordinary people to voice an opinion, nearly always in the face of more powerful forces (especially those with a hardened motivation of profit without forethought)

there are already laws that can be applied re criminal behaviour, eg wilful destruction - (except when that damage is on a monumental scale or part of a cascade of damaging consequences to the earth by aforementioned powerful forces who can pay huge sums for rafts of legal advice to ferret out exceptions however tenuous.)

if the leaders of a country or district are blinkered or simply ignorant, the voice of the people is the only thing that can bring about change and to resist an embedded way of acting can require very skilled and strong resistance

So I quote "The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose."

Yours sincerely,  
Jenny Masters

---

This email was sent by Jenny Masters via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jenny provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jenny Masters at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)  
To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 9:57:49 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. Our Australian democracy is important to every Australian. We value honesty & openness, & if something is not right or fair, we expect to be able to express that in a respectful peaceful protest. In all legislation, Australian public values needs to be put first (especially in the context of business malpractice) but also for our own human rights, our environment and our children's future.

Yours sincerely,

Jenny Skillen

Repton, New South Wales, 2454, Australia

---

This email was sent by Jenny Skillen via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jenny provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jenny Skillen at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 10:09:23 PM

---

Dear Premier Hodgman,

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Jenny Weber

Blackmans Bay, Tasmania, 7052, Australia

---

This email was sent by Jenny Weber via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jenny provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jenny Weber at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Friday, 1 March 2019 9:30:39 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 20).

A healthy society requires no protests. An unhealthy society requires the right to protest and a sick society forbids protest.

Yours sincerely,  
Jeremy Price  
South Hobart, Tasmania, 7004, Australia

---

This email was sent by Jeremy Price via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jeremy provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jeremy Price at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)  
To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 9:06:58 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

I believe the bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Jessica McEldowney

---

This email was sent by Jessica McEldowney via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you

regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jessica provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jessica McEldowney at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 10:40:55 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

Please read carefully as this is very important to many people.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

jjyah nicholson

---

This email was sent by Jiyah Nicholson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jiyah provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jiyah Nicholson at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 12:10:47 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because I believe in all of the below points:

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Jo Betlehem

South Hobart, Tasmania, 7004, Australia

---

This email was sent by Jo Betlehem via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jo provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jo Betlehem at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 1:25:41 PM

---

This is a Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned for several reasons outlined below:

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Jo Clarke

---

This email was sent by Jo Clarke via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues

they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jo provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jo Clarke at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 9:57:27 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

I am appalled that this government is once again attempting to take away the rights of its people.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Jo East

Mornington, Tasmania, 7018, Australia

---

This email was sent by Jo East via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jo provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jo East at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Friday, 1 March 2019 10:32:35 PM

---

Dear whoever this may concern,

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Joe Fender

---

This email was sent by Joe Fender via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Joe provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Joe Fender at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 1:45:12 PM

---

Dear Will, I defend my right to protest if I feel it is required. Only people with something to hide make laws to silence others.

The Workplace(Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019 seems to

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Jo May

---

This email was sent by Jo May via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jo provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jo May at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 11:25:12 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. Personally I have protested a few times in my life on issues I feel passionate about. In the 70s it was the feminist movement and now I take a keen interest in preserving our environment for future generations. Just recently I protested on the steps of Parliament House in Adelaide with 500 others against a walking company wanting to move the location of their huts of track in a National Park. I could be arrested for such action in Tasmania if this Bill passes. I think this is an appalling waste of tax payers money and abuse of our right to protest peacefully.

Yours sincerely,

JOANNE BRAME

Hayborough, South Australia, 5211, Australia

---

This email was sent by JOANNE BRAME via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however JOANNE provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to JOANNE BRAME at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 7:38:14 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Thank you

Jodie Boundy

Tenterfield, New South Wales, 2372, Australia

---

This email was sent by Jodie Boundy via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding

issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Jodie provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jodie Boundy at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Friday, 1 March 2019 9:21:46 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The Bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This Bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The Bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the Bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The Bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the Bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

John Chadderton

---

This email was sent by John Chadderton via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding

issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however John provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to John Chadderton at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Monday, 4 March 2019 8:14:00 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

The right to protest is fundamental to a thriving democracy and the proposed law is at odds with this.

Yours sincerely,

John Smith

---

This email was sent by John Smith via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however John provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to John Smith at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 2:43:59 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.
7. You suck

Yours sincerely,

Jonah Wiltshire

Tassie, Australia

---

This email was sent by Jonah Wiltshire via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Jonah provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Jonah Wiltshire at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 11:53:02 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

So, back off your attack on citizens' rights to peacefully protesst, we don't need this draconian push to punish protesters in Tasmania.

Yours sincerely,

Josephine Murray

Bream Creek, Tasmania, 7175, Australia

---

This email was sent by Josephine Murray via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Josephine provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Josephine Murray at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 10:06:21 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
2. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
3. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
4. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
5. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Josh Nichols

North Hobart, Tasmania, 7000, Australia

---

This email was sent by Josh Nichols via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Josh provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Josh Nichols at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 8:41:42 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Points 4. and 5. are particularly concerning to me.

Yours sincerely,

Julian Strudwick

---

This email was sent by Julian Strudwick via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding

issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Julian provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Julian Strudwick at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 9:33:21 AM

---

Dear Premier

I am writing to you about your government's Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

This bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Julianne Livingston

---

This email was sent by Julianne Livingston via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Julianne provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Julianne Livingston at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Friday, 1 March 2019 11:24:36 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. This bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, this bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. This bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Julie Baldwin

---

This email was sent by Julie Baldwin via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding

issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Julie provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Julie Baldwin at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 9:40:11 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

We need to keep australia a defender of civil rights

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Julie Sellens

---

This email was sent by Julie Sellens via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Julie provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Julie Sellens at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 11:23:10 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Regards,

Julie Thea

Green Valley, New South Wales, 2168, Australia

---

This email was sent by Julie Thea via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Julie provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Julie Thea at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 9:38:45 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

Scrap the bill because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Julius Hofstetter

Tullera, New South Wales, 2480, Australia

---

This email was sent by Julius Hofstetter via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Julius provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Julius Hofstetter at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 9:41:49 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

I also think it's a fundamental right in a democracy to voice your opinion when you feel strongly about something. Being silenced by government is not the Australian way . It's 40 degrees here today in March. We need to protect our planet and have a balance between employment tourism and our precious environment which is being eroded by climate change and development.

Yours sincerely,

Judy Kerrisk

Opossum Bay, Tasmania, 7023, Australia

---

This email was sent by Judy Kerrisk via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Judy provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Judy Kerrisk at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Friday, 1 March 2019 9:32:11 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, stops the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Karen Corbett

Northcote, Victoria, 3070, Australia

---

This email was sent by Karen Corbett via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Karen provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Karen Corbett at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 9:55:05 PM

---

Dear Premier Hodgman,

I am writing to you regarding the submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Ultimately, you and you're government should back off and stop trying to take citizens right to peacefully protest.

Yours sincerely,

Karen Hill

Coburg North, Victoria, 3058, Australia

---

This email was sent by Karen Hill via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Karen provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Karen Hill at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 7:43:13 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit and leaves far too much room for interpretation and bullying practices.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary and draconian, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Karen Knowles

Surrey Hills, Victoria, 3127, Australia

---

This email was sent by Karen Knowles via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Karen provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Karen Knowles at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 8:49:40 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

The people have spoken.

Yours sincerely,

Karina Morrison

Benowa, Queensland, 4217, Australia

---

This email was sent by Karina Morrison via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Karina provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Karina Morrison at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 11:28:54 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

This is a terrible bill and it should be stopped now before it makes a bigger joke of Tasmania that the old two-headed tropes ever could...

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Karl Thompson

---

This email was sent by Karl Thompson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Karl provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Karl Thompson at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 11:42:52 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

To whom ever it may concern,

I am a Tasmanian Aboriginal woman and I was blessed to be born in a time where I could grow up with a particular privilege that my mother, my father, my grandmother and all my aunties and uncles fought for. I got to grow up on Aboriginal land that was in the care of Aboriginal people.

This wouldn't have been possible if it weren't for the right to protest and rally. We all know the story of the women who surrounded that giant rock at putalina (Oyster Cove). You've seen us on Invasion Day. Even when we just couldn't win in the tragedy that was kutalayna (The Brighton bypass protest) at least we had the right to try.

Everyone protesting whether they 'disrupt a business' or not still deserve the right to try! They deserve the right to fight for what they believe in! This bill will give that to these businesses, they'll have every right to do what they want without being called out!

"Everyone gets a fair go!" Cry true blue Australians but why doesn't that apply to those fighting for takayna/The Tarkine?

Do the right thing and scrap this pile of crap, because that's what it is.

Read the below for your own education.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.

4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.

5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.

6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Kartanya Maynard

Glenorchy, Tasmania, 7010, Australia

---

This email was sent by Kartanya Maynard via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Kartanya provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kartanya Maynard at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 1:48:25 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

Please listen to the people. The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Kasey Mcnamara

Invermay, Tasmania, 7248, Australia

---

This email was sent by Kasey Mcnamara via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Kasey provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kasey Mcnamara at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 9:43:56 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit. It makes it very difficult for people to follow the law if they are unclear on what is classified as criminal behaviour and what is not
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

This bill leaves much unclear and open to interpretation which makes it challenging for people who want to lawfully be able to voice their concerns and object to situations. It seems to me that it is also curtailing people's right to free speech and healthy, peaceful expression of opinion in this state.

This is a draconian bill that would be a step backwards for democracy in Tasmania if approved.

Yours sincerely,

Kate McEldowney

---

This email was sent by Kate McEldowney via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Kate provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kate McEldowney at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 9:21:53 PM

---

This bill should both to ahead under any circumstances.

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Katherine Castle

---

This email was sent by Katherine Castle via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Katherine provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Katherine Castle at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 9:33:49 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Kathryn Loughton

---

This email was sent by Kathryn Loughton via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding

issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Kathryn provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kathryn Loughton at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 11:17:47 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference. So even the simplest act of arguing with a cashier about being overcharged over a bill and not moving on till a refund is received could mean the person is charged.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Kathryn Osborn

Neika, Tasmania, 7054, Australia

---

This email was sent by Kathryn Osborn via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Kathryn provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kathryn Osborn at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 10:59:36 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

I believe freedom of speech and the right to peaceful protest is fundamental to democracy. As the State government of a democratic country you should be utterly ashamed of reintroducing this bill. See you on Mt Wellington.

Yours sincerely,

Kathy Hodgson

---

This email was sent by Kathy Hodgson via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Kathy provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kathy Hodgson at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 8:57:22 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

Do the right thing.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Katie Freeman

Brunswick, Victoria, 3056, Australia

---

This email was sent by Katie Freeman via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Katie provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Katie Freeman at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 11:20:34 AM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The right to protest is a human right. It is every human beings right to speak and stand up for what they believe, and it is the governments job to ensure they can do, and do it safely.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Katy Raucher

---

This email was sent by katy Raucher via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however katy provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to katy Raucher at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 6:39:50 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Thank you for listening.

Yours sincerely,

Kawinwit Kittipalawattanapol

Dynnyrne, Tasmania, 7005, Australia

---

This email was sent by Kawinwit Kittipalawattanapol via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Kawinwit provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kawinwit Kittipalawattanapol at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Friday, 1 March 2019 9:02:41 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.

Yours sincerely,

Kelly Hurley

---

This email was sent by Kelly Hurley via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Kelly provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kelly Hurley at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Sunday, 3 March 2019 9:02:15 PM

---

I wish to make the following submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

I believe the bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Kendal Hodgman

---

This email was sent by Kendal Hodgman via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding

issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Kendal provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kendal Hodgman at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Saturday, 2 March 2019 8:02:09 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Please stop

Yours sincerely,

Kerry Munro

---

This email was sent by Kerry Munro via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Kerry provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kerry Munro at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Friday, 1 March 2019 9:01:11 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because it is an assault on my democratic rights. Australia purports to be a bastion of human rights, which it largely is, but our standing as a freedom loving democratic nation is inhibited by these proposed laws. Peaceful protest has assisted Australian citizens to exercise their role in our democracy, it is a foundation of our democracy and should not be threatened by the proposed legislative changes.

Further to this the proposed legislation should be abandoned because;

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Kerry Trapnell

---

This email was sent by Kerry Trapnell via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at [campaigns@good.do](mailto:campaigns@good.do), however Kerry provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kerry Trapnell at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)  
**Subject:** Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019  
**Date:** Friday, 1 March 2019 10:54:46 PM

---

Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

Firstly the bill affects many rights of genuine citizens due to the following issues ,

1. It compounds the confused nature of the original Act. This bill fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable and so is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trammel the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court accepted that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. Worryingly, the bill would also create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may drift dangerously into regulating public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Kerryn Bell

Wongaling Beach, Queensland, 4852, Australia

---

This email was sent by Kerryn Bell via Do Gooder, a website that allows people to contact you regarding issues they consider important. In accordance with web protocol FC 3834 we have set the FROM field of this email to our generic no-reply address at campaigns@good.do, however Kerryn provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kerryn Bell at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit [www.dogooder.co](http://www.dogooder.co)

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: [www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html](http://www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html)