

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)
Subject: Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019
Date: Saturday, 2 March 2019 11:35:30 AM

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.

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.

Yours sincerely,

Kim Cummins

Peregian Springs, Queensland, 4573, Australia

This email was sent by Kim Cummins 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 Kim provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kim Cummins at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 6:25:49 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 is poorly written piece of proposed legislature which fails to make the Act clear and easily applicable. It is unfair to both the public and the law enforcement 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,

Kimberley Wheeler

This email was sent by Kimberley Wheeler 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 Kimberley provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kimberley Wheeler at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:31:08 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 an attempt to undermine the right of people to have a voice within what Australia wishes to call a democracy.

Yours sincerely,

Kiri Kreger

This email was sent by Kiri Kreger 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 Kiri provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kiri Kreger at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 1:28:37 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 is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business and 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 too vague.
4. There are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.
5. The bill will 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.
7. The High Court has already ruled on the original bill form which this new one has been drafted.

Yours sincerely,

Kirsten O'Halloran

North Hobart, Tasmania, 7000, Australia

This email was sent by Kirsten O'Halloran 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 Kirsten provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kirsten O'Halloran at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:33:33 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. Everyone should have the right to peaceful protest.

Yours sincerely,

Kirsten Tanner

Geilston Bay, Tasmania, 7015, Australia

This email was sent by Kirsten Tanner 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 Kirsten provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kirsten Tanner at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:45:52 PM

This is a 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,

Kris Tiggelaven

Old Beach, Tasmania, 7017, Australia

This email was sent by Kris Tiggelaven 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 Kris provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kris Tiggelaven at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 7:17:24 PM

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

To whom it may concern,

I write as a concerned citizen regarding the proposed revival of the draconian anti-protest bill that was struck down as unconstitutional.

The proposed 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,

Kristy Alger

Campania, Tasmania, 7026, Australia

This email was sent by Kristy Alger 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 Kristy provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kristy Alger at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:05:50 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

Yours sincerely,

Kristie Lucas

Murwillumbah, New South Wales, 2484, Australia

This email was sent by Kristie Lucas 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 Kristie provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Kristie Lucas at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 3:44:49 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.

The Australian government for too long has put business interests before the general population's wishes. Now you want to limit our protest power!

Shame on you!

Yours sincerely,

Leigh Farley

Dallas, Victoria, 3047, Australia

This email was sent by Leigh Farley 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 Leigh provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Leigh Farley at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 3:15:07 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.

A bill of similar content has already been rejected by the high courts, what makes you think you can get this one passed? Australian are watching and listening, we have a right to protest!

Yours sincerely,

Laura Caldwell

Lenah Valley, Tasmania, 7008, Australia

This email was sent by Laura Caldwell 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 Laura provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Laura Caldwell at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)
Subject: [REDACTED]
Date: Sunday, 3 March 2019 3:36:58 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 in protecting the future good of humanity,

Laura Malady

This email was sent by Laura Malady 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 Laura provided an email address

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

Please reply to Laura Malady at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:00:18 PM

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,

Laura Plowright

This email was sent by Laura Plowright 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 Laura provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Laura Plowright at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:28:37 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. Inalienable right to peaceful protest in the face of the ruling 2%

Yours sincerely,

Lauren Terry

Melbourne, Victoria, 3004, Australia

This email was sent by Lauren Terry 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 Lauren provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Lauren Terry at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:41:11 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. A further waste of taxpayers money to pursue the government's anti-democratic agenda, to put profits for the few over the welfare of the people, using servants of the public as tools of the state.

Yours sincerely,

Leonard Aronsten

Reservoir, Victoria, 3073, Australia

This email was sent by Leonard Aronsten 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 Leonard provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Leonard Aronsten at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 7:58:16 AM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

This is an affront to the rights of all Tasmanians and Australians.

. 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,

Leonie Cowan

South Hobart, Tasmania, 7004, Australia

This email was sent by Leonie 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, however Leonie provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Leonie Cowan at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:53:00 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.

I believe that I have the right to stand up and protest against actions that damage the environment and unjust laws take away the individuals rights to have a say.

Yours sincerely,

lesley nicklason

This email was sent by lesley nicklason 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 lesley provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to lesley nicklason at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:40:08 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.

Yours sincerely,

Leslie Dunbar

This email was sent by Leslie Dunbar 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 Leslie provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Leslie Dunbar at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:56:31 AM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

0. It degrades the fundamental democratic rights of freedom of expression, the media, and information.

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,

Lincoln Quilliam

Lindisfarne, Tasmania, 7015, Australia

This email was sent by Lincoln 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, however Lincoln provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Lincoln Quilliam at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 2:49:42 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.
7. Please understand that you must not take away the right of protest. Business has a major advantage just by being business ordinary people require ways to have their protests heard.

Yours sincerely,

Linda Lawrence

Seaholme, Victoria, 3018, Australia

This email was sent by Linda Lawrence 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 Linda provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Linda Lawrence at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 3:53:19 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.

Some of the most world changing progress has been made due to its citizens right to protest. The world is in dire straits. Governments making draconian and selfish laws to protect the rights of businesses to make money with disregard for all other beings are only thinking politically. This must stop. All governments, businesses and communities now need to work together towards a solution to the environmental issues we can all see clearly before us.

Yours sincerely,

Lisa Lokki

The Ridgeway, New South Wales, 2620, Australia

This email was sent by Lisa Lokki 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 Lisa provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Lisa Lokki at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 12:22:01 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, 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,

Lisa Maclean

This email was sent by Lisa Maclean 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 Lisa provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Lisa Maclean at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 7:18:01 AM

To whine 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,

Lissa Maloney

Byron Bay, New South Wales, 2481, Australia

This email was sent by Lissa Maloney 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 Lissa provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Lissa Maloney at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 12:24:58 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,

Logan Hunt

This email was sent by Logan Hunt 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 Logan provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Logan Hunt at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 7:16:18 AM

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

The bill 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.

Yours sincerely,

Loren Kronemyer

This email was sent by Loren Kronemyer 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 Loren provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Loren Kronemyer at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:52:51 PM

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

I strongly believe in and value the right in the Australian democratic system to peaceful protest, and would urge that this bill be abandoned primarily 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,

Lorraine Perrins

This email was sent by Lorraine Perrins 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 Lorraine provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Lorraine Perrins at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:00:01 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.

Finally, it is important to respect and uphold the right of an individual to protest peacefully! Using 'protection of business' as a means to control our right to protest is pathetic.

Yours sincerely,

Louisa Brown

Bsc. Australian Environmental Science Dip.

PostGradDip Urban Design

Lindisfarne, Tasmania, 7015, Australia

This email was sent by Louisa 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, however Louisa provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Louisa Brown at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:21:42 PM

Many thanks for the opportunity to make a Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

I believe that the bill should be abandoned for the following reasons:

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,

Louise Sales

South Hobart, Tasmania, 7004, Australia

This email was sent by Louise Sales 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 Louise provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Louise Sales at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:50:26 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. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to reduce the rights of environmental protesters to cut the rights of all Tasmanians to object to business malpractice.

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

There are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests. This is something accepted by the High Court. The bill is therefore extremely unnecessary, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional.

Yours sincerely,

Lucas Chamberlain

This email was sent by Lucas Chamberlain 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 Lucas provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Lucas Chamberlain at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:22:46 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.

WE HAVE A RIGHT TO PROTEST, A RIGHT TO LET OUR VOICES BE HEARD.

Yours sincerely,

Lucia Moon

This email was sent by Lucia Moon 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 Lucia provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Lucia Moon at [REDACTED]

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 11:45:29 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.

Please, this bill should not pass, or we head down a path too dreadful to contemplate.

Yours sincerely,

Luis Trujillo

This email was sent by Luis Trujillo 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 Luis provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Luis Trujillo at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 11:07:10 AM

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

The right to peacefully protest is fundamental to our democracy. 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 your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Lydia Birch

This email was sent by Lydia Birch 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 Lydia provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Lydia Birch at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 6:50:47 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,

Lynda Stuckey

Werribee, Victoria, 3030, Australia

This email was sent by Lynda Stuckey 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 Lynda provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Lynda Stuckey at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:38:46 PM

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

It is appalling that your government should seek to introduce such a anti democratic 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,

Lynne Shortt

Austinmer, New South Wales, 2515, Australia

This email was sent by Lynne Shortt 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 Lynne provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Lynne Shortt at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:31:30 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 wasting the tax payers money, we should have the right to protest anywhere in Australia.

Yours sincerely,

Madeleine Kendell

Aberglasslyn, New South Wales, 2320, Australia

This email was sent by Madeleine Kendell 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 Madeleine provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Madeleine Kendell at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:47:21 PM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. This bill restricts us from basic human rights, where objecting to controversial business motives or business structure is stripped away. As a community we should be able to make a stand and demonstrate against business malpractice .
2. It should not be up to police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means. This renders the law unclear.
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. With such laws already in place, this bill become excessive.
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,

Madeleine Stopp

West Launceston, Tasmania, 7250, Australia

This email was sent by Madeleine Stopp 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 Madeleine provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Madeleine Stopp at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:54:23 PM

Hello There,

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,

Maggie Aylmore

Brunswick East, Victoria, 3057, Australia

This email was sent by Maggie Aylmore 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 Maggie provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Maggie Aylmore at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:22:36 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.

Yours sincerely,

Mahalia White-McColl

Dynnyrne, Tasmania, 7005, Australia

This email was sent by Mahalia White-McColl 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 [REDACTED], however Mahalia provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Mahalia White-McColl at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 5:20:23 PM

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

Without this bill, we sacrifice a core part of our democracy.

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,

Maighan Brandwood

West Launceston, Tasmania, 7250, Australia

This email was sent by Maighan Brandwood 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 Maighan provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Maighan Brandwood at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:27:06 AM

Drop this Hodgey! The people and the planet are more important than profit. There is too much corruption in this world to not have the right to protest. You can try and stop the people but who is going to stop the endless greed and destruction. Hodgey, this bill has got to go!

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,

Maile Ingall

Hobart, Tasmania, 7000, Australia

This email was sent by Maile Ingall 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 Maile provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Maile Ingall at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 11:01:13 AM

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

It's obvious;

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,

M Lade

Camberwell, Victoria, 3124, Australia

This email was sent by Mal Lade 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 Mal provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Mal Lade at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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. Protect the vital democratic right of peaceful protest.
Date: Sunday, 3 March 2019 8:09:00 AM

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

Let's be honest. This bill has really little to do with "workplace protection". It is more to do with diluting the vital democratic right to protest. The Tasmanian Government sadly has a long history of this because it's intent is to exploit our natural environment free of dissent.

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,

Malcolm Fisher

South Hobart, Tasmania, 7004, Australia

This email was sent by Malcolm Fisher 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 Malcolm provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Malcolm Fisher at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:17:50 AM

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

I consider that this bill is unnecessary and should be abandoned on the following grounds:

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

Malcolm Mars

This email was sent by Malcolm Mars 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 Malcolm provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Malcolm Mars at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 6:36:40 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,

Manderlee Anstice

This email was sent by Manderlee Anstice 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 Manderlee provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Manderlee Anstice at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:20:19 PM

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

The bill should be abandoned because it will have a detrimental impact on our democracy. Australia must continue to support its citizens' right to peacefully protest. The use of the word 'threatening' is open to interpretation for both police and the public to determine based on their own perception regardless of intention. The introduction of this bill undermines our democracy and takes dangerous steps toward a more draconian state further dividing those in government from those who elected them. This is a backward step we must not take.

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 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.
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,

Marcia Brandwood

Deloraine, Tasmania, 7304, Australia

This email was sent by Marcia Brandwood 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 Marcia provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Marcia Brandwood at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 1:03:30 AM

I object strongly to the submission of this Bill. It criminalises any interference with any business and removes the long held right of our citizens to peacefully and conscientiously object to business malpractice.

This Bill is an attempt to circumvent the recent High Court ruling that there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour, including those that may take place in public forests.

The bill is unnecessary!

Yours sincerely,
Marcia Winstead
Blackmans Bay, Tasmania, 7052, Australia

This email was sent by Marcia Winstead 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 Marcia provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Marcia Winstead at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co
To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:41:50 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.

The only threat here is one that strikes at the soul of a fundamental democratic right, afforded to all citizens living in a free society. This is a dangerous time & your inability to think outside the current paradigm - sets you on a path down the wrong side of history.

History is unforgiving.

Yours sincerely,

M Owen

Sandy Bay, Tasmania, 7005, Australia

This email was sent by Marcus Owen 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 Marcus provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Marcus Owen at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:13:43 PM

Australian citizens should have the right to peacefully protest and voice their views in a democratic society. Therefore,

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,

Maree Cross

This email was sent by Maree Cross 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 Maree provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Maree Cross at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 2:14:34 PM

To Whom it may concern,

I would like to provide a submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

It is my strong belief that the bill should be dropped 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,

Marg Sutherland

This email was sent by Marg Sutherland 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 Marg provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Marg Sutherland at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 12:04:31 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.
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,

Margaret French

Toronto, New South Wales, 2283, Australia

This email was sent by Margaret French 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 Margaret provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Margaret French at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:43:16 AM

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

I urge that the bill ought to 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,

Margaret Hunter

Taroona, Tasmania, 7053, Australia

This email was sent by Margaret Hunter 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 Margaret provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Margaret Hunter at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 7:06:34 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. 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. I live in a democracy and it's my right to protest.
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,

Margaret Mangelsdorf

Bilambil, New South Wales, 2486, Australia

This email was sent by Margaret Mangelsdorf 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 Margaret provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Margaret Mangelsdorf at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:50:07 AM

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

I support the right to protest peacefully.

Yours sincerely,
Margaret Sonnemann
Lucaston, Tasmania, 7109, Australia

This email was sent by Margaret Sonnemann 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 Margaret provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Margaret Sonnemann at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 5:09:13 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,

MARIA DUGGAN

This email was sent by MARIA 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 MARIA provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to MARIA DUGGAN at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 3:49:45 PM

Dear Premier Hodgman

I would like you to consider the right to freedom of speech that all Australian should have, and to reconsider that the passing of this law will have an adverse effect on the Tasmanian residents as individuals and as a whole community:

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,

Mariangela Vecchi

Palmwoods, Queensland, 4555, Australia

This email was sent by Mariangela Vecchi 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 Mariangela provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Mariangela Vecchi at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 1:49:54 PM

Dear Premier Hodgeman,

Although this is a form email, I completely agree with the sentiments it expresses. The right to protest is the only hung that will save the Tasmanian wilderness from the greed & corruption that has led our world to the escalating collapse of all climate systems.

Sincerely approaching you to heed:

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,

Marianna Kositsin

Beecroft, New South Wales, 2119, Australia

This email was sent by Marianna Kositsin 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 Marianna provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Marianna Kositsin at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 11:57:06 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.

Why do you believe silencing your constituents, your EMPLOYERS is of any consequence other than abuse of democratic rights. Look to history to realise this will do nothing but alienate those who have employed you to govern this little island state responsibly.

Yours sincerely,

Marion Curtain

This email was sent by Marion Curtain 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 Marion provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Marion Curtain at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 2:30:43 AM

stop interfering with the common man's right to peaceful protest.

Submission 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,

Marion Mulholland

Moonah, Tasmania, 7009, Australia

This email was sent by Marion Mulholland 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 Marion provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Marion Mulholland at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:03:34 AM

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

The amended 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,

mark rich

Hobart, Tasmania, 7000, Australia

This email was sent by mark rich 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 mark provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to mark rich at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:36:00 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.
7. Please consider the rights of the public who have a point of view to show .

Yours sincerely,

Martin Balkwill

This email was sent by Martin Balkwill 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 Martin provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Martin Balkwill at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 11:10:48 AM

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

"The right to peaceful assembly protects the right of individuals and groups to meet and to engage in peaceful protest."

<https://www.ag.gov.au/RightsAndProtections/HumanRights/Human-rights-scrutiny/PublicSectorGuidanceSheets/Pages/Righttofreedomofassemblyandassociation.aspx>

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,

Mary Jane Crowley

This email was sent by Mary Jane Crowley 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 Mary Jane provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Mary Jane Crowley at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:05:59 PM

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

While not a resident of Tasmania, I feel strongly that this bill should be abandoned because it places the rights of Australian citizens below a corporate entity.

Australians should have as much right to 'lobby' or influence the government through peaceful protest as a corporate lobbyist does through paying for privileges to access and influence via political donations.

This bill effectively reduces ordinary citizens rights to organised protest against poor or unethical practices.

It is law making like this which has reduced Australians 'rule of law' standard to 11th in the world, and to approve these laws is a step backwards for representational democracy for ordinary citizens who wish to be heard.

Regards

Mat Misdale

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,

Mathew Misdale

Farmborough Heights, New South Wales, 2526, Australia

This email was sent by Mathew Misdale 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 Mathew provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Mathew Misdale at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 5:45:05 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,

Matt Elliot

This email was sent by matt elliot 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 matt provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to matt elliot at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:29:29 PM

You read all this.

You know all this.

Have a heart.

Do what is right, not what is simply advantageous to yourselves.

Please.

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,

Matt Haubrick

Moonah, Tasmania, 7009, Australia

This email was sent by Matt Haubrick 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 Matt provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Matt Haubrick at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 1:37:49 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,

Matthew Forshaw

Coffs Harbour, New South Wales, 2450, Australia

This email was sent by Matthew Forshaw 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 Matthew provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Matthew Forshaw at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 4:21:33 PM

Max hopwood resonates with the following

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,

Max Hopwood

Sandford, Tasmania, 7020, Australia

This email was sent by Max Hopwood 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 Max provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Max Hopwood at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 6:08:53 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.
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,

Megan Davies

This email was sent by Megan Davies 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 Megan provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Megan Davies at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 11:36:36 AM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

It is an attempt to eliminate the voice of the people for whom the government was elected in the first place to represent.

and

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,

Melinda Brown

Ciccione, Northern Territory, 0870, Australia

This email was sent by Melinda 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, however Melinda provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Melinda Brown at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:03:28 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. It is unfair to both the public and the police who are implementing it.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, cuts down the right of citizens to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to quell 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,

Meredith Reardon

Norwood, South Australia, 5067, Australia

This email was sent by Meredith Reardon 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 Meredith provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Meredith Reardon at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:32:49 PM

As an Australian citizen I value my right to protest peacefully against any practices that are unethical or damage our magnificent environment. I reject any legislation that limits or cancels my rights as a law-abiding citizen.

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,

Merilyn Grey

Malvern East, Victoria, 3145, Australia

This email was sent by Merilyn Grey 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 Merilyn provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Merilyn Grey at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 7:28:58 AM

Premier Hodgman

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

It is critically important that your government abandons this 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. That means it 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. Consequently it will 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,

Mishael Jay

This email was sent by Mishael Jay 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 Mishael provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Mishael Jay at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:04:25 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. it is in breach of U.N.declaration of human rights for freedom of association.

Yours sincerely,

michael swanton Union Official

This email was sent by michael swanton 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 michael provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to michael swanton at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 6:15:29 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.

The right to protest peacefully should be upheld, it has seen many benefits for our communities. That businesses can determine a peaceful protest to be a threat will undermine the individuals right to question a flawed process that they would like to see changed.

Yours sincerely,

Michelle Aorangi

This email was sent by Michelle Aorangi 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 Michelle provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Michelle Aorangi at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:44:40 PM

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

The bill should be abandoned ...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. Its unfair to expect 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,

Michelle Caccioppola

This email was sent by Michelle Caccioppola 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 Michelle provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Michelle Caccioppola at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:47:46 AM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

Freedom to protest is a basic, human right in a democratic, free country like Australia. I know it can be inconvenient, but it's essential.

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.

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,

Michelle Harvey

Mylor, South Australia, 5153, Australia

This email was sent by Michelle Harvey 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 Michelle provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Michelle Harvey at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:18:10 AM

I am writing this Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019, because it needs to be abandoned for the following reasons;

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,

Millicent Huber

Hobart, Tasmania, 7000, Australia

This email was sent by Millicent Huber 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 Millicent provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Millicent Huber at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:04:54 PM

To Premier Hodgman,

I wish to present reasons why the Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019 should be abandoned.

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,

Miranda Walker

Riverside, Tasmania, 7250, Australia

This email was sent by Miranda Walker 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 Miranda provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Miranda Walker at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 4:09:53 PM

Dear Mr Hodgman,

I am writing to express my concern regarding 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,

Miss Marley

Blue Knob, New South Wales, 2480, Australia

This email was sent by Miss Marley 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 Miss provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Miss Marley at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:13:53 PM

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

I think 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 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,

Muy Loa

This email was sent by Muy Loa 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 Muy provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Muy Loa at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 7:09:16 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.

All humans should have the right to peacefully protest for or against social issues without fear of criminal enforcement

Yours sincerely,

Nat Tientjes

Rokeby, Tasmania, 7019, Australia

This email was sent by Nat Tientjes 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 Nat provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Nat Tientjes at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 7:25:48 AM

Dear Premier Hodgemann, this is my submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It complicates the already confused and complicated 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. With this the public are in danger from radical confused police.
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 is my right, do not take it away.
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. The public will end up being bullied and threatened by the police.
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,

Natalie Keene

This email was sent by Natalie Keene 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 Natalie provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Natalie Keene at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:45:58 PM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

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

Above all it is just not democratic!

Yours sincerely,
Natalie Saunders
Blackmans Bay, Tasmania, 7052, Australia

This email was sent by Natalie Saunders 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 Natalie provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Natalie Saunders at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 11:24:13 AM

To the Tasmanian Government. Please reconsider this amendment.

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,

Natasha Wardale

West Hobart, Tasmania, 7000, Australia

This email was sent by Natasha Wardale 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 Natasha provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Natasha Wardale at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 3:50:36 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.
7. Business should not have blanket protections from peaceful protests

Yours sincerely,

Nathan Hartwell

Landsdale, Western Australia, 6065, Australia

This email was sent by Nathan Hartwell 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 Nathan provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Nathan Hartwell at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 7:40:45 PM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. Why does an entity that does not exist i.e. a business, get more rights than the human beings that created or help create it?

Yours sincerely,
Neal Ames

This email was sent by Neal Ames 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 Neal provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Neal Ames at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 3:07:12 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.

Yours sincerely,

Neralie Joy

This email was sent by Neralie Joy 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 Neralie provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Neralie Joy at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:25:57 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,

Nicholas Higgins

Wynyard, Tasmania, 7325, Australia

This email was sent by Nicholas Higgins 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 Nicholas provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Nicholas Higgins at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 7:03:17 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.

Premier Hodgman and the Liberal Government back off your attack on citizens' rights to peacefully protest. Stop the draconian push to punish protesters in Tasmania.

Yours sincerely,

Nicholas Parrott

Bream Creek, Tasmania, 7175, Australia

This email was sent by Nicholas Parrott 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 Nicholas provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Nicholas Parrott at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:55:09 PM

Draconian indeed. Poor form.... it is 2019 not 1819!!

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,

Nikki B

This email was sent by Nikki B 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 Nikki provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Nikki B at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:25:09 AM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

It is draconian and anti democratic. Wasting Tasmanian taxpayers money on such a futile piece of legislation to push an outdated anti green agenda is reprehensible.

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,

Nola Errey

Dunalley, Tasmania, 7177, Australia

This email was sent by Nola Errey 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 Nola provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Nola Errey at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 7:17:40 PM

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

It is worrying to see the content of this bill and its implications.

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,

Nury Gordillo

Chadstone, Victoria, 3148, Australia

This email was sent by Nury Gordillo 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 Nury provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Nury Gordillo at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:33:33 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

Oliver Maxwell

South Hobart, Tasmania, 7004, Australia

This email was sent by Oliver Maxwell 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 Oliver provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Oliver Maxwell at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:47:32 PM

The right to protest is a fundamental aspect of democracy, allowing criticism and preventing zimlle corruption. I beg you to reconsider and allow this crucial part of what makes Australia a great 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,

Oliver Westwood

Sandy Bay, Tasmania, 7005, Australia

This email was sent by Oliver Westwood 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 Oliver provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Oliver Westwood at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:24:01 PM

The act to challenge the governing bodies decisions is and should maintain the right of the constituents. To attempt to block the right to protest insures the lack of communication between the representatives and those of whom that represent. Therefore I continue this email as initially stated and support the statement hence forth.

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,

Olly Carter

This email was sent by Olly Carter 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 Olly provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Olly Carter at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 11:38:09 PM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It is confusing and fails to make the Act clear.
2. The bill criminalises interference with any business and cuts down the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice.
3. It leaves police to decide what the term 'threatening' means and is a failure of the need for laws to be clear and explicit.
4. The High Court has accepted there are other Tasmanian laws to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour.
5. the bill would create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether this happens or not. This suggests the law may unacceptably be used to regulate public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference.
6. The bill is unnecessary, duplicates and is unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Pam Sykes

South Hobart, Tasmania, 7004, Australia

This email was sent by Pam Sykes 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, however Pam provided an email address

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

Please reply to Pam Sykes at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 7:35:32 AM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It is confusing and the average person like me cannot easily understand their civil rights and their right to free speech.
2. The bill takes away my long-held right 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,

Pam OMalley

Bellerive, Tasmania, 7018, Australia

This email was sent by Pamela OMalley 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 Pamela provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Pamela OMalley at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 12:55:31 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 the above to infringe on our basic rights as humans to express our point of view in protecting those who cannot protect them/itselfes.

Yours sincerely,

Patricia McIntosh

Williamstown, Victoria, 3016, Australia

This email was sent by Patricia McIntosh 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 Patricia provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Patricia McIntosh at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 5:19:24 PM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. Citizens should be able to peacefully dissent and express their concerns about practices that damage the environment, the well being of the public and infringe on human rights. To take this away is to interfere with our democracy and a dangerous step.

- 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.

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,

Patti Wilkins

Ainslie, Australian Capital Territory, 2602, Australia

This email was sent by Patti Wilkins 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, however Patti provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Patti Wilkins at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:01:59 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.

As a Tasmanian Taxpayer I view the wanton waste of money hurled at a bad bill, rejected by the courts as to be unconstitutional, shows that the Hodgeman govt. is brain dead. Clearly there are better uses for taxpayer money and better legislation that could be written instead of continuing on the ugly ideas cooked up in the vague, and ridiculous legislation above. Wake up to yourselves and try being a grown up government.

Yours sincerely,

Paula Hanks

Parklands, Tasmania, 7320, Australia

This email was sent by Paula Hanks 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 Paula provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Paula Hanks at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 6:49:52 AM

To whom it may concern...

I urge you to reconsider drafting an anti-protest law here in Tasmania. It's unconstitutional, draconian, undemocratic and downright scary.

I love Tasmania. I don't want to see it become a Bjelke-Peterson like state.

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,

Paula Hatton

Battery Point, Tasmania, 7004, Australia

This email was sent by Paula Hatton 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 Paula provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Paula Hatton at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 6:06:01 PM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

.05 we should be allowed to have a say esp. when you guys are being stupid and greedy

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,

Penny Dann

Claremont, Tasmania, 7011, Australia

This email was sent by Penny Dann 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 Penny provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Penny Dann at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 12:10:18 PM

Will 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,

Pete Westwood

Parkdale, Victoria, 3195, Australia

This email was sent by Pete Westwood 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 Pete provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Pete Westwood at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:18:12 AM

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

The bill should be abandoned because any law that places the rights of business interests over the democratic civil rights to protest is undermining the foundations of freedom in a liberal democracy, specifically:

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,

Peter Barker

Yungaburra, Queensland, 4884, Australia

This email was sent by Peter Barker 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 Peter provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Peter Barker at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:20:49 AM

We do not need this act. Who are you governing for? The people always have the right to protest in numbers.

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,

Peter Macpherson

This email was sent by Peter Macpherson 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 Peter provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Peter Macpherson at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:21:10 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.

...and it is demonstrably draconian and fascist in its intent!

Yours sincerely,

Philip Wallis

This email was sent by Philip Wallis 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 Philip provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Philip Wallis at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 3:15:31 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 don't live in Tasmania but I'm a frequent visitor. Every year, I go there as a tourist and seek out its natural beauty; it's forests and wilderness especially. As a fellow citizen, I consider the proposed bill an infringement on democratic rights. Peaceful protest is not a threat to businesses or society and it never has been. The greatest threat we are facing right now, as a nation, is climate change and the destruction of nature. No governments have listened to the electorate on this matter. It is among the top three concerns for the Australian electorate in the upcoming election. We can also protest and express our dissatisfaction by voting. And we will.

Yours sincerely,

Philippa Bateman

Potts Point, New South Wales, 2011, Australia

This email was sent by Philippa Bateman 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 Philippa provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Philippa Bateman at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:11:02 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.

Please don't pass this bill

Yours sincerely,

Rachael Bullen

Brighton East, Victoria, 3187, Australia

This email was sent by Rachael Bullen 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 Rachael provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Rachael Bullen at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 4:52:37 PM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

It is designed specifically to give slash and burn forestry clear reign over forests. Forests, that as a resident and taxpayer of Tasmania also belong to me. I object to their destruction and as the Government of the day has so little care and understanding of their importance I feel it my duty to our future to be able to protest in order to save them. The continued skewing of bias toward one group of Tasmanians over another is simply wrong and should not have a part in our law.

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,

Rachel Howell

Rosevears, Tasmania, 7277, Australia

This email was sent by Rachel Howell 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 Rachel provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Rachel Howell at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 4:25:47 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.
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 blatant attack on the rights of citizens' to object to businesses behaving badly. Businesses should not have the right to criminalise citizens when the business is acting in the wrong.

You should be ashamed of putting up this Bill.

Yours sincerely,

Rachel Johnson

This email was sent by Rachel Johnson 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 Rachel provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Rachel Johnson at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:35:35 PM

Dear Premier Hodgman,

I am writing regarding the Protection from Protestors 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,

Rachel Meyers

Fern Tree, Tasmania, 7054, Australia

This email was sent by Rachel Meyers 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 Rachel provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Rachel Meyers at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:21:41 PM

To the Tasmanian Government,

Please drop this draconian bill. This anti-protest draft law has been released favouring business over civil rights.

This is a 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 criminalizes 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 offenses renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Please consider this letter and submission as well as the implications that this new Bill will have on the general public and their basic human rights.

Yours sincerely,

Raquel Yeomans

This email was sent by Raquel Yeomans 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 Raquel provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Raquel Yeomans at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:43:21 PM

I am writing 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,

Rebecca Buchanan

This email was sent by Rebecca Buchanan 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 Rebecca provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Rebecca Buchanan at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:46:58 PM

Hello,

Re; 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,

Renae Rivierr

Longley, Tasmania, 7150, Australia

This email was sent by Renae Riviere 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 Renae provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Renae Riviere at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:03:36 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 sincerely hope that you consider the above points and throw out this bill.

Yours sincerely,

Rhys Gray

This email was sent by Rhys 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 Rhys provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Rhys Gray at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:23:41 PM

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,

Richard Baxter

This email was sent by Richard Baxter 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 Richard provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Richard Baxter at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 11:06:18 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.

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.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Hoskings

This email was sent by Richard Hoskings 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, however Richard provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Richard Hoskings at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 5:11:23 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.

bad things happen when good people do nothing

Yours sincerely,

rick fisher

Altona North, Victoria, 3025, Australia thanks

This email was sent by rick fisher 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 rick provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to rick fisher at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 1:44:26 PM

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

Free speech and free protest which doesn't endanger lives is a fundamental right in a democratic society.

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,

Ritamay Roberts

East Toowoomba, Queensland, 4350, Australia

This email was sent by Ritamay 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, however Ritamay provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Ritamay Roberts at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:28:56 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. It compromises freedom of speech.
8. It is an act of a wannit to be dictator to suppress the rights of citizens to protest against environmental vandalism

Yours sincerely,

Rob Perry

This email was sent by Rob Perry 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 Rob provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Rob Perry at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 5:22:27 PM

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

The bill should be abandoned not only because corporate and government entities have an unfair balance of power, finances and access to knowledge at their disposal, potential reward from proposed actions, and have a dwindling focus on the Australian people, but also 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,

wanron Rob

Heidelberg Heights, Victoria, 3081, Australia

This email was sent by wanron Rob 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 wanron provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to wanron Rob at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:40:39 PM

Submission on the 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,

Robert Gonsalves

This email was sent by Robert Gonsalves 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 Robert provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Robert Gonsalves at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 6:22:13 AM

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

Industry that neglects the environment and shuns sustainable practices should be fought. In the first instance such malpractice should be curtailed by government; but if needs must the people should be free to protest directly. While economic growth and environmental protection are not mutually exclusive, the stakes are that high; with the literal erosion of our land, that we are all bound to interject when current wealth creation for a few outweighs the collective prosperity of our future. We should all be free to make that determination and fight those who would deny us.

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,

Robert Kelly

Cromer, New South Wales, 2099, Australia

This email was sent by Robert Kelly 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 Robert provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Robert Kelly at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 6:40:17 PM

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

I am writing to protest against the introduction of 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,

Roberta Julian

Sandford, Tasmania, 7020, Australia

This email was sent by Roberta Julian 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 Roberta provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Roberta Julian at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 5:23:48 PM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

I Robin Tanner whole agree with all the points stated below. The proposed bill I believe is an affront to my right as a citizen to not agree with the governance in power at this time.

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,

Robin Tanner

Invermay, Tasmania, 7248, Australia

This email was sent by Robin Tanner 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 Robin provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Robin Tanner at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 3:36:46 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.

I agree with all of the above and add that Australia is meant to be a country where people can express an opinion or belief which is not Government policy. To lose this right is too dangerous to contemplate.

Yours sincerely,

Robyn Mitchell

Oakbank, South Australia, 5243, Australia

This email was sent by Robyn Mitchell 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 Robyn provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Robyn Mitchell at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 7:38:44 AM

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

The bill should be abandoned because first and foremost its our democratic right to do so!

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.
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,

Robyn Neeson

Vincentia, New South Wales, 2540, Australia

This email was sent by Robyn Neeson 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 Robyn provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Robyn Neeson at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 3:48:18 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.

Yours sincerely,

Robyn Rose

This email was sent by Robyn Rose 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 Robyn provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Robyn Rose at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:53:20 PM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

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

. 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,

Robyn Trousselot

Lindisfarne, Tasmania, 7015, Australia

This email was sent by Robyn Trousselot 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 Robyn provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Robyn Trousselot at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 3:07:03 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.

Throw this mob out !!!

Yours sincerely,

Roger Brown

This email was sent by Roger 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, however Roger provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Roger Brown at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 3:14:45 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,

Roseanne Pearce

Fitzgerald, Tasmania, 7140, Australia

This email was sent by Roseanne Pearce 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 Roseanne provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Roseanne Pearce at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:44:37 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 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.
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,

Rosemary Glaiser

Saint Andrews, Victoria, 3761, Australia

This email was sent by Rosemary Glaisher 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 Rosemary provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Rosemary Glaisher at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 5:21:49 PM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

This is supposed to be a democratic country..to criminalize protests is to step towards a repressive police state.
Australia is not North Korea or Egypt

Yours sincerely,
Rosemary Ingram
Northcote, Victoria, 3070, Australia

This email was sent by Rosemary Ingram 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 Rosemary provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Rosemary Ingram at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co
To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:05:02 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.

Yours sincerely,

Rosie Culic

Narrabundah, Australian Capital Territory, 2604, Australia

This email was sent by Rosie Culic 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 Rosie provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Rosie Culic at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 5:45:17 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.

Remember this is a democracy not China.

Yours sincerely,

Ross Farrell

This email was sent by Ross Farrell 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 Ross provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Ross Farrell at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:01:05 AM

Hello Mr Hodgman.

I trust you are well.

Please throw out the bill against peaceful protesting. It's our right, our future and our world and our voices must be heard!

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,

Rowen Privett

This email was sent by Rowen Privett 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 Rowen provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Rowen Privett at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 5:02:12 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.

And lastly the liberal party is out of touch with the people of Tasmania and of Australia. We will see you thugs voted out!!

Yours sincerely,

Roxe McCarthy

Moonah, Tasmania, 7009, Australia

This email was sent by Roxe McCarthy 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 Roxe provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Roxe McCarthy at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:32:07 PM

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

The bill is deeply flawed & 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,

Russ Graham

This email was sent by Russ Graham 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 Russ provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Russ Graham at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 11:07:33 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,

Ryder Jamson

This email was sent by Ryder Jamson 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 Ryder provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Ryder Jamson at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 3:26:32 PM

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

Governments are for the people. Not commercial interests!

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,

Sally Guildford

Thornbury, Victoria, 3071, Australia

This email was sent by Sally Guildford 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 Sally provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sally Guildford at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 1:19:46 PM

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

To whom it may concern,

It's time the Tasmanian government gave up on trying to pass this ridiculous law. We live in a country known for freedom of speech! When a government doesn't listen or respect our values the best way to do our bit is to protest directly. Stop wasting taxpayers money trying to bring on such right wing laws!

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,

Sally Prescott

South Hobart, Tasmania, 7004, Australia

This email was sent by Sally Prescott 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 Sally provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sally Prescott at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 4:00:48 PM

The bill should be abandoned because:

1. It fails to make the Act clear. This is unfair to both the public and the police who are expected to implement it.
2. It criminalises any interference with business by limiting the right of citizens to peacefully object to business malpractice.
3. Leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' means is a concern. Our laws need 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. This legislation is unnecessary.
5. The bill would create a new, standalone offence of 'threatening' to interfere with a business, regardless of whether or not this occurs. This will regulate public expression rather than actual physical acts of interference. For this reason alone, the Bill must be abandoned.

Yours sincerely,

Sandra Kellett

Lenah Valley, Tasmania, 7008, Australia

This email was sent by Sandra 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, however Sandra provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sandra Kellett at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:40:30 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. Australians should have the right to protest, no matter how uncomfortable it makes people and businesses. Government is elected to protect the interests of the people. Not big business.

Yours sincerely,

Sara Hammer

South Toowoomba, Queensland, 4350, Australia

This email was sent by Sara Hammer 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 Sara provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sara Hammer at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 7:12:47 AM

Dear Hodgeman Government,

I ask you to reconsider 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,

Sarah Burton

New Town, Tasmania, 7008, Australia

This email was sent by Sarah Burton 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 Sarah provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sarah Burton at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:39:31 AM

This bill offends our basic right to free speech and assembly. What an utter shame to democracy.

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,

Sarah Crawford

This email was sent by Sarah Crawford 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 Sarah provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sarah Crawford at [REDACTED] .

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 11:01:13 PM

I wish to make a 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,

Sarah Green

Nunamara, Tasmania, 7259, Australia

This email was sent by Sarah Green 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 Sarah provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sarah Green at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:18:08 AM

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

To keep this short, I would urge you to reconsider this amendment. There are many reasons why the bill is unethical; it take away the basic right of free speech, it will make those who wrong our community (and the country as a whole) far less publicly accountable (as standing up for what's right will be punishable), and it will punish good people.

Should the ethical reasons here not be enough for you, consider how this bill will make you look publicly. You will be the ones who tried to silence Tasmanians, which will undoubtedly cause your votes to plummet. It makes you look like less of a leader and more of a dictator, and surely no good politician wants that?

Finally, you surely know that you will not stop protests with this bill. Instead, you will increase crime rates, as good people attempt to stand up for their beliefs. Crime rates will go up because people will be arrested for peaceful protest, and as a result people may resort to more violent and/or destructive methods to get their message across. Graffiti, public stunts and hacking of your personal computers and websites would likely become favoured methods of protest.

You will not stop protest - instead you will punish good people and push them towards more drastic measures to make their voices heard. Protest is already regulated, so I urge you to consider the snowball effect such an ammendment would have on the community as a whole. Protest is healthy, necessary for progress towards a better society - so please do not halt Tasmania's progress as one of the most accepting and progressive states in Australia.

Yours sincerely,
Sarah Livingston
Claremont, Tasmania, 7011, Australia

This email was sent by Sarah 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, however Sarah provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sarah Livingston at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co
To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 1:49:49 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.

It's unfair to create a bill that is this convoluted.

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.

Our right to protest is important in a day and age where the government are doing little to listen to the majority of its people. As well as lacking the foresight to consider future generations.

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.

There will be inconsistency with how this is delivered. How can people determine how to be lawful when it is unclear.

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's a shame that this has to be dealt with again. Protest is a human right and is important for citizens when governments and big business' only focus on their needs.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Scholtes

Skenes Creek, Victoria, 3233, Australia

This email was sent by Sarah Scholtes 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 Sarah provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sarah Scholtes at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 5:03:22 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.

Having the right to peacefully protect the landscapes, seascapes and skylscapes should not be taken away from rights holders of this country. Haven't we lost enough?

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Wilcox

Snug, Tasmania, 7054, Australia

This email was sent by Sarah Wilcox 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 Sarah provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sarah Wilcox at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:13:56 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 do believe George Orwell would be rolling over in his grave at this legislation. This sets an extremely frightening set of circumstances for those who wish to speak out about what they feel and deem to be right. It is not the governments job now , or ever to tell a citizen what they are allowed to support. Let alone setting consequences for peaceful protesting.

Yours sincerely,

Sean Ash-Williams

This email was sent by Sean Ash-Williams 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 Sean provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sean Ash-Williams at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 12:30:25 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.

Finally, the community at large has a constitutional right to express freedom of speech on matters that directly affect them whether it be through organised campaigns or by speaking out as an individual. Why is this law being re-drafted after the High Court ruled it un-constitutional?

This amended and re-branded proposed legislation has no place in Australian democratic society and should be discarded. I expect better from our elected govt.

As a new and permanent resident of Tasmania I will be watching with great interest as to how the Hodgman Govt responds to this and other submissions in regard to Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

Yours sincerely,

Sean Tooker

Cygnets, Tasmania, 7112, Australia

This email was sent by Sean Tooker 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 Sean provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sean Tooker at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:58:29 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.

Do the right thing!!!

Yours sincerely,

Shachar Efrati

This email was sent by Shachar Efrati 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 Shachar provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Shachar Efrati at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 1:54:04 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.

Kind regards,

Shannon Baker

Nabiac, New South Wales, 2312, Australia

This email was sent by Shannon Baker 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 Shannon provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Shannon Baker at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 3:05:15 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.

Their needs to be a balance between the rights of business and the individual. This bill is contrary to the rights of the individual. It is important in a democracy that the well informed and concerned individual have the right to speak up or to protest in a non violent manner, in fact it could be said they have such a duty.

Yours sincerely,

Sharon Kinnison

Scotland Island, New South Wales, 2105, Australia

This email was sent by Sharon Kinnison 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, however Sharon provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sharon Kinnison at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 5:57:31 PM

To whom it may concern,

Our freedom of speech and right to publicly disagree is a fundamental human right. Taking away our ability to peacefully protest is morally and ethically wrong.

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,

Simone Somerfield

Woodcroft, South Australia, 5162, Australia

This email was sent by Simone Somerfield 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 Simone provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Simone Somerfield at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:17:49 AM

To whom it may concern

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

I think 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,

Sky Hugman

Lane Cove North, New South Wales, 2066, Australia

This email was sent by Sky Hugman 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 Sky provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sky Hugman at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:26:18 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 free speech is an essential part of our democracy, and of this country's freedom.

Yours sincerely,

Sonya Herasemiuk

Campsie, New South Wales, 2194, Australia

This email was sent by Sonya Herasemiuk 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 Sonya provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sonya Herasemiuk at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:34:32 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,

Sophia Broese van Groenou

Mount Stuart, Tasmania, 7000, Australia

This email was sent by Sophia Broese van Groenou 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 Sophia provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sophia Broese van Groenou at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 12:52:38 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.
7. It seems to me that our government cares more about large companies than the people.

Yours sincerely,

Stanley Date

Mira Mar, Western Australia, 6330, Australia

This email was sent by Stanley Date 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 Stanley provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Stanley Date at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 2:30:01 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 Australia we should have the law on our side when peacefully protesting against businesses and politicians. In this era, when the protection of human rights and biodiversity is imperative, nobody should be punished for speaking up. Otherwise what hope is there really?

Yours sincerely,

Steph Blackwell

Arana Hills, Queensland, 4054, Australia

This email was sent by Steph Blackwell 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 Steph provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Steph Blackwell at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 5:20:40 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. Its a shocking waste of tax payers money for all above reasons
8. It is being used solely as a devious means to prevent people to have a right to protest

Yours sincerely,

Stephanie Kensitt

Evandale, Tasmania, 7212, Australia

This email was sent by Stephanie Kensitt 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 Stephanie provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Stephanie Kensitt at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 11:37:42 AM

The right to protest is fundamental to democracy, it must be given full protection. People do not protest good and just things, no one is out picketing a solar panel factory. When bad decisions are made they need to be stood up against, this appalling law takes away that right.

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,

Stephen Friederich

This email was sent by Stephen Friederich 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 Stephen provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Stephen Friederich at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:32:06 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.
7. Australia is a Democracy and protesting is one way for citizens to have our voice heard, any law hindering citizens using their voice is not welcome in Australia

Yours sincerely,

Steve Convine

Thornbury, Victoria, 3071, Australia

This email was sent by Steven Convine 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 Steven provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Steven Convine at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:29:59 PM

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

The bill should without hesitation 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,

Whendiey Stewart

Richmond, Tasmania, 7025, Australia

This email was sent by Whendiey Stewart 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 Whendiey provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Whendiey Stewart at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:50:05 PM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

It is draconian to punish peaceful protesters.

To protest peacefully is a civil 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,

Sue Collings

This email was sent by Sue Collings 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 Sue provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sue Collings at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:50:04 AM

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

The Tasmanian government should not interfere with the right to free speech and reasonable action taken by its citizens against corruption and greed of certain people, only interested in monetary gain without respect to the threat of temporary or permanent damage to the natural environment or other aspects of Tasmania.

Australia is a democracy and this action is unconstitutional.

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,

Sue Lafferty

This email was sent by Sue Lafferty 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 Sue provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sue Lafferty at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 6:28:48 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 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. As a Tasmanian resident i feel i should have the right to protest when my elected representatives have stopped representing me, instead putting development dollars ahead of the environment and the citizens who have elected them.

Yours sincerely,

Sue O'Connell

Ranelagh, Tasmania, 7109, Australia

This email was sent by Sue O'Connell 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 Sue provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sue O'Connell at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:38:21 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.

We need to be free to protest peacefully.

Yours sincerely,

Sue Turner

Australind, WA, 6233, Australia

This email was sent by Sue Turner 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 Sue provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sue Turner at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)
Subject: Submission: Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019
Date: Sunday, 3 March 2019 10:28:05 PM

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

I'm writing today as 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,

Sumeena Keshow

Otago, Tasmania, 7017, Australia

This email was sent by Sumeena Keshow 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 Sumeena provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sumeena Keshow at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 6:21:42 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.

I am particularly concerned about this bill threatening my right to protect kunyani from the cable car proponents and the failure of the current government to consider the growing voice of dissent against their support of the cable car.

Yours sincerely,

Suanne Lawrence

This email was sent by Suanne Lawrence 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 Suanne provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Suanne Lawrence at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 12:02:10 AM

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 very sincerely,

Suzanne Tunks

Kambah, Australian Capital Territory, 2902, Australia

This email was sent by Suzanne Tunks 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 Suzanne provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Suzanne Tunks at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 2:42:39 PM

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

Attention: The Tasmanian Government

We have a long proud democratic history and this bill does nothing to enhance or defend that. It reeks of 'jobs for the boys' and an agenda driven by an entitled elite. People aren't going to buy that today, or take it lying down.

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,

Suzette Pelt

Adventure Bay, Tasmania, 7150, Australia

This email was sent by Suzette Pelt 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 Suzette provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Suzette Pelt at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 12:00:04 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.
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' 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,

Sylvia Eilermann

This email was sent by Sylvia Eilermann 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 Sylvia provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sylvia Eilermann at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:11:26 AM

I would like to make a submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

The bill should be abandoned because;

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

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.

It removes 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.

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

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,

Sylvia van der Peet

This email was sent by Sylvia van der Peet 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 Sylvia provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Sylvia van der Peet at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:51:01 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.

Implementation of this bill is socially irresponsible and relinquishes community freedom. As painful as even peaceful protests maybe, it should be given that the protestors at least care enough to be involved. Tasmanian should be thankful to have such a passionate community.

Yours sincerely,

Tabatha Badger

Coles Bay, Tasmania, 7215, Australia

This email was sent by Tabatha Badger 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 Tabatha provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Tabatha Badger at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:17:01 AM

Dear Hodgeman, as a Tasmanian I am severely disappointed in the decisions that you have made thus far concerning our rights as citizens to peacefully protest. This shows just how out of touch you are with our community & how blindly you follow the wills of businesses and profit over people.

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,

Takani Clark

Lenah Valley, Tasmania, 7008, Australia

This email was sent by Takani 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, however Takani provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Takani Clark at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 7:27:34 AM

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

My name is Tamara and our community strongly opposes the 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,

Tamara Kempton

North Hobart, Tasmania, 7000, Australia

This email was sent by Tamara Kempton 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 Tamara provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Tamara Kempton at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 7:48:06 AM

We live in a Democracy! How dare ANYONE attempt to take away the voice of the citizens?! You will lose your position of power, we, the people, will NOT BE SILENCED!!

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,

Tamara Venables

This email was sent by Tamara Venables 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 Tamara provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Tamara Venables at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 11:14:11 AM

To Premier Hodgman,

I hope this finds you well..

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

As a public health advocate who is keenly aware of the inextricable link between the health of humans and the health of the natural environment, I believe the right to protest against organisations who threaten our natural environment is paramount, especially in our democratic society.

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,

DR Tamzyn Davey

This email was sent by Tamzyn Davey 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 Tamzyn provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Tamzyn Davey at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:20:11 PM

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

To Hodgman

Please consider your legacy, your children and how history will veiw those on the wrong side of what is right... the fact that citizens are moved into action to protest against companys is proof enough that something is very wrong.

Passing a bill to stop people expressing concerns seems idiotic at best!

I belive very strongly 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,

Tanya Hawkes

Cygnets, Tasmania, 7112, Australia

This email was sent by Tanya Hawkes 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 Tanya provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Tanya Hawkes at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 3:16:47 PM

STOP BEING SO SELFISH! THE WORLD IS BIGGER AND MORE IMPORTANT THAN YOU. IF YOU WERENT SUCH SHORT SUGHTED, IGNORANT PEOPLE, WE WOULDNT HAVE TO PROTEST. STOP TAKING AWAY OUR RIGHT TO DO GOOD.

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,

Tayla Sernaggia

West Hobart, Tasmania, 7000, Australia

This email was sent by Tayla Sernaggia 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 Tayla provided an email address [REDACTED] which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Tayla Sernaggia at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:07:59 AM

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

This bill takes away the long-held right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice and the rights of all Tasmanians to protest against this malpractice.

Why is the Hodgeman Government leaving police to decide what the term 'threatening' (to interfere with a business) means?

There are already Tasmanian laws in place, to deal with criminal or destructive behaviour in workplaces!

The bill is simply an unnecessary and ambiguous attempt by the Hodgeman Government to censure the civil rights of the citizens of Tasmania!

STOP THIS BILL !

Yours sincerely,

Teresa Maddox

Claremont, Tasmania, 7011, Australia

This email was sent by Teresa Maddox 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 Teresa provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Teresa Maddox at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:55:24 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,

Terri Tompkins

This email was sent by Terri Tompkins 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 Terri provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Terri Tompkins at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 3:17:49 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.
7. The bill goes against the right to free speech, which is an in-built part of Australian culture.

Yours sincerely,

Theresa Healy

This email was sent by Theresa Healy 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 Theresa provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Theresa Healy at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 7:26:47 PM

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

The right to protest should be protected. I don't understand how I can explain to my students that under some circumstances they could be arrested for peaceful protest. This is not something that young people support and they fail to understand how the world could be that way.

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,

Therese Smith

This email was sent by Therese 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, however Therese provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Therese Smith at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 4:49:09 PM

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

Dear law makers, This bill should be abandoned on the following grounds that, in summary, the bill represents everything Australia should not be; an authoritarian state that attempts to criminalise resistance to authority. Conservatives pay lip service to 'the Anzac spirit' but then try to crush it. My father did not serve for nonsense like this. Just stop being nazis - please.

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,

Thomas Williams

Berowra, New South Wales, 2081, Australia

This email was sent by Thomas Williams 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 Thomas provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Thomas Williams at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 6:25:55 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.

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.

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,

Tiffany Smith

Sandy Bay, Tasmania, 7005, Australia

This email was sent by Tiffany 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, however Tiffany provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Tiffany Smith at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 11:34:17 AM

To whom it may concern.

Below is my submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019.

I strongly 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.

Tim Levy

Performing Arts Technician

GPO Box 1980,

Canberra, ACT, 2601.

[REDACTED]

This email was sent by Tim Levy 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 Tim provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Tim Levy at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:57:39 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.

Yours sincerely,

Tom Castles

Grovedale, Victoria, 3216, Australia

This email was sent by Tom Castles 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 Tom provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Tom Castles at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:51:07 PM

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

The bill should be immediately 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.

Do you think this bill will help? Tasmania has enough issues as it is. Could you not devote your time better, for example by putting funding towards the eradication of the Tasmanian Devil Facial Tumour Disease?

Yours sincerely,

Tracey Kraehenbuehl

This email was sent by Tracey Kraehenbuehl 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 Tracey provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Tracey Kraehenbuehl at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 12:27:39 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.

When a government cannot debate with and accept criticism from citizens it cannot be governing - it is ruling. Why would a democratic government try to silence it's electorate ? This sort of medieaval law has no place in modern Australia. History also shows that people will demonstrate regardless and that totalitarian governments fall. Why would a modern clever politician or indeed company (that relies on the public for income) feel the need to hide from protest?

Yours sincerely,

Tracy Raby

Corio, Victoria, 3214, Australia

This email was sent by Tracy 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, however Tracy provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Tracy Raby at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:16:08 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,

Trevor Ockenden

This email was sent by Trevor Ockenden 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 Trevor provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Trevor Ockenden at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 7:23:05 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 by protestors.
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,

Trish Clayton

This email was sent by Trish Clayton 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 Trish provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Trish Clayton at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 6:11:23 PM

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

I do not 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,

Trudy Sharman

Buderim, Queensland, 4556, Australia

This email was sent by Trudy Sharman 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 Trudy provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Trudy Sharman at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 6:10:18 PM

On the SUBJECT of 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,

tully lloyd

This email was sent by tully lloyd 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 tully provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to tully lloyd at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:27:50 AM

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,

Vanessa Peck

This email was sent by Vanessa Peck 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 Vanessa provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Vanessa Peck at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 7:49:48 AM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. It adds to 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 redundant, and the duplication of offences renders the bill unconstitutional as the bill is not reasonable and appropriately adapted to its purpose.

Yours sincerely,

Veena Tilly

This email was sent by Veena Tilly 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 Veena provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Veena Tilly at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:00:49 AM

Please abandon the bill for the following reasons:

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,

Victoria Pitel

South Lismore, New South Wales, 2480, Australia

This email was sent by Victoria Pitel 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 Victoria provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Victoria Pitel at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 5:39:07 AM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. The Tasmanian Government had their anti-protest law soundly rejected on the grounds that it was unconstitutional, confusing and unworkable, costing the Tasmanian taxpayer more than \$350,000 in the process. The process of the law should be respected, as should costs to taxpayers.
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,

Vija Hughes

This email was sent by Vija Hughes 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 Vija provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Vija Hughes at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 6:52:41 PM

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

To whom it may concern,

I wish to register my objection to the Bill below. I live in a democratic nation and the right of protest is intrinsic to our democratic processes. I refer you to the statements by UTAS Senior lecturer in Law, Dr Gogarty, as to the confused nature of this Bill and I strongly object to it.

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,

Virginia Brown

Sandy Bay, Tasmania, 7005, Australia

This email was sent by Virginia 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, however Virginia provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Virginia Brown at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 10:42:28 AM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

1. it is part of a death by a thousand cuts of democracy
2. It is a democratic responsibility of citizens to protest at unfair processes or laws
3. It is deliberately worded to make it wide ranging and unequally applied
4. Citizens have less power than businesses so need the ability to protest but in Peron's and on social media.

Yours sincerely,

Vivian Harris

Bega, New South Wales, 2550, Australia

This email was sent by Vivian Harris 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 Vivian provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Vivian Harris at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 6:41:59 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.

Yours sincerely,

William Lane

Trevallyn, Tasmania, 7250, Australia

This email was sent by William Lane 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 William provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to William Lane at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 9:42:14 PM

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

The bill should be abandoned because;

To me, the number one thing that makes people happy, and society work, is freedom.

This law that has been proposed in Tasmania (for the second time) strongly restricts people's freedom to protest.

I don't necessarily agree with a lot of the protests, but Tasmania has a consistent track record of successful protests that favour wilderness and conservation over industry - and that's part of the reason it's so beautiful.

Please consider the importance of freedom as a core aspect of society.

Regards,
Yaroslav Sakov

This email was sent by Yaroslav Sakov 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 Yaroslav provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Yaroslav Sakov at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 8:49:58 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. So the bill actually places business rights above human rights. This is into,era Le in a liberal democracy.
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,

Yvonne Hartman

This email was sent by Yvonne Hartman 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 Yvonne provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Yvonne Hartman at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Have Your Say \(DoJ\)](#)
Subject: Erosion of democratic right to protest Submission on the Workplaces (Protection from Protesters) Amendment Bill 2019
Date: Saturday, 2 March 2019 1:11:11 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 unclear and unambiguous and difficult for the public and the police to interpret.
2. The bill criminalises any interference with any business or, in the reverse, reduces right of citizen's to peacefully object to business malpractice. The amendments effectively widen the original intent to trample 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,

[REDACTED]

This email was sent by Yvonne Lynch 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 Yvonne provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Yvonne Lynch at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 4:15:54 PM

I stand with the points raised below

I am tired of the secrecy that surrounds this government and its refusal to heed the will of the people with regard to the protection of our wilderness.

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,

Yvonne Trevaskis

Battery Point, Tasmania, 7004, Australia

This email was sent by Yvonne Trevaskis 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 Yvonne provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Yvonne Trevaskis at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: 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 12:30:08 PM

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

This bill is a gross infringement of human rights.

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,

Zoe Saltz

West Launceston, Tasmania, 7250, Australia

This email was sent by Zoe Saltz 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 Zoe provided an email address ([REDACTED]) which we included in the REPLY-TO field.

Please reply to Zoe Saltz at [REDACTED].

To learn more about Do Gooder visit www.dogooder.co

To learn more about web protocol FC 3834 visit: www.rfc-base.org/rfc-3834.html