

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee](#)
Subject: Response to the Summary Offences and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019 ("Dangerous Devices" Bill)
Date: Thursday, 3 October 2019 11:03:43 AM

I strongly oppose the proposed amendments regarding attachment devices for peaceful protest. The "consequences of the employment of these "dangerous" attachment devices" is greatly overstated in your rational and the arguments for their use completely ignored.

Regarding your rational for this proposal, "Alarminglly, some people have made use of attachment devices that have also been constructed or designed in such a way as to endanger themselves, emergency service workers and potentially members of the public." Have they? Where is your evidence for such a claim? This way of thinking is completely contrary to the fundamental foundation of peaceful protesters. From a protesters point of view attachment devices serve two purposes. To extend the period of time that the protest can occur and to eliminate any possibility of violent altercation, at least from the protesters position, as it is completely impossible for the protester to retaliate no matter how violent the police response may be. This ensures at least from the protesters side there is no possibility of violence erupting. With the absence of attachment devices police responses have become so intense and at times violent in an effort to remove protesters as quickly as possible that these attachment devices have been a necessary introduction to maintain peace. The introduction of them has resulted in more effective yet more peaceful protest actions. Yes some tactics such as tripods and mono-poles do introduce a certain risk to the highly trained protesters who have the skills and training to employ them, but it is only themselves who are taking that risk, they put no one else at risk, and for those individuals who choose to employ such tactics they do so fully informed and therefor must weight their own personal risk against the impeding emergency they are protesting about, which is and will continue to impact all of our society, including yourselves. Also any reinforcing placed inside concrete to increase the robustness of the device while posing a strategic delay for the police removal is nothing new or out of the ordinary. Every day tradespeople all over the world are cutting concrete containing steel, plastic, rubber or any many of other materials. This requires patience and special equipment but no one is suggesting these everyday trades people are somehow at serious risk of death. If you disagree with my statement then you should be focusing your time and energy to introduce legislation to protect all those tradespeople exposing themselves to this every day as their number far outweighs the few police who are required to remove lock on devices. Your rational in justifying this proposed change is completely upside down. Without you bringing forward hard and irrefutable evidence of the widespread use of "booby trapped" devices I think we can all safely say it is your own twisted violent imagination which is creating that imaginary danger yet somehow ignoring the real and present danger of inaction or insufficient action on climate change.

All scientific, economic and social analysis indicates that the object of protest, i.e. the climate emergency, will cause profound disruption. To use/quote your own rational for these laws ... Detailed studies which you, our policy makers, have full access to indicate that the "direct costs though delays in services, business deliveries etc. and social costs by adversely impacting on people's quality of life" caused by climate change will with high confidence cause societal breakdown. "This disruption (will) surpass the inconveniences to the public traditionally caused by" any other lawful or unlawful activity any protesters have ever or will ever undertake. The law should focus on making inaction or insufficient action on climate change illegal and hold those policy makers who fail to rapidly take actions to reduce emissions, and so protect the public from it's impacts, to account for this life threatening and dangerous insufficient action.

Peaceful protest including the use of any devices to prolong the protest action and counter forceful and sometimes violent police action to terminate the protest while also reducing or eliminating any possibility of retaliation to police violence and so de-escalating protests must remain a foundation of our democracy. Most, if not all, social advances of recent history, from womens voting rights to awareness of racial discrimination, to safe working

conditions, to the 8 hour day, to environmental protections, have involved legal and illegal peaceful protest including attachment devices and until everyday citizens are afforded an equal voice to the powerful lobbyists, who are impacting adversely on our democracy, they will continue to do so.

I reject your proposed legislation amendment entirely as you have based it on false and misleading rational and completely ignored the arguments in favour of lock on devices which help maintain peaceful protests even in the face of violent police response.

Regards,

Paul Jukes

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.