From:	Madeleine Roberts
To:	Whistleblowers
Subject:	Submission on Consultation Paper
Date:	Wednesday, 8 February 2017 12:44:22 PM

There are numerous failings in the existing whistleblower legislation, and the protections afforded to those who risk their livelihoods and or physical and mental health in coming forward to alert authorities to wrongdoing.

Despite the desire of bureaucracies to make every issue as complex as possible, the best solutions are almost always the simplest.

In this instance, there should be an umbrella agency tasked with receiving all whistleblower communications and farming out those alerts to the appropriate body for investigation.

Rather than nominate particular types of individuals, any person with information should be allowed to whistleblow and be protected from any and all repercussions for doing so. If they choose to remain anonymous, as is currently the case with people who contact CrimeStoppers, this must be respected.

The whistleblower must not be financially at risk of costs or penalty by the courts, their employer or the government for making a legitimate revelation of wrongdoing.

Compensation should be paid to any person whose information leads to the revelation of wrongdoing in any government department or corporation or small business of any size or turnover, if their identity is revealed without their permission or they suffer in any material or psychological way as a result of their whistleblowing.

Although this has not been mentioned at any point in the consultation document, the information supplied by a whistleblower MUST be acted upon until such time as it can be proved, beyond a reasonable doubt, that there is no case to answer by the government department, corporate entity or small business of any size or turnover, accused of wrongdoing.

Additionally, when a government department, corporate entity or small business of any size or turnover is found to have broken the law it MUST be prosecuted to the full extent of the law and the fines must be a significant portion of their annual income (before expenses) - averaged over 10 years - so that the penalty is appropriately harsh and likely to constitute an actual disincentive for ever committing this or any other wrongdoing.

Dr Madeleine R H Roberts
PhD, BA(Hons)