

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE
AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

**'THE ELECTRONIC EYE' - INQUIRY INTO THE EFFICACY OF
SURVEILLANCE CAMERAS**

Report No. 2 of the Standing Committee on Legal Affairs

September 1996

Resolution of Appointment

The following general purpose standing Committees be established to inquire into and report on matters referred to them by the Assembly or matters that are considered by the committee to be of concern to the community ...

... a Standing Committee on Legal Affairs to examine matters related to administrative law, civil liberties and human rights, censorship, company law, law and order, criminal law, and consumer affairs.

Legislative Assembly for the A.C.T., *Minutes of Proceedings*, (1995), No. 1, 9 March 1995, p 7

Terms of Reference

That the Standing Committee on Legal Affairs inquire into the efficacy of surveillance cameras in preventing crime, and the implications of such action for the community, and report to the Assembly by the first sitting day in September 1996.

Legislative Assembly for the A.C.T., *Minutes of Proceedings*, (1995-96), No. 40, 29 February 1996, p 280

Committee Membership

Mr Paul Osborne, MLA (Chair)

Mr Trevor Kaine, MLA (Deputy Chair)

Ms Rosemary Follett, MLA

Secretary: Mr Russell Keith (to 3 May 1996)

Ms Beth Irvin (from 6 May 1996)

Research Officer: Mrs Kim Blackburn

Administrative Officer: Ms Anne Munns

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RESOLUTION OF APPOINTMENT	iii
TERMS OF REFERENCE	iii
COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP	iv
PREFACE	vii
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	ix
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
REFERENCE BY ASSEMBLY	1
CONDUCT OF INQUIRY	1
LAYOUT OF THE REPORT.....	2
CHAPTER 2. CCTV: TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENTS	3
CHAPTER 3. CCTV: USE IN PUBLIC PLACES IN THE A.C.T.	7
BELCONNEN AND WODEN BUS INTERCHANGES	7
WEST BELCONNEN AND MUGGA LANE LANDFILLS	7
A.C.T. LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY	8
PROPOSED USE IN CIVIC	9
<i>Incidences of Crime</i>	9
<i>View of the Attorney-General's Department</i>	10
<i>View of Australian Federal Police</i>	10
<i>View of the Australian Privacy Commissioner</i>	11
<i>Other Views</i>	12
CHAPTER 4. CCTV: USE IN PUBLIC PLACES AROUND AUSTRALIA (OTHER THAN THE A.C.T.)	13
QUEENSLAND.....	13
<i>Brisbane</i>	13
<i>Gold Coast</i>	14
<i>Ipswich</i>	14
<i>Townsville</i>	15
<i>Cairns</i>	15
<i>Toowoomba</i>	16
NEW SOUTH WALES	16
<i>Sydney</i>	16
<i>Manly</i>	17
<i>Walgett</i>	17
<i>Lismore</i>	17
WESTERN AUSTRALIA	18
SOUTH AUSTRALIA	18
VICTORIA	19
TASMANIA	19
<i>Hobart</i>	19
<i>Launceston</i>	19
NORTHERN TERRITORY.....	20
<i>Darwin</i>	20
<i>Alice Springs</i>	20
NSW LAW REFORM COMMISSION INQUIRY.....	20

CHAPTER 5. CCTV: USE IN NEW ZEALAND AND THE UNITED KINGDOM.....	23
NEW ZEALAND	23
UNITED KINGDOM	23
CHAPTER 6. CCTV: THE COMMITTEE’S VIEW.....	25
PROLIFERATION OF CCTV	25
<i>View of the Committee</i>	26
RESEARCH DATA ON CCTV	26
URBAN DESIGN AND OTHER STRATEGIES	27
PRIVACY	28
INDEPENDENT AUDITOR/OMBUDSMAN	29
CODE OF PRACTICE	30
DISPLACEMENT	31
<i>View of the Committee</i>	32
MOBILE CCTV UNITS	32
<i>View of the Committee</i>	33
SIGNAGE	33
MONITORING OF CCTV SYSTEMS	34
TRIAL OF CCTV IN CIVIC	35
DEVELOPMENTS FOLLOWING THE TRIAL	37
UNSUBSTANTIATED CLAIMS AND MEDIA PUBLICITY	38
<i>View of the Committee</i>	39
PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR CCTV IN PUBLIC PLACES	39
<i>View of the Committee</i>	40
CCTV IN PUBLIC PLACES IN THE A.C.T.	40
APPENDIX A: LIST OF SUBMISSIONS	43
APPENDIX B: PUBLIC HEARINGS.....	45

Preface

The Standing Committee on Legal Affairs is pleased to report on the issues surrounding the use and effectiveness of video surveillance in preventing crime, with a view to the possible use of this technology in Canberra. The Committee has conducted a broad inquiry and considered the experiences of cities and towns that operate surveillance cameras both within Australia and overseas.

It has been difficult for the Committee to produce a definitive assessment on the effectiveness of surveillance cameras in preventing crime as it was only able to find a couple of occasions worldwide where a video surveillance system (whether installed, trialed or expanded) has undergone the rigours of both pre-installation and post-installation assessment.

One of the major concerns that members of the of the public brought to the Committee's attention during this inquiry had to do with the issue of privacy. The Committee believes that safeguards **must** be developed **before** any system is installed and not after it. The Committee's recommendations form a step-by-step process which Members of the Legislative Assembly should carefully consider in assessing and debating the use of video surveillance.

The Committee was surprised and concerned to learn of the prevalence of video surveillance cameras across Australia, and indeed that they are already in use in public places in the A.C.T. This latter finding is especially of concern as the A.C.T. does not yet have any legal framework for the protection of privacy. The Committee recommends that the A.C.T. Government enact privacy legislation and develop appropriate protocols to redress this situation as soon as possible.

Paul Osborne, MLA
Chair

19 September 1996

Summary of Recommendations

6.10. Recommendation 1.

Because of the lack of substantive Australian research about the effectiveness of CCTV, the Committee requests the A.C.T. Attorney-General seek the co-operation of the Commonwealth in having an Australia wide review conducted - possibly using the resources of the Australian Institute of Criminology.

6.15. Recommendation 2.

Given the lack of substantive research available on the effectiveness of CCTV the Committee recommends that the Government reconsider the recommendations in the *Civic By Night Final Report* and the *Role of Urban Design in Crime Prevention and Community Safety Report*.

6.18. Recommendation 3.

The Committee recommends that the Government enact Privacy legislation incorporating penalties for breaches which will cover video surveillance before commencing any trial of CCTV systems in public places in the A.C.T.

6.25. Recommendation 4.

The Committee recommends that the Government, before commencing any trial of CCTV, establish an independent auditor/ombudsman with powers to audit the system , both random and specified periodic audits, and investigate complaints.

6.30. Recommendation 5.

The Committee recommends that the Government ensure an adequate Code of Practice is developed prior to introducing a CCTV system. The Committee would appreciate seeing the Code of Practice before it is adopted in its final form. The Committee believes that the Independent Auditor/Ombudsman would be the appropriate person to develop the Code of Practice, perhaps in conjunction with the Australian Privacy Commissioner.

6.49. Recommendation 6.

The Committee recommends that the Government ensure signs are clearly visible to advise the public that a CCTV system is operating in the area.

6.59. Recommendation 7.

The Committee recommends that the Government ensure that the system is monitored by properly qualified people employed by the A.C.T. Government or the AFP.

6.66. Recommendation 8.

The Committee recommends that after the Government has:

- **reconsidered and where possible implemented the recommendations in the *Civic By Night Final Report* and the *Role of Urban Design in Crime Prevention and Community Safety Report* (recommendation 2);**
- **enacted Privacy legislation (recommendation 3);**
- **established an independent auditor/ombudsman (recommendation 4);**
- **developed a Code of Practice (recommendation 5);**
- **erected adequate signage (recommendation 6); and**
- **tasked properly qualified people employed by the A.C.T. Government or the AFP to monitor the system (recommendation 7),**

it arrange a six month (cost free) trial to be comprehensively evaluated by an independent organisation for, amongst other things, its effectiveness in reducing crime and displacement.

6.69. Recommendation 9.

The Committee recommends that the:

- **Government present the evaluation report to the Assembly on the first sitting day after it has been submitted to the Government;**
- **evaluation report be referred to the Standing Committee on Legal Affairs; and**
- **cameras be turned off until after the Standing Committee on Legal Affairs reports to the Assembly on the evaluation report.**

6.75. Recommendation 10.

The Committee recommends that the Government establish a process which allows for public comment on any proposal to install, expand or upgrade the use of surveillance cameras in the A.C.T. The Standing Committee on Legal Affairs gives notice that it will monitor any such developments.

6.88. Recommendation 11.

The Committee recommends that the Government, in relation to those places where CCTV is being used in public places, immediately:

- **erect signs advising the public that they are under CCTV surveillance;**
- **develop and implement protocols governing the operation and management of the system and handling of video footage; and**
- **develop procedures to audit each system.**

Chapter 1. Introduction

Reference by Assembly

1.1. The origin of the inquiry arose from an approach by a private security company (Wormald Security) to the Attorney-General, Mr Gary Humphries, MLA. The Company offered the free use of surveillance cameras (known in the security industry as closed circuit television or CCTV) for a specified time to conduct a trial in Civic.¹

1.2. On 29 February 1996 the Assembly (on the motion of Ms Follett, MLA) asked the Committee to:

“inquire into the efficacy of surveillance cameras in preventing crime, and the implications of such action for the community, and report to the Assembly by the first sitting day in September 1996”.²

1.3. The debate on Ms Follett’s motion focused almost exclusively on surveillance cameras in **public** places. Therefore, the Committee took the view that the Assembly resolution intended that it restrict itself to the effectiveness of surveillance equipment in public places.

1.4. The Assembly resolved that the Government not take any action to install a CCTV system in Civic until the Assembly considered the issue.³

1.5. On 29 August 1996 the Assembly amended the Committee’s reporting date to 26 September 1996.

Conduct of Inquiry

1.6. The Committee advertised its inquiry in *The Canberra Times, Chronicle* and *Valley View* and asked for public comment to be lodged by 13 May 1996. The Committee continued to accept submissions after the original closing date. Thirteen submissions were received by the Committee. A list of Submissions is at Appendix A.

1.7. The Committee held a public hearing on 8 August 1996. The persons and organisations who appeared at the hearing are listed in Appendix B.

1.8. In order to gain a wider perspective on the issues related to introducing CCTV into public places the Committee travelled to Queensland. The Committee met with representatives from the Brisbane and Gold Coast City Councils, Queensland Police, the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties and a security risk management consultant.

¹ Mr Gary Humphries, MLA, *Hansard*, 29 February 1996, p 508

² Legislative Assembly for the A.C.T., Minutes of Proceedings, (1995-96), No. 40, 29 February 1996, p 280

³ Ms Rosemary Follett, MLA, *Hansard*, 29 February 1996, p 504

1.9. The Committee saw first hand the equipment in operation, what it can see and do, the range of technology and options available and gained an understanding of the rapid pace of change in the technology. Members discussed the reasons why CCTV was introduced into Brisbane and the Gold Coast (and what other options were considered) and how successful the respective Councils and Queensland Police considered the equipment to be.

1.10. The Committee also met the Vice President of the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties to discuss how he believed the introduction of CCTV into public places in Queensland affected people's privacy and civil liberties issues.

1.11. To gain a better understanding of the privacy issues involved in the installation of CCTV in public places, the Committee met with the Australian Privacy Commissioner, Mr Kevin O'Connor, on 2 September 1996.

Layout of the Report

1.12. The following chapter examines the development of CCTV in Australia, including the features of modern equipment, common uses for the technology and examples of innovative uses.

1.13. Chapter 3 describes where CCTV is used in public places in the A.C.T., its proposed use in Civic and crime in Civic.

1.14. Chapter 4 then gives an overview of the use of CCTV in public places around the rest of Australia (including details of the NSW Law Reform Commission Inquiry), New Zealand and the United Kingdom.

1.15. The final Chapter of the report outlines the view of the Committee following a review of all the preceding material. It contains findings and makes 11 recommendations.

Chapter 2. CCTV: Technological Developments

Video surveillance is substantially different from human visual surveillance and makes possible a wide range of applications which would not be feasible simply with human surveillance.⁴

2.1. CCTV technology was first introduced into Australia in the mid 1960s. Its use was restricted until the mid 1980s when significant technological improvements enabled its use to expand. The dramatic reduction in the cost of equipment in the early 1990s led to a rapidly expanding market.⁵

2.2. Features of modern CCTV equipment include powerful remote facilities to pan, tilt and zoom; cheaper, higher quality colour reproduction; and an ability to produce quality images in almost complete darkness. Cameras can also be equipped with an audio recording capacity, although it does not appear that many have been so equipped.⁶

2.3. It is expected that further technological advancements will encourage “more widespread use of video surveillance”.⁷ These advancements include the move to digital technology. The new technology will be able to communicate video images and translate the tapes into digital information and provide automated remote surveillance and automatic optical recognition of individuals through biometric features such as faces or retinal scans. Improved features such as picture quality, zooming capacity, miniaturisation, remote transmission and night vision are also continually coming onto the market.⁸

2.4. These technological advancements are likely to show up early in Australia, reflecting the fact that “Australia is a world leader in adopting new technologies, in particular personal information and communication devices” and that the “adoption of video surveillance has proceeded at a faster pace in Australia than in many other industrialised societies”.⁹

2.5. Already, CCTV technology is commonly used in many locations in Australia including:

- intersections (“red light cameras”);
- speed cameras;

⁴ Privacy Committee of NSW, *Invisible Eyes: Report on Video Surveillance in the Workplace*, No. 67, Sydney, September 1995, p 1

⁵ *ibid*

⁶ *ibid*

⁷ *ibid*, p 21

⁸ *ibid*

⁹ *ibid*

- major traffic areas for peak hour traffic flow management and to measure traffic flow control;
- public transport;
- automatic teller machines;
- casinos;
- banks, large retail stores, video stores, chemists etc;
- shopping centres and malls;
- petrol stations;
- building and site access;
- the foyers and lobbies of offices;
- elevators;
- building perimeters;
- car parks; and
- public places.¹⁰

2.6. The technology is also used to record Police interviews. The Australian Privacy Commissioner expressed the view that this use of CCTV technology:

seems to have freed police of allegations of corrupt and unlawful activity and ... [given] courts very meaningful evidence of the demeanour and attitude and understanding of the situation from the point of view of the accused.¹¹

2.7. Video surveillance equipment is also being used (or tested to be used) in a number of innovative ways including:

- video cameras are being used by the Olympic Construction Authority in NSW to compile a time-lapse historical record of the gradual completion of the construction project;
- a taxi company plans to install video cameras in cabs to protect drivers;
- video surveillance cameras are to be installed in police vehicles for evidence when complaints arise concerning police conduct;

¹⁰ *ibid*, p 20

¹¹ Transcript (unedited) (Mr Kevin O'Connor), 2 September 1996, p 15

- video surveillance is being tested to prevent theft from “drive offs” where motorists at petrol stations fill their tank and drive away without paying;
- the Roads and Traffic Authority in NSW has installed cameras to track vehicle speeds and check registration details of heavy vehicles. Vehicle owners are warned in writing if they have exceeded the speed limit or failed to take their required rest breaks. They can have their licences or vehicle registration cancelled if repeated breaches occur; and
- the Sydney Football Stadium system is able to quickly produce a photograph of an individual spectator in a crowd.¹²

¹² Privacy Committee of NSW, *op cit*

Chapter 3. CCTV: Use in Public Places in the A.C.T.

3.1. The Committee is aware of three instances in the A.C.T. involving CCTV surveillance of public places. These are bus interchanges, Landfills and at the A.C.T. Legislative Assembly.

Belconnen and Woden Bus Interchanges

3.2. ACTION advised the Committee that the Belconnen and Woden Bus Interchanges have been under CCTV surveillance since the late 1970's or early 1980's. Belconnen has a 11 camera system in place and Woden has 13 cameras.

3.3. The systems were not designed as a crime prevention or security strategy but rather to allow supervisors to observe bus movements and to a lesser extent passenger movements. Tuggeranong and the City Bus Interchanges are not equipped with .CCTV technology because their design allows for better line of sight.

3.4. Until recently the technology did not have a record function. However, the equipment was recently upgraded and it is now possible to record with a series of time-lapsed still photographs.

3.5. Because the purpose of the system was to allow supervisors to observe bus and passenger movements and the original system did not have a record function, the public has not been advised that the area is under CCTV surveillance. ACTION has not erected signs either. Therefore, the public is mostly unaware that the interchanges have this equipment in operation.

3.6. However, since the equipment was upgraded the system is now used to protect the interchanges from vandalism. The system is used to record after hours.

3.7. ACTION advised that some years ago a person stole one of the cameras and was filmed by the camera during the process. The Police approached ACTION to use the footage to help them solve the case, ACTION agreed and the person was apprehended and successfully prosecuted.

3.8. ACTION does not have any protocols concerning the use of the video footage obtained from CCTV systems.

West Belconnen and Mugga Lane Landfills

3.9. The Department of Urban Services advised the Committee that CCTV equipment was installed at the West Belconnen and Mugga Lane Landfills in 1993 following the introduction of tip charges.

3.10. Both systems are located on the weighbridges and consist of three cameras. One camera observes the number plates, the second the load, and the third camera is on the back door of the building housing the weighbridge operator.

3.11. The purpose of the systems is to help the operators to see number plates (the accounting system is linked to the number plates of vehicles) and to observe the contents of loads to ensure that no hazardous materials are delivered.

3.12. Records are kept to provide an audit trail for transactions in the event of a dispute with clients or questions concerning the revenue collected. The tapes are collected once a week and taken to Macarthur House where they are kept for three months.

3.13. No written procedures exist for the operation of the equipment or handling of the tapes nor have signs been erected advising the public that the area is under CCTV surveillance.

3.14. The systems are only used while the weighbridges operate. The Department of Urban Services advised that two cameras have been stolen from the West Belconnen Landfill.

A.C.T. Legislative Assembly

3.15. The Speaker advised the Committee that two cameras were installed under the eaves of the Assembly building during its refurbishment. One camera is located near the public entrance and the other near the Members' entrance.¹³

3.16. The system is used during demonstrations to ascertain whether the building security system needs to be activated and to protect the building from vandalism. The tapes have been viewed on a couple of occasions to help with investigations.

3.17. Two attendants monitor the system during business hours. The cameras can pan, tilt and zoom and record 24 hours per day. The tapes are changed each day and rotated over a seven day period. MSS Security staff change the tapes on weekends and public holidays. The tapes are stored in a cupboard in the attendant's station (which is a secure area out of business hours).

3.18. Access to the system and tapes is restricted to the attendants and the Serjeant-at-Arms.

3.19. There are no signs advising the public that they are under CCTV surveillance and it is possible that many occupants of the building may be unaware of its existence. There are also no written protocols concerning the operation and management of the system (including the handling of video footage), auditing procedures or a formal complaints mechanism.

¹³ Speaker, *Letter*, 18 September 1996

Proposed Use in Civic

3.20. The Committee focused its inquiry on the Government's proposed trial of CCTV in public places in Civic. In particular, the Committee was interested to learn about the incidences of crime in Civic, the magnitude of the problem, the views of the Attorney-General's Department, the AFP, the Australian Privacy Commissioner and other interested organisations.

Incidences of Crime

3.21. The size of the crime problem in Civic has not been clarified to the Committee. The Attorney-General's Department¹⁴ provided the Committee with statistical information on reported incidents in Civic. The information was obtained from three sources:

- AFP and Liquor Licensing Section data which covered the period November 1995 to May 1996. The data included incidents of assault, offensive behaviour, disturbance, intoxicated persons, drink public place, under age drinking, supply under age person and other.
- Community Safety Unit (Attorney-General's Department) data. The Unit surveyed:
 - * 67 people late at night on 17 and 18 November 1995 about crime in Civic; and
 - * 96 people from ground floor premises (and higher if open late at night), taxi drivers and DUS litter clearers in November 1995 about reported and unreported crime. The survey showed that "a high number of behaviours that would fall under the "street offence" label were not reported to the police.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics data. The Bureau surveyed a sample of A.C.T. households in April 1995 about reported and unreported crime. The data "indicates that approximately 7 in every 10 assaults in the A.C.T. are not reported to the police. This data relates to all assaults (excluding sexual assault) occurring throughout the A.C.T. and not just those occurring in Civic. The table lends weight to the concept that typically, assault is usually under reported."

3.22. However, the Committee was not able to conclude from the statistical information whether the level of crime in Civic compared favourably or otherwise with other areas of Canberra (such as Manuka, Belconnen, Woden or Tuggeranong), other cities in Australia or overseas.

¹⁴ Attorney-General's Department, *Letter*, 12 August 1996

View of the Attorney-General's Department

3.23. The Attorney-General's Department advised the Committee that the Department:

considers that the use of CCTV in Civic would assist principally in deterring and detecting behaviours that are sometimes referred to as 'street offences'. These behaviours include assault, offensive behaviour, malicious damage (including graffiti) and, although not as prevalent, robbery.¹⁵

3.24. An officer from the Department told the Committee that:

... CCTV is not intended to be a panacea. It is something to be used along with other policing methods. Clearly, this has to be designed as part of a strategic approach. One of the benefits that CCTV provides is that, to some extent, it replaces labour with capital. The technology is not cheap, and there will have to be a lot of work done yet to refine costs for specific ACT use, but nor are human resources, particularly when you are talking about a 24-hour-a-day operation. One of the potential benefits is that substituting capital for labour allows human resources to be more effectively employed and allows for strategies to be utilised which otherwise would not be available.¹⁶

View of Australian Federal Police

3.25. The Australian Federal Police (AFP) told the Committee that although CCTV will not eliminate all crime it can deter crimes such as:

theft from the person (including pick pocketing, bag snatching and robbery at automatic teller machines), robberies within retail premises, illicit drug dealing, vehicle offences (theft of vehicles and associated property) and property damage (such as graffiti).¹⁷

3.26. Although the AFP has not undertaken a study into the placement of CCTV cameras it has identified the following areas as potential sites for CCTV camera coverage:

- Northbourne Avenue (between London Circuit and Rodd/Bunda Streets);
- East Row;
- Murulla Lane;
- Bunda Street (Northbourne Avenue to Binara Street);
- Alinga Street (between West Row and East Row);
- London Circuit (Between West Row and Akuna Street);
- City Walk;

¹⁵ *ibid*

¹⁶ Transcript (Mr Keady), p 18

¹⁷ AFP, *Submission*, p 2

- Petrie Plaza;
- Garema Place;
- car-parks in Bunda Street and London Circuit (adjacent to Northbourne Avenue); and
- Glebe Park.¹⁸

3.27. Mobile CCTV units are being considered by the AFP to cover problem areas for short periods of time (such as Manuka on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights and Exhibition Park during the Summernats).¹⁹

3.28. The AFP will consult with the community (including the Community Safety Council, the local Neighbourhood Watch Committee and retail trading organisations) and other Government agencies concerning the placement of CCTV cameras. The sites would also need to be approved by the A.C.T. Minister for Police.²⁰

View of the Australian Privacy Commissioner

3.29. In examining the issue of CCTV in public places, the Committee has carefully considered the view of the Australian Privacy Commissioner, who told the Committee that:

the erection of surveillance technology in any place in a manner whereby it functions on a continuous basis represents a threat to the way in which people go about their ordinary lives and it is no answer ... to say that only the dishonest and rogues and criminals have anything to fear from being continuously observed. There is a point which is frequently made that only rogues and the dishonest and the like have anything to fear from privacy information and it is an argument that seeks to trivialise the need for people in a civilised community to organise and go about their lives and affairs as they see fit within the ordinary boundaries of lawfulness, but certainly to be able to make choices as to how they disport themselves, what social arrangements they make, who they mix with, where they meet people and so on.²¹

3.30. The Australian Privacy Commissioner went on to say that some people feel that “conduct that occurs in public places does not involve a privacy issue”²². He argued that:

the effective conduct of one’s ordinary life must necessitate the undertaking of that life in environments that are public in nature. It is not realistic to speak of people going about their lives in a manner which involves them simply staying behind closed doors

¹⁸ *ibid*, pp 4 and 5

¹⁹ *ibid*, p 5

²⁰ *ibid*, p 5

²¹ Transcript (unedited) (Mr Kevin O’Connor), 2 September 1996, p 2

²² *ibid*, p 2

or on private property or in other places that are the subject of the distinction that is often made as between public and private domains.²³

3.31. In concluding his argument the Australian Privacy Commissioner told the Committee that:

I think it not reasonable for people to say that there are situations of intense personal privacy that need to be managed from time to time within a public environment and so I would argue that whilst maybe the degree to which you can effectively protect privacy in such an environment is less there is still an interest in privacy that ought to be respected and understood to exist and given some emphasis ... in a balanced approach to these issues.²⁴

Other Views

3.32. Concern about the use of CCTV in public places in Canberra was expressed by Mr Wade, the Council of Social Service Inc., Council for Civil Liberties, the Criminal Law Committee of the Law Society, the Australian Hotels Association and the Community Information and Referral Service. The concern relates to civil liberties issues (including privacy), the lack of substantive research data, the lack of legislation regulating the use of CCTV equipment, procedures governing the operation of CCTV equipment and the effectiveness of CCTV equipment in preventing or detecting crime.

²³ *ibid*, p 2

²⁴ Transcript (unedited) (Mr Kevin O'Connor), 2 September 1996, p 2

Chapter 4. CCTV: Use in Public Places Around Australia (Other Than the A.C.T.)

4.1. Many Councils in Australia have installed, have considered, or are considering installing, a CCTV system into public places. This Chapter gives a brief summary of the Committee's research into what is happening around the rest of Australia concerning the installation of CCTV, including the recent reference to the NSW Law Reform Commission.

Queensland

4.2. The Committee travelled to Brisbane and the Gold Coast on 12-14 August 1996 to see CCTV systems in operation. The Committee's findings are summarised below.

Brisbane

4.3. Brisbane City Council²⁵ has a 27 camera system covering the Queen Street Mall, Fortitude Valley and Chinatown. The first cameras were installed in 1993, following election undertakings by the current Lord Mayor.

4.4. The system is operated by a private security firm contracted by the Council and is monitored 24 hours a day 7 days a week.

4.5. Strict protocols were said to have been established governing the operation of the system and use of video footage. The system is regularly audited by a consultant employed by the Brisbane City Council.

4.6. The Committee was told that signs were placed on garbage bins warning people that the area was under CCTV surveillance. However, Members of this Committee were unable to find a single sign. It may be that the signs are missing because the Council is replacing the street furniture.

4.7. There does not seem to be a formal complaints process in place. It seems that the only avenue for disgruntled people is to write to the Council with their complaint.

4.8. The Committee was interested to learn that local businesses (through the Chamber of Commerce) seem to have been instrumental in the original installation and have made a substantial financial contribution to the system.

4.9. An officer from the Council explained to the Committee that work was being undertaken on a more "holistic" approach to crime prevention.

²⁵ Discussions in Brisbane.

Gold Coast

4.10. The Gold Coast's system was installed in 1991 with 16 cameras in the Cavill Mall and Orchard Avenue area.²⁶ In July 1996 it was upgraded to allow 24 hour recording, provide footage of evidentiary quality and provide for future expansion of the system to 32 cameras.

4.11. The system was originally installed as "concealed surveillance cameras"²⁷ within light pole lids. However, this concept did not provide sufficient deterrent value and, combined with other shortcomings, was changed during the upgrade to a more visible system.

4.12. The control room is currently housed in a Police kiosk in Cavill Mall. The system is not manually monitored at the moment but the Council hopes to employ a security company in the future to monitor the system.

4.13. During discussions with Council officers the Committee gained the impression that, like Brisbane, local businesses were also instrumental in the original installation and have made a substantial financial contribution to the system.

Ipswich

4.14. Ipswich City Council installed 13 CCTV cameras in its central business district (CBD) in 1994. A further 15 cameras were added in 1996. It is intended to extend the coverage from the CBD to most suburban shopping centres.

4.15. The cameras are monitored 24 hours a day by a security service contracted to the Council.

4.16. The Ipswich CCTV system is one strand of a crime reduction and prevention strategy incorporating three task groups: the Venue Management Task Group; the Security and Policing Task Group and the Safety of Public Spaces Task Group.²⁸

4.17. The strategy also includes the introduction of safety/security officers from the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community; a security consultant; a steering committee and a Police shopfront.

4.18. There are no signs advising the public that the area is under CCTV surveillance. However, the Council has published a brochure about its Safe City Program and the CCTV system has received consistent media coverage.

²⁶ Discussions at the Gold Coast.

²⁷ Minutes, Council Meeting 15 December 1995, Coordination Committee 11, 12 and 13 December 1995, Item 29, Security Cameras Cavill Mall, 769/0/2.

²⁸ Brochure, Ipswich Safe City Program.

Townsville

4.19. Townsville City Council installed a nine camera system in Flinders Mall during 1994-95.²⁹ It will shortly be extended to include three more cameras.

4.20. The system is monitored by a private security firm contracted by the Council. The control room is housed in a building shared with a Police Shopfront.

4.21. The Council developed a Code of Conduct for the operation of the equipment and has also placed signs advising the public that the Mall is under electronic surveillance.

Cairns

4.22. The Cairns City Council trialed a four camera system in the Cairns Mall in 1995.³⁰ As a result of the trial the Council will shortly install 12 CCTV cameras throughout the Cairns CBD. Six other locations have been identified for future consideration.

4.23. The Council is also considering purchasing a mobile camera to monitor “trouble spots” in public places.

4.24. A Code of Conduct for staff has been prepared along with protocols which cover the collection and maintenance of statistical information, storage of tapes, the provision of information to the Police and other relevant matters.

4.25. Signs were erected at the commencement of the trial advising the public that surveillance cameras were in use in the area.

4.26. The CCTV system is part of a range of crime prevention strategies. Other elements of the strategy include development of a Local Planning Policy for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, the co-ordination of a cross-media community awareness campaign and the preparation of a Code of Conduct for Managers of licensed venues.

4.27. The Council also established the Cairns Community Safety Consultative Committee in 1994. The Committee consists of officers from the Council and Queensland Police Service, together with representatives the public, private and media sectors.

4.28. The Committee has helped a co-operative relationship to develop between the Council and Police which has enabled joint strategies being implemented between the Police, venue managers, bus companies and Council during major events such as New Year’s Eve celebrations.

²⁹ Townsville City Council, *Letter*, 13 August 1996.

³⁰ Cairns City Council, *Letter*, 14 August 1996.

Toowoomba

4.29. In 1994-95 the Toowoomba City Council installed a 26 camera CCTV system.³¹ Sixteen of the cameras are located in the central business district and 10 are located in car parks.

4.30. Prior to the installation of the system, a survey was conducted into the community's perception of public safety which included the possible installation of a CCTV system. A test camera was then trialed and a media campaign undertaken to publicise its installation and purpose.

4.31. The Council decided to install a CCTV system but delayed its installation to make sure the community were not reacting in a "knee jerk" way.

4.32. The Council own, operate and control the system with a contractor monitoring it. The control room is located in a public place where it is visible, but not accessible, to the public. This is to raise the profile and transparency of the project.

4.33. Strict Standing Operating Procedures have been established which specify how the system operates and conditions for using video footage. Signs have been erected in stairways and lifts but not in the CBD. This has been a deliberate decision by the Council to avoid re-enforcing the perception that public places are not safe.

4.34. The system is one of a range of initiatives undertaken by the Council to reduce anti-social behaviour. The initiatives include alcohol awareness through the licensing authorities and licence vendors (for example licensing hours and consumption) and increasing the number of taxis available at the closing times of "nightspots".

New South Wales

Sydney

4.35. CCTV systems were installed in the George Street cinema complex area in May 1995 (originally for a three month trial) and in other commercial centres such as Cabramatta, Campbelltown and Willoughby³².

4.36. The Committee also understands that the central area of King's Cross has CCTV surveillance.³³

4.37. The Darling Harbour Authority installed a 27 camera CCTV system in 1988 and expects to install another five to 10 cameras before the Sydney Olympics in 2000.³⁴

³¹ Toowoomba City Council, *Letter*, 30 August 1996.

³² Mr Nigel Waters, Head, Privacy Branch, Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, *Street Surveillance and Privacy*, Privacy Issues Forum, Christchurch, New Zealand, 13 June 1996, p 2

³³ Attorney-General Department, *Submission*, covering letter.

³⁴ Darling Harbour Authority, *Letter*, 9 September 1996.

4.38. The system is monitored 24 hours a day, 7 days per week by security guards contracted to the Authority.

4.39. The Authority installed the system to increase public safety and to help with crowd control. The system has a secondary aim of preventing and reducing crime (such as vandalism and graffiti). It is also used to increase the safety of security guards during threatening confrontations. The NSW Police Force has also used the system to help with its operations.

4.40. The Authority advised the Committee that video footage has been used successfully as evidence on a number of occasions in matters before the Courts.

4.41. The Authority has not erected signs advising the public that they are under CCTV surveillance.

4.42. In 1993/94 the NSW Privacy Committee carried out an inspection of the CCTV system. The Authority has not had any feedback.

Manly

4.43. The Manly Community Safety Committee (a committee under the umbrella of the Manly Council) has recently approved a brief for a consultant to undertake a feasibility study of the suitability of installing CCTV into the Manly town centre. The Manly Chamber of Commerce has agreed to fund the consultancy.

4.44. The primary aim of the feasibility study is to provide a cost benefit analysis of installing a CCTV system that addresses both real and perceived community safety issues.

4.45. The feasibility study is one of a number of community safety initiatives for the town centre, including the introduction of an alcohol free zone, a survey of perceived and real safety issues, safety audits and an agreement with hotels in the Manly town centre to voluntarily close by 3 am.

Walgett

4.46. The Walgett Shire Council considered CCTV as part of its CBD reconstruction. The Council hoped to reduce crime and encourage businesses to remove bars from shop windows.

4.47. The Council planned to install two cameras on a trial basis and eventually to install a six camera system. It was proposed that the NSW Police monitor the system; however, the proposal is not proceeding because a NSW Police Force study recommended that Police not monitor CCTV systems.

Lismore

4.48. The Lismore City Council is considering installing surveillance cameras in its central business district.

Western Australia

4.49. Perth City Council was the first municipality in Australia to use CCTV in public places. The Council installed 27 cameras into its CBD in 1991. The system has since grown to 73 cameras.

4.50. The system is monitored by Council employees 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. Employees must sign a Code of Conduct which details the operation of the system and handling of video footage. The Council randomly checks the video tapes fortnightly.

4.51. There are no signs explaining that the area is under CCTV surveillance, however, this is currently under review.

4.52. The State Ombudsman has the power to investigate complaints and has done so on one recent occasion.

4.53. Several Western Australian Councils are considering installing CCTV into public places and have visited Perth to see the Council's system.

South Australia

4.54. Adelaide City Council has installed a 22 camera system. Thirteen cameras were installed in Rundle Mall in early 1995; five cameras became operational in Hindley Street in late 1995 and four cameras were installed at the Soldier's Memorial in 1996.

4.55. The Council own, install and maintain the equipment with the State Government responsible for monitoring the system. The State Government uses an organisation called the Police Security Services (civilian security guards) attached to the Police Department. The system is monitored 24 hours per day 7 days per week.

4.56. Signs have been erected around the Memorial advising the public that CCTV is in use. It is proposed to extend the signage to Rundle Mall and Hindley Street.

4.57. The installation was a joint initiative by the Premier and the Lord Mayor following a spate of anti-social behaviour. Public surveys indicated a public perception that the Rundle Mall was a dangerous place to visit after hours. It is interesting to note that this perception was not confirmed by Police statistical information.

4.58. Protocols have been established to regulate the operation of the system and handling of video footage.

4.59. The Council and South Australian Government are considering extending the system to include the State Library and the South Australian Art Gallery.

Victoria

4.60. Melbourne City Council trialed four cameras during March 1996. As a result of the trial the Council will be installing 10 cameras into King Street during December 1996.

4.61. This initiative is one of a number of measures to improve the safety of King Street. Other measures include improvements in transport and pedestrian access, urban design improvements such as lighting, and a marketing plan to revitalise the area.

4.62. King Street is considered a special case in using surveillance cameras because a number of nightclubs are located in a very small area of the street. The cameras will be monitored on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights by a private company contracted to the Council.

4.63. The Council is designing a comprehensive evaluation program to assess the value and effect of the cameras. An Audit Committee will be established to monitor the protocols to protect the privacy of individuals.

4.64. The Council plans to erect signs to advise the public that the area is under surveillance.

Tasmania

Hobart

4.65. Hobart City Safe Incorporated (consisting of representatives of the Tasmanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Hobart City Council, Tasmanian Police, City Heart Business Association Ltd (a business group) and Metropolitan Transport Trust) will install a four camera system into the Hobart Mall area during October 1996.

4.66. The system will be monitored and recorded at Police Headquarters by Police 24 hours per day. A System Ombudsman will be appointed with powers to randomly audit the system and investigate any complaints. A management committee will be established and the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission has been invited onto the committee.

4.67. The system has received considerable publicity in the media and a special launch will be arranged. At this stage it is not proposed that signs will be erected.

Launceston

4.68. A four camera system was installed in the Launceston CBD in 1995. It was funded by the State Government and City Prom (a local self promotional central business district business group). There are plans to extend the system by installing at least two more cameras.

4.69. The system tapes 24 hours per day and it is proposed to be operated by Police screened Neighbourhood Watch volunteers during peak times (for example Thursday,

Friday and Saturday nights). The control room is housed at Launceston Police Headquarters.

4.70. A committee manages the system with representatives from business (City Prom, an insurance company and Chamber of Commerce), the Tasmanian Police Force and Launceston City Council.

4.71. At this stage there are no signs in Launceston advising the public that the area is under CCTV surveillance.

Northern Territory

Darwin

4.72. The Northern Territory Government planned to install a nine camera CCTV system in Darwin's inner city area. However, the proposal has not progressed beyond the presentation of the 'Territory Safe' Position Paper in August 1995.

4.73. The Position Paper made suggestions concerning operating procedures and policy; auditing process; tendering and installation process; marketing strategy; the establishment of a committee to manage the system, including handling of complaints, changes to operating procedures and auditing; and the security of the video tapes (which were to closely mirror the measures for the security of audio tapes currently in use by Police officers).

Alice Springs

4.74. The Northern Territory Government approached the Alice Springs Town Council in 1995 with a suggestion that CCTV may be useful to reduce anti-social behaviour in the Todd Mall area. Following extensive negotiations the proposal floundered because the cost of monitoring the equipment (approximately \$150,000 per year) was to be borne by the Council.

4.75. Constant lobbying by the Alice Springs Town Council led to increased Police foot patrols in the CBD. As a result, the Council has recently written to the Northern Territory Government saying that the increased police presence in the Todd Mall area has resolved the anti-social behaviour problems and the Council does not believe it is necessary to install CCTV at the moment. Todd Mall traders agree with this decision.

NSW Law Reform Commission Inquiry

4.76. The Committee was also very interested to learn that on 2 July 1996 the NSW Attorney General asked the NSW Law Reform Commission to inquire into and report on:

- the current scope and operation of the *Listening Devices Act 1984 (NSW)*
- the need to regulate the use of visual surveillance equipment, and

- any related matter.

In undertaking this review the Commission should have regard to:

- the protection of the privacy of the individual;
- the views and interests of users of surveillance technology, including law enforcement agencies, private investigators, and owners of private premises such as banks, service stations and shops;
- the use of surveillance technology in public places.

In making this reference the Attorney draws the Commission's attention to the Government's proposals for the introduction of privacy and data protection legislation and to the current review of the issue of the regulation of workplace visual surveillance being conducted by the Department of Industrial Relations.³⁵

³⁵ NSW Law Reform Commission, Terms of Reference, Review of Visual and Aural Surveillance Devices.

Chapter 5. CCTV: Use in New Zealand and the United Kingdom.

New Zealand

5.1. The Committee understands that CCTV systems were installed in Auckland in January 1995 and Christchurch in 1995.³⁶ These systems were initiated by the Police and are operated in conjunction with the respective councils and local businesses.

5.2. Twelve cameras are located in Queen Street (the main street of Auckland) and Auckland Police “average seven to 10 offences a week where they identify offenders from the tapes”.³⁷

5.3. In 1995 national guidelines were developed by New Zealand Police to regulate the installation and operation of these systems. These guidelines are not legally binding. They cover:

camera location; security and retention of tapes; public awareness of cameras; control and operation of cameras including hours of surveillance; auditing; access to information by individual concerned; and use of information collected.³⁸

5.4. The Police District Commander audits the scheme internally and Audit New Zealand audits the scheme externally.³⁹

United Kingdom

5.5. It is said that three quarters of Britain’s local authorities have installed CCTV systems in 250 town centres in an effort “to combat crime, soccer hooliganism and terrorism”. The central government plans to purchase 10,000 more cameras for city centres this year which will triple its expenditure on CCTV to \$22.5 million.⁴⁰

5.6. The financial district of the City of London has 1,300 cameras. Approximately 70 scan traffic, “while 16 photograph the license number, driver and front-seat passenger of every car that passes through eight police-controlled entry points”. The system can also simultaneously check license plates against a central database.⁴¹

5.7. Metropolitan Police advertise that the London Underground has “more than 14,000 cameras throughout the transport system”.⁴²

³⁶ Mr Nigel Waters, Head, Privacy Branch, Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, *Street Surveillance and Privacy*, Privacy Issues Forum, Christchurch, New Zealand, 13 June 1996, pp 4, 8 and 9

³⁷ Transcript (Commander McDermott), p 12

³⁸ Mr Nigel Waters, op cit, p 8

³⁹ *ibid*, p 9

⁴⁰ Helen Gibson, “Voyeur on The Corner - Big Brother Britain spies on its citizens with unblinking cameras”, *Time*, TIME Australia Magazine Pty Ltd, Sydney, 8 April 1996, p 59

⁴¹ *ibid*, p 59

⁴² *ibid*, p 59

5.8. The Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission states that there are now over 200,000 CCTV cameras in public places in Britain.⁴³ A South Bank University survey found that:

82 percent of towns had a CCTV system in a public place and these were monitored either by local authorities (61%), police (24%), or partnerships of the two (15%). 61 percent of these schemes operated under a code of practice with others in the process of developing a code.⁴⁴

5.9. The United Kingdom Local Government Information Unit published “A Watching Brief: A Code of Practice for CCTV” in March 1996. The Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission said that “[T]his code gives particular consideration to privacy and civil liberties issues”.⁴⁵ The Code provides:

for transparency and accountability of operations, staff training, recording and processing, access, purpose, storage, public information, disposal of tapes and security procedures. There are special provisions for police access and the use of tapes in evidence, as well as special equity provisions to exclude petty crimes and certain types of behaviour.⁴⁶

5.10. The Code also provides that an annual report be published detailing:

the outcome of evaluation of the scheme, information on the impact of the scheme in addressing purposes and key objectives, and particulars of any complaints. The report should also provide information about the cost of the scheme during the relevant year.⁴⁷

⁴³ Mr Nigel Waters, op cit, p 4

⁴⁴ ibid, p 4

⁴⁵ ibid, p 8

⁴⁶ ibid, p 8

⁴⁷ Hilary Kitchin, *A Watching Brief: A Code of Practice for CCTV*, Local Government Information Unit, March 1996

Chapter 6. CCTV: The Committee's View

6.1. In examining all of the material outlined in previous chapters of this report, the Committee considers that 15 key issues arise in assessing the effectiveness of surveillance cameras in reducing or preventing crime and the impact on the community of this technology. These issues are discussed in this Chapter. In order of treatment they are:

- the proliferation of CCTV in public places in Australia;
- the lack of substantive research data;
- the use of urban design and other strategies to prevent crime;
- the lack of privacy legislation covering the use video surveillance;
- the need for an independent Auditor/Ombudsman to audit the system and investigate complaints;
- the need for a Code of Practice to govern the management of the system and use of footage;
- whether crime is displaced to another location not under CCTV surveillance;
- the use of mobile CCTV units;
- the need for signs to protect privacy;
- who monitors the system;
- proposed trial in Civic;
- the placement and number of cameras and “function creep”;
- unsubstantiated claims and media publicity;
- public support of CCTV in public places; and
- CCTV in public places in the A.C.T.

Proliferation of CCTV

6.2. The Committee notes the rapid proliferation of CCTV in public places in Australia (see Chapter 4). The Committee was very surprised to learn that so many Councils around Australia had already installed CCTV into their public places or plan to do so in the near future.

6.3. The Committee is concerned that CCTV systems are being installed in what appears to be an “ad hoc” manner. Some systems are part of an overall strategy to reduce and prevent crime (for example in Ipswich and Cairns) while others appear to be based on little research. Very few systems seem to have a complaints handling process in place, other than the fact that citizens can write to the Council if they are unhappy. Some Councils have erected signs to advise that an area is under camera surveillance while others rely on publicity to let the public know that the area is subject to CCTV surveillance.

View of the Committee

6.4. *The Committee gained the impression that the rapid expansion of CCTV into public places in Australia has been largely driven by:*

- *a perception that public places are not safe, particularly at night (it is interesting to note that often this perception is not substantiated by Police statistical information);*
- *lobbying from local businesses through business groups such as the Chamber of Commerce (the Committee is intrigued with the apparent lack of interest from the A.C.T. Chamber of Commerce and Industry);*
- *local politicians (usually councillors but in some instances State Members of Parliament) who consider that CCTV can assist “them in terms of their presentation on law and order issues to be thought to be providing a measure of assurance to the public that if bad conduct occurs in these areas something can be done about it”⁴⁸; and*
- *the security industry which has “seen the opportunity” and as a consequence has been proactive in a number of jurisdictions in offering a “solution” to the perceived problem with public safety.*

6.5. *It is the view of the Committee that the perception of public danger may be overstated and that the effectiveness of CCTV as the solution has yet to be demonstrated. Further, the use of CCTV has the potential to create other problems involving civil liberties issues and displacement.*

Research Data on CCTV

6.6. Despite the fact that many local government authorities have installed CCTV systems in Australia and that over 250 town centres in the United Kingdom⁴⁹ use CCTV systems, little research exists about whether CCTV really prevents or detects

⁴⁸ Transcript (unedited) (Mr O’Connor), 2 September 1996, p, 9

⁴⁹ Helen Gibson, “Voyeur on The Corner - Big Brother Britain spies on its citizens with unblinking cameras”, *Time*, TIME Australia Magazine Pty Ltd, Sydney, 8 April 1996, p 59

crime. No substantive research has been undertaken in Australia⁵⁰ and very few studies have been undertaken in the United Kingdom.

6.7. The Committee considers there is an urgent need for more studies to be done, in Australia and overseas. The absence of such studies makes it extremely difficult to come to a firm view about claims that CCTV is effective in preventing or detecting crime. It is possible that public money might be wasted on wider use of CCTV without clear evidence of its effectiveness and that this public money could be used on more effective crime prevention strategies.

6.8. Closely linked to the issue of availability of research data on CCTV is the question of the public's perception of safety. The Committee heard anecdotal evidence during its visit to Brisbane and the Gold Coast that people felt safer if they knew the area was monitored by CCTV. The feeling of greater safety may or may not be based on fact. It may be that the area was not unsafe to begin with or that the cameras were not effective in preventing or detecting crime.

6.9. The Committee observes that this public perception of feeling safer in the presence of surveillance cameras is an important factor in considering the whole issue of CCTV. Until the detailed studies referred to above are undertaken, it is not possible to accurately assess the basis of the perception.

6.10. Recommendation 1.

Because of the lack of substantive Australian research about the effectiveness of CCTV, the Committee requests the A.C.T. Attorney-General seek the co-operation of the Commonwealth in having an Australia wide review conducted - possibly using the resources of the Australian Institute of Criminology.

Urban Design and Other Strategies

6.11. The *Civic By Night* Final Report from the A.C.T. Community Safety Committee considered a suggestion to install a CCTV system in Civic and recommended "that video surveillance is not appropriate for Civic and should not be introduced".⁵¹ Instead, the A.C.T. Community Safety Committee saw the solution to Civic's problems as:

- stronger and more collaborative partnerships;
- more community involvement to address problems;
- the diversification of activities and attractions;
- a stronger emphasis on the responsible serving and consumption of alcohol;

⁵⁰ Attorney-General's Department, *Submission*, p 4.

⁵¹ A.C.T. Community Safety Committee, *Civic By Night - Final Report*, Canberra, 4 November 1994, p 32

- the vigorous enforcement of existing liquor laws; and
- the amelioration of the physical design and urban setting.⁵²

6.12. The *Role of Urban Design in Crime Prevention and Community Safety Report*⁵³ was presented in the Assembly on 14 December 1995 by the Attorney-General, Mr Gary Humphries, MLA. In his presentation speech Mr Humphries commented that:

Worldwide research has documented links between crime prevention and the physical design, management and planning of facilities and urban areas. The study sets out to identify those elements of urban design which contribute to crime and anti-social behaviours, or give rise to perceived fears of crime, with the aim of formulating advisory design guidelines for future planning, building and development.⁵⁴

6.13. The Committee agrees with Mr Humphries that urban design can prevent crime. The Committee notes the call by the Community Information and Referral Service for a holistic approach to Civic's problems to be developed, which would include urban design.⁵⁵

6.14. Given that the *Civic By Night* Final Report and the *Role of Urban Design in Crime Prevention and Community Safety Report* are both recent reports which canvass other crime prevention strategies the Committee believes that it would be appropriate for the Government to reconsider their recommendations.

6.15. Recommendation 2.

Given the lack of substantive research available on the effectiveness of CCTV the Committee recommends that the Government reconsider the recommendations in the *Civic By Night* Final Report and the *Role of Urban Design in Crime Prevention and Community Safety Report*.

Privacy

6.16. The Committee is concerned that there are no laws in the A.C.T. regulating video surveillance of public places. An officer from the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission stated that:

The Federal *Privacy Act 1988* is the only information privacy law in Australia with legally binding rules. It regulates the handling of personal information by Commonwealth government agencies and all users of consumer credit information and

⁵² *ibid*, p 33

⁵³ A.C.T. Planning Authority and ACT Attorney General's Department, *Role of Urban Design in Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, Publications and Public Communication for the A.C.T. Planning Authority, Canberra, 1995

⁵⁴ Mr Gary Humphries, MLA, *Hansard*, 14 December 1995, p 3,173

⁵⁵ Community Information and Referral service of the A.C.T. Inc., *Supplementary Submission*, 19 August 1996, pp 6 and 7

Tax File Numbers. It does not cover video surveillance. The Australian Privacy Commissioner receives enquiries relating to surveillance but can only comment or advise in a watchdog or ombudsman capacity. He cannot enforce procedures or practices in this area of activity.⁵⁶

6.17. The Committee is very concerned that people's right to privacy is protected. It considers that not only should there be legislation to protect people's privacy but that it should include penalties for inappropriate access, use and disclosure of recordings.

6.18. Recommendation 3.

The Committee recommends that the Government enact Privacy legislation incorporating penalties for breaches which will cover video surveillance before commencing any trial of CCTV systems in public places in the A.C.T.

Independent Auditor/Ombudsman

6.19. The need for an independent auditor was addressed in the AFP submission which commented that:

the use of CCTV cameras should be subjected to auditing by an external agency.⁵⁷

6.20. The Council for Civil Liberties went further and suggested that an independent body with powers to investigate complaints, carry out random inspections and "award compensation for breaches of privacy" would need to be established.⁵⁸

6.21. This need was emphasised during the Committee's visit to Brisbane where Members heard anecdotal evidence that video footage may have been used for purposes for which it was not intended. Specifically, the Committee was told by Members of the Queensland Police Force of the existence of a tape of their "successes" and were in fact using one video as a training film at their Police Academy. This is despite the fact that strict protocols are said to exist.

6.22. During discussions with an officer from Brisbane City Council and a consultant contracted by the Council, the Committee was told that the Council owns the video footage and the Queensland Police Force writes to the Council requesting footage, usually for evidentiary purposes. The Committee was told that the released footage is only to be used for the purpose it has been released, no copies are to be made and it should be returned as soon as possible. The system is audited regularly by the consultant that the Council contracted to design and implement the system. The audit checks, amongst other things, that the tapes are returned on time and that no copies have been made.

⁵⁶ Mr Nigel Waters, Head, Privacy Branch, Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, *Street Surveillance and Privacy*, Privacy Issues Forum, Christchurch, New Zealand, 13 June 1996, p 3

⁵⁷ AFP, *Submission*, pp 8 and 9

⁵⁸ Mr Michael Cope, Member Board of the A.C.T. Council for Civil Liberties, *Submission*

6.23. In the Committee's view this information highlights the need for an independent auditor/ombudsman to ensure that the privacy of individuals is protected.

6.24. Privacy issues were raised in seven of the 13 submissions received by the Committee. The AFP submission argued that:

[T]he CCTV system should include procedures that eliminate the potential for the personnel operating the monitors to 'spy on people' and the potential for the illegal use of the equipment (for entertainment purposes or for blackmailing people involved in personal and private activities).⁵⁹

6.25. Recommendation 4.

The Committee recommends that the Government, before commencing any trial of CCTV, establish an independent auditor/ombudsman with powers to audit the system, both random and specified periodic audits, and investigate complaints.

Code of Practice

6.26. Submissions lodged by the Council for Civil Liberties, Retail Traders' Association of NSW, Criminal Law Committee of the Law Society, the AFP, Attorney-General's Department and Community Information and Referral Service all mentioned the need for procedures for the operation of CCTV equipment.

6.27. The Australian Privacy Commissioner noted that the United Kingdom Code of Practice and the New Zealand Policy for CCTV in public places were good examples. He:

thought the UK approach was more substantial and covered a number of points that the New Zealand material failed to cover. But nevertheless both are significant advances on anything that we have seen in Australia.⁶⁰

6.28. The Committee was also impressed with the United Kingdom Code of Practice, in particular, its section concerning an annual report. The Code requires the owner of the scheme to produce an annual report evaluating the scheme against its purposes and key objectives and provide details about the cost of the scheme and any complaints.⁶¹

6.29. The Committee believes that a Code of Practice to regulate the actions of those operating surveillance equipment and the consequent usage of video footage should be developed.

⁵⁹ AFP, *op cit*, p 8

⁶⁰ Transcript (unedited) (Mr O'Connor), 2 September 1996, p 5

⁶¹ Hilary Kitchin, *A Watching Brief: A Code of Practice for CCTV*, Local Government Information Unit, March 1996, p 37

6.30. Recommendation 5.

The Committee recommends that the Government ensure an adequate Code of Practice is developed prior to introducing a CCTV system. The Committee would appreciate seeing the Code of Practice before it is adopted in its final form. The Committee believes that the Independent Auditor/Ombudsman would be the appropriate person to develop the Code of Practice, perhaps in conjunction with the Australian Privacy Commissioner.

Displacement

6.31. By 'displacement' is meant:

One of the problems common to all crime prevention schemes is that criminals may simply ply their trade elsewhere - a phenomenon known as displacement. An obvious instance of displacement came to light in the Sutton study, where thieves stopped stealing on the streets where they could be caught on camera and started stealing from people in shops instead.⁶²

6.32. The Committee was interested to learn about what appears to be an Australian example of displacement. The Privacy Committee of NSW heard during its public hearings into video surveillance in the workplace that:

because financial institutions and retailers have developed more sophisticated security systems, armed robberies have shifted to "softer" targets such as petrol stations, liquor shops and pharmacies.⁶³

6.33. The Committee noted that in both Brisbane and the Gold Coast there are plans to expand the use of surveillance cameras beyond the immediate vicinity of the perceived "trouble spots" into surrounding streets. The Committee considers this may have become necessary because crime and anti-social behaviour has been displaced by the surveillance cameras.

6.34. Eight of the 13 submissions received by the Committee addressed the issue of displacement. The AFP in its evidence to the Committee at the public hearing said:

[I]n a very strong Neighbourhood Watch area you do get a ... displacement into another area where maybe the facility is not quite as strong. ... on anecdotal evidence as well as research I would suspect that there is going to be a displacement.⁶⁴

6.35. The Attorney-General's Department submission argued that:

⁶² Mark Ward, "Someone to watch over me", *New Scientist*, Anthony Bertini, West Chatswood, 20 January 1996, p 13

⁶³ Privacy Committee of NSW, *Invisible Eyes: Report on Video Surveillance in the Workplace*, No. 67, Sydney, September 1995, p 19

⁶⁴ Transcript (Assistant Commissioner Stoll), p 10

One of the constant arguments against the use of CCTV is that it displaces crime ... One could argue that all crime prevention programs which are targeted at specific areas have the potential to do this. ... Tilley (1993) noted that rather than a displacement effect of crime to another area, there sometimes appears to be a ‘diffusion of benefits’, whereby the preventative effect spreads to nearby areas, even though the measures are not in place in those areas.⁶⁵

6.36. The Committee is aware of a United Kingdom study which concluded that CCTV can help reduce some types of crime. The study found what appeared to be an example of “diffusion of benefits”.⁶⁶

6.37. However, the study also found evidence which suggested that displacement may have occurred. This seemed to depend on “the extent of the camera coverage” and the fact that some crimes (such as robbery and theft from the person) “appear to be more difficult to control using cameras than property crime, and therefore are more easily displaced”.⁶⁷

6.38. An officer from the Australian Institute of Criminology said that even though displacement was possible it was not inevitable.⁶⁸

View of the Committee

6.39. *The Committee would be very concerned if the introduction of CCTV into Civic displaced crime to other areas but notes that this is not inevitable. The Committee hopes that if the Government decides to install a CCTV system it will:*

- *take steps to minimise the potential for any displacement to occur; and*
- *include an assessment of displacement in any evaluation of CCTV.*

Mobile CCTV Units

6.40. It is possible that the introduction of mobile units could reduce the likelihood of displacement and improve the effectiveness of CCTV.

6.41. The Committee is aware that mobile units have been used in the United Kingdom and that Cairns City Council is considering purchasing a mobile unit for its “trouble spots”. The AFP is considering using mobile units for short periods of time in problem areas (for example Manuka on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights and at Exhibition Park during the Summernats).⁶⁹

6.42. The Criminal Law Committee of the Law Society argued that:

⁶⁵ Attorney-General’s Department, op cit, p 8

⁶⁶ Ben Brown, “CCTV in Town Centres: Three Case Studies”, Home Office Police Research Group, London, 1995, pp 62, and 63

⁶⁷ *ibid*, p 64

⁶⁸ Transcript (Dr Grabosky), p 51

⁶⁹ AFP, op cit, p 5

cameras are stationary, and people will soon get to know where they are, whereas increasing police presence ... is going to be quite random. Patrols will not necessarily be at precisely the same places or the same areas ... [will] be a more effective preventive, overall.⁷⁰

6.43. An officer from the Australian Institute of Criminology compared CCTV with random breath testing as it has been implemented in NSW. He argued that:

[T]here is a sustained intervention there and, if anything, an increased risk of being tested. This risk of being identified and ultimately sanctioned ... has been sustained over 15 years, so the positive effects on the road toll ... have also been sustained over that period.⁷¹

View of the Committee

6.44. It seems to the Committee that mobile units might increase the deterrent effect of video surveillance in the same way that random breath testing has been so successful. In addition, just as the Criminal Law Committee of the Law Society argued that patrols could be more useful than stationary CCTV systems, the mobile units might be more effective than stationary systems.

6.45. The Committee is unsure whether mobile CCTV units may have a greater impact on civil liberties than stationary CCTV systems and believes that this aspect should be investigated before any mobile units are purchased in the A.C.T.

Signage

6.46. The Committee believes that an important part of protecting privacy is the erection of signs advising the public that an area is subjected to camera surveillance.

6.47. An officer from the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission said that:

[T]he difference between covert surveillance and most street surveillance is the issue of notice. It is assumed that to maximise the deterrent effect street surveillance schemes will normally include notices to the effect that the surveillance is being carried out, at what times, in what range and by whom. If there are no, or inadequate, notices, then such schemes are in effect covert. ... the Privacy Commissioner states that 'Covert surveillance is an activity which intrudes into the privacy of individuals in an extreme way'.⁷²

6.48. The Committee was surprised to learn during its research that some inter-state systems:

- do not have signage, for example Perth (which has been in operation since 1991) and Launceston;

⁷⁰ Transcript (Mr Refshauge), p 3

⁷¹ Transcript (Dr Grabosky), p 55

⁷² Mr Nigel Waters, op cit, pp 3 and 4

- do not plan to erect signage at this stage, for example Hobart; or
- have only partial signage, for example Adelaide.

6.49. Recommendation 6.

The Committee recommends that the Government ensure signs are clearly visible to advise the public that a CCTV system is operating in the area.

Monitoring of CCTV Systems

6.50. The Committee is aware that CCTV systems can be monitored by:

- the Police (as is proposed in the Hobart City Safe Incorporated system to be introduced during September 1996);
- Council/Government employees (as suggested by the AFP submission to this Inquiry);
- private security employees (Brisbane, Townsville and Melbourne City Councils have contracted private security companies to monitor their systems); or
- volunteers (Launceston are considering using Police screened Neighbourhood Watch volunteers to operate their system).

6.51. The question of who should monitor the system was also raised during the public hearing held on 8 August 1996. The Attorney-General's Department suggested that the monitoring should be done within the AFP, but not necessarily by Police officers.⁷³ The Assistant Director of the Community Information and Referral Service and the Co-Ordinator of Pathways felt that the AFP should be responsible for monitoring the system because of the:

complaints mechanisms that the police have in place ... are much more likely to be able to produce benefits for people where the camera is misused than is a contractor to the Government.⁷⁴

6.52. The Council for Civil Liberties favoured Government control of the system because "the degree of control that the Government is subject to is greater than a private contractor."⁷⁵

6.53. On the other hand, the Law Society's Criminal Law Committee believe that a body other than the AFP should be responsible for the monitoring process.⁷⁶

⁷³ Transcript, (Mr Keady), p 19

⁷⁴ Transcript, (Mr Stankevicius), p 40

⁷⁵ Transcript (Mr Cope), p 61

⁷⁶ Criminal Law Committee of the Law Society, *Submission*

6.54. The AFP argued that “the system should be monitored by Government employees rather than by private industry employees”.⁷⁷ The AFP considers that “the Government has limited control over the training, skills and attitude” of private security employees and that there may be a “public reservation to private security monitoring of public places”.⁷⁸

6.55. The Committee considers that the question of who monitors the cameras is less important if this Committee’s recommendations are implemented, namely:

- privacy legislation to protect individual’s privacy (recommendation 3);
- penalties for deliberate misuse of the system (recommendation 3);
- regular random and periodic audits of the system (recommendation 4);
- a complaints mechanism (recommendation 4); and
- a strict Code of Practice will be established to regulate the operation of the system and subsequent usage of video footage (recommendation 5).

6.56. Having considered all the issues, the Committee is of the view that either A.C.T. Government employees or AFP employees should monitor the system because the Government can retain greater control of these employees.

6.57. The AFP also commented that:

[T]he number and calibre of personnel monitoring CCTV cameras is more important for the network’s effectiveness than the number of cameras used or the quality of the picture obtained.⁷⁹

6.58. Having considered this the Committee believes that it is important that the system be monitored by properly qualified people.

6.59. Recommendation 7.

The Committee recommends that the Government ensure that the system is monitored by properly qualified people employed by the A.C.T. Government or the AFP.

Trial of CCTV in Civic

6.60. An official from the Attorney-General’s Department told the Committee during the public hearing that:

⁷⁷ AFP, op cit, p 9

⁷⁸ ibid, p 6

⁷⁹ ibid, p 5

[T]he Government had an offer from Wormald to do a cost free trial, essentially using three laser line-of-sight cameras in Garema Place ... [and that] private security companies may be willing to offer a cost free trial ... knowing ... there is the possibility of tendering for a full process later on.⁸⁰

6.61. The Committee is aware that an independently evaluated trial is underway of the A.C.T.'s liquor trading hours. The trial is to be evaluated by John Walker Consulting Services - it began on 1 September 1996 and concludes in March 1997.

6.62. The Committee can see merit in a trial of CCTV at no cost to the A.C.T. rate payer. The trial would form one of the detailed studies referred to in the Committee's Recommendation 1 with the results shared with all Australian Governments and local councils.

6.63. The Committee considers it essential that the study be independently monitored and assessed.

6.64. An important aspect to the trial would be the evaluation of displacement. The Committee believes that a trial would provide an opportunity to test this.

6.65. Therefore, the Committee would support a cost free trial that was comprehensively evaluated by an independent organisation (for example the Australian Institute of Criminology) along the lines that the liquor trading hours trial is being evaluated.

6.66. Recommendation 8.

The Committee recommends that after the Government has:

- **reconsidered and where possible implemented the recommendations in the *Civic By Night Final Report* and the *Role of Urban Design in Crime Prevention and Community Safety Report* (recommendation 2);**
- **enacted Privacy legislation (recommendation 3);**
- **established an independent auditor/ombudsman (recommendation 4);**
- **developed a Code of Practice (recommendation 5);**
- **erected adequate signage (recommendation 6); and**
- **tasked properly qualified people employed by the A.C.T. Government or the AFP to monitor the system (recommendation 7),**

⁸⁰ Transcript (Mr Jory), p 26

it arrange a six month (cost free) trial to be comprehensively evaluated by an independent organisation for, amongst other things, its effectiveness in reducing crime and displacement.

6.67. The Committee would be very interested in the results of a trial in Civic, as it would in information about the results of any studies in Australia or overseas. The Committee intends to carefully monitor the implementation of such a trial in Civic if it goes ahead. To that end the Committee believes that the Government should keep it informed about the progress of the trial and assessment of the results.

6.68. It will take some time for the results of the six month trial to be evaluated. In the Committee's view, the cameras should cease to operate at the end of the trial period (although they need not be removed pending the results of the study).

6.69. Recommendation 9.

The Committee recommends that the:

- **Government present the evaluation report to the Assembly on the first sitting day after it has been submitted to the Government;**
- **evaluation report be referred to the Standing Committee on Legal Affairs; and**
- **cameras be turned off until after the Standing Committee on Legal Affairs reports to the Assembly on the evaluation report.**

Developments Following the Trial

6.70. In the event that a CCTV system is permanently introduced into Civic the Committee considers there are two important matters to take into account. The first matter is a judgement on the placement and number of cameras, and the second matter is "function creep".

6.71. It will be obvious from the content of this report that the Committee views the installation of CCTV in public places with concern, and therefore the Committee considers the Assembly should be kept well informed about the location and number of surveillance cameras in public places.

6.72. Concern about "function creep" was expressed by the Law Society's Criminal Law Committee.⁸¹ Also, the Committee became aware of the problem following discussions in Brisbane⁸² and through a report from the Privacy Committee of NSW.⁸³ "Function creep" is a term used to describe the combination of expanding a

⁸¹ Criminal Law Committee of the Law Society, op cit

⁸² Discussions between the Committee and the Vice President of the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties held in Brisbane on 12 August 1996.

⁸³ Privacy Committee of NSW, op cit, p 19

system (to include more cameras) and/or upgrading equipment (to more sophisticated technology). All the councils in Australia that operate a CCTV system (and that were contacted by the Committee) have incurred, or expect to incur, “function creep”.

6.73. The Criminal Law Committee of the Law Society of the A.C.T. asked:

that any subsequent introduction of CCTV into a public place be preceded by a full public inquiry. It is the concern of the [Law Society’s Criminal Law] Committee that any introduction of CCTV into Civic should not constitute a precedent for future installations in other parts of the ACT.⁸⁴

6.74. The Committee shares the Law Society’s concerns.

6.75. Recommendation 10.

The Committee recommends that the Government establish a process which allows for public comment on any proposal to install, expand or upgrade the use of surveillance cameras in the A.C.T. The Standing Committee on Legal Affairs gives notice that it will monitor any such developments.

Unsubstantiated Claims and Media Publicity

6.76. The Committee heard anecdotal evidence during its visit to Brisbane that CCTV surveillance in public places has cut crime by over 60 percent. However, this figure cannot be substantiated as there has been no comprehensive evaluation.

6.77. The Committee understands that a CCTV system recently installed in Cabramatta has begun very successfully. *The Sydney Morning Herald* reported that:

[W]ithin 20 minutes of ... switching on the ... cameras, Cabramatta police were making arrests based on incidents they had captured on the cameras.

By late yesterday afternoon, the vandal-proof cameras, which had cost \$800,000 to install, had contributed to seven drug-related arrests.⁸⁵

6.78. However, there is a question about CCTV’s long term effectiveness in preventing and detecting crime. The Vice-President of the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties expressed concern that research in the United Kingdom had found some evidence that the effect of the cameras can fade.⁸⁶ Indeed, a recent study in the United Kingdom concluded that:

as is common with many crime prevention efforts, the effectiveness of packages that include CCTV may wear off over time.⁸⁷

⁸⁴ Criminal Law Committee of the Law Society, op cit

⁸⁵ Daniel Lewis, *Police drug-busters snap to it with their new candid cameras*, *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 17 September 1996, 4

⁸⁶ Discussions in Brisbane, 12 August 1996.

⁸⁷ Ben Brown, op cit, p 65

View of the Committee

6.79. *The Committee considers that caution is warranted in assessing unsubstantiated claims that the use of CCTV has led to a significant reduction in the incidence of crime such as the estimated 60 percent reduction in crime in Brisbane or the apparent success of the Cabramatta system.*

Public Support for CCTV in Public Places

6.80. A recent editorial in the *New Scientist* commented that:

More studies and more debate are needed urgently. Video cameras are seductive symbols: they make the public feel safer, politicians that something tangible has been done, and authoritarians that antisocial elements cannot escape their all-seeing eye. But if they do turn out to be little more than symbols, much money and effort will have been wasted.⁸⁸

6.81. The Committee was assured that the local community strongly supported the use of CCTV in public places in Brisbane and the Gold Coast because it made them “feel safer”.⁸⁹ It is possible that such support is not warranted on the actual results of CCTV. A United Kingdom study concluded that:

CCTV cameras have a broadly positive reception from members of the general public. Levels of concern are not high [from the public] and CCTV cameras are assumed to be effective in crime control. However, they observed that public acceptance is based on limited, and partly inaccurate, knowledge of the functions and capabilities of CCTV systems in public places.⁹⁰

6.82. Perhaps the public does have “limited or inaccurate knowledge” about CCTV and this explains the contradiction between the public’s apparent acceptance of CCTV and the Australian Privacy Commission’s finding that Australians placed a very high value on privacy.

6.83. A clear message coming through to the Committee from the submissions, the literature and oral evidence in that people have different expectations on what is an acceptable intrusion into their privacy. This view is confirmed by the Privacy Committee of NSW when it noted that:

[I]ndividuals have different expectations of privacy protection in their public and private worlds.⁹¹

⁸⁸ Ian Anderson, Editorial, “Every move you make”, *New Scientist*, Anthony Bertini, West Chatswood, 20 January 1996, p 3

⁸⁹ Discussions in Brisbane and the Gold Coast, 12-14 August 1996.

⁹⁰ AFP, op cit, p 8

⁹¹ Privacy Committee of NSW, op cit, p 2

View of the Committee

6.84. *The Committee has not been able to ascertain whether CCTV is effective in reducing or detecting crime. Publicity about the “estimated 60 percent” reduction in crime in Brisbane⁹² and the initial success of the Cabramatta system may be giving the public and legislators alike a false impression. The Brisbane estimate has not been substantiated by a comprehensive evaluation and the Cabramatta system’s effect may fade over time.*

6.85. *The Committee believes that CCTV may be merely a “seductive symbol” for the public and legislators.*

CCTV in Public Places in the A.C.T.

6.86. The Committee was surprised to learn that CCTV is already used in public places in the A.C.T. CCTV systems have been installed at the Belconnen and Woden Bus Interchanges, the West Belconnen and Mugga Lane Landfills and the A.C.T. Legislative Assembly building (see Chapter 3 for further details). The Committee is not aware of other instances involving the use of CCTV in public places in the Territory.

6.87. The Committee is concerned that none of the systems:

- have signs advising the public that they are under CCTV surveillance;
- protocols in place governing the operation and management of the system or handling of video footage; or
- procedures to audit the system.

6.88. Recommendation 11.

The Committee recommends that the Government, in relation to those places where CCTV is being used in public places, immediately:

- **erect signs advising the public that they are under CCTV surveillance;**
- **develop and implement protocols governing the operation and management of the system and handling of video footage; and**
- **develop procedures to audit each system.**

⁹² Daniel Lewis, op cit, p 4 and Alister McMillan, *Covert cameras snap to work with five drug-related arrests*, *The Daily Telegraph*, 17 September 1996, p 5

The Committee observes that the above recommendations are an interim measure pending the implementation of other recommendations contained in the report.

Paul Osborne, MLA
Chair

19 September 1996

Appendix A: List of Submissions

1. Mr David Wade.
2. Australian Institute of Criminology.
3. A.C.T. Council of Social Services (ACTCOSS).
4. A.C.T. Council for Civil Liberties.
5. The Retail Traders' Association of NSW.
6. Criminal Law Committee of the Law Society of the A.C.T.
7. Australian Federal Police.
8. Attorney-General's Department.
9. Australian Hotels Association - A.C.T. Region.
10. Community Information and Referral Service of the A.C.T. Inc. (31 May 1996)
- Confidential submission.
11. Community Information and Referral Service of the A.C.T. Inc.
(19 August 1996).
12. Mr P. Cheney.
13. Guardian Angel Security Pty Ltd.

Appendix B: Public Hearings

Thursday, 8 August 1996

The Law Society of the Australian Capital Territory - Criminal Law Committee

Mr Richard Refshauge

Mr Matt O'Brien

Australian Federal Police

Assistant Commissioner W J Stoll

Mr Dennis McDermott

Attorney-General's Department

Mr Tim Keady

Mr Keith Simpson

Mr Derek Jory

A.C.T. Council for Social Services

Mr Shaun Elliott

Community Information and Referral Service of the A.C.T. Inc

Mr Adam Stankevicius

Mr David Matthews

Australian Hotels Association

Mr Ken Smith

Mr Robert McHarg

Australian Institute of Criminology

Dr Peter Grabosky

A.C.T. Council for Civil Liberties

Mr Michael Cope

Monday, 2 September 1996

Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission

Mr Kevin O'Connor, Australian Privacy Commissioner

Mr Paul Kelly