



# Crime in Australia

## The First National Outlook Symposium

Canberra, 5 & 6 June 1995

### PROGRAM

Papers No. 1 - 8

#### Monday 5 June 1995

8.00 am Registration

9.00 am **1** Opening **Hon. Duncan Kerr**  
Minister for Justice

**2** Crime: The State of the Nation **Dr Adam Graycar**  
Director  
Australian Institute of Criminology  
*Chair:*  
Justice Sally Brown  
Family Court of Australia

10.00 am Morning Tea

10.30 am **3** Crime Prevention **Hon. Trevor Griffin**  
Attorney-General  
South Australia

**4. Mr Daryl Smeaton**  
Commonwealth Law Enforcement Board

*Panel:*  
Ms Christine Nixon  
Asst Commissioner, NSW Police  
Dr Adam Sutton  
University of Melbourne  
Mr Clive Begg  
Australian Community Safety & Research  
Organisation

*Chair:*  
Dr Adam Graycar  
Australian Institute of  
Criminology

12.30 pm Lunch

**Monday 5 June 1995 (cont.)**

**1.30 pm CONCURRENT SESSIONS:**

**Session A (Lake Superior Room)**

**[5] Organised Crime**

*Chair:*

Prof. John Braithwaite  
Australian National  
University

**Mr Tom Sherman**

**Chairman, National Crime Authority**

*Panel:*

Dr Grant Wardlaw  
Office of Strategic Crime Assessments  
Dr David Brereton  
Queensland Criminal Justice Commission

**Session B (Lake Michigan Room)**

**[6] Child Abuse & Family  
Violence**

*Chair:*

Ms Jane Mugford  
Australian Institute of  
Criminology

**Mrs Rosemary Sinclair**

**National Association for Prevention of  
Child Abuse & Neglect**

*Panel:*

Justice Sally Brown  
Family Court of Australia

**2.30-3.30 pm CONCURRENT SESSIONS:**

**Session C (Lake Michigan Room)**

**[7] Policing Multicultural  
Australia**

*Chair:*

Dr Jeanette Packer  
National Police Research Unit

**Mr Neil Comrie**

**Chief Commissioner, Victoria Police**

*Panel:*

Mr Ivan Kolarik  
National Police Ethnic Advisory Bureau

**Session D (Lake Superior Room)**

**[8] White Collar Crime**

*Chair:*

Prof. Arie Freiberg  
University of Melbourne

**Mr Mick Palmer**

**Commissioner, Australian Federal Police**

*Panel:*

Prof. John Braithwaite  
Australian National University

**3.30-4.00 pm Afternoon Tea**

**4.00-5.30 pm [9] Aboriginal Justice Issues**

*Chair:*

Mr David McDonald  
Australian Institute of  
Criminology

**Commissioner Michael Dodson**

**Human Rights & Equal Opportunity  
Commission**

*Panel:*

Dr Bill Jonas  
Australian Institute of Aboriginal &  
Torres Strait Islander Studies

**7.00 pm [10] Symposium Dinner (Lake Michigan Room)**  
**Guest Speaker: Justice Michael Kirby**

**Tuesday 6 June 1995**

8.30-10.00 am [11] **Violence Against Women**

*Chair:*  
Ms Kathy Townsend  
Office of the Status of Women

**Hon. Carmen Lawrence**  
**Minister for Human Services & Health**

*Panel:*  
Mr Frank Morgan  
University of Western Australia  
Ms Zoe Rathus  
Women's Legal Service, Queensland

10.00 am *Morning Tea*

10.30-11.30 am **CONCURRENT SESSIONS:**

**Session E** (Lake Michigan Room)

[12] **Fraud Against Government**

*Chair:*  
Dr Jo Herlihy  
Australian Institute of  
Criminology

**Mr Ken McPherson**  
**Auditor-General, South Australia**

*Panel:*  
Dr Vernon Kronenberg  
Department of Defence  
Mr Anton Schneider  
Commonwealth Law Enforcement Board

**Session F** (Lake Superior Room)

[13] **Juvenile Justice**

*Chair:*  
Ms Lynn Atkinson  
Australian Institute of Criminology

**Justice Hal Jackson**  
**District Court of Western Australia**

*Panel:*  
Prof. Ian O'Connor  
University of Queensland

11.30-12.30 pm **CONCURRENT SESSIONS:**

**Session G** (Lake Michigan Room)

[14] **Consumer Crime**

*Chair:*  
Mr John Myrtle  
Australian Institute of Criminology

**Philip Noonan**  
**Federal Bureau of Consumer Affairs**

*Panel:*  
Mr Alan Asher  
Trade Practices Commission

**Session H** (Lake Superior Room)

[15] **Violent Crime**

*Chair:*  
Prof. Ross Homel  
Griffith University

**Ms Christine Nixon**  
**Asst Commissioner, NSW Police**

*Panel:*  
Dr Sandra Egger  
University of New South Wales  
Dr Satyanshu Mukherjee  
Australian Institute Criminology

**12.30 pm Lunch - Guest Speaker: Senator Amanda Vanstone**

2.00 pm [16] **The Changing Social  
Context of Crime**

*Chair:*  
Dr Peter Grabosky  
Australian Institute of  
Criminology

**Dr Don Weatherburn**  
**NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics & Research**

*Panel:*  
Prof. Arie Freiberg  
University of Melbourne  
Justice Andrew Wilson  
Australian Crime Prevention Council

3.00-4.00 pm **Overview: Future Directions**

*Chair:*  
Dr Adam Graycar

**Ms Rhonda Galbally**  
**Victorian Health Promotion Foundation**

## Conference Speakers

### **Hon. Duncan Kerr**

Minister for Justice since 1993; MHR (ALP) for Denison, Tasmania, since 1987; Chair National Crime Authority Inter-Governmental Committee since 1993; Chair House of Representatives Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs 1990-93, Member House of Representatives Legal and Constitutional Committee 1990-93.

### **Adam Graycar**

Director of the Australian Institute of Criminology since November 1994; Chief Executive Officer, Office of Tertiary Education and Executive Director, Department of Employment & TAFE (SA) (1990-94); Commissioner for the Ageing (SA) 1985-90; Foundation Director, Social Policy Research Centre, UNSW (1980-85).

### **Hon. Trevor Griffin**

SA Attorney-General and Minister for Consumer Affairs 1993-; Deputy Leader of the SA Government in the Legislative Council 1993-; SA Attorney-General 1979-82; Member of the State Council of the Liberal Party.

### **Daryl Smeaton**

Executive Member, Commonwealth Law Enforcement Board 1994-; Senior Adviser Federal Justice Ministers Senator Michael Tate and the Hon. Duncan Kerr 1987-94; since 1984 has advised on law enforcement policy matters.

### **Tom Sherman**

Chairperson, National Crime Authority 1992-96; President of the Financial Action Task Force established by the G7 Summit 1992-93; Chairman of the Queensland Electoral and Administrative Review Commission 1989-92; Commonwealth Crown Solicitor 1984-89.

### **Rosemary Sinclair**

1990-93 National Office Coordinator, National Association for the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (NAPCAN); First National President NAPCAN 1988; Co-Founder NAPCAN 1987.

### **Neil Comrie APM**

Chief Commissioner of the Victoria Police Force 1993-; Assistant Commissioner, Qld Police in Command of Task Force 1990-92; commenced duty with Victoria Police 1967; family tradition of 143 years of Victoria Police Service.

### **Mick Palmer APM**

Commissioner, Australian Federal Police 1994-; Commissioner of the Northern Territory Police 1988-94; served with Northern Territory Police 1983-94 and 1963-79; practised at Queensland Bar 1982-83.

### **Michael Dodson**

First Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner 1993-; Director of the Northern Land

Council 1990-93, and Senior Legal Adviser 1984-90; a prominent advocate on land rights and other issues affecting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

### **Justice Michael Kirby**

President, Court of Appeal, Supreme Court of NSW since 1984; Chairman Law Reform Commission of Australia 1975-84; extensive membership of and involvement in national and international organisations associated with jurisprudence and human rights.

### **Hon. Carmen Lawrence**

Minister for Human Services & Health since 1994; Minister assisting the Prime Minister for the Status of Women since 1994; MHR (ALP) for Fremantle (WA) since 1994; WA Premier, Treas. 1990-93.

### **Ken McPherson**

SA Auditor-General since 1990; full-time Member National Companies and Securities Commission, Melbourne 1987-90; Commissioner for Corporate Affairs (SA) 1981-87.

### **Justice Hal Jackson**

District Court Judge (WA) 1986-; First President of the Children's Court of Western Australia 1989-94; one of first two full-time members of WA Law Reform Commission 1980-86, including term as Chairman 1984.

### **Philip Noonan**

Acting Executive Director, Federal Bureau of Consumer Affairs, 29 May 1995-.

### **Christine Nixon**

First woman Assistant Commissioner in history of NSW policing 1994-; Superintendent in charge Specialist Skills training, Police Academy, Goulburn, 1992-94; Quality Control Officer, Distance Learning and Field Training 1991; began police career in New South Wales in 1972; has studied at Harvard and worked in London.

### **Senator Amanda Vanstone**

Shadow Commissioner for Justice and Consumer Affairs since 1993; Senator (Lib.) for South Australia since 1984; legal practitioner 1984.

### **Don Weatherburn**

Director NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research 1990-; formerly Research Director NSW Judicial Commission; has published widely on aspects of criminal justice.

### **Rhonda Galbally AO**

Chief Executive Officer, Victorian Health Promotion Foundation 1988-; Member Board CAE since 1991, Alfred Hospital since 1990; Trustee Reichstein Foundation 1985-; Founding Director Commission for the Future 1985-88.

UNEDITED. PAPER AS PRESENTED AT CONFERENCE

AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY

**Crime in Australia**  
**THE FIRST NATIONAL OUTLOOK SYMPOSIUM**  
**Canberra, 5 & 6 June 1995**

**OPENING ADDRESS**

©The Duncan Kerr  
Minister for Justice

Distinguished guests - and there are too many of you to name individually - ladies and gentlemen, thank you for having me as the first speaker at this "Crime in Australia" symposium.

Too often in Australia we see crime policies used as a political football, where politicians of all sides engage in bidding wars to see who can promise to extract the most pounds of flesh from convicted criminals

Obviously populist posturing is not sensible policy making. Crime policy has to be developed sensibly and rationally, not through a series of knee jerk reactions to outrageous criminal acts, the stimulus of an imminent election or perceived voter pressure.

This is one reason I am so pleased to have been invited to speak at this symposium and why this symposium is so important. It's not an occasion for political point scoring or for impressing voters. Instead practitioners and policy makers can exchange information, debate the issues and we will all be better for it.

The sensible way to tackle crime is not to see how far we can push up the penalties - this a path that leads to capital punishment and the sort of society many of us would not choose to live in.

Clearly deterrence alone is no way of getting rid of crime. Prisons themselves, no matter how enlightened or how brutal, are not a solution to crime. If prisons, long jail sentences, and the threat of capital punishment made for a crime free society then the United States would be crime free. We all know it is not.

That the degrading conditions in many prisons may in fact promote crime is well known. When the famous French pair Alexis de Tocqueville and Gustave de Beaumont visited the United States in 1833 they made the following observation.

"While society in the United States gives the example of the most extended liberty, the prisons of the same country offers the spectacle of the most complete despotism."

At about the same time the French men were touring the United States, the British Government, surveying the financial success of transportation, observed that it cost about eight pounds a year to keep convicts locked up in hulks or 24 pounds a year to keep convicts locked up in a jail.

On the other hand exporting 4000 convicts to Australia cost on average 15 pounds per convict. Clearly the British felt they were onto a good thing with transportation they could get rid of the convicts - often permanently - at a fraction of what it would cost to keep locked up for just three or four years.

To keep a prisoner locked up for a year in Australia today costs about \$40,000 a year. That in itself should provide us with motivation to find ways to reduce crime. But \$40,000 per year per prisoner is just a fraction of the true cost of crime.

When you add it all up - court costs, police time, damage and destruction it comes to as much as 26 billion a year. That's the estimate the Australian Institute of Criminology puts on the total cost of crime to the Australian economy each year.

But of course crime can't be reduced to an economic equation. Human misery and suffering, the alienation of many young Australians, black alienation, the fear women feel alone on the street at night, lives cut short - all this defies a dollar and cents analysis.

The drafters of our constitution, in their wisdom, gave the federal government little power in this area, which means that, by large, crime and its ramifications are a matter for the states. Federalism of course, has its strengths and weaknesses.

What is undeniable though is that it has left Australia and its relatively small population - about the size of greater New York City - with a confusing array of criminal laws and procedures, a different police force in each state and territory plus the Australian Federal Police, different court systems, a range of laws covering police investigative techniques, eight different gun law regimes, a host of prison systems and so on.

True it is that in diversity lies strength. But sometimes diversity can also lead to confusion.

The Federal Government believes that in many areas it would make far greater sense for Australia to adopt uniform national laws. and we have been leading the states in this direction.

There is no reason, for example, that our nations' police forces should operate under a range of different laws governing their rights to compel suspects to provide forensic samples. Why should police in Wodonga and Albury operate under different laws?

For this reason the Commonwealth, together with the states, have developed a model forensic procedures bill. I hope to introduce proposed Commonwealth laws - based on that bill - into Parliament this month. I was very pleased recently when the new NSW Attorney-General said he too would back legislation based on that bill.

The need for national laws applies in other areas evidence law, criminal law, gun laws. In all these areas the Commonwealth is encouraging a national approach - we have passed an evidence law, are in the process of passing a criminal law, and just a week ago urged the states to adopt uniform gun laws so far as is possible.

Recently the Prime Minister announced the Federal Government's commitment to a Safer Australia program that will allow the Federal Government to take an active role in encouraging crime prevention and community safety at a local level.

Safer Australia will provide \$4 million to fund specific crime reduction measures and undertake Community Safety Surveys. The Government will launch Safer Australia at a forum later this year.

The media has a central role to play in all of this. Last week a leading current affairs program conducted a poll which purported to find that more than 60 per cent of Australians are in favour of capital punishment.

In many ways that is hardly surprising. The media, or elements of it, tends to focus on crime, especially violent crime, and the more violent the better.

Fed a steady diet of murder, rape, child abuse and so called lenient sentences for offenders, is it any wonder that tabloid newspaper and television consumers believe the world is full of out of touch judges, soft prisons, short sentences, and under resourced police forces.

The public, by and large, form their perceptions of the crime through social contact and the media. The media has a greater responsibility than to merely entertain - they have an obligation to present information in a way that does not cause unnecessary fear or insecurity.

We therefore plan to work with the media to develop a code for the coverage of violent crime.

In conclusion, I wish you the very best in your endeavours here today and tomorrow. If we can add to or improve on our traditional responses to crime all Australians will be the better for it. Good luck.

## Australian Institute of Criminology

### First National Outlook Symposium on Crime in Australia

#### The State of the Nation

Adam Graycar

---

Crime hurts, crime outrages, crime exasperates, and it costs, but crime is not out of control.

- crime hurts, it shatters victims, devastates families, terrifies witnesses, causes illness;
- crime outrages - many are outraged by evildoing and by less heinous forms of criminal activity
- crime exasperates - many people are exasperated by what they perceive as the unwillingness or inability of the criminal justice system to deal severely with people whose behaviour is unlawful.
- crime costs big bucks, estimates vary from \$17 to \$27 billion per annum - we don't know exactly how much, but it's big bucks;

While crime hurts, costs and offends, and has certainly increased, it would be incorrect to assert that it is out of control. Some parts of the media would have us believe it is out of control, and survey findings indicate that the fear of crime is a very serious matter.

Ideologically polar positions produce their own explanations for increases in crime. Those on the right blame permissiveness, bankrupt moral values, contempt for authority, inadequate penalties, while those on the left blame poor social conditions, unemployment, lack of life chances, poverty traps, deprivation, limited educational opportunities etc. Viewed from a different perspective, there are probably many many more opportunities than ever before for criminal behaviour, and as Marcus Felson (1994) argues, much crime may be the price we pay for living in a world which offers high material benefits and a very mobile lifestyle. Put that against a context of tremendous social and technological change, and we have a complex casserole, with very varied ingredients put together using an unrepeatable recipe.



How can we harness our activities to ensure, at the end of the day, good policy for the promotion of justice and the prevention of crime, and a safer Australia?

As Lawrence Sherman has written:

The task of criminology is to determine the causes and consequences of rule making, rule breaking, and rule enforcing. The task of policy analysis is to integrate scientific evidence and difficult value judgments to recommend the best course of action, no matter how limited the available evidence.

(Sherman, 1992:xi)

The matching of criminology and policy brings into play our craft and our practice. We all do different things. We need to be skilled in our research, and in promoting our findings. We need also to be skilled in our policy development so that there is coherence and focussed societal relevance. We need to be skilled in our practice, and ensure that it is built on sound knowledge, a sense of purpose, and an understanding of our professional power.

What I want to do today is identify issues for analysis by those of us involved in understanding the criminal justice system and making it work. I want to discuss what we know, what we don't know, what we need to know, and how we might go about finding out.

In outlining the state of the nation, I don't want to recite lists of statistics (lots of statistics are in the data booklet in your satchels) and I don't want to dwell on best practice in crime prevention (the booklet *The Promise of Crime Prevention*, which is in your satchels has 22 case studies of things that work). I want to focus on policy, on knowledge for policy and on putting policy into practice.

Three types of crime must be distinguished.

**First**, there are crimes that harm people. Mostly these have been in criminal codes over the years, eg homicide, assault, theft, rape, robbery, burglary, etc. These are usually the crimes that citizens fear most, and often associate with the notion of increasing crime. These are also the ones which receive significant media attention.

**Second**, are activities that frighten, annoy or offend people. Many of these are the victimless crimes or perceptions of dangerous or unsafe behaviour that could affect a bystander.

Third are the 'new' crimes, those which have surfaced in recent years, associated particularly with organised crime, drugs trafficking, money laundering, computer crime, crime against the environment.

We live in a world of rapid and sometimes unfathomable change. It would be trite for me to list the technological developments that have changed our lives, and criminal activities. What is obvious that our ability to deal with social change lags badly behind our ability to deal with technological change. It is 25 years since we sent somebody to the moon, but we still have a lot to learn about our changing demography - changing ethnicity, changing family structure, changing education and employment patterns. All of these things affect our formulation and implementation of public policy, and our practice of criminal justice. If we ponder for just a moment on changes in dependency in our society - think about it - changing dependency of young and old, changing dependency of men and women, changing dependency resulting from labour market changes - all of these have a major impact on practices in criminal justice.

Anticipating crime of the future and dealing with it is no easy feat. It wasn't very long ago that we could not have imagined crimes like credit card fraud, superannuation fraud, computer hacking etc., nor have we had the haunting spectre of the possibility of having genetic predictions prior to birth, of an individual's likelihood of growing up violent. Nation states and unborn children could certainly be targets of sophisticated crime. What we know is that however we anticipate the future, it is not going to be a continuation of the past. The old saying goes that history repeats itself - in reality it is historians who repeat each other.

Globalisation provides many opportunities, and is changing the way we go about our lives. The years ahead will see a continuation in the international movement of products, finance, people, plants and animals, and information. Add to that the telecommunications revolution, and the way in which telecommunications systems will continue to be at risk of becoming the targets and the tools of criminal activity. Developments in communications will be exploited for fun or for profit, by those with a variety of illicit objectives from fraud, to money laundering, to the marketing of illicit goods and services.

### What do we know

We know that public opinion polls show violence and crime to be one of the major concerns of Australians. However, most generalisations on crime as a whole are inaccurate because the term 'crime' denotes too wide a variety of events to be described by a single label. Furthermore, examination of the data will show that Australia is a considerably less violent society than it was 100

years ago, and as the cover of your data booklets shows, violent crime accounts for 1.3% of all crime in Australia.

We know that we are faced with terminological confusion about what crime is, about how it is measured, how crimes are ranked and about who suffers most. Furthermore, our data on crime send us conflicting messages, and we're not sure how reliable they are.

We know that conflict and crime are related. Conflict in our society is inevitable and the management of conflict and the capacity of social organisations to reduce its escalation structures the incidence of crime. Public policy has a significant role in containing and de-escalating conflict.

We know that crime is not an equal opportunity predator. The chance of becoming a victim depends on where you live, how you live, who you are and who you know.

We know that victims invariably feel isolated from and disparaged by the criminal justice system. Several states have legislation on victims' rights, but victim support agencies cannot meet the demand on their resources.

We know that for some people the fear of crime is greater than the risk of becoming a victim of crime, and while fear has increased it is necessary not to lose sight of real increases in crime, which have not occurred at constant rates, and which have risen and fallen as different definitions and enforcement methods have been applied.

We know who goes to prison - essentially males who are young, poorly educated, unemployed, with a track record in the juvenile justice system and disproportionately Aboriginal. Considerably fewer women go to prison, but the proportion of Aboriginal women is higher. While we know who goes to prison we don't know who commits all the crime - or why. Most crimes are not reported, very few lead to an identification of the offender and a negligible proportion of crimes ever end with a conviction. Sophisticated and white collar crime is a vast playing field and really we don't know very much about who criminals are, apart from the tiny minority who are caught.

We know that the conventional belief for offenders who commit serious crime, the beneficial sequence of events is to:

- arrest, prosecute them promptly;
- send them to an appropriate correctional program;
- while in the program maintain contact with friends and family whom the person might cherish;
- on release, help them find a job, having provided training and living skills;

- if they return to crime after their release, send them to an even more secure correctional institution for a longer time.

That conventional wisdom has been seriously challenged in recent times in the United States, where in 1994 the number of people in prison topped 1 million for the first time (and this does not include the half million people in jail on remand). In California, where the three strikes and you're out was implemented early in 1994, it has been estimated that 20 new prisons will be needed, in addition to the State's current 28 and the 12 on the drawing board. The cost of housing the extra prisoners will hit \$5.7 billion 30 years from now. Whereas 10 years ago 14% of the California budget was allocated to higher education and 4% to prisons, today it is 9% each and the balance is projected to continue to change in favour of prisons. Jerome Skolnik, from the University of California, claims that in California the prison budget has increased 400% in the past decade, the corrections budget 500%, while violent crime has risen 40%.

We know what not to do, but there are no clear and unequivocal ideas about what to do. We can do experiments; we can develop policy; we can sharpen our practice; we can offer leadership. We can discard those initiatives which fail to live up to their promise; refine and improve those which are partially successful; and for those programs which prove to be demonstratively effective, we can expand them and replicate them as widely as possible.

We know that the good old days when there was no crime are a figment of fiction. For centuries writers have lamented the prevalence of and danger from villains. We do know that patterns of work, housing, technology, family structure, domestic arrangements, financial dependency and sexual activity have made the way young people live and do things very different to the way they lived and did things 100 years ago, or even 40 years ago. We can't just bring back the 'good old days' when young people supposedly behaved better and showed more respect for their elders. This would involve swimming against the tide. Ideally we swim with the tide, or if we are interested in good public policy, ahead of the tide, and this brings to the fore tensions in the balance between leadership and democracy.

We know that you can turn fish into bouillabaisse, but you can't reverse the process!

### **What Do We Need to Know**

The title of this talk, Crime: The State of the Nation, describes the work of the AIC. Our work program involves us in tasks which:

- explore
- describe; and
- explain.

There is no shortage of phenomena or propositions to **explore** - propositions covering all the issues under discussion over the next two days, and many many more. Why is a problem a problem? What are the differences between conditions and problems? Being young is a condition. Being young and boisterous is a condition. Being young, boisterous and in trouble with the police as a result is a problem. Whose problem? Why? What can we do about it? What **should** we do about it? Are there more important things to be bothered with? How do we determine this? - And on and on goes the process of exploration seeking to conceptualise various phenomena, distinguish them from others, place them in a social and policy context etc.

**Describing** seems pretty straightforward. We acquire and assemble our data, and tell our stories, but of course, as already noted, acquiring and assembling the data is not as straightforward as it sounds.

**Explaining** brings together theory and practice - it lays the basis for the development of new theory and it also lays the basis for policy.

We need also to know about the criminal consequences of public policies and the unintended consequences of interventions.. The fragmented nature of contemporary public policy means that decisions taken in one policy sphere often have impacts in others. The greatest impacts on our criminal justice system may well come, for example, from the education system, from practices in primary health care, from policies of the Department of Communication and the Arts, and from Government white papers, such as *Working Nation* which was released a year ago.

Let me give just one example. The movement to de-institutionalise psychiatric hospital patients in the 1970s and 80s was heralded as humane and progressive; life in "the community" simply had to be better than in the Dickensian institutions of the state. The absence of intermediate care or community based facilities, did not provide protection against harm, and resulted in new problems of public order and homelessness, with a substantial increase in the workload of welfare and housing authorities, not to mention agencies of the criminal justice system.

We need to know, conceptually and empirically, more about a whole range of activities so that we can better explore, describe and explain e.g.

- \* the nature of change

- \* traditional crimes
- \* new crimes
- \* serious crimes (crimes that hurt)
- \* less serious crimes (crimes that offend)
- \* major interventions
- \* crimes against persons
- \* crimes against property
- \* illegal sales
  - prostitution
  - gambling
  - narcotics
- \* illegal performance
  - drunkenness
  - disorderly conduct
- \* negligence & harm
- \* boundaries of criminal justice policies and practices

## Data

Crime can be measured in many ways, but perhaps the most predominant are from police reports and victim surveys. Police data sets show that during the last 20 years all major crimes (except homicide) have increased - and serious assault has increased over sixfold. The three ABS Australian crime victim surveys (1975, 1983, 1993), although not strictly comparable with each other, do not show measurable increases in crime victimisation rates.

The collection and recording of data leave a great deal to be desired. Definitions change, in some cases the unit is an individual, in others an incident eg. in some jurisdictions if a credit card is stolen and used fraudulently by one person five times, that can be recorded as five crimes, in others as one only. If one person steals ten cards and uses them dozens of times, who knows what the bottom line becomes?

Names of crimes change. Not only are new crimes added to the lexicon, but crimes like rape, fraud and assault are refined and sometimes renamed.

While the ABS crime victimisation surveys diverge from police reports, one can cast around for explanations. Some assault victims - especially those who were assaulted by their spouse or partner - may report an incident to the police when it happens, but months later, after tempers have cooled, may not identify the incident in an ABS survey. On the other side of the coin, some who don't report to the police because they don't want more family trouble might well

indicate a positive response to the ABS where confidentiality is guaranteed and data collection the only outcome.

The police reports will count crimes reported by people such as street kids and homeless people and also by businesses - none of which are reached by the ABS surveys. The ABS will count victims and will rely on their memories of incidents in the past. The police will count incidents.

Not only do these factors make it difficult to assess the detailed state of play, there are difficulties in assessing trends. We have more sophisticated data recording and analytic techniques than ever before, but no matter how sophisticated the tools, the results are only as good as what goes in. Some offences for which people were charged 100 years ago are no longer offences or are often not worth the trouble today. Others are reported much more, especially burglary and theft, because insurance companies won't pay without a police report. Some behaviours which were not deemed criminal in the past, especially domestic violence and child abuse, were not reported and recorded as they are today. Then and now we still find people, particularly Aboriginal people, occasionally charged for swearing in front of a police officer.

Whatever the explanations, we who deal thoughtfully with Australian crime data have so many reservations and caveats that any discussion sounds apologetic, while we all know that the media beats up incidents of crime and often portrays horrible incidents as the norm.

I haven't mentioned court data or corrections data, which tell different, yet complicated stories.

Overall, our data often do not distinguish sufficiently the seriousness of the activities, the concentration or spread of the activities, the continuity of the activities or the many correlates of these.

We have a long way to go before we can describe crime in Australia sufficiently well to offer explanations. The AIC sees as one of its prime roles the development of clear, coherent and comparable data, and will put a great deal of effort into working with the states to develop data that are clear, coherent and comparable.

### What works

We know a lot about what doesn't work, and our research and its implementation tells us quite a bit about what does work. However, many of the programs that have been implemented and evaluated show significant gains, but in localised areas, and the big task is to replicate things that work well, and wherever possible,

make principles more generalisable. The National Violence Prevention Awards received over 100 nominations, most of which were from programs that have demonstrated a reduction in violence. Programs like *Reducing Violence: Crime and Fear in the Gay and Lesbian Community (NSW)*; *Positive Parenting of Preschoolers (Q'ld)*; *Anti-bullying Project, (ACT)*; *Media Violence and Advocacy Project (South Australia)*; *Entertainment Safe Train (Vic)*; *Wunngagatu Patrol (WA)*; *NSW Department of School Education Anti-Violence Initiatives*; and dozens of others were conceived and tried out in communities across Australia, and bringing them to wider attention is one of the Institute's tasks. Informed publicity can help enormously.

The research of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody outlined a range of activities that work in reducing the prison population.

In responding to the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, all governments committed themselves to using arrest only when no other option is available for dealing with problems and using imprisonment as a sanction of last resort. But the prison population continued to rise.

Without leading to any increase in crime, the number of people being sent to prison can be reduced significantly by simple measures and all governments know this. They include (especially):

1. Not imprisoning people for fine default.
2. Instructing police not to charge people for minor offences such as obscene language where the police officer was the only person offended by the words.
3. Providing more non-custodial sentencing options.

We can also harness resources outside the public sector in furtherance of crime control. What makes for a successful local Neighbourhood Watch program, for example? Does it require a given degree of existing community cohesion? A charismatic neighbourhood leader? Can it be effective, or may it indeed be counterproductive, if it lacks an essential ingredient?

A thorough analysis of community crime prevention efforts would identify those which truly succeed, and why. The recipe for best practice can then be shared more widely.

All of this requires careful planning, testing, and rigorous evaluation. What do we mean by rigorous evaluation? Clear evidence is preferable to hunches. We can not conclude that a program which produces a warm inner glow is *ipso facto* successful.



## Finding out

The ideal evaluation is based on the principles of scientific experimentation, with random assignment to treatment and control groups. For those who might regard this as inherently unethical, let me relate the following anecdote:

It was once considered desirable to administer oxygen-enriched air to premature babies. So entrenched was this wisdom, that when a randomised experiment was conducted in the United States in the 1950s to demonstrate conclusively the effects of oxygen in reducing infant mortality, some hospital staff subverted the experimental design by administering oxygen to the control babies. They believed that it was unethical to withhold such a beneficial treatment from a control group. When the subversion was detected and the experiment conducted properly, it was found that not only did oxygen fail to reduce infant mortality, it significantly increased the risk of blindness in premature babies. Over 10,000 babies were blinded by this "beneficial treatment"

Of course, true experimentation is not always feasible, for ethical, logistical or financial reasons. Research on the deterrent impact of capital punishment is an obvious example. But where true experimentation is precluded, a quasi-experimental design can be useful. Such research has conclusively demonstrated the deterrent effect of random breath testing in Australia, a policy which has saved thousands of lives over the past decade.

We can listen to stories, we can do experiments, we can undertake rigorous evaluations. All are useful in certain circumstances. We should learn from our mistakes and also take very careful heed of unintended consequences of criminal justice programs and policies

Blind replication of programs which have met with success elsewhere is not a wise strategy. There may be situational or cultural differences which may influence processes and outcomes. What works in Wollongong may not succeed in Toowoomba, and vice versa.

In some cases, programs, apparently well designed and with the best of intentions, may do more harm than good (providing oxygen-enriched air to premature babies). Let me give you some examples:

- One of the earliest and most celebrated delinquency prevention initiatives was undertaken more than 50 years ago in the Boston area. The Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study, as it was known, provided services to at-risk youth, including academic tutoring, recreational opportunities, family support, health services, and counselling. The program made eminent theoretical sense, and

was praised by participants and administrators alike. Unfortunately, a follow-up study of program participants and a control group revealed that the program failed on a number of criteria. Not only were participants more likely than members of the control group to offend, but they compared unfavourably on a number of additional criteria including mortality, stress related disease, and evidence of mental illness and alcoholism.

- Aggressive interdiction of youthful joy-riders can bring about high speed police chases which may end in extensive property damage, injury, or death.
- Warning messages can be unintentionally enticing, and thereby produce a "forbidden fruit effect". Denunciation by moral entrepreneurs can impel the eager consumption of controversial literature, film and related material.-- precisely the activity they intend to discourage.
- The ingenuity and adaptability of criminals may be enhanced by new challenges, and with repeated strengthening, may constitute a more formidable threat than was initially the case. One might speak of an endless spiral of technologies and counter-technologies for crime and crime prevention, and an increasing "professionalization" of crime.
- Rather than enhancing freedom, some crime prevention activities may produce a fortress mentality. While one of the fundamental objectives of crime prevention is fear reduction, there remains the risk that crime prevention activity may actually exacerbate fear of crime. Various child protection programs have been criticised for delivering more fear than actual security.
- Research on the use of arrest in cases of domestic violence has found that arrest deters selectively - reducing the likelihood of subsequent violence by some offenders, and increasing it in others.

### Research and the dynamics of policy

In the making of policy governments both initiate and respond. Our democratic politics involves balancing rights, shares, and claims of individuals and groups.

Any government's social policy can be analysed in terms of values, targets, resources, and style and strategy. All governments respond to crime in their society, but resource allocation depends on targets and values. A government such as that in California implementing a three strikes policy targets young men and allocates massive resources to prisons. The British Safer Cities program or the South Australian Crime Prevention Strategy have different values, targets, and resource allocation strategies.

Governments of course, are continually besieged by interest groups - some of which speak for their section of the population, e.g. gun owners, industry associations such as those in the security industry, and police unions, while others promote a cause, such as NAPCAN, temperance associations, women against domestic violence. Others both speak for members and promote a cause, such as victims' associations. Whether the activist interest groups are sectional or promotional, they are in the business of making claims, and our politics involves the resolution of conflicting claims. Who wins, who loses, who goes on the scrapheap and who doesn't?

Three sorts of lobbies are part of the claims structure. First, there is the direct interest type. Claims are made by those who are the potential recipients and who thus have a direct interest. The direct interest lobby can be divided into two parts - a recipient section, like victim associations, and a provider section, like industry groups and professional bodies who stand to gain through policies that are in their interest.

Second, politicians and bureaucrats are a strong lobby, and the policies they propose and support vary with dominant political agendas. Australian public policy is full of examples of a strong bureaucratic initiatives. The former Federal Justice Office's *Creating a Safer Community* is one such example. Many bureaucrats have a strong commitment to the groups with which they work and continually support those groups' interest. Other bureaucrats are more detached.

Finally, there is the lobby of *conscience*, made up of persons and groups acting out of a sense of *noblesse oblige*—those who have nothing to gain directly other than the satisfaction of their humanitarian aspirations by positive social pay-off. This lobby includes individuals throughout the community who possess a sense of social justice, a belief in a reduction of inequality, and a hope for a better social future. This forms the basis of their activism, which has been seen in many social movements, especially in the criminal justice arena.

Interest groups use many tools, one of which, of course, is research. Many interest groups hope that the facts speak for themselves and therefore place a large store on the outcomes of research studies. Governments sometimes are persuaded by research findings; but it would be naive to assume that research findings are the basic components of policy decisions.

There is enough research in public policy to show that political decisions are made on the basis of political not scientific factors. One famous study found that 'the immediate impact of research on political decision makers depends more on the decision makers' perception of the problem and the degree of conformity of the research to this perception, than on the quality of the research or its relevance to the problems.' (Boeckmann, 1976)

The Australian Institute of Criminology is in the business of policy research. There is often a gulf between social scientists and policymakers. Social scientists can provide policymakers with theories about people and society, they can provide data, and they can propose socio-technical solutions. Policymakers are under no obligation to accept any of this, and whether they do depends on their values, their theories about cause and effect, and the facts available to them.

In academic research the primary starting point is an intellectual problem posed by previous research or theory and whose solution will bring about advance in the discipline. In policy research we begin with a problem, a problem that defies the boundaries and methods of academic disciplines and is rooted in the real world. The policy maker is concerned with arriving at a decision on the basis of the information available, while the scholar is concerned with determining the information necessary to make the decision. To provide maximum support to our policy making stakeholders we, at the AIC are concentrating on having a world class national information bank.

Researchers and decision makers have different resources. While researchers have a certain range of expertise and methodological skills, decision makers have a political knowledge of daily events, a time frame, political orientation and access to funds at their disposal. Not all of these resources can always be shared and a trade-off situation develops. Communicating research findings to decision makers is also often fraught with difficulty. Decision makers seldom have the time or the inclination to read the researchers' most favoured output - the research report that consists of hundreds of typed pages replete with jargon, tables, statistics, and footnotes. We know that most of the consumers of our product are not academics who value, more than anything, contribution to existing knowledge in the literature, but policy makers and practitioners who are not necessarily trained in the social sciences, and thus our product needs to be a "plain English" product.

Better communication techniques are desirable, and often research results are disseminated through seminars, meetings, teaching situations and abstracts of research. There is no guarantee, however, that once confronted with research outputs, the political decision makers will know what to do with it all.

There are purists who believe that the power of research is such that its findings will automatically flow into policy. At the AIC we realise this is optimism at the extreme. We also realise that we still have not, and probably never will, acquire the necessary methodological tools in most circumstances to produce unequivocal, non-trivial findings concerning policy problems

Policy decisions have an immediacy and an urgency and given the timing of a decision it must be made on the basis of information that is available at the time - not information that might become available later. Obviously partial

information available at the time is better than complete information (if possible!) after the event.

Too often results and data are worked on again and again until there is a reasonable level of certainty. Good policy values results that are approximately correct, rather than those which might be more elegantly derived but delayed until a high level of accuracy is obtained. For example, one might want to know now whether the rate of motor vehicle theft is closer to 600 per 100,000 or 6,000 per 100,000 rather than whether it is 596.425, but that information may not be available until next year! While never condoning sloppy data and compromising data standards, near enough, in a policy sense is often good enough.

We need to know which variables are subject to policy manipulation, and which situational variables are not. Here action and research interact. Importantly, we have to have a fair idea about why we want to know what there is to know and how, methodologically, we get there.

Policy research is our (the Institute's) business. Many of you here today are practitioners - the doers. Determining suitable practice standards is an important part of understanding the state of the nation. There is often a gulf between the planners and the practitioners - those who deliver (police officers, court workers, domestic violence workers, youth advocates, corrections officers etc) often do not understand the planning process. This can result in poor implementation of good policy because there is no sense of ownership, and because many apparent inconsistencies and practices are inexplicable. Poor communication and poor training can lead to indifference, or burnout, and one way of pre-empting burnout is through the development of quality assurance programs, and thoughtful and sensitive staff appraisal. Quality assurance is a way of ensuring that favourable outcomes are occurring. Quality assurance simply means that quality, a degree of excellence, is assured, that is positively declared and guaranteed. It lays a rigorous basis for setting goals and achieving outcomes.

While we at the Australian Institute of Criminology are not operational practitioners, we are interested in practice, and in working collaboratively to improve the quality of practice, and in limiting the gulf between policy and practice.

I see this symposium as the relaunch of the Australian Institute of Criminology as an organisation whose focus is policy, and whose product is information and research which informs government policy in the promotion of justice and the prevention of crime. I would like to think of our product in four categories:

- Criminology as a Philosophical Concept
- Criminology as a Product

- Criminology as a Process
- Criminology as a Framework for Action

Some of you here today are criminal justice practitioners, others policymakers, others researchers, others interest group activists etc.etc. In thinking with me about *Crime: The State of the Nation* I would like you to think about your work as a philosophical concept, as a product, as a process, and as a framework for action. The objective of this is to put principles into practice, within a context of understanding the politics and dynamics of our society, and the special components of your professional activities which add value to our society.

Quality assurance identifies structure, process, and outcome. When we review the State of the nation at the 2nd National Outlook Symposium two years from now, I would hope we would focus on how our structures and processes facilitate excellent and safe outcomes for all Australians.

### *References*

Boeckmann, M.E. (1976), 'Policy Impacts of the New Jersey Income Maintenance Experiment', *Policy Sciences* 7: 53-76.

Felson, M. (1994), *Crime and Everyday Life*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Sherman, L. (1992), *Policing Domestic Violence*, New York: The Free Press.

MONDAY, 5TH JUNE 1995

**SPEECH BY THE HON. K. TREVOR GRIFFIN, MLC  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL AND MINISTER FOR  
CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

**CRIME PREVENTION  
NATIONAL OUTLOOK CONFERENCE ON CRIME  
IN AUSTRALIA**

**THE ROLE OF CRIME PREVENTION  
IN MODERN AUSTRALIA**

**BRING BACK HANGING!**

**THREE STRIKES LAW ON THE AGENDA!**

**PUT MORE POLICE ON THE STREETS!**

How many times have you read, heard or seen those headline grabbing one-liners? They have a familiar ring to them.

Take this for example, from Adelaide's Advertiser Newspaper on 1st May 1995:

**PARENTS OPPOSE CHILD CRIME PLAN**

*"A controversial plan to make parents pay for criminal damage caused by their children could create more problems than it solved, a leading parents group warned yesterday."*

The headline which catches most readers' eyes is sensational, but the substance of what follows takes a different line.

The story was the result of a concerted push by the Opposition in South Australia to make "grossly negligent" parents legally liable for the criminal actions of their children aged 10 to 15 years.

Late last year there were a series of graffiti attacks which severely provoked the community. The last straw was an attack on the State's War Memorial. The frustrated community responded with something akin to a lynch mentality and the media, predictably, reported reactions:

- *Convicted graffiti vandals should be publicly identified*
- *Stocks and the cane are more appropriate*
- *Sentence them (graffiti artists) to microchip insertion whereby the law could monitor their whereabouts and check their behaviour 24 hours a day, just as zoologists do with other animals*

A number of more colourful but basic suggestions were made.

More recently an elderly Adelaide man shot and killed an intruder. The incident came hot on the heels of a similar "home invasion" type incident in Queensland, and the media and the community launched into a feeding frenzy on self defence issues.

The local paper featured a large colour photograph on the front page of the elderly man with his walking frame. Inside there was a 2-page spread including a sketch of the inside of the home showing where the intruder got in, where the elderly man was standing and where the body was slumped after the intruder was shot. Readers got a minute by minute account of the events leading up to the fatal shooting - something like the O.J. Simpson story.

The feature also included interviews with neighbours and a number of imaginary scenarios with a line about how the law would apply in each particular instance.



One caller to a talkback radio programme even suggested that the families of criminals should have their social security stopped!

The story of the shooting was treated in a similar fashion by all the media at the time, not just one.

The fact that the fatal shooting of intruders rarely happens was not reported. Neither was the fact that crime statistics show many crimes have generally gone down. There was no restraint on debating the merits of the case even though the matter was under investigation and the DPP had not, at that stage, taken a decision to prosecute or not to prosecute.

The issue of how crime-related information is perceived and conveyed is a community responsibility as much as a media responsibility so what I say is not to be taken as criticism of the media. The reasons why some media reporting is distorted is multi-faceted and more complex than asserting "sheer irresponsibility," although sometimes that is undoubtedly the case. However, the way crime is presented to the public has an all important bearing on community perceptions.

It is a well established fact that the fear of crime is much greater than the amount of crime actually committed.

Frequently, perceptions are misplaced. In April I spoke at a Law and Order Forum in a suburb called Noarlunga. This suburb is one of several in Adelaide's south which is widely reported and regarded as suffering a high crime rate. However, the Forum was staggered to find that the most recent crime statistics told a completely different story - Noarlunga's rate of offending is in fact below the State average.

Crime statistics can paint a vivid picture of what is happening in our community but interpretation requires care.

Australia has experienced large increases in levels of RECORDED crime in the past 20 years and public concern about crime is high. The 1993 national crime and safety survey estimated that over half a million (522,000) Australian households were victims of either break-ins, attempted break-ins or vehicle theft. A similar number of individuals were victims of violent offences. Police records show that break-ins to commercial and community premises are almost as frequent as household break-ins and that fraud and property damage are also common offences.

While the cost of crime in Australia is difficult to estimate a 1992 report put the figure in the range of \$17.7 billion to \$26.7 billion per year, including over \$4 billion spent on police, courts and correctional services.

In the face of such costs it would seem logical to devote resources to developing information systems and a statistical base for examining crime at the national level. Yet past efforts in this direction have failed. Crime trend analyses in Australia have been plagued by two major problems:

- Crimes recorded by the police have not been comparable between States; and
- Alternative sources of data such as crime surveys have been available on only an intermittent and inconsistent basis

With this background in mind, some trends in selected crime categories for the period between 1973 and 1993 will help to paint a balanced picture.

#### MURDER, MANSLAUGHTER (other than driving) AND INFANTICIDE

There has been no observable change in Australian rates of homicide although recorded annual rates fluctuated.

#### ASSAULT

Since 1973 the number of both serious and minor assaults recorded by police has grown substantially. At the national level serious assault rates increased by 370 percent. In

contrast with the police statistics, crime surveys indicate a *decrease* of more than a quarter since 1983. Furthermore, Western Australia data show constant rates of hospital admissions due to violent crime over the same time span.

These divergent results are difficult to reconcile. However, a reasonable hypothesis is that police now record a higher proportion of domestic incidents as criminal events rather than regarding them as private disputes. This change in police recording practices partially explains the difference between police and crime survey trends.

### **ROBBERY**

Police statistics reveal an increase of 240 percent in robbery rates and crime surveys support this trend, showing that robbery doubled over the past ten years.

### **BREAK AND ENTER DWELLINGS**

Police figures reveal a 200 percent increase in break-in rates. The bulk of this increase occurred between 1975 and 1983 with an increase of 15 percent in the past 10 years. Crime surveys again support the trend. However, more recent crime surveys in New South Wales, South Australia and Western Australia indicate *decreasing* rates of break-ins between 1990 and 1993.

### **MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT**

Recorded vehicle theft statistics are considered reliable because independent crime surveys show that over ninety percent of these incidents are reported to police. The increase in this category was 77 percent but the bulk of this occurred before 1983. A closer analysis reveals that national rates of vehicle theft peaked in 1991.

The trend in vehicle theft in South Australia is down; initial figures, not yet released, indicate that the current level of theft is the lowest in 10 years.

Figures are often used to get a message across (frequently depending on one's desired goal) but, as I have just demonstrated, we should be wary about the true significance of

many crime statistics. The way they are collected and interpreted is vital in order to achieve a more accurate picture upon which policy can be developed and planning occur. For instance, it is not surprising that there are high rates of both personal and property crime in the centre of Adelaide. The city attracts thousands of non-residents to work, shop and entertainment venues every day. Many victims of crime in Adelaide live in other areas. Because of this one should be cautious about interpreting the crime rate in Adelaide as an indicator of personal risk of victimisation in the city. It is possible that one's personal risk of crime while working, shopping or being entertained is lower in the city than in some other areas.

This, then, is the background against which the Brown Liberal Government has sought to address issues of crime prevention.

I should pause here for a few moments to talk about what is crime prevention. In South Australia we had to give close attention to this question as we began an audit of all programmes across Government which were regarded as "crime prevention" programmes. Our Audit Group assessed the programmes using the Helsinki Institute for Crime Prevention and Control (HEUNI) classification of crime prevention (noted in the 1990 Report "Crime Prevention Strategies in Europe and North America"). This defines crime prevention activities in 3 levels; these prevention activities are where "...the main target of primary prevention is the general public as a whole, secondary prevention targets those most likely to offend and tertiary prevention those who have already offended."

It became evident to the Audit Group as it assessed programmes that "community safety" as a definition of intervention needed to be added to the classification model. Some S.A. police programmes, for example, did not neatly fit into the HEUNI approach to crime prevention definition. Crime prevention outcomes were not the primary goal of some programmes. Community safety is a broader concept than crime prevention which, although more difficult to measure, clearly has a place when assessing programmes across Government agencies.

For example, is merely watching a neighbour's house crime prevention if someone strange has been seen lurking about? I would say not. This falls more into the category of "community safety" as distinct from crime prevention which targets specific groups and specific problems.

An example of a community safety programme is the Security Advice Unit. It aims to create public awareness on security techniques through lectures, displays and one-to-one advice. The Unit is a mobile service. Security assessments range from providing advice to banks and other businesses to dealing on a one-to-one basis with members of the community.

The Safety House Association of South Australia also falls under the community safety heading. It aims to promote safety and security of the community at all times; create opportunities for citizens to fulfil a useful role in the interaction of school, police and community and to deter wrong doers. This programme targets the general community.

Traditional responses have not worked in stabilising crime. Ratcheting up penalties each time the community demands a tougher stand achieves little, if anything, particularly in an environment where penalties are generally already tough. More police on the beat may, in fact, result in higher levels of reported crime and more arrests and court appearances.

Because traditional responses do not appear to be working, the Liberal Government of South Australia is committed to developing crime prevention as an alternative - in other words, to determine the causes of crime and tackling them at a community level. This is directed towards diverting at an early stage those who may otherwise be involved in a life of crime to more constructive endeavours. It contrasts with the idea of keeping a watch out for anyone acting suspiciously and then calling the police, apprehending the offender and dealing with him or her through the criminal justice system, although that is important.

Crime prevention and community safety have only been taken up by Governments in Australia relatively recently. By contrast, since the 1980's, many jurisdictions in both Europe and North America have been developing a greater community involvement in the concept of crime prevention and community safety. There has been a worldwide recognition that police and criminal justice responses cannot alone deal with the problem of rising crime.

I have recently returned from Europe where I had the opportunity to examine crime prevention programs in Britain, France and the Netherlands. From this visit, and drawing on South Australia's experience, there are some issues worthy of attention.

For Australia to take a strategic approach to crime and safety issues at the national level each sector must identify, and respond to, its area of responsibility. These sectors include Government (Federal/State/Local), the private sector and the community. Not only must each sector respond, but there must also be a co-operative approach adopted across the sectors.

The community role is not an easy one to define as each community has different crime and safety issues to deal with. The first and most important step, however, is to educate the community about crime and crime prevention and what can be achieved. The key issue to resolve, however, is the paradox in crime prevention. All too often the community (at the broadest level of definition), takes the view that harsher penalties, longer sentences, etc. will prevent crime. There is no doubt that criminal justice sanctions have a role. But when asked to identify the causes of crime communities will relay back concerns such as unemployment, drug and alcohol abuse, education and training concerns and poor parenting including family violence. Clearly these social issues are not going to be addressed through the criminal justice responses which are presently identified by the community as ways to prevent crime. Recognising this paradox is the first step to understanding the issues involved in crime prevention.

The private sector includes the media, industry and employment groups, the corporate sector and small business. In relation to the media, responsible reporting and accurately presenting information is a key to promoting community safety. In order to assist the media, Government agencies must provide clear information to journalists and assist them on good practice in accurate reporting. Other industry and corporate sector groups can contribute to specific crime issues (insurance, car and house theft, retail sector and shop theft), as well as consider lateral approaches to employment and training opportunities for young people 'at risk' in the community. The British Safer Cities program has much to offer in relation to involving this sector.

The Government sector must work in partnership with these sectors and take a leading role at the national, state and local levels. Community safety is a key quality of life issue and, therefore, connects with local Government. Facilitation at the local level is vital. Local Government also has a range of interests in crime prevention including urban design and planning, the costs of removing graffiti and repairing vandalism and harnessing community development projects for young people.

State Governments have the prime responsibility for crime and law and order. They can and should provide policy direction as well as funding and support for local programs. Planning tools are available for State Governments to work with local Governments in partnership for crime prevention.

These include focusing on:

- 1) Primary, secondary and tertiary interventions
- 2) Specific groups and localities issues
- 3) Social, situational and community crime prevention

As well, through policing strategies, and other State Government agencies, the role of State Government can sharpen policing development for both crime prevention and

community safety. It can also play a significant part in sponsorship of crime prevention, as in the United Kingdom.

The Federal Government also has a key role in crime prevention. State Government and local communities can address some elements and causal factors but it is not possible for these levels of Government to have a major impact on areas where the Federal Government controls the levers. For example, unemployment is often considered a key issue in criminal behaviour - similarly, drug abuse. Policies on generating employment, health, housing, education and training can clearly affect crime occurring, or not occurring, in local communities. Yet, economic direction and unemployment policies are the responsibility of the Commonwealth.

When the Liberal Government came to Office in December 1993 it inherited the **Crime Prevention Strategy** although it had given some measure of support to such an approach while in Opposition. The **Strategy** is operated by the Crime Prevention Unit within the Attorney-General's Department. It was established in 1989 by the previous Government as a 5 year program. No other State had developed a strategic approach to crime prevention so it was largely experimental in nature.

The **Strategy** had 4 sub programs (currently it has 3), one of them called the **Local Crime Prevention Committee Program**. This comprises 22 Committees across South Australia which operates or has operated more than 520 programs. It involves the participation of community volunteers, service clubs, churches, non-Government service providers, local Government, police and youth workers to name but a few. Generally, each Committee is serviced by a full-time or part-time co-ordinator funded by Government

The range of issues these Committees have addressed is impressive; fear of crime (particularly among older members of the community), urban design, family and domestic violence, graffiti and vandalism, vehicle theft, drug and alcohol abuse and community safety. Social integration, encouraging local employment opportunities and developing skill based training options have also been part of the program.



A few examples may help to better illustrate how the Committees work.

One beachside Committee has developed a project which addresses issues surrounding youth crime and anti-social behaviour and it provides protection for young people at risk. It involves youth workers visiting the Glenelg Foreshore, mostly at night, to identify which young people are at risk, such as the homeless and those involved with drug and alcohol abuse. Those who need assistance are put in touch with the particular service they require.

Street Legal was introduced by another Committee to provide options for youths who have dropped out of society or who have been unable to cope with the mainstream education system and whose early adolescence has been characterised by a lack of identified or achievable goals. The program gives these young people an opportunity to be constructive, achieve personal stability and regain self-esteem. Ultimately it seeks to encourage participants to gain employment and become responsible citizens. Street Legal involves a co-operative approach between local vehicle businesses and TAFE. Young people are encouraged to build and repair vehicles with the assistance of the private sector while, at the same time, acquiring the necessary skills to follow this through at TAFE. As a result of their involvement several young people have opted for more formal training, while some have been successful in gaining employment.

Yet another Committee has developed an innovative approach to crime prevention in its area by teaming up with a local Football League to get young people off the streets and onto the sports field. If young people can focus their energies on something constructive, stimulating and entertaining, like playing sport, they are less likely to be troublesome and are more likely to develop a positive outlook. As part of this programme the Football League is also interested in developing a responsible approach to alcohol as part of the participation in the programme.

Workable crime prevention programmes require commitment, determination and co-ordination. This has successfully occurred in several projects involving the Crime Prevention Unit working in partnership with other sectors.

For example, **SAFE PROFIT** is a management planning tool for safety and service in the hotel and hospitality industry. It was developed by the Crime Prevention Unit working with several industry groups and individual hoteliers to help them establish and implement methods of preventing crime and improving the safety of both their customers and staff. It helps managers to work through the various features of their business which contribute to safety and it advises on ways to develop practical and realistic strategies to improve their service and safety. These safety tactics can only enhance a business by increasing the range and number of customers who feel safe on the premises. A **SAFE PROFIT MANUAL** has also been launched and the response to it by licensees has been enthusiastic.

In relation to vehicle theft 2 projects are underway in South Australia which involve the commitment and co-operation of several public and private sector agencies. A comprehensive database is being developed to ascertain patterns of vehicle theft so that theft reduction strategies can be established. Collecting the information for the database involves a co-operative initiative by the Attorney-General's Department, TransAdelaide, the Police, the insurance industry, the Royal Automobile Association, the Motor Trades Association and car park operators.

Another project has recently begun involving the public and private sectors. A joint industry/Government taskforce has been established to develop a Code of Practice for the crash repair, vehicle dismantling and insurance industries.

There is no doubt that any crime prevention programme must have clear goals (what is the crime problem sought to be addressed), must carefully identify and assess the causes of that crime problem and seek to minimise, if not eliminate, or at least counter those causes. Above all, there must be a proper evaluation method identified by the operator

of the project before it commences and rigorously undertaken during the project for final analysis when the project is completed.

In December 1992 the former Attorney-General commissioned a major independent Review of the **Crime Prevention Strategy** but it did not provide a comprehensive process and outcome evaluation of the **Crime Prevention Strategy** as expected. It provided little analysis of crime prevention issues or outcomes of the sub programs or options for future directions for crime prevention.

Consequently, the new Government had to determine future directions for crime prevention without the benefit of a well-reasoned, balanced assessment of the **Strategy**. As a response, an audit has commenced across the whole of Government of all programmes having a crime prevention emphasis - Police, Education, Transport, Youth S.A., Family and Community Services and others all have programmes. What this audit is showing is that in many cases a clear objective has not initially been established and evaluation is patchy. Evaluation does depend on good initial planning as well as programme development and implementation which has been well conceptualised.

How one measures success is, of course, difficult but it is important to try to do so objectively, not only because of the cost, but more particularly because crime prevention is such a new area of policy. If something is not working we should ask why and learn from that, or we should discover why a programme is working and how it can be improved or modified to suit different circumstances.

In any evaluation a log of "confounding" events should be kept which shows what has happened outside the programme which could influence the data. For example: new buildings or shopping precincts could be built, special police operations might be undertaken or there could be changes to legislation or enforcement practices. Such "confounding" events can either be local events or involve wider background changes. These external events need to be distinguished from the intended and the unintended effects of the crime prevention scheme. For example, an unintended effect of a crime

prevention programme could be increased reporting of the crime to police. This can be assessed to some extent by running a local crime survey to determine any changes to victimisation and reporting rates over the period in question.

Adequate programme details are essential in any attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of a programme such as:

- The aim and objective of the intervention or programme - what is it trying to achieve?
- Dates the programme started/ended/or if it is ongoing
- The geographic area covered by the programme
- What offences/offenders/victims are covered by the programme
- What is expected to happen to the crime data and why? when? and for how long

The future for crime prevention in South Australia, for the next three years, has necessarily shifted its original emphasis; for instance, the primary objective of the Local Crime Prevention Committee Program is that it be clearly and unambiguously identified as crime prevention rather than community safety. The **Crime Prevention Strategy**, within the Attorney-General's Department, will continue to address crime prevention as its key operating principle while the South Australian Police programs focus on community safety issues which are much broader. The **Strategy** will also focus on the role of other Government agencies in crime prevention, and further strengthen the connections of the local **Crime Prevention Committees** with local government. Partnerships will be developed with the private sector in areas such as retail theft, alcohol and its link with crime.

In addition, professionalisation in Crime Prevention is an issue for the future so that all involved in crime prevention and the criminal justice area have training in crime prevention principles. Finally evaluation will be further strengthened.

The new direction in crime prevention is still in its infancy, having only just been formalised, but there are great expectations of success. Increased community commitment will be vital to that success. The community has to be intimately involved in any strategy aimed at making the environment safer and citizens better informed about crime related issues. If Governments take on the responsibility for crime prevention alone the community will not accept any responsibility. If that happens people will inevitably lack a sense of purpose or pride or ownership, they will not be well informed about the real issues affecting their safety and they may inadvertently put themselves at risk. They will wipe their hands of the issue and put the blame and responsibility solely onto Government.

Teamwork is a critical component in effectively addressing crime prevention issues and by that I mean the Government, Courts and Police cannot be expected to clean up crime on their own. There needs to be a commitment from the community - parents, teachers, businesses - everyone who makes up our society.

That has already been acknowledged at a national level. Premiers and Chief Ministers have agreed that effective crime prevention strategies need the support of national benchmarks for "best practice" which in turn will require the co-ordinated piloting of crime prevention projects across the country and their systematic evaluation over time. This will maximise the opportunities for various jurisdictions to learn from one another. It was also agreed at a Leaders' Forum last February that pilot projects would be established in each State during the year and would be subject to initial expert evaluation in 1996 before being considered further by Heads of Government. Governments will also establish effective intra-State and interstate mechanisms to evaluate, on a continuing basis, the impact of crime prevention pilot programmes in their various jurisdictions. We should be able to learn from each other.

Five years ago few people in Australia had heard about crime prevention. Five years from now I believe it will be an integral part of our legal and community landscape; that it will be as necessary a cog in the criminal justice wheel as our courts, the police and

prisons. Apart from a major change in community and personal values and standards, crime prevention offers the most significant prospects of any programme to effectively reduce crime and so improve community safety.

**CRIME PREVENTION: A NATIONAL APPROACH**

**PAPER PREPARED BY MR DARYL SMEATON  
EXECUTIVE MEMBER  
COMMONWEALTH LAW ENFORCEMENT BOARD**

**CRIME IN AUSTRALIA: THE FIRST NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM  
AIC  
5-6 JUNE 1995**

# **CRIME PREVENTION: A NATIONAL APPROACH**

## **Introduction**

In this paper, I will take the opportunity to outline the features of the national approach to crime prevention being developed in Australia and some of the initiatives we are undertaking at the Commonwealth level, which are part of this 'whole system' agenda.

## **Crime rates**

General community concern about law and order is perennial. Law and order issues frequently become the subject of competing claims to measures which are aimed at generating a greater sense of safety in the community. The media appear to dwell on crime, particularly the more 'sensational' crimes and this preoccupation gives rise to a sense of fear among sections of the community, reinforcing the prominence of law and order as a political issue. We often see this cycle generating demands for tougher responses from the criminal justice system - more police, the creation of new offences, harsher sentences.

Crime rate trends indicate that while homicide rates have remained relatively stable over recent years, there have been increases in crimes against property and forms of violent crime other than homicide. Figures for different types of crime over the last two decades show similar changes in Australia and other comparable countries - New Zealand, Canada, England and Wales, West Germany and the USA - with the notable exception of homicide in the USA, where the rate is considerably higher than all comparable countries. But as Dr Adam Graycar noted recently, we are safer now from crime than citizens were at the turn of the century, especially when we realise that matters which are now reported as crimes, went unreported one hundred years ago, such as domestic violence and serious assaults arising from drunken brawls.

## **The Costs of Crime**

All this notwithstanding, crime is an unwelcome intrusion into people's lives and reduces the general wellbeing of the community. The level of a community's perception of safety is an indicator of the quality of life that its citizens may enjoy.

In straightforward economic terms, 'white collar' crime imposes the greatest costs on the community but it is the other types of crimes - the street, property and violent crimes - that the community is most concerned about. The cost of these forms of crime, not only to the community in general but to the individuals whose lives are changed forever as victims of crime, should not be ignored. There are also considerable costs arising from the fear of crime, which cannot readily be quantified.



Crime is a huge cost to the Australian economy. The Australian Institute of Criminology estimates that crime costs over \$20 billion per year.<sup>1</sup> Homicide, for instance, is estimated to cost up to \$275 million a year; assaults, including sexual assaults, at least \$331 million a year; shoplifting, between \$20 and \$1500 million a year; while fraud is estimated to cost between \$6,710 million and \$13,770 million per year. Add to these the costs in maintaining police forces, courts and prisons, and the costs become large indeed.

### **Traditional responses to crime**

Traditionally, most countries have developed a law enforcement response to crime through the establishment of a permanent police force. Police forces have been seen as the first line of contact in the criminal justice system, with a primary responsibility for the apprehension and processing of offenders. Traditionally, law enforcement agencies have concentrated on the symptoms rather than the underlying causes of criminal behaviour, of necessity. In the past, they have targeted their resources accordingly. Our police protect us from criminals and solve crime. But of necessity, police spend more time responding to crime than preventing crime.

The law enforcement solution to crime is costly, and has not been shown to be successful in eliminating or even reducing opportunistic street and community crime. It is politically visible and is therefore often the first response taken to community concerns about crime. One of the essential indicators of quality of life, in the view of many people, is the extent to which people feel safe and secure.

Current thinking recognises that concentration on the offender is a necessary aspect of law enforcement but it is neither wholly effective nor sufficient. The social factors and attitudes associated with criminal behaviour must be addressed. Of course, more recently there have been significant efforts by police forces to develop more effective policing strategies to address crime in the community. Community policing, problem-oriented policing, country-town policing and diversionary conferencing are all examples of new approaches to the primary tasks of policing. But they are focussed more on the results of crime and the symptoms, rather than the causes of crime.

As a society, we need a sophisticated approach to issues of crime prevention. This recognition has been the starting point for many of the more recent initiatives in situational crime prevention which all States and Territories have established through their police forces often in conjunction with other agencies. Programs to assist the elderly in the community to feel safe and secure, Safety House programs for children, safety audits and improved physical design of public places are examples.

### **The role of States and Territories**

Under the Australian Constitution, primary responsibility for law and order, law enforcement and the protection of the citizenry belongs to the States and Territories. Criminal laws, prisons and police forces are largely the concern of the States and Territories. The Commonwealth has a general power to

execute and maintain Commonwealth laws, including powers to create criminal offences and to provide for related enforcement action.

In recent times the Commonwealth has taken a lead role in promoting justice and preventing crime on a national basis. Over the past decade in particular, the Government has undertaken significant work in the policy areas of violence prevention, crime prevention and community safety, Aboriginal justice and law enforcement.

As a member of the key forum at the national level, The Australian Police Ministers Council (APMC), the Commonwealth has participated in developing co-operative arrangements between governments, law enforcement agencies and community based-groups which are essential to preventing crime. In the past, the Commonwealth has been directly involved with the States and Territories in developing new policies on issues such as firearms and domestic violence.

The Commonwealth has also been a key participant in efforts at the national level through APMC to establish a national crime prevention and community safety strategy. As part of this initiative, the Commonwealth prepared an Issues Paper, *Creating a Safer Community: Crime Prevention and Community Safety into the 21st Century.*<sup>ii</sup> This was launched at a national conference on crime prevention and community safety sponsored by APMC in 1992.

Interest in a national framework to support these jurisdictional and local initiatives has continued and in May 1994, APMC agreed that there was a need to put in place a national crime prevention strategy under its auspices. An APMC advisory group has since worked to develop the outlines of such a strategy. This was endorsed by Council at its meeting in December 1994. An action plan has been developed by the Advisory Group for consideration by Council at its meeting in May 1995. The Commonwealth Law Enforcement Board has assisted the Advisory group in this process.

The Strategy provides a statement of principles which should guide national efforts in crime prevention and community safety and sets out an infrastructure for implementation. This is premised on national leadership but relies on co-operation and integration of activities at the local, jurisdictional and national levels. Jurisdictions are expected to continue to develop and refine their crime prevention and community safety programs and it is suggested that each jurisdiction establish a Ministerial Coordination Group. At the community level, community based forums and service delivery by specific agencies should augment successful local programs.

The Action Plan identifies a range of activities which the Advisory Group sees as necessary for the Strategy to be effective, covering communities, government, public administration, religious groups, education, the media, policing, the corporate sector and professional and other organisations. The Commonwealth, through the Commonwealth Law Enforcement Board, has assisted the Advisory Group, in developing the Strategy and Action Plan. A copy of the draft Strategy is attached.

Premiers and Chief Ministers of all Australian jurisdictions organised a Conference on Crime which was held in November 1994. They plan to hold a

further conference in June this year. The main outcomes from the November 1994 meeting have been a commitment to action to develop national anti-crime strategies which could be drawn on by all jurisdictions, including increased sharing of law enforcement data between jurisdictions, establishment of similar coordinating structures in all jurisdictions and action to improve across-border arrangements (in the case of domestic violence orders, extradition and the like). These initiatives are most welcome.

### **A National focus**

The Commonwealth Government is keen to facilitate action which helps prevent crime and promote community safety. While we recognise that law enforcement is largely a matter for States and Territories, I believe that there are ways in which the Commonwealth can assist.

The Commonwealth Government has recently announced that it will set up a small, focussed national crime prevention body called **SAFER AUSTRALIA** to act as a resource for research and information-sharing, assist where co-ordination of activities is desirable and to facilitate developments in community safety and crime prevention best practice and policy.

Safer Australia aims to prevent crime by assisting communities and governments in identifying and developing effective solutions to the problems of crime and fear of crime at the community level.

Safer Australia will be similar to bodies in other countries such as the National Crime Prevention Councils in the UK and Canada. These are not high budget, big spending bodies but bodies that promote carefully planned, targeted, efficient programs.

There are many groups and organisations in Australia working to prevent crime and help the victims of crime, such as the Victorian Community Council Against Violence, the Crime Prevention Council in South Australia, the Community Safety and Research Organisation in Queensland and nationally, the Australian Crime Prevention Council and the Australasian Victims of Crime Association (AVOCA). 'Safer Australia' will complement the work of these and other voluntary and government bodies by providing funding for coordinated national activities and initiatives at the community level. 'Safer Australia' is concerned to address the risk factors in crime. Its activities will complement state and territory government policies, build on the partnerships which have already developed, and provide a means of integrating these into a national framework.

The 'Safer Australia' council will be a small, high profile group of people drawn from a variety of professional, community and cultural backgrounds. It will provide a crucial link between the police, the media, the corporate and community sectors and the three levels of government.

The Government plans to launch 'Safer Australia' at a national forum a little later this year. The forum is designed to bring together people from these various areas to exchange ideas about existing local projects and plans for the future.

### **Community Safety Surveys**

Many effective grass roots crime prevention programs developed by local communities are already operating. Considerable work has also been done at the community level to examine the 'fear of crime' which people experience. One recent example is the study carried out in Mulgrave Shire, in Queensland. The study examined community perceptions of the causes of, and attitudes to crime and found that most people felt safe in their own homes and neighbourhoods. They felt less safe when shopping, in the town centre at night and when approached by strangers.

The project recommended improved lighting in residential side streets and other public areas, improved safety in carparks near local shopping centres and a widening of the definition of 'safety houses' for children. Action has been taken at the local government level in that shire to address these concerns.

'Safer Australia' will aim to encourage more work of this nature to be undertaken. While Safer Australia will not provide funds for all the projects which are now operating or may be likely to, as this is the province of state and local governments, it will provide funding to enable some nationally significant projects to get off the ground. It will provide funds to assist community groups develop the best crime prevention and community safety projects possible, to evaluate the effectiveness of these projects and to assist community and other organisations share their knowledge and experience of what works. 'Safer Australia' will also fund studies to identify the causes of crime, allowing practical programs to be developed and put into effect.

Cooperation and an active partnership between the various agencies (government and non-government) which might have an interest in the matter is needed for any project to work. The police, although well placed to solve crimes once they have been committed, are not able to prevent crime in isolation from other groups in the community. Schools, the media, community service organisations, local businesses, as well as government departments with responsibility for education, health, social and community welfare and corrections, all have a role to play and must adopt an integrated and consistent approach.

'Safer Australia' will promote the need for active partnerships to be formed and will provide assistance to ensure that this is a feature of programs. Many successful programs both here and overseas have been based on an interdisciplinary and cooperative model. Multi-agency approaches have been developed in different places to address community safety issues for the elderly and people from non-English speaking background communities. 'Safer Australia' will work to promote targeted programs which are designed to address particular aspects of crime prevention, within a nationally coordinated framework.

'Safer Australia' will encourage sponsorship for community crime prevention programs. Business and institutions close to the source of the problem might be asked to become actively involved by funding local crime prevention programs. Insurance companies, for example, could provide financial support to programs in areas with particularly high property crime rates. Interestingly, the fear of being a victim of crime expressed by Mulgrave residents was far greater than the statistics on crime for the area. Fear of crime can be just as

damaging as crime itself. And while there is dispute whether crime is really increasing, there is no doubt that the fear of crime has increased.

Current research indicates that the fear of crime comes not from the actual experience of crime, as relatively few people are victims of crime, but is formed by the media, social contact and people's perceptions of the condition of the local environment. The media clearly must recognise the power they wield to create community perceptions of issues and must use it wisely.

The media must responsibly represent crime, particularly violent crime, in a way that does not have unintended negative effects, such as fear and intolerance. It must portray crime in a way that is accurate and not sensationalised. 'Safer Australia' will include a member who has worked in the media for some years and who will be able to convey the message back to those who work in the media so that a code of practice can be developed with the support of the media.

### **Social Policy Research**

The government has a strong interest in addressing crime prevention and community safety on a broader level beyond the situational - the level of general underlying social conditions as contributing factors - which demands attention through research and policy initiatives. *Creating a Safer Community* addressed issues of crime prevention at this more general level and attempted to set the scene for further action, especially by governments.

Just as there are many different types of crime, there are many causes of crime. We tend to blame individuals and their circumstances when we are considering particular offences.

Less often do we stop to consider the situational factors contributing to particular types of crime. To take a simple example, in the past, the fact that public phone boxes usually held a large amount of coin in them, served to encourage vandalism and destruction of public phones. The phonecard system has replaced coin operated phones in many areas and there has been a significant reduction in this type of vandalism. Poor lighting and poor physical security in public places are other examples of situational factors which can be addressed to remove the opportunity for crime.

As a consequence, situational factors are now a focus of many crime prevention programs at the local community level as well as within broader programs such as the Better Cities project.

Conditions which encourage crime can also be created unintentionally by social and economic policies. Changes to welfare policies may generate circumstances in which it is easier to defraud the government, changes to immigration rules may make it easier for criminals to enter the country undetected, changes to the laws concerning the possession of certain drugs may be reflected in the number of fine defaulters.

As part of our strategy to address issues of crime prevention and community safety on all levels, we believe it is important to make an impact at the level of policy. The implementation of policies by departments and other Government agencies have the potential to affect social conditions and the quality of life of citizens. While it is usually intended that any effects are positive, occasionally

there may be unanticipated negative effects on community safety and wellbeing, crime, violence and the fear of crime.

Some analysis of this dimension of crime prevention is now overdue. A program of social policy research will be initiated with aim to produce a mechanism which enables policy advising bodies such as government departments, to assess whether new policies or major changes in policies may have an impact on criminal or anti-social behaviour, the general incidence of crime or specific types of criminal behaviour. Indicators of the potential of a policy to generate crime would be developed into a measure which would allow agencies to prepare 'crime impact statements'. These 'crime impact statements' might become a part of the normal policy development process.

All significant Commonwealth Government programs are required to incorporate evaluation components. These evaluations almost invariably, and quite properly, focus on whether the objectives of programs are being met in the most efficient manner. Many program evaluations undertaken lead to changes in the program itself. Most evaluations are focussed on assessing effectiveness in terms of the primary objectives of the program; seldom are the 'second order' consequences examined when evaluating or considering a change in program or policy. It is this missing information which I believe should be sought. A number of government departments have indicated an interest in having work of this nature undertaken.

The same issues also apply to the programs funded by the Commonwealth in the States and Territories. The Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet produces the *Catalogue of Specific Purpose Payments to the States and Territories*, which outlines in general terms the various features of each of the specific purpose payments to and through the States and Territories in each financial year. In particular, the Catalogue provides details of the amount and conditions of funding as well as arrangements for reporting, enforcement and review of payments.

Conditions on specific purpose payments are often concerned with input controls rather than output monitoring. In general, performance information which allows assessment of outcomes and the development of agreed national goals is insufficient. There is scope for developing guidelines for assessing the various features of inter-governmental agreements for specific purpose payments against an overall framework focusing on outcomes and performance against agreed objectives, including unintended adverse consequences and costs for society as a whole.

However, as far as I am aware, no specific resource is dedicated to examine the question of unintended consequences. It follows that we are unable to say categorically whether a program involving the expenditure of considerable sums for social welfare, educational or urban developmental purposes does not itself indirectly generate other costs (which may be borne by the Commonwealth and/or the States) which significantly diminish the social return on the original expenditure.

Let me offer two examples of what I mean.

- Housing and Urban Development objectives endorsed by the Council of Australian Governments are intended to provide the basis for a shared national perspective on housing and urban development issues, with a view to promoting improved national economic performance, increased effectiveness of the social and environmental programs of each sphere of government, and enhanced housing and locational choices for all Australians. The objectives do not appear to include an assessment of the prospective impact of funded projects against adverse social justice and law enforcement perspectives, eg would a particular project enhance, reduce or have no effect on criminality in its immediate environment given its particular scope or location?
- Similarly, the Commonwealth expends considerable funds for primary and secondary education, including the provision of capital grants for new schools or the upgrading of existing facilities. While Commonwealth processes and procedures are extensive, detailed and thorough and all submissions for capital funding are scrutinised by local, regional, state and national authorities including, in the case of new schools, against future population growth and shifts, I am again unaware of the scrutiny of such projects against possible adverse social justice or law enforcement perspectives.

I do not suggest that unintended adverse consequences of measurable cost exist in all programs or are of a particular dimension. I do believe that at present we have no assurances that this does not occur. There is no established system or methodology to determine whether, where and to what extent such costs occur. It is long past time that there was.

Indeed, there is a current inquiry by the Parliamentary Joint Committee of Public Accounts in to matters related to specific purpose payments to the States. But the inquiry's Terms of Reference do not refer to the possibility that Government programs may have unintended consequences, or should be evaluated other than in terms of the objectives of the relevant program.

No substantial disruption is implied by the introduction of such a system. The Council of Australian Governments on 25 February 1994 agreed that the overriding objective in delineating Commonwealth-State roles and responsibilities in service delivery should be to improve outcomes for clients and value for money for taxpayers.

A review of Commonwealth and State Service Provision, chaired by Mr Bill Scales of the Industry Commission, to collect and publish program performance indicators to allow comparisons of efficiency and effectiveness of Commonwealth and State government services, and assess relevant service provision reforms could be asked to include social justice and law enforcement parameters in its work. Similarly, the *Roles and Responsibilities* working group of officials established by COAG in June 1993 may be a suitable body for ensuring the future inclusion of social justice and law enforcement parameters in funding considerations. Research when programs are developed or already in effect may also assist in adjusting them to

minimise adverse consequences, as may the involvement of experts from areas outside the program in question but potentially affected by its impact.

Such a research program would provide the opportunity for all government agencies to expand their capacity to meet the overall Government responsibility to ensure that Australians enjoy a safe and secure community, free as far as possible from crime and the fear of crime.

### Crime prevention: a holistic approach

Crime prevention is not just the responsibility of police forces. It is a matter for the entire community.

'Safer Australia' aims to prevent crime and to deal with crime more effectively outside the criminal justice system. 'Safer Australia' aims to encourage all Australians to accept that crime prevention and community safety is a common responsibility. People need to know what part they can play. 'Safer Australia' will do just that.

<sup>i</sup> Reported in the Report of the Review of Commonwealth Law Enforcement Arrangements, AGPS, Canberra, February 1994, p.41

Major category	Best available estimate of current costs
Homicide	Maximum \$275 million
Assaults, including sexual assaults	Minimum \$331 million
Robbery and extortion	\$93 million
Breaking and entering	\$893 million
Fraud/forgery/false pretences	\$6,710 million - \$13,770 million
Theft/illegal use of motor vehicle	\$667 million
Shoplifting	\$20 million - \$1,500 million
Other theft	\$545 million
Property damage & environmental crime	\$525 million - \$1,645 million
Drug Offences	\$1,200 million
<b>Total crime</b>	<b>\$11,259 million - \$20,719 million</b>
Police & law enforcement	\$2,575 million
Courts & administration of justice	\$619 million - \$1,030 million
Corrective services	\$600 million
Other CJS	\$550 million - \$550 million
<b>Total criminal justice system</b>	<b>\$4,294 million - \$4,755 million</b>
Other	\$1,250 million
<b>Grand total</b>	<b>\$16,703 million - \$26,724 million</b>

As the Report of the Review of Commonwealth Law Enforcement Arrangements notes, "these estimates cover the full spectrum of crime in Australia, not just major and organised crime. They do not indicate which sectors of the community meet these costs. Some are borne by State or Commonwealth Governments, while others are borne by the private sector."

<sup>ii</sup> AGPS, Canberra, 1992 (Copies can be obtained from the Commonwealth Law Enforcement Board, Locked Bag 23 Queen Victoria Terrace, Parkes ACT 2601).



AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY  
Conference: "Crime in Australia"  
Canberra, 5 June 1995

**ORGANISED CRIME**  
(Tom Sherman, Chairperson, National Crime Authority)

I would like to thank the Australian Institute of Criminology for inviting me to speak at this conference.

I propose to cover four broad issues of significance concerning organised crime:

- the nature of organised crime in Australia and the changes that have occurred in recent years,
- the response to these changes (both at a policy and a practical level),
- the gaps in our knowledge of organized crime, and
- likely future directions in law enforcement efforts against organised crime.

I feel I ought to begin by defining "organised crime". At the NCA we have developed the following working definition:

*a systematic and continuing conspiracy to commit serious offences.*

This definition deliberately does not include any reference to the internal hierarchy of organised criminal groups, as the Australian experience of organised crime has suggested that such crime is mostly entrepreneurial and not directed by some national, hierarchical organisation with a supreme board of control. The experience of other countries, however, may be different.

A technical definition does not necessarily give us much guidance when we try to understand the true nature and extent of organised crime. Grant Wardlaw<sup>1</sup> has suggested a conceptual approach to organised crime which examines the characteristics of the **illegal markets** within which organised criminal groups operate and the circumstances which give rise to these markets. This approach is consistent with the view that the primary motive for organised crime is **profit** - the 'greed factor'.

Illegal markets have two basic characteristics:

- Certain goods and services which are illegal are desired by consumers and that demand creates the market (obvious examples include prostitution, illegal gambling, and certain types of drugs).
- The illegality of these markets creates the conditions for the provision of other services which help the markets operate (such as corruption, intimidation, violence, protection, and money laundering). Some of these other services are also present in legal markets (for example, tenderers for the supply of goods and services may offer bribes to secure favourable decisions).

The illegal markets approach explains a substantial part but not all of the phenomenon. Historically, significant elements of organised crime laid their foundations in the monopolisation and undue exploitation of legal markets. As Diego Gambetta said:

'Historically, the crime most characteristic of the mafia is the use of violence to enforce the monopoly of otherwise legal goods.'<sup>2</sup>

This is certainly the case in those areas where organised crime is also associated with territorial dominance.

---

<sup>1</sup> G. Wardlaw, *Conceptual frameworks of organised crime - useful tools or academic irrelevancies?*, Paper delivered to Organised Crime Conference, Australian Institute of Criminology, 1989

<sup>2</sup> D. Gambetta (ed.), *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*, New York, Basil Blackwell, 1988.

The exploitation of legal markets in Australia does occur but it does not have the territorial dominance that, for example, the mafia possesses in southern Italy. The exploitation of legal markets also has another significant implication, and that is in the area of money laundering. An economic rationalist would argue that black money creates jobs just as effectively as white money, but the economic rationalist does not realise that organised crime, by reinvesting its profits in legal markets, cannot resist the temptation to exploit and monopolise those markets by violent means if necessary.

As the majority of organised criminal activity involves the systematic exploitation of opportunities for profit (often related to the large scale supply of illicit goods and services), it is thus an integral part of most societies, with the level of organised crime being directly related to opportunities for profit.

Organised crime is also systemic, being the consequence of a wide range of social, political, economic and other factors, including:

- pressures for individuals and groups to better their positions in society;
- the potential rewards (and risks) from supplying illicit markets; and
- a lack of desire or opportunity for individuals or groups to participate in the social, economic and political life of the community by lawful means.

In 1994 the review of Commonwealth Law Enforcement Arrangements identified eleven areas of organised criminal activity and recommended that the NCA concentrate upon these areas.<sup>3</sup> The areas have since been broadly prioritised and are now endorsed by the NCA's Inter-Governmental Committee as the NCA's 'menu of work' for the foreseeable future. It is interesting to note that all the organised crime groups and areas identified

---

<sup>3</sup> The eleven areas are: Chinese triads, Vietnamese organised crime groups, the 'Ndrangheta, Lebanese criminal groups, the East Coast criminal milieu, Romanian crime groups, outlaw motorcycle gangs, organised paedophile networks, Colombian cocaine syndicates, Yakuza groups, and Eastern Bloc organized crime groups.

have clear international connections. Perhaps the only exception is the East Coast criminal milieu, where the international connection, though not apparent, is real.

The content of this menu will vary over time, as more intelligence and knowledge is gained of organised crime problems affecting Australia. It does, however, remain a valuable start to the process of identifying and ordering Australia's priority organised crime threats.

During the past decade there have been a range of technological, economic, and political changes which have considerably altered the criminal environment, both domestically and internationally. These changes have:

- challenged the effectiveness of traditional law enforcement methods,
- increased the effectiveness and efficiency of organised crime groups, and
- led to the greater internationalisation of organised crime.

Another recent development has been the increasing sophistication of criminals, and the rapid increase in the availability of information about law enforcement methodologies and powers. This has occurred at a time when governments are seeking "value for money" from law enforcement agencies. The resources being applied to law enforcement are being examined (and in many cases reduced), which has implications for the manner in which we do things in the future and the priorities and targets we set ourselves.

The revolution in modern technology, particularly communications and transport, has provided opportunities for criminals:

- The rapid development of accessible electronic communication devices - including cellular mobile telephones, facsimile machines and pagers - enable local (and international) criminal activity and even international criminal conspiracies to be initiated and undertaken with far greater ease than ten years ago.

- World-wide increases in the demand for consumer products and raw materials, coupled with the improved efficiency and low cost of containerised cargo handling, have produced a steady rise in the volume of cargo moving around the world and through Australian ports. This has facilitated the smuggling of illicit goods and even people.
- The availability and low cost of international air travel has allowed an increase in the mobility of criminals and their activities. This does not always involve the movement of foreign criminals into this country, as Australian criminals are becoming more active on the international stage. Whereas in years gone by we perhaps only needed to worry about our own local organised crime groups, we are now confronting criminal activities which originate well beyond our own borders.
- There has been a rapid increase in the use of computers, digital diaries and other microelectronic equipment for the storage of information. Whereas complex criminal ventures previously left paper records which could be seized and examined, law enforcement agencies are often finding that any such records exist in electronic form only, usually protected by passwords or encryption devices which are difficult to defeat.
- The availability of high quality printing and document reproduction machines has prompted the rapid growth of many forms of counterfeiting and fraud.
- The implementation of computerised control systems throughout the world's banks and the growing interconnection of financial markets have together created what is in effect an international financial system, within which millions of dollars can easily be moved with a few computer keystrokes.

As international markets have developed in the supply of legitimate goods and services, parallel developments have occurred in crime. Some criminal markets have always been international. In recent years, however, there has been a change in the number, size and range of these illicit markets. A decade ago, the seizure of ten kilograms of heroin or 100 kilograms of hashish would have been regarded as exceptional. Australian law enforcement agencies are now investigating drug importations which can involve more than 100kg of heroin or cocaine, or as much as ten tonnes of hashish, in a single shipment. Such massive shipments are attributable to truly international criminal activity which supplies narcotics to illicit markets in many countries.

So far as Australia is concerned, the illegal markets in heroin and cocaine are substantially international in the sense that Australia imports these products and Australian re-sellers are at the end of a very long chain of distribution. Cannabis, on the other hand, is substantially domestic with some imports from Papua New Guinea and other countries.

Recent developments which have improved the efficiency of the *legitimate* global markets in goods and services, have also benefited organised and major crime in Australia:

- The deregulation of many of our financial systems has facilitated criminal activity. This freer environment is capable of exploitation by organised crime, as deregulation makes the movement of products and money much easier.
- A variety of banking services and products have come into popular usage which expedite the international transfer and laundering of criminal profits, including telegraphic transfers, letters of credit, and bearer bonds. Modern banking also allows for large sums of money to be moved instantaneously by electronic transfer.

Since the early 1980s there has been a substantial growth in the economic power of international organised crime groups. This is primarily the result of the expansion in markets for heroin and cocaine and consequent laundering of the proceeds. For example, in 1991 the United Nations estimated that the global proceeds for narcotics trafficking generated about US\$ 500 billion annually. This compares with the annual world trade in crude oil of approximately US\$ 450 billion in 1994. I realise that we are not comparing "apples with apples", but the comparison is still astounding.

The growing economic power of organised crime groups has had a number of consequences:

- The profits from the illicit narcotics trade now make a substantial contribution to the economies of certain countries. In those countries, the eradication of narcotic production and trafficking or related money laundering would have a measurable impact on the quality of life of the average citizen. Under those circumstances it is difficult for the respective governments to sustain a prolonged attack on narcotics production. For example, in Peru the coca market generates US\$ 1 billion in export earnings (the equivalent of 30% of that country's legal exports) and employs 15% of the Peruvian workforce. In Bolivia, the coca market generates US\$ 600 million in export earnings (the equivalent of **all** of Bolivia's legal exports) and employs 20% of the workforce.<sup>4</sup>
- Many countries are tempted to attract investment capital without screening its source. It has become apparent that a number of jurisdictions have become attractive for money laundering, some in Asia, some in the Caribbean, and others elsewhere (it needs to be recognised, however, that as a result of a series of international conventions and other initiatives, at least some of these secrecy provisions are gradually being wound back). The work of the Financial Action Task Force on money laundering has been instrumental in modifying bank secrecy regimes (at least in relation to narcotics-related money laundering).

---

<sup>4</sup> P.R. Andreas, E.C. Bertram, M.J. Blachman and K.E. Sharpe, 'Dead End Drug Wars', *Foreign Policy*, vol. 85, Winter 1991, p. 113.

- Possession of large amounts of money has enabled international criminal syndicates to purchase the very best of equipment and other facilities. The operating capital of criminal networks can sometimes greatly exceed that of the law enforcement agencies investigating their activities.
- The large sums now available to criminal groups for investment have enabled them to enter the world of legitimate business, to launder and invest their funds. The dividing line between the so-called black and white economies is becoming less distinct. Of greater concern, however, is the fact that organised crime figures do not change their methods when engaging in legitimate business activity.

As internal social and political systems in the formerly communist countries change, the demand for illegal goods and services has rapidly increased. A very wide range of criminal groups have exploited these new markets for illegal products. At the same time, the deregulation of once highly regulated countries, most notably in Eastern Europe, has reduced the impediments to supplying those demands. Similarly, the free market policies adopted by the Chinese and Vietnamese Governments have created opportunities for those countries to be used for the transit of heroin from the Golden Triangle to Australia, the United States and other markets. There are also signs that countries which were once only transit countries, are now having significant domestic consumption problems. Pakistan is a good example.

We should also be concerned with the growth in knowledge, expertise and sophistication of criminals. There can be no doubt that criminals are increasingly aware of the investigative tools and methodologies employed by law enforcement agencies and that they are sharing that information with one another.

Another increasing problem for law enforcement is the availability of sophisticated legal and accounting advice to enable offenders to protect their activities from detection and prosecution. This is particularly so in the field of high level white collar crime and money laundering. It is clear that organised



criminals cannot operate without the professional advice of lawyers and accountants, any more than ordinary citizens can in complex commercial transactions.

Elaborate financial trails involving a multitude of offshore companies and nominee directors are now comparatively common. Unravelling those trails can take years, if it takes place at all. While the capacity of law enforcement agencies to investigate these schemes is steadily being improved, their increasing number requires more complex decisions on resource allocation.

Major changes are currently taking place throughout the public and private sectors. After the excesses of the 1980s, the new catchphrase is "doing more with less". The concept has even been recognised in our arbitration system, underlying the principles of agency bargaining, job restructuring and redesign, productivity dividends, and so on. We are all expected to achieve as much or more than previously, but with fewer resources.

Law enforcement is not immune. Many Australian law enforcement agencies are being called upon to reduce budgets in real terms, if not also in overall terms. My own agency will undergo an 8% overall reduction in its annual operating budget for FY 1995/96 and a staff reduction of somewhat less than that. Other agencies are in a similar or even more severe position. There is likely to be little increase in the resources made available to target major and organised crime, despite the apparent increases in the range of groups involved in such crime.

In the first section of this speech, I have described a range of national and international developments that are having an impact on the opportunities for and level of organised crime. I would now like to look at the Australian response to existing and potential threats from such activities. In particular I would like to focus on:

- recent institutional responses to organised crime;
- recent legislative responses to organised crime;

- the 1994 Commonwealth Law Enforcement Review Report (the CLER Report);
- the development of arrangements for better cooperation and coordination of effort; and
- the development of a strategic approach to tackling the problems of organised crime.

Since the early 1980s, a number of new law enforcement agencies with special powers have been established by the Commonwealth and by the States, to deal with organised crime specifically or with aspects of organised criminal activity as part of their charters. The NCA itself is an example of this, as are the New South Wales Crime Commission, the New South Wales Independent Commission Against Corruption, and the Queensland Criminal Justice Commission.

As well, since the mid-1980s Commonwealth and State governments have introduced a number of significant Acts of Parliament to enhance law enforcement efforts against organised crime, both domestically and internationally. For example, in 1987 and 1988, the Commonwealth Government introduced a comprehensive package of legislation designed to attack organised crime, including:

- the *Proceeds of Crime Act 1987*;
- the *Cash Transaction Reports Act 1988*;
- the *Telecommunications (Interception) Amendment Act 1987*;
- the *Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters Act 1987* and the *Extradition Act 1988* (and considerable expansion of Australia's treaty arrangements with other countries in both areas).

Taken together, they have significantly improved the effectiveness of the law enforcement effort against organised crime in Australia.

Nevertheless, the 1994 CLER Report reminded us that the present structure of the Commonwealth's principal law enforcement agencies was created just over a decade ago - with the establishment and tasking of the AFP and the NCA, and that since then there has been no major change in the national approach to organised crime.

In light of the changes in the international criminal environment which I described earlier, the Review concluded that there was a need for significant change in the agencies undertaking criminal investigations on behalf of the Commonwealth. Some of the more important changes are:

- A Commonwealth Law Enforcement Board (CLEB) has been established. I hold the Chair of that Board, while the other Board members are the AFP Commissioner, the Secretary of the Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department the Chairman of the ASC and an Executive Member. Together, we are responsible for improving coordination between Commonwealth law enforcement agencies, for enhancing their management and performance, for improving the quality of decisions about law enforcement priorities, and for enhancing Government's access to information about law enforcement. It is important to realise that CLEB is a coordinating body. The various agencies maintain their independence.
- To assist us in that role, an Office of Strategic Crime Assessments (OSCA) is now being established. Its primary role will be to produce that over-the-horizon strategic intelligence which the CLER Report found was lacking in this country. In doing so, it will draw upon the strategic intelligence and other material being produced by other agencies, particularly the NCA, AFP, ABCI, AUSTRAC, ACS and ASC. It will not be in competition with any other agency, but will provide Government with a wider and longer-term assessment than is available from other sources.

- The Report explicitly acknowledged that "most crime in Australia is dealt with by State laws and State police services, and that will remain the case." The implication of this is that much greater cooperation and coordination is necessary if Australian law enforcement is to be effective. The NCA's role as a national coordinator and facilitator for law enforcement efforts against organised crime was particularly emphasised.

One positive development in recent years has been the recognition by Australian law enforcement agencies that cooperation between jurisdictions at an operational level is no longer sufficient to counteract organised crime. We are beginning to develop mechanisms for cooperation at a *strategic* level, both to identify what our national priorities should be and to seek strategies to address these priorities, at a national and international level.

The benefits of cooperation are that:

- by sharing intelligence between law enforcement agencies, we are more likely to acquire a better picture of organised criminal structures, players and activities;
- better intelligence is more likely to lead to better assessments of the vulnerabilities of criminal organisations;
- cooperation also ensures a much more effective and efficient use of resources; and
- more effective results are likely to follow from cooperation.

In the Western democracies, however, competition (not cooperation) is highly valued and enshrined in many aspects of social and economic life. From an early age, children are taught to compete with one another in the classroom and in sport. Later in life, we train our young adults to continue this competition into business activity in the "free market" of capitalism.

Similarly, most organisations foster a culture which stresses the advancement of the organisation ahead of its competitors or even its allies. The interests of the organisation are seen as paramount by its staff, in some cases even when they conflict with administrative regulations or legal obligations.

Both these things can undermine our efforts to engender a spirit of cooperation in any field of endeavour, but they are amplified within police and law enforcement organisations. Many aspects of the "police culture" mitigate against cooperation. Specifically, that culture stresses the absolute security of all investigations and operations, the distrust of anyone whose motives are not entirely certain, avoiding contact with any other officer who might possibly be corrupt, and the application of the "need to know" principle to limit the flow of information (rather than to ensure that information does reach those who truly need to know). These security concerns can, however, be overstated. One NCA national cooperative investigation, for example, involving virtually every law enforcement and regulatory agency in Australia, has been conducted over three years, has included over eighty sub-operations, and has never had a breach of operational security.

Recent NCA experience shows that these obstacles can be overcome. There is now sufficient commitment to improved cooperation amongst the leadership of law enforcement in Australia and amongst governments for it to be an irreversible process. Cooperation is still far from perfect and needs constant improvement, but it is far better than it was.

Domestically, we can be much more effective in attacking organised crime and the other threats to our community if we recognise:

- the jurisdictional limitations of each of our agencies and organisations;
- that we must cooperate to overcome those jurisdictional limitations;
- the mutual benefits in sharing intelligence;
- the mutual benefits in sharing improvements in techniques and technology; and

- the mutual benefit in cooperation at an operational level.

We must remember that no agency has either all the answers or even sole jurisdiction when confronting an organised or a major crime problem. Moreover, as I indicated earlier, like all other elements of our society, the law enforcement community is now a part of the global community. As such, international cooperation is also essential to combat the activities of Australian and international organised crime groups.

Within the world community, Australia has taken a leading role in the development of reciprocal mutual assistance schemes and extradition arrangements, and in the development of the Financial Action Task Force. Through a program of negotiations with other countries, since 1985 Australia has concluded a large number of modern bilateral extradition and mutual assistance arrangements. It has also revised its own extradition legislation and has adopted new mutual assistance legislation, in order to enhance the level of assistance which Australia can provide to, and receive from, other countries. The AFP has devoted considerable effort and resources to establishing a network of liaison officers overseas. This network is an increasingly important resource for our efforts against organised crime.

I spoke earlier of the need to develop a strategic approach to tackling the problems of organised crime. A strategic approach is one which aims to achieve maximum effect from limited resources, by firmly basing all the activities of the organisation on its mission and the outcomes which it is seeking to achieve.

Such an approach is reflected in forward planning and the taking of active measures. Within forward planning, I include the selection of priorities and allocation of resources on the basis of the relative importance of one area over another. Using the NCA as an example, this would involve targeting those organised crime activities and groups which have the most adverse impact on the community. In fact, in 1994 the NCA conducted the Ranking Organised Crime project in order to determine the various types of harm (physical, economic and psychological) to the Australian community that

results from the many and varied forms of organised crime. From this determination, the NCA was able to rank organised criminal activities in terms of their overall impact on the Australian community, and able to determine a rational priority for investigating organised crime.

By taking active measures, I mean the use of appropriate strategies to prevent the recurrence of a threat. Again using the NCA as an example, this would include making use of enforcement, prevention, regulation, deterrence, legislation or administrative action, on the basis of their capacity to have an *enduring* and *significant* effect on the criminal environment, and in particular on the conditions and circumstances which provide opportunities for organised crime. As part of a recent reorganisation, the NCA will be devoting dedicated resources to this broader deterrent work.

In the Australian context, a strategic approach aims to counteract organised criminal activities through appropriate and effective *national* law enforcement action. In order to achieve that aim, Australian law enforcement agencies are seeking to effectively disrupt organised criminal activity and to prevent and deter future organised criminal activity. Specific strategies for disruption, prevention and deterrence adopted in Australia include:

- the use of non-traditional police methodologies, such as proactive targeting, long-term electronic surveillance, remote electronic vehicle tracking, as well as "sting" and other undercover operations;
- ensuring that relevant information held by Government agencies or public utilities is readily available to Australian law enforcement agencies;
- providing special powers, of the kind available to Royal Commissions of Inquiry, to the National Crime Authority;
- establishing a comprehensive system for recording and identifying large or suspicious transactions in cash, and for recording the flow of funds into and out of Australia, through the operation of the Australian Transactions Reports and Analysis Centre;

- establishing the Australian Securities Commission to, amongst other things, investigate white-collar crime; and
- ensuring that law enforcement efforts are congruent with other Government initiatives (eg; needle exchange programs) which seek to minimise the harm caused as an indirect consequence of organised criminal activities.

In order to adopt a strategic approach, and in order to make the best use of resources in a cooperative and coordinated manner, quality criminal intelligence and criminological analysis is vital. People like myself need to know where we should put the resources which we control in order to have the greatest effect. The development of coordinated national strategic assessments on organised crime in Australia, and the establishment of OSCA (to provide over-the-horizon strategic intelligence) goes some way to determining:

- which organised criminal groups and activities are the most harmful, and therefore which deserve the greatest priority and the greatest allocation of resources; and
- which strategies will have an enduring and significant effect on the environment in which the activities occur.

But there are gaps in our understanding of organised crime that require different methodologies and approaches. As I indicated at the beginning of this presentation, we believe that organised crime also needs to be understood in the context of the markets within which organised criminal groups operate and the circumstances which give rise to these markets. And it is in these areas that information and analysis is lacking.

We know very little of the nature and dynamics of illicit markets in goods and services. Nor do we fully understand the social, political and, most importantly, the economic forces (either domestically or internationally) within which these illicit markets operate. For example, we need to know the magnitude of markets for illicit goods and services, in terms of:



- turnover,
- profitability and
- consumer base.

Analysis of illicit marketplaces may well indicate vulnerabilities that law enforcement can exploit, or suggest more appropriate and more effective non-law enforcement responses to organised crime. At the same time, we need a better understanding of the effectiveness of traditional and non-traditional approaches to organised crime. For example:

- What effect has the introduction of the cannabis expiation notice system in South Australia and the ACT (whereby cannabis users are growing small amounts of marijuana for personal use) had on the organised supply of cannabis?
- How cost effective are law enforcement programs in the area of illicit drugs?
- How cost effective are demand reduction programs in the same area?

This is the challenge for those working in the field of criminology.

Let me conclude by saying that the increasing complexity of organised crime - its international dimensions and the increasing sophistication of organised criminals - makes it imperative that cooperation continues and improves, not only between jurisdictions and organisations within Australia, but between Australian and international law enforcement agencies. To be effective, cooperation requires both a strategic approach to organised crime, and the coordination of resources and strategies to maximise their effectiveness.

**Note:** I would like to acknowledge the considerable assistance of Leon Atkinson-MacEwen, NCA, Strategic Intelligence Unit, in the preparation of this paper.

AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY

**CRIME IN AUSTRALIA**

THE FIRST NATIONAL OUTLOOK SYMPOSIUM  
Canberra 5 & 6 June 1995

**CHILD ABUSE  
AND FAMILY VIOLENCE**

*by*

**ROSEMARY SINCLAIR**

Co-founder & National Consulting Director for the National Association  
for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (NAPCAN)

June 1995

## CHILD ABUSE AND FAMILY VIOLENCE

---

The given title for my address "Child Abuse and Family Violence" implies that these are separate issues when indeed they share common links: we know that most child abuse occurs within the family, hence the majority of perpetrators of child abuse are people well-known and trusted by the child, and violence between adults in the family where children are present is a direct form of child abuse. I would argue that in the main, child abuse is family violence is child abuse!

In his book "Stopping Family Violence" (1988) David Finklehor<sup>1</sup> includes physical child abuse, sexual child abuse and spouse abuse in his definition of family violence. He says, and I quote, "All three fall under the rubric of family violence, but other things do as well, including violence between siblings and violence against elderly family members". He goes on, "Unfortunately, 'family violence' does not have a commonly accepted definition and a commonly accepted set of components. It is a term that has been defined by social movements and used in different ways at different times". Indeed, under the heading "spouse abuse" we should include emotional neglect and verbal abuse, and the subsequent effects on children.

It is an undeniable consequence that the majority of crime and violence in the community has its genesis in the home environs. The home then should be a major focus of attention in our efforts to make the world a better place.

There are many related issues which cannot possibly be covered in the time available and there are many effective and, perhaps, not so effective prevention and intervention, and treatment programs and projects in operation which equally cannot be covered in the time.

In this paper I set out a brief background of my involvement in the child protection field, an overview of developments in Australia in the last decade, including the establishment and progress of the National Association for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (NAPCAN), and I will present some ideas on activities which should be undertaken to improve the wellbeing of children and their families.

When I first became involved in the child protection field in 1985, I had minimal knowledge of child abuse and related issues affecting children and their families. My childhood was idyllic. I grew up on Lord Howe Island believing the world was "puddle wonderful", that every family was as happy as my own. It will come as no surprise to learn that the bubble of ignorance was well and truly burst when in later years I realised that even on the tiny and remote Lord Howe Island, child abuse and family violence were not unknown.

The extent and seriousness of the problem throughout this country is still not widely recognised and it was an invitation to assist in the production and publicity of the "It's OK To Say No" series of children's colouring-in and activity books in 1985 which generated my own thirst for knowledge in the area.

## **SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENTS IN AUSTRALIA IN THE LAST DECADE**

1985 also saw the release of the NSW Government Task Force Report On Child Sexual Assault, coinciding with the release of the "It's OK To Say No" series of booklets for children, aimed specifically at the prevention of child sexual assault. These four publications represented the first time in Australia that children themselves were encouraged in self-assertiveness, and to understand body safety for the 2 - 12 years age bracket.

The NSW Government's Task Force Report resulted in the recommended establishment of the NSW Child Protection Council with an initial four-year application to child sexual assault. Various similar bodies have operated in other states with departmental and community representation operating as advisory bodies to their respective governments.

1986 was another eventful year in Australia with the Sixth International Congress on Child Abuse and Neglect held in Sydney under the auspices of the International Society for the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (ISPCAN).

1987 saw the establishment of the National Association for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (NAPCAN) and in the same year the Victorian Society for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (VICSPCAN) was formalised (in that State) as a direct response to the Sixth International Congress recommendations. VICSPCAN has since registered the name Australians Against Child Abuse (AACA), and KIDSFIRST, with some confusion surrounding the roles of each, and their relationship to NAPCAN. We are working toward clarification of the situation.

Those of us responsible for setting up NAPCAN had a grand vision of a country united in its approach to the prevention of child abuse and neglect. It was established because of a perceived need for greater communication, co-operation and co-ordination between all those working in the child protection field.

We were greatly encouraged by the professional support for establishment of NAPCAN - the first national organisation of its kind in Australia working for prevention of all forms of child abuse and neglect. Our focus on PRIMARY PREVENTION reflected the paucity of relevant programs and policies in the child protection field and reflected also an awareness of the prevailing "band-aid" approach with a predominance of treatment services and negligible attention to prevention.

By 1990, when NAPCAN had consolidated committees with multi-disciplinary representation in all states and territories, it appointed the NATIONAL FORUM as the policy-making body comprised of representatives of each state and territory committee.

NAPCAN is recognised as the key non-government body in the child protection field - it is non-profit, volunteer-based and registered as a charity, continually seeking one-off government grants to assist in production of our community education materials and relying on assistance in kind from corporate sponsorship and committee fund-raising to maintain our programs.

When the Federal Government established the National Child Protection Council in 1991, this was seen as a significant, if somewhat belated, political recognition of the necessity for a focus on PREVENTION of child abuse and neglect. Its establishment was in response to the National Committee on Violence report "VIOLENCE - DIRECTIONS FOR AUSTRALIA" (1990), with its structure (according to reliable information) modelled on NAPCAN.

The National Child Protection Council established the National Child Protection Clearing House in 1992, and has produced the National Prevention Strategy (1993), the effectiveness of which is governed by the level of commitment of state and territory governments.

While NAPCAN has maintained informal links with the National Child Protection Council, Council's reticence in communicating relevant information raises questions about its role. A case in point is the recent media publicity surrounding the Council's discussion paper "Legal Aspects of Physical Punishment", reportedly produced in July 1994 and about which NAPCAN et al knew nothing prior to media publicity in the *Sydney Morning Herald* (30 April 1995). The publicity was prompted by the launch of NAPCAN's publication dealing with the concern of physical punishment as a disciplinary measure.

NAPCAN was, in July 1994, initiating the production of the recently released "101 Alternatives to Whacking a Child" written by children as a responsible approach to this controversial issue. While Council has been fully consulted on this and other NAPCAN initiatives, sadly and for unknown reasons, the reverse does not apply.

## THE WAY IT IS

When NAPCAN was established eight years ago, there was a growing awareness of the gravity of the child abuse problem, with a particular emphasis on child sexual assault and related issues. Credit is due largely to the feminist movement for raising the profile of such a serious issue at a time when denial was the order of the day. Knowledge of such unspeakable abuses was to all intents and purposes best ignored.

While that credit is readily given, we nonetheless recognised the accompanying apparent denial that sexual assault victims might include males to a far greater degree than quoted statistics of the day suggest, ie 1 in 4 girls and 1 in 10 boys (1985).

NAPCAN promotes a balanced view and we have seen a subsequent shift in thinking in recent years with recognition of sexual victimisation of male children to a far greater degree than previously considered (statistics quoted are 1 in 4 girls and 1 in 7 boys).

In the last decade we have seen a broader community acceptance of the incidence of child abuse and family violence, but interestingly with regard to the latter, a disinclination in some quarters to recognise its harmful effects on children. NAPCAN works to change this regrettable misconception. To quote David Finklehor, "If you have seen others use violence to handle conflict and frustration, it will seem a more plausible and legitimate

answer when you too encounter difficulties" (*Stopping Family Violence*, 1988).

That broader community acceptance has in part been generated by media publicity surrounding particular cases, and published research, eg the report released by the National Committee on Violence Against Women found that in 1992 that 1 in 5 people in Australia believe it is okay for men to use physical violence against a spouse.

Family violence, where children are a part of the family, is a direct form of child abuse. Indeed, a recent survey in Western Australia found that child witnesses of domestic violence are traumatised in a manner similar to that experienced by children living in a war zone.

Evidence suggests that services for children from violent homes are essential, and should be funded, and overseas programs have shown that counselling children is vital to breaking the cycle of abuse and improving their self-esteem (Jennifer Gardiner, Curtin University School of Social Work). Yet, there is still a perceived rejection of such evidence with the adults the primary focus. This is evidenced by the Federal Government's 1995 national campaign against domestic violence with nary a mention of children or the effects on them of family violence.

If we are going to reduce the level of violence in our community, it is important to try to appreciate the complexity of child abuse and the harm caused to children by the apparent devaluing of the parenting role: "The job of parenting is being devalued, and with it the quality of children's lives and society's future" (*Progress of Nations*, UNICEF, 1993).

When members of the general community think of "CHILD ABUSE", it's a sure bet they think of sexual abuse, physical abuse and physical neglect, and I suspect many acknowledge only those more horrific cases as portrayed by the media.

In NAPCAN's view, we should all be maintaining an equal focus on those less well recognised forms of abuse, some of which may not even be recognised as such by the "perpetrators", eg nutritional abuse, verbal abuse, emotional neglect, and shaking of babies. It is noteworthy that the knowledge that the stress-related shaking of an infant can cause brain damage and even death had not received adequate attention until NAPCAN's national campaign in 1994. The positive evaluation of that campaign is very encouraging and it subsequently received a certificate of merit in the VIOLENCE PREVENTION AWARDS 1994 and has been adapted for introduction in the United Kingdom, by the National Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC).

NAPCAN's holistic approach encompasses recognition of all forms of child abuse, emphasises the importance of promoting balanced, healthy lifestyles, "life skills" education for children, and emphasises the needs of parents to be supported in their child-rearing role.

So often it is the lack of practical assistance which leads to the stressful situations which provide the catalyst for abuse of children, particularly physical abuse, the majority of perpetrators of which are mothers (R K Oates, 1991).

That the home should be the target of our attention is evidenced further by the findings of the Burdekin Report "Our Homeless Children" in 1990. Brian Burdekin's enquiries found that 20 - 25,000 children live on the streets in different parts of Australia and found also that the majority of these children, some so young they should have been at home hearing bed-time stories, were victims of some form of child abuse in their home environs. A more recent study conducted by Oz Child: Children Australia, "A Profile of Young Australians" (May 1995) finds little improvement in their circumstances.

Richard Eckersley's Report on Youth Attitudes in 1988 identified a disturbing acceleration of problems affecting our young people. The Report noted that young Australians were killing themselves at a rate of about one a day and that suicide was (after traffic accidents, which are often themselves suicides) the second biggest killer of the young. The suicide rate among males aged 15 to 19 years had more than doubled over the previous two decades.

"The majority of most crimes", Richard Eckersley reported, "are committed by the young, and since 1974 the incidence of serious assault has risen four-fold and the incidence of rape, fraud, robbery, break enter and steal, vehicle theft and larceny have at least doubled. The incidence of rape has risen 150% in that time". Mr Eckersley reports that, in spite of all the evidence, the young are in a terrible predicament and while their resorts to suicide, drug abuse and crime are proofs of that predicament, the thought and debate given to this emergency is "superficial" (*The Canberra Times*, 1 August 1988).

Is the situation any different today? UNICEF's Progress of Nations (1993) reports that Australia now has the highest youth suicide rate in the western world and is the single biggest killer of the young. It also reports that the number of Australian infants dying because of child abuse is higher than in some comparable countries. The rate in Canada, for example, is almost half the Australian rate.

The WA Child Health Survey conducted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Institute for Child Health Research (March 1995) reports: "It is apparent that parents and teachers are not identifying a significant proportion of adolescents who are "at risk" by virtue of their self-reported suicidal behaviour and self rating of mental health". Brian Burdekin's Mental Health Inquiry (1993) found that 60% of psychiatric patients have been abused as children.

Perhaps saddest of all is the revelation that the highest homicide rate occurs in the 0 - 3 years age group (Heather Strang, Australian Institute of Criminology). This statistic alone indicates the urgent requirement to provide practical support for parents and care-givers and give greater emphasis to the importance of the parenting role.

In 1995 there is no Commissioner for Children, no uniform definition of child abuse, no co-ordinated approach to identification and treatment. The National Child Protection Council's "National Prevention Strategy" sets down the principles for co-ordination of prevention activities, yet to be realised; some useful research is being conducted by the Council et al and NAPCAN advocates research also into the incidence and consequences of child abuse and neglect - in other words, A NATIONAL INQUIRY.

A mammoth task, but a necessary one in our view, to sheet home the dangers of ignoring the issue.

Training of professionals and voluntary workers differs across the country and support systems for overloaded workers are sadly deficient, and while annual national statistics are released by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, they represent an amalgam of the different reporting laws across the country and, as such, cannot reflect the true picture. 1992-93 statistics show an increase of 10% over 1991-92 with over 59,122 reported cases of child abuse and neglect. There is a decline in practical government support for relevant organisations and agencies and NAPCAN can attest to that. Our National Child Protection Week initiative receives no funding assistance from the Federal Government, although it publicly recognises the value of the campaign and advocates its enhancement (*National Prevention Strategy*, 1993).

In 1995, drastic steps in the name of "economic rationalism" have seen the demise in Western Australia of the Advisory and Coordinating Committee on Child Abuse (ACCCA), a downgraded redefining of child maltreatment for the purposes of reporting assessment and intervention (*A Review of Departmental Responses to Child Maltreatment*, 1995), the demise of the South Australian Child Protection Council and deferral of mandatory reporting introduction in the ACT. In Tasmania, there are no support services for child sexual assault victims and non offending family members.

## PREVENTION INITIATIVES

NAPCAN initiatives, over the years, have been undertaken in response to perceived needs, and in consultation with key government and non-government organisations and agencies.

Community education is a vital component of any prevention initiative, providing information and encouraging long term attitudinal change for the benefit of children and their families.

National Child Protection Week initiated by NAPCAN in 1990 as the first national campaign promoting the importance of effective care and protection of children, is now recognised by governments and the community as the major national child protection campaign, providing the opportunity for all involved in the field to promote their own programs and projects.

A different theme each year provides a focus on a particular issue, eg in the 1994 International Year of the Family, NAPCAN's National Child Protection Week theme was "Every Child Needs a Caring Family", with a NAPCAN emphasis on "Family Violence Hurts Children Too" and "Alcohol Problems in Families Hurt Children Too". Similarly, the 1995 theme "LET'S TALK WITH CHILDREN" relates to the International Year for Tolerance and the National Child Protection Council's previously advised plans to focus on emotional abuse as a community education campaign (plans since apparently abandoned).



In conjunction with each National Child Protection Week, NAPCAN produces a child protection information kit relevant to the theme and including both new and existing resource materials. These kits, with posters and other display items, find a ready market throughout the country and are keenly sought on an ongoing basis by professionals, government departments and agencies, community groups, schools, pre-schools, child care centres, hospitals, TAFE colleges, women's refuges, correctional centres, etc. The kits and brochures have a unique "user friendly" appeal with a universal application, making them a much sought after commodity, and with adaption for use by other countries, eg New Zealand and the Philippines.

While practical assistance to families is piecemeal with programs targeting families identified as "at risk" of abusing their children, NAPCAN advocates a UNIVERSAL HOME VISITATION program targeting all homes with a new baby utilising the services of health professionals and trained volunteers. Such a program would be non-discriminatory, recognise that all parents need assistance at some time, and would provide the opportunity to identify those families in need of extra support. We need to shift the focus from the forensic approach to one of assessment and support.

NAPCAN sees such a program as a variation on our "NEIGHBOUR NETWORK" scheme, launched in 1989 following a successful piloting by a Police Citizens Youth Club in Sydney's Mt Druitt. "NEIGHBOUR NETWORK" barely got off the ground, in spite of recommendation for Government support by the National Committee on Violence - "*Violence - Directions for Australia*" (1990) - and in spite of NAPCAN's valiant attempts to introduce the scheme as an extension of the successful NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH program, providing a bridge between NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH and the SAFETY HOUSE scheme.

Based on low key community caring, ie provision of assistance when and if required, it is modelled on New Zealand's successful NEIGHBOURHOOD SUPPORT GROUPS, established in the mid 80s. The factors contributing to its singular lack of success are, firstly, NAPCAN's own inadequate marketing (minimal human and financial resources) and, secondly, a general community aversion to "invasion of privacy" - the latter could also be interpreted as a determination to pursue the notion that whatever happens behind the four walls of another's home is nobody else's business. Looking out for people's property is one thing - looking out for their personal safety is not!

Changing that prevailing attitude will undoubtedly prove long and arduous but change it we must if we want to see a reduction of crime and violence in the community. In our view, introduction of a universal home visitation program would provide the support envisaged in NAPCAN's NEIGHBOUR NETWORK program, with community acceptance based on the utilisation of professionals and trained volunteers. Interestingly, the National Committee on Violence also recommended that "support services for all parents should be available after the birth of the child" (*Violence Directions for Australia*, 1990).

The National Child Protection Council is presently <sup>considering</sup> conducting an evaluation of a number of home visitation programs operating in NSW, and utilising the services of Professor Graham Vimpani - Newcastle-based Professor of Community Paediatrics, and we are

hopeful of a report within twelve months. Studies in the USA by Professor David Olds found "that public health nurse home visits are able to have a positive impact on adolescent, single mothers in several domains, a reduction in physical abuse, fewer emergency room visits, better family planning and higher quality personal interactions (*Future Directions in Preventing Child Abuse*, R D Krugman, March 1995).

An evaluation of a program of pre-natal and post-natal visits by nurses to rural homes in Elmira, New York, found that families receiving the services had an abuse rate 50% lower than those who did not receive the services. Among the high risk group of low income sole parent families, headed by teenage women who received home-visiting services until their children were two years old, the abuse rate was 4% compared to a rate of 19% for a similar high risk group who did not receive the home visiting services (*Child Abuse Prevention - A Perspective On Parent Enhancement Programs from the United States*, Marianne James, 1994).

The Australian Government's ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1990 was seen by those of us working in the prevention field as a ray of light for children and the vehicle by which positive legislative changes could be made. More particularly, NAPCAN and others proposed Federal Government action to include a Commissioner for Children and uniformity of child protection laws, with a Federal Child Protection Act which would provide model legislation for states and territories. National uniformity of child protection laws is supported also by Chief Judge of the Family Court, Justice Alastair Nicholson, and the National Children's and Youth Law Centre set up in 1993.

As stated in Australian Early Childhood journal (April 1989), *The New Convention on the Rights of the Child*, "A Federal Government Child Protection Act would need to incorporate a broad and agreed definition of child abuse and neglect and should make provision for:

- nation-wide co-ordination of efforts to identify, treat and prevent child abuse and neglect;
- research leading to new knowledge and the identification of effective strategies for treatment and prevention of child abuse;
- compilation and dissemination of information about successful methods and programs;
- training of professionals and voluntary workers;
- support for both public and private agencies and organisations working in the area to enable them to improve their services; and
- a systematic compilation of statistics on the incidence of child abuse and neglect" (*The Need for Federal Government Action on Child Abuse and Neglect*, Sinclair & Ginn, 1989).

## THE WAY AHEAD

While it is apparent that much needs to be done to reverse what NAPCAN's Five Year Plan refers to as a potential "national emergency" in Australia, we must acknowledge the productive efforts of those organisations and agencies et al whose commitment to the welfare of children and their families ensures a continuation of their efforts and subsequently a better world for at least some of our children.

It is desirable for governments and the community to work together to reduce child abuse and family violence, and to that end we advocate:

- a closer working relationship incorporating communication and consultation between the Federal Government's National Child Protection Council and non-government organisations, and tangible recognition of the educational role undertaken by NAPCAN;
- recognition by the National Committee on Violence Against Women of the impact of domestic violence on children;
- universal Home Visitation Programs as envisaged by NAPCAN;
- mandatory introduction of life skills programs in schools, beginning in primary school, to include education in parenting and relationship roles and responsibilities (and responsibility for sexuality for both sexes), child development, nutrition, conflict resolution, relationships skills, self-esteem and home management. Courses could be conducted with the assistance of "community experts", to relieve the ever-increasing demands on school teachers;
- media assistance in educating the wider community about the complexity of the problems;
- appointment of a Commissioner for Children, as envisaged by SA's Children's Interests Bureau and the National Children's and Youth Law Centre;
- nationally consistent child protection laws;
- child and family impact statements to accompany every Cabinet submission;
- implementation of a Federal Child Protection Act, and
- a National Inquiry into all forms of child abuse.

NAPCAN itself will continue its networking, lobbying and community education role, and is working to establish a peak advocacy body for children and their families.

None of these approaches can succeed in reducing the incidence of child abuse and family violence without broad-based appreciation of the long-term goal - the "big picture"

is what we should be looking at accompanied by a sincere acknowledgement of the rights and needs of children. We all need to acknowledge that the effective care and protection of our children is inextricably linked to the health and welfare of our nation.

Behind the reports and statistics is evidence of an horrific problem directly affecting children, their families, the community and society as a whole, and while I have documented a number of worthwhile initiatives at the government and community level, it is apparent that their effectiveness is limited by a lack of communication, co-operation and co-ordination.

We have identified the problems. NOW is the time for governments at all levels to summon the political will to elevate issues affecting children and their families to the top of the political agenda, and it is time for the entire adult community to recognise that we are all responsible for all of the children all of the time. The future of our nation is at stake.

It is only by working together to prevent child abuse and family violence that we will be able to reduce crime and violence in the community.

**ROSEMARY SINCLAIR**  
**National Consulting Director**  
**NAPCAN**

#### Footnote

<sup>1</sup>David Finkelhor is recognised as a leading authority in the field of family violence. He has published dozens of scholarly articles and authored or edited several books, including "A Sourcebook On Child Sexual Abuse", "Coping With Family Violence", "Family Abuse And Its Consequences: New Directions In Research", "Licence To Rape", "The Dark Side of Families", and "Child Sexual Abuse: New Theory and Research". He is the Associate Director for the Family Research Laboratory and Family Violence Research Program at the University of New Hampshire (USA), and has received grants from the National Institute of Mental Health and the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (USA).

**ADDRESS OF THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF VICTORIA,  
MR. NEIL COMRIE  
TO THE AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY  
TO BE HELD IN CANBERRA, OF 5-6 JUNE 1995**

**POLICING MULTICULTURAL AUSTRALIA**

Mr Chairman.

Distinguished guests,

Thank you for this opportunity to address the First National Outlook Symposium on Crime in Australia.

As travel and communications across this vast continent of ours keep improving and as the structures, means and procedures for such communications become more efficient it also becomes increasingly urgent that we adopt a national perspective on many aspects of mutual concern; aspects which for too long we tended to approach on a more individualistic basis. Despite certain real and perceived advantages of such separate approaches, the complex nature of the question of crime detection and prevention and the necessity for efficient use of resources make a national approach imperative.

I therefore join the other distinguished participants in welcoming this opportunity to address the Symposium and I look forward to a

constructive analysis of the issues and a real dialogue as to the best ways of approaching them.

I have been asked to address the topic of "Policing Multicultural Australia" within the overall context of the Institutes' aims for the Symposium i.e. the need to focus our discussion on the policy agenda for crime prevention and its social context for the next few years.

In addressing the topic I find it necessary to momentarily digress and to briefly discuss some of the key concepts and developments which underpin the ideas and comments I am about to make.

The first comment I wish to make has to do with the multicultural nature of Australia. It is very important, I believe, to acknowledge that while the term "multicultural" is a relatively new addition to our officialese language, Australia has always been a multicultural society.

To our detriment, not only Police Forces around the country but also other government departments and services have tended to assume a monocultural and monolingual society in which they operated. I am referring here of course not only to the indigenous Australians, who have lived in this country for more than 40,000 years but also to the large numbers of settlers who came from many different parts of the world to settle in Australia. The documenting, in recent years, of the

settlement histories by historians and other social scientists from within and outside the ethnic communities presents us with the interesting phenomenon of many ethnic groups claiming a share of the Holy Grail of Australia's past, i.e. its convict past! So what we have come to know in recent years as "ethnic" Australians, have always been part of this land since the early days of white settlement.

In addition to large ethnic groups such as the Italians and the Greeks who make such claims we are all familiar with the significant present, indeed the important role which groups such as the Chinese, the Kanakas, and others have been playing in Australia's settlement and development as a modern nation. I don't propose to dwell on past history for too long but I consider it necessary to make one final point before I move on: I think we would all agree that some of the short sighted policies of the past by governments and government departments, especially as they affected our Aboriginal and non-Anglo-Celtic populations, are still evident today and are still causing pain and heartache.

The concept of multiculturalism arrived on the scene in the early '70's having pursued a relatively rapid passage through the assimilationist 40's and 50's and the integrationist '60's. The constitutional changes following the referendum of 1967 and the abolition of the White Australia policy in the early '70's constitute, I believe, two of the most

important policy changes of modern Australia with far-reaching effects on all sorts of areas, including policing.

My second preliminary comment relates to the radical changes in policing taking place in most democratic countries of the world, including Australia. Concepts and programs such as Neighbourhood Watch, Police Community Consultative Committees, Police School Involvement Programs, and many others exemplify the changes I have in mind. The constant and increasing demands on the Police to provide protection and security to citizens and their property, coupled with the realisation that there are real limits to resource allocation for such protection and security have brought about changes which have been incorporated in Police/community joint ventures and partnerships exemplified by these programs.

However, the real importance of these changes lies, I believe, in the conceptual shift which has made these and other programs possible. The very terminology employed to describe these programs, "neighbourhood", "community", "consultative", "involvement" etc. reflects the important shifts which have occurred in our work in recent years.

Modern Police policies and practices require Police to think and operate in a way which will offer "customer value". To quote from Karl



Albrecht's book "The Only Thing that Matters", a complete package, "... a combination of tangibles, intangibles, experiences, and outcomes designed to win the customer's approval and secure the right to survive and thrive in our market place", is essential if we are to strive for customer satisfaction.

Today's market place for Australian Police Agencies is one of the most diverse communities in terms of race, religion, ethnic or linguistic background. So how are Police to respond to this multiracial, multicultural and multilingual clientele? What are the major challenges and responses which would enable us to deliver Albrecht's complete "Customer Value Package" to as many of our clients as possible? What have we found to work and what can we learn together by sharing our experiences? Indeed, can we really say that our planning and policy formulation is always cognisant of our society's diversity and of the need for imaginative new programs and partnerships for customer satisfaction?

The 1990 National Conference on Police Services in a Multicultural Australia stands, I believe, as a landmark in our quest for answers to these questions. For the first time, all Australian Police agencies, including the South West Pacific region, came together to examine police service delivery to a multicultural Australia. It is important to restate here the principal issues which emerged from the Conference.

- Firstly the promotion of a better understanding of the needs of the community; and,
- Secondly the basic right of all Australians to equality of opportunity and that Police Services must promote, as part of their corporate philosophy, an environment that is tolerant of cultural diversity.

These two issues, I believe, encapsulate the essence of the two day conference. Moreover, translated into more than 60 specific recommendations by the conference participants they cover aspects ranging from recruitment and training to access and equity issues and to Police as cross-cultural agents.

A tangible outcome of the Conference has been the establishment of the National Police Ethnic Advisory Bureau. This important joint initiative, of the Australian Police Commissioners and the Australian Multicultural Foundation, supported by the Office of Multicultural Affairs, has the potential to guide and assist all of us in meeting the challenges of policing a multicultural Australia. Already, in the brief space of some 2 years since its establishment the Bureau has started paying dividends. Not only has it facilitated direct dialogue and exchange amongst the relevant jurisdictions it has also taken tangible steps to assist in streamlining a number of policies across the nation. As part of this

quest the Bureau has produced some exceptionally useful material on aspects ranging from Cross-cultural Emergency Communication, Recruitment from Ethnic Communities and, more importantly, a set of governing principles which must underpin our policing in a multicultural Australia.

The governing principles are in tandem with the Commonwealth Government's Access and Equity policies and the National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia. In essence they constitute the ground rules on which future multicultural policies should be based.

Developments in migration patterns of recent years have created changed circumstances and have generated some disquiet in the community. The large numbers of arrivals from non-traditional sources of migrants, especially from Asia and Africa are a key part of such developments. The arrival of these groups has tended to accentuate issues relating to race and physical appearance which are attributes which can attract unwarranted attention or generate unmerited assumptions.

As early as 1985 the Victoria Police, faced with the extremely difficult situation of providing effective policing in areas of high concentration of newly arrived groups, responded with the establishment of a Task Force known as "BAO VE" or "Protection" for the purposes of providing

protection to shop owners of a suburb who were subjected to extortion and other illegal activities by criminal elements within their own community. The Bao Ve Task Force, appropriately resourced and supported, achieved some extremely positive outcomes and went on to broaden its focus and to specialise in crime in Asian communities. It has been subsequently renamed Asian Squad and has, over the last 10 years gained a reputation as an effective policing instrument as well as a resource for the whole Victoria Police Force.

The important point, I believe, conveyed to us all by the Bao Ve example, is the need to develop specific policies and programs focussing on specific issues or, where necessary, groups. Asian Squads or similar groups have since been established in most jurisdictions in Australia. Similarly, Ethnic Affairs Advisers or Liaison Officers have become necessary and useful features to Police work throughout Australia. In my own State a number of other initiatives have been attempted which, I believe are worth mentioning. In particular, I would like to underline the important role of the Ethnic Communities/Police Advisory Committee (ECPAC) and to expand on some initiatives currently undertaken by it in conjunction with our Ethnic Affairs Adviser.

ECPAC was established some 18 years ago and although it has undergone a number of changes its main characteristics remain the same: it comprises equal numbers of Police and ethnic communities

representatives and its core activities are essentially proactive in nature. Whether in the area of ethnic youth and Police or in situations of inter-ethnic conflict - e.g. as with the recent events surrounding certain ethnic groups from the Balkan countries, - ECPAC has been an ideal vehicle for arranging consultations, holding discussions and enabling debates between opposing sides in a safe, contained environment. The outcomes of these consultations and discussions have been extremely helpful in lessening tensions and mostly avoiding potentially overt hostile conflicts.

A useful and effective adjunct to our work with some of the newer, less established communities has been the creation of consultative forums with specific communities. In addition to a Police/Vietnamese Community Forum which has been in existence for some 3 years now, we are currently negotiating the establishment of a similar Forum with the Chinese community. We are hopeful that a Police/Chinese Community Forum will become an additional useful instrument of consultation and co-operation with that community. The amount of resources required for such joint ventures are minimal and the pay-offs in the form of good, harmonious community relations and co-operation with the ethnic communities concerned are invaluable.

These organisational initiatives however cannot progress very far unless they are supported with attitudinal changes within the Police. Those of us who are familiar with Commander Barbara Etter's work on Cross-

Cultural and Race Relations Training for Operational Police Officers will recall her detailed account of potential problems and the sources of such problems, often based on incorrect perceptions or unwarranted assumptions. Commander Etter raises the problem of ethnocentrism built into the terminology used by Police and quotes the Chan study of 1992 which argued that,

**".... while racial prejudice and stereotyping may be a factor, the more problematic area is the police's own perception of their work, particularly in relation to marginal groups from visible minorities".**

Ways need to be found to assist Police members to critically examine their perceptions and assumptions. In Victoria, our Recruit training includes not only significant input from our Aboriginal and Ethnic Affairs Advisory Units but it also incorporates components of experiential learning in the form of visits by recruits to an Adult Migrant Education Services (AMES) centre and return visits by the AMES students to our Police Academy. Again our experience in this area confirms the value of experiential learning exemplified in these visits and underscores Commander Etter's comments, based on findings of other studies, that similar training components in N.T. recruit training attracted "some of the most positive responses from recruits". If cross-cultural training is to be meaningful it has to be relevant and needs to be fully incorporated into the basic training of our young men and women. The old approach of a "stand alone" module, characterised by

the didactic approach of standing "chalk and talk" appears to be neither interesting nor effective. Furthermore, we need to be constantly evaluating the processes employed and the outcomes achieved by such training. The necessity for input from the groups and communities concerned into such training is, I believe self evident.

This brings me to the final points I wish to make which relate to our overall accountability. I believe that recent reports from a number of quarters have brought these questions to the forefront and they beg our urgent attention. The most important such reports have been :

- the "National Report of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody",
- the Report of the National Committee on Violence;
- the report of the National Conference on Police Services in a Multicultural Australia; and
- the National Enquiry into Racist Violence undertaken by the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commissions.

These reports have reinforced the theme of policing being seen not only as law enforcement strategy but also as having service and welfare aspects. The service and welfare aspects have always been present in policing. However, it is probably true to say that modern policing must

not only acknowledge them; it must also seek ways and means to operationalise them in the most effective way possible.

I believe that we are well on our way to exploring and testing ways and means of providing adequate responses to these difficult, sensitive questions. Despite some shortcomings and despite the gaps in our knowledge, we have the resolve and determination to continue pushing with the necessary changes and reforms. At this point, I would like to show a segment of a video made last year at the Derby Hill "Bluelight" Camp in country Victoria near the township of Maldon.

By way of background, Victoria Police and members of the Aboriginal Communities of Victoria came together in 1994 to develop programs which would improve the relationships between Police and the Aboriginal Communities. One such program involved Aboriginal Youth attending a five day line-in camp with operational police members and it was during the first camp that this video was made.

The camp allowed police and Aboriginal Youth to examine and question their perceptions of each other in a non confrontational manner through sport and other activities including team building and trust exercises. This camp and others that have followed, have been a success in breaking down the barriers and "Working Together - Learning Together" which was the theme of the camps.



Let us now take a look at this video piece and hear from some of the participants.

**-SHOW VIDEO (5 MINUTES 02 SECONDS)-**

As we continue to form more extensive and intensive partnerships with the ethnic communities and other groups we come to understand better the perceptions of these groups and communities about us. Conversely, these communities gain a better understanding and appreciation of our potential as well as our limitations. This realisation, I believe, will contribute further in cementing the partnerships and joint ventures we are building for the benefit of all.

Thank you.

WHITE COLLAR CRIME - PRESENTATION TO AIC NATIONAL OUTLOOK  
SYMPOSIUM ON CRIME IN AUSTRALIA BY MR M. J. PALMER, COMMISSIONER  
OF THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE - 6 JUNE 1995

INTRODUCTION

I have been invited to speak on the subject of "White Collar Crime". It is a term that is frequently used to cover a wide range of criminal activities, including:

- . theft from, and fraud against, businesses by their senior staff and managers;
- . offences against corporations law, such as insider trading or against other regulatory legislation such as the Insurance and Superannuation Act;
- . offences against bankruptcy law, such as operating as a director of a company while being an undischarged bankrupt;
- . offences against particular legislation (such as environment protection, trade practices and quarantine legislation) by corporate bodies or by the managers of such bodies;
- . fraud against the Commonwealth, whether it be the robbing of welfare or other benefits schemes or the evasion of sales tax or income tax; and
- . fraud against State/Territory and local governments, whether it

be against their benefits schemes or against their revenue raising.

The term "white collar crime" had its genesis in the days when society was quite different to the way it is today, at a time when socio-economic class distinctions, in particular, were more apparent. At that time, it may have been a useful way of categorising the criminal activities of the relatively well-educated and those in clerical occupations or managerial positions, as opposed to the criminal activities of individuals from "blue collar" or manual labour occupations.

The term "white collar crime" is not a useful way of categorising crime in Australia in the 1990s, when individuals from a wide range of occupations and socio-economic backgrounds have sufficient education and opportunity to carry out, and do in fact commit, the sort of offences which historically may have been carried out by a particular socio-economic group.

I suggest that it is more useful to use the term "fraud" to denote these offences because most of them involve the use of deceit or other dishonest conduct with the object of obtaining money or other benefits or avoiding liabilities.

I propose to concentrate today on the subject of "serious fraud". I will not attempt to indicate how "seriousness" might be defined, other than to say that any consideration of the issue should require an assessment of the nature and extent of the criminality of the activity rather than total reliance on purely monetary benchmarks.

The 1994 Commonwealth Law Enforcement Review (CLER) noted (para 4.86) that : "Most instances of so-called white collar crime amount to a form of fraud. The great majority of these offences are comparatively minor and have cumulatively the greatest impact on the Australian community and governments. A minority of cases are large scale in terms of the sums of money in question and have a major effect on the community's perceptions of the integrity of financial markets, corporate regulation and the tax system."

We can all readily recall instances of serious fraud in recent years which have been of such size and political importance that they have been major factors in changes of government in Australia. Some instances of serious fraud that have occurred overseas have been of such that they have brought down huge multi-national companies.

### THE COST OF FRAUD

While the major instances of detected serious fraud can be readily identified, one major problem for law enforcement agencies and for governments is that we do not have reliable and comprehensive data on the extent and nature of fraud in Australia.

Many of the existing estimates are no more than extrapolations, based on overseas studies. Others are simply guesswork.

In 1992, Walker (Trends and Issues No 39, Estimates of the Costs of Crime in Australia, John Walker, August 1992) estimated the total cost of fraud, forgery and false pretences in Australia at between \$6710 million and \$13770 million, comprising 40-50% of the total cost of crime in Australia. This

compares to an estimate of a staggering 8500 million pounds for the cost of serious fraud in the UK.

The revolution in modern technology, particularly in communications and transport, the development of global markets associated with the deregulation of financial systems and the progressive removal of border controls, and the emergence of new market economies have profoundly influenced the criminal environment.

Criminals involved in serious frauds will not confine their activities to one city, or one state, or even one country, any more. The investigation of serious corporate fraud at the national level in Australia now commonly requires the examination of international transactions. The bottom line is that even though the offence might be quite local in nature, the investigation of it will frequently require the examination of material and the interviewing of witnesses in other jurisdictions.

## POLICY RESPONSE

While there is little doubt that fraud has by far the biggest impact, in monetary terms, on the community, further research is required to better establish the extent of it and the relative importance of the various types of fraud. One of the major findings of the 1993 "Focusing on Fraud" report of the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Banking, Finance and Public Administration (the Elliott Committee) was that there was a need for enhanced data collection and analysis systems for both policy and program evaluation and criminal intelligence purposes.

At the Commonwealth level, at least, there is a need to obtain better information on the extent and nature of fraud. This need has been generally acknowledged, and the Government has approved the establishment of the Commonwealth Fraud Information Database (CFID) hosted by the AFP. Commonwealth agencies subject to the Fraud Control Policy of the Commonwealth (issued in December 1994) are obliged to implement arrangements to provide to the AFP information on instances of fraud against their programs.

The AFP will enter this information on the CFID in order to produce intelligence and statistical information of value to the Government, the agencies, and the AFP itself. The CFID will take some time to reach its full potential and will be limited to agencies that come within the scope of the proposed Financial Management and Accountability Act and those entities within the scope of the proposed Commonwealth Authorities and Companies Act which are budget funded for their operating costs.

While there is a very important category of Commonwealth entity not subject to the reporting requirements, namely Government Business Enterprises, the establishment of the CFID represents a major step forward.

The establishment of the Australian Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre (AUSTRAC) and the Office of Strategic Crime Assessments (OSCA) can also be seen, to some extent, as policy responses to the need for more information on serious fraud at the Commonwealth level.

The main function of AUSTRAC is to provide accurate and timely information and analysis to government agencies on significant movements of cash,

international funds transfers and suspect transactions within the financial system which may be relevant to the investigation of taxation and other Commonwealth and State/Territory offences.

OSCA was established in March 1994 to provide the Government and the Commonwealth Law Enforcement Board with over-the-horizon strategic assessments of significant crime trends and emerging criminal threats to the national interest.

## PRACTICAL RESPONSES

One of the main practical ingredients for a successful investigation in the current criminal environment is a spirit of co-operation and collaboration. We must realise that the game is bigger than the players and that the law enforcement players must operate as a team. There must be greater preparedness to establish multi-disciplinary, multi-agency and multi-jurisdictional (including international) teams or task forces, which contain the skills, expertise, authority and flexibility to best:

- . target the individuals/groups under investigation;
- . make use of the legal powers and authorities of the jurisdictions in which investigations are conducted;
- . minimise demarcation lines and other restrictions which may operate to subvert the investigation and the court process;
- . mix and match the range of skills, professional knowledge and local

knowledge likely to be vital to success; and

share and utilise relevant intelligence.

The provision of better training for investigators is another key practical response. While training and education issues have received much increased attention and resources from police services in recent years, particularly in the context of their vigorous pursuit of the development of police professionalism, I believe there is more to be done.

Investigation of serious fraud cases requires, in addition to a good level of competence in relation to standard criminal investigation techniques and practices, a general knowledge of the financial environment in which the criminal activity was committed (i.e. banking, insurance, stock market, bullion market, etc) and of the specialist tools available to the investigator, such as the capabilities of AUSTRAC.

The one constant element in the fraud environment (and which applies to other types of criminal activity as well, although not always to the same extent) is that the motivation for the activity is generally to acquire wealth and/or the power that derives from possession of wealth. This fundamental factor in major fraud provides one of the keys to selecting strategies which effectively deter such criminal conduct.

In order to deter such behaviour it is essential that the criminal justice system not only brand the offender with the stigma of a criminal conviction but strip the person of the money and assets they have gained through their criminal endeavours.



Better training in the use of Proceeds of Crime Act provisions will encourage the use of a tool which has the capacity to hit the perpetrators of white collar crime where it really hurts them - in their hip pockets. The seizure of fraudulently obtained assets constitutes an extremely powerful and meaningful punishment to offenders and a strong disincentive to others inclined to go down the same path.

Law enforcement agencies and law-makers must be alert to the need to modernise powers, legislation and procedures. Numerous recommendations for improvements and reforms were made in the context of the 1992 NCA Conference on White Collar Crime, and the implementation of these has been the subject of ongoing consideration by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General.

I suspect that there is potential for greater use of the power to compel testimony which is possessed by a number of agencies. The NCA is one such agency, having the power to compel attendance at a hearing before a Member to give evidence and produce documents in relation to matters upon which it is conducting a special investigation, that is, in an investigation being conducted pursuant of a reference granted by the Commonwealth and/or a State or Territory. The Chairperson of the NCA, Mr Tom Sherman, put to the Review of Commonwealth Law Enforcement Arrangements that the NCA should use its special powers to support co-operative investigations.

There is, therefore, a mechanism available to all jurisdictions to obtain testimony in appropriate cases. The exercise of the compulsory examination power needs to be closely aligned with the criminal investigation if the

intelligence it produces is to be used to best effect. The AFP, and other police agencies must be prepared to avail themselves of this tool.

The investigation of serious fraud cases can be greatly assisted through the use of information technology. Fraud cases generally involve the examination and analysis of very large numbers of documents. Some recent investigations by the AFP have involved the seizure of over 100,000 documents. Such seizures cause serious problems in relation to the maintenance of evidentiary continuity and in relation to the efficient and logical exploitation of the material.

Like a number of other agencies, the AFP is looking to information technology to assist with the management of documentary evidence. AFP studies have established the feasibility of a document control and management database to assist investigators to locate documents, to control continuity, and to make efficient and effective use of large amounts of seized material.

The ability to transfer information to other agencies is essential to realise the full potential of such systems. To this end, the AFP has participated in a working party at Commonwealth level, chaired by the DPP, which has reached agreement on standard image file formats. Ultimately, it is aimed to have a document handling system which will allow for information to be passed from an agency to the AFP, from the AFP to the DPP, and from the DPP to the defence and the court.

The other key practical response I would like to mention is the use of experts from relevant disciplines to assist investigators. Police services have

increasingly recognised that the services of auditors, accountants, financial analysts, information technology specialists, lawyers and other professionals are of great assistance, if not essential, to the successful investigation of complex fraud.

To a greater extent than ever before, these professionals are being used in teams or task forces, where their work is fully integrated with other elements of the criminal investigation and where their priorities are directed by the case officer. The trend to use such professionals in this way should be encouraged and applauded.

The AFP and the NCA are currently collaborating on a joint research project into white collar crime in Australia. The purpose of the project is to provide Governments, law enforcement agencies, and public and private sector agencies with a clear understanding of the nature, extent and impact of white collar crime in Australia and ways of combating it.

## CONCLUDING COMMENTS

I believe that Australia already has the basic organisational structures in place to deal with serious fraud of national concern:

- . the State police services to conduct and co-ordinate investigations at the State level;
- . the Australian Federal Police to conduct and co-ordinate investigations at the Commonwealth level;

- the National Crime Authority to conduct and co-ordinate investigations into organised frauds impacting upon both the States and the Commonwealth; and
- specialist agencies at both Commonwealth and State level, such as the Australian Securities Commission, the Insurance and Superannuation Commission which have relevant specialist roles.

One of the topics that is frequently mentioned in discussions about major fraud is the need for a Serious Fraud Office along the lines of the United Kingdom model. One of the attractions of this model is the ability to compel witnesses to give evidence. NSW and Queensland already have access to this facility through the State Crime Commission and Criminal Justice Commission respectively.

As I noted earlier, such a facility is also available to all jurisdictions in Australia through the National Crime Authority, which can compel attendance at a hearing before a Member to give evidence and produce documents in relation to matters upon which it is conducting a special investigation, that is, in an investigation being conducted pursuant to a reference granted by the Commonwealth and or a State or Territory.

There is, therefore, a mechanism available to all jurisdictions to use to compel testimony in appropriate cases.

Law enforcement must think more in terms of a multi-agency approach to serious fraud of national concern. While one agency may have principal

carriage of an investigation, the support and co-operation of other agencies is essential where the activity breaches a number of laws, some of which are administered by other agencies. At both State and Commonwealth levels there will frequently be other agencies with a strong interest in (and in some cases statutory responsibility for) aspects of major fraud investigations.

At the Commonwealth level, the other agencies may include for instance, the Australian Securities Commission, the Australian Taxation Office, the Australian Customs Service or the Insurance and Superannuation Commission. Serious fraud frequently involves breaches of both State and Commonwealth criminal and regulatory legislation.

The pursuit of evidence will often be facilitated by access to the intelligence and information holdings of numerous agencies such as the AFP, State police services, State land titles offices, the Australian Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre and the Australian Securities Commission.

The tracking of overseas transactions may be facilitated by Interpol, the use of the AFP's international liaison officer network, international treaty arrangements and the bi-lateral assistance of law enforcement agencies in other countries.

Clearly it is essential that there be close co-operation between agencies, both within and between jurisdictions and a preparedness to ask for, and to provide, assistance in relation to such investigations. We are already moving in this direction but we need to do more.

Thank you.