

**Submission
No 166**

MOBILE SPEED CAMERA ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS IN NSW

Name: Mr Darryl Bailey

Date Received: 22 June 2021

To whom it may concern,

I would like to submit my view and opinion regarding the "Inquiry into mobile speed camera enforcement programs in NSW".

I would like to give a short insight to my background and experience. I am a NSW resident and tax payer living in a regional area and have been driving for 28 and a half years. I have never received a speeding fine, be it from the police, a fixed or mobile speed camera, so I am giving my opinion from my life experience, observation, moral and what I deem, ethical point of view, not from someone that has been "stung" by a speed camera and has an axe to grind so to speak.

My first point is in reference to point c) in the terms of reference. (Community views towards these changes)

I disagree with the removal of signage in regards to Mobile Speed Cameras. The reason I hold this view is because, to use a simple analogy, if you were watching over a child that was near a stove with a pot of boiling water on it, if you sincerely have the child's best interest at heart, you do not wait until the child scalds itself and then wait a number of weeks before reprimanding the child on the dangers of boiling water. You would intervene before the event and avert the situation from becoming worse. This is how I see the removal of the signage from the mobile speed cameras (what I call Macquarie Bank Camera Cars). If you were truly wanting to "save lives", averting any possible result due to speeding "there and then" has to be more effective than letting that speeding motorist continue on their way without potentially even knowing they had been photographed speeding and causing an accident further down the road injuring themselves or someone else with their next of kin receiving a fine in the post some weeks after the event.

The argument that "This Saves Lives" and "if it saves 1 life, it is worthwhile" is an old ploy by proponents of a view point designed to stifle any opponent to the contrary side of the debate. You are seen as uncaring or that you devalue human life if you disagree with the argument. I don't agree with this. If you truly wanted to save lives, ban cars altogether and there would be zero car fatalities but the practicalities of this are ridiculous so we have to have a happy medium.

We, as a community, are made up of so many different people with as many different personalities and I am not ignorant to the proportion of people that flout the law regardless of the consequences, but I truly believe most people do want to do the right thing and if a simple gesture of having the sign out before the camera to prompt people to think and give them the opportunity to correct themselves, I believe most at a minimum, check their speed and abide (slow down if over the limit). Anyone from then on, run their own destiny knowing the consequences if they continue over the limit. I do not believe that having sneaky un-marked cars taking fines and sending them in the post way after the event has anywhere near the instant desired effect of slowing down motorists as a sign posted / marked camera car. I also believe this to be true with Police vehicles in the same manner. For instant results, a marked presence is by far more effective.

My second point is in reference to point b) in the terms of reference. (research, modelling, and the evidence base of fatality and serious injury reduction)

I do not profess to be a statistician or pour over graphs of road statistics, but simple logic to me says that with each year, the population of NSW grows by 80,000 to 120,000 (from 2011 to 2020). I would imagine that a large proportion of this growth would be people of age to drive a motor vehicle. It is inevitable with a larger population, the incidence of fatalities will reflect this rise of motorist numbers. I, like everyone else, would love to see zero fatalities and I think that a visible presence does more to achieve reaching this goal than a covert style approach.

My third point is in reference to points d) and e) in the terms of reference. (the nature and oversight of compliance or enforcement contracts with government and private companies & the projected impact on revenue generated by these changes)

I totally disagree with the use of private companies to carry out the task of "Policing" our roads, be it speeding or any other form such as road tolls etc. We all, as NSW tax payers, submit a portion of our

tax (from many forms) for the use in the overseeing of our national, state and local services. When a private entity such as Macquarie Bank enters the mix to conduct this task of "Policing", there is a very murky line crossed of capturing "offences" via camera and then the secondary task of enforcing legislation to incur penalties / fines. The link between the two, I am sure is related and my view is that the penalty system has gone from a deterrent to one run for profit serving both parties at the expense of the very people that it is supposed to be there to protect. I am not fully up to speed if Macquarie Bank is the sole operator or if there are other private companies also in partnership with the NSW state government in regards to the supply of information for the purposes of infringement notification but as a layman, I am sure Macquarie Bank, as a successful business as it is, does not enter into such a program without the inducement of growth year on year, as any such business would model any investment. To me, this is where the system has gone from being a means of the upkeep of law to being a business for profit.

This also to me goes hand in hand with the point of projected impact on revenue generated. I am generally a conservative voter, but both sides of politics (conservative and labor) are just as guilty as each other and have let the NSW public down in regards to their lust for immediate revenue to fund quick, short term items in an election period with a total disregard for the sacrifice made to build up and the future wealth generated from government owned assets. What I mean by this is the sale of state owned assets, that were not owned by the sitting governments in the first place to sell off, they were owned by the NSW people. There had been generations of NSW taxpayer funds gone into building and developing these assets over many years and the selling them to not only private business but in some cases, foreign entities, borders on the criminal, because once they are gone, not only the service that they provided gains in price, but the revenue that they provided for the government to fund other projects, has to be made up from somewhere else.

In conclusion, the "void" of government income from the once profitable assets not owned by the state government anymore has to be made up from somewhere and the mobile speed camera sector is one place where I think it is being done otherwise the move and push to not stop speeding motorists with high visibility deterrents on the spot but to catch them on camera and impose fines does not make sense. The monetary figures in fines quoted since this came to fruition at the end of last year speak for themselves. I would like to finish by thanking you for taking the time to ready my submission. For what it is worth, at least you know that there is one NSW inhabitant that thinks this is in the worst interest of "saving lives" of NSW people, most of whom are just going about their business, but in the best interest of contributing to a shortfall of NSW state government revenue.