

Developments in Crime Prevention In New Zealand

by Mr. DAVID OUGHTON

Reference has already been made to the conference on "Crime Prevention: A National Overview" recently organised by the Australian Institute of Criminology. One of the papers presented at that conference was that which we now produce below.

Mr. David Oughton is Secretary for Justice in New Zealand and we feel confident that our readers will be interested to have details of the work that is being done by our neighbours across the Tasman Sea.

Again, our thanks are due to the author and to the Australian Institute of Criminology for permission to reprint the paper in the Journal.

Section One

In a number of ways New Zealand has undergone a revolution of change in recent years. The impetus for change has been centred on the need to address long term structural problems, and perceived defects in the economy. By and large the changes that have occurred have been effected swiftly, and with determination. The changes included a radical restructuring of the state sector, the corporatisation and privatisation of some state agencies, a general deregulation of the economy, and the labour market, a reorganisation of local government, and a re-organisation of the funding and delivery of social services. Add to this the changes in foreign policy, the nuclear free stance, and the development of CER and you might begin to realise the enormity of the change process.

"At the central government level these (changes) included the corporatisation and subsequent privatisation of state trading activities, the introduction of a new financial management regime, major changes to the machinery of government, a new system of appointing and remunerating senior public servants, substantial cuts in various government programmes, significant changes to public sector industrial relations practices, a growing emphasis upon biculturalism and employment equity, and a much greater concern with accountability and performance assessment. At the local government level, too, major reforms were initiated, many of them paralleling those in the core public sector (e.g. commercialisation, corporatisation, the contracting-out of services, the decoupling of advisory, regulatory and delivery functions, and new accountability mechanisms."¹

The reforms that were undertaken by the fourth Labour Government (1984-1990) were massive by any standards and achieved in a relatively short period of time. It was often

difficult, even for persons close to the government of the day, or the most keen observer, to appreciate all the changes that were being made during those hectic six years or so. It is only now, with the benefit of hindsight, and the assistance of analytic and detached commentaries and accounts of the events that the full implications of the revolution are being realised.

The first section of this paper is designed to provide the reader with an overview of the New Zealand situation, and some framework for understanding the environment within which crime prevention is currently developing.

The second section of the paper concentrates on the establishment of the recent crime prevention initiatives in New Zealand, particularly the Safer Communities Programme.

The third and final section examines some issues confronting policy developers in New Zealand in the context of the changing role of the state

Although New Zealand has often laid claim to taking a leading role in the development of social policies,² there has been a relative lack of progressive development in the past decade. The reforms of earlier administrations; the works of the architects of the welfare state have been eroded.³ The reasons become clear when the wider economic and political realities are taken into consideration. New Zealand has been losing ground in relative terms with other OECD countries⁴ in respect to those measures that are accepted as indicators of general prosperity. The crisis of the 'welfare state' of the 70s and 80s, and changes to economic management, have affected social policy development. The notion of a welfare state that provides universal, accessible, and affordable support and services from taxation funding has been sorely challenged. Part of the reason for this may be found in the aging population.

The present administration, a National Government elected in October 1990, has set the agenda for redefining the welfare state "so that those in genuine need receive appropriate help, and those who can fend for themselves do not have assistance they could do without."⁵ According to the present government the approach to social policy will be guided by four key principles.

Namely:

"* **Fairness.** It is essential that adequate access to government

assistance be available to those in genuine need, but for those who can make greater provision for their own needs should be encouraged to do so;

- * **Self reliance.** The design of Government programmes should not foster dependency on state provision, but increase the ability and incentives to individuals to take care of themselves;
- * **Efficiency.** Social services should be provided in a manner that ensures that quality and quantity of service represents the highest possible value for each tax dollar spent;
- * **Greater personal choice.** Alternative providers of health, education, housing, and welfare services will provide people with a wide choice to meet their needs.⁶

Against this background of change there has been another dimension of change that impacts on the character of New Zealand life, and future directions. This relates to the re-emergence of the issues of the Treaty of Waitangi, and the recognition that the tangata whenua⁷ not only have legitimate grievances from the past that need to be resolved, but also a right to be recognised as parties to the Treaty, and as original inhabitants. In those respects it is important that any actions of the Crown, and of all its instruments, should be consistent with the spirit and intent of the Treaty and its various interpretations. As an example, all Chief Executives of governmental agencies are charged with maintaining personnel policies that contain provisions that recognise the aspirations, employment requirements, and the need for greater involvement of the Maori people in the public service,⁸ and to "promote decision making in the machinery of government, in areas of importance to Maori communities, which provide opportunities for Maori people to actively participate, on jointly agreed terms, in such policy formulation and service delivery."⁹

However, in spite of the focus on macro-change there were some important other changes that have emerged, and are being fostered under the current administration. These relate to the concern with preventive measures and initiatives affecting a range of activities, and interest areas. In a number of ways, the fourth Labour Government endeavoured to encourage a more preventive approach in social provision. With the amalgamation of hospital boards and community organisations into area health boards, an incentive was introduced to maintain good health rather than continue the traditional concern for illness. The preventive aspect of good early child care was recognised by the Roper Report on Violence (1987), and the Government significantly increased its funding in this area in the 1989 Budget. At a programme level, the Government encouraged individual responsibility for a better quality of life through anti-smoking, parent awareness, and safe sex campaigns, along with encouraging students to stay at school longer. 'New legislation has also endeavoured to limit several causes of accidents, such as the fencing of swimming pools, restriction on licences for new drivers, and sanctions against alcohol-impaired driving.'¹⁰ (In that respect a comprehensive Road Safety Plan has recently been produced within the Ministry of Transport.) One of the Labour Government's last initiatives in the preventive area before it lost office was to inaugurate a Safer Communities Programme. But, before discussing that in more detail it may be helpful to try and locate the Safer Community Programme in the context of crime prevention, generally.

The need for a concerted approach to crime prevention in New Zealand has been apparent for some time. New Zealand's

crime rate has been increasing over the past decade, and offences against the person have risen disproportionately against all other offences. In addition the average daily muster of sentenced inmates has grown alarmingly in recent years.¹¹ Domestic and family violence have become the focus for urgent attention, and the needs of victims of offences have also acquired a priority status in terms of policy development.¹²

In terms of central government expenditure the picture is equally discouraging. For the year ended June 1990 it cost the tax-payer of New Zealand \$505 million to maintain the Police enforcement role, \$26 million to run the Courts (criminal only), \$150 million to administer sentences, and there was approximately \$348 million devoted to community development funding. In terms of total government expenditure this means that 3.6 cents of each dollar was spent on law and order or crime prevention measures.¹³

One of the problems in discussing crime prevention is a definitional one; what constitutes crime prevention? In the New Zealand context it is problematic, and at this stage no clear definition exists.¹⁴ The Police rightly claim that much of their work is concerned with crime prevention programmes, including Neighbourhood Watch, and/or Neighbourhood Support, public education and media campaigns, and security services are directly contributing to the prevention of offending behaviour, and the reduction of opportunity for crime to occur.

The Police hold an important position within the wider criminal justice or law and order system. They are an organisation with a considerable degree of autonomy, and in all matters are free from political interference. For instance, the decisions to investigate crimes, and prosecute suspected persons is almost entirely in the hands of the constabulary. They also have the responsibility for providing a prosecution service in the courts.¹⁵

From about 1989, with changes to the Police management systems, the appointment of a new Commissioner, the Police have shifted the emphasis from enforcement alone, toward including a community oriented approach to their work. This has meant that resources are being employed increasingly in developing community-specific approaches to policing. Police Community Councils are a common feature in most towns and cities in New Zealand, and community constables are becoming a common feature of suburban New Zealand.

The need for communities to 'help themselves' and be more self-sufficient and determining has been brought about not only by the fiscal considerations of central government, but also by the general movement sometimes referred to as devolution. The passage of the Criminal Justice Act, 1985, was indicative of this trend. A greater focus on community sentences, and dealing with people outside the prison walls was stressed. At the same time the value of community development skills in the Probation Service was elevated, and in relative terms the value of other social work skills were reduced.¹⁶

Similarly, there have been reforms instituted within the prison service. The accent on habilitation, and case management reflect the thinking that prisons are part of the community, and that the community has a responsibility to play a part in determining how the prisons ought to be administered, and what services are required to best assist those persons committed to the care of the institutions for the time being. In that respect there is an implicit recognition that crime prevention, incorporating as it does both security and

habilitation, is a primary objective of the administration of the sentence of imprisonment.

Of course, the central government agencies are not the only organisations delivering social services that can be broadly defined as 'crime prevention' in nature. There are a considerable number of voluntary welfare agencies, community, and some profit making bodies that contribute directly to social objectives, and which offer a wide range of services.¹⁷ It is recognised, however, that not many organisations have directed their activities at crime prevention as a specific objective. Some notable but not always welcome exceptions have been the ad hoc vigilante groups that have sprung up from time to time.

Although crime prevention has long been considered one of the main objectives of criminal justice policy, it remains a rather ill-defined concept.¹⁸ It has been seen mostly in terms of other elements of the system, such as policing, sentencing, and the administration of sentences that have crime prevention as a goal. In that respect crime prevention has tended to be thought of as those activities that are directed toward 'at risk' young people, and those persons who are already within the 'system' in one way or another, or as situational crime prevention as practised by the Police.¹⁹

It is tempting to employ the much-borrowed health model when analysing approaches to crime prevention.²⁰ The difficulty with using the primary, secondary, and tertiary classifications²¹ for crime prevention is that while they fit neatly for the secondary and tertiary types, the boundaries for the primary level are less easily defined. In the New Zealand context this is specially so. It could be argued that the community development activities, for instance, are likely to have a positive crime reducing effect, whether they have specific crime prevention objectives or not.

Section Two

The development of crime prevention needs to be seen as a distinct but complimentary process within the general criminal justice system. As central government withdraws further from the delivery of social services the onus on providing resources for local government, and in turn, the communities themselves, grows accordingly. The job of central government agencies is to help develop policies and facilitate their application at local level – not to be the providers. It is important to instil the feeling that the ownership and control of the various approaches is located at local level. Any attempt, in the New Zealand context, to impose crime prevention on communities is going to be met with hostility.

The idea of promoting a broader approach to crime prevention than had hitherto prevailed was first examined seriously by an Interdepartmental Officials Committee on Crime Prevention (February 1989) which was charged with analysing the French crime prevention initiative and to apply the key principles to the New Zealand situation. The Committee was concerned with establishing criteria for projects, liaison with local government authorities, and for considering funding issues.

The Officials Committee identified five major objectives for a New Zealand Crime Prevention initiative:

1. To foster recognition that crime and crime prevention are issues that concern all the community and that the control or prevention of crime cannot be the responsibility of the various agencies of social control and law enforcement alone.

2. To provide a forum at the local community level to identify crime problems affecting that community and co-ordinate the resources and expertise of local government, government departments, iwi authorities, private organisations, educational institutions, individuals, and where appropriate, relevant cultural authorities and other organisations to address the problems identified.
3. To facilitate and promote local initiatives focusing on crime, its prevention, and the context in which crime occurs.
4. To promote the development of effective crime prevention initiatives which are suited to New Zealand; in particular, taking account of the status of the Maori people.
5. To promote and support worthwhile crime prevention projects.

Many of the perceptions underlying the development of crime prevention initiatives in France and other countries were seen to have their parallels in the New Zealand context. New Zealand had not only seen a significant rate of increase in offending rates at all levels, but this had been matched by an increase in the concern about crime, and the fear of becoming a victim of crime.

The interest of the Department of Justice in crime prevention derived from its concern to 'protect the community and to promote social order'. Traditionally, these goals had been pursued through the corrections system, including the provision of rehabilitative services. These are all reactive measures. That is, they take place after a crime has occurred. The Department believed, and still does, that proactive measures are also required, particularly to divert young people from entering what is seen as 'the cycle of crime'.

In the sense that it is designed to contribute to community protection, and community stability, crime prevention is integral to community well-being and community development. It is, therefore, related to the responsibilities of most governmental agencies. Certainly no one agency has a monopoly on crime prevention and, except in certain respects, this responsibility is not the sole prerogative of centralised bureaucracies. Efforts to make communities safe, or healthy, and to promote productive and cooperative activities within communities need to be made by central government in partnership with local communities.

The prevention of urban crime was a focus of the Eighth Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders (Havana, Cuba 1990). The Congress emphasised that prevention is the concern of all – that is, citizens, communities, and governmental organisations, and that it is the task of governments and other institutions to promote the development of national and local prevention programmes. Another notable aspect of the Congress resolution was the recognition that prevention must bring together those with responsibility for family, health, housing, social services, leisure activities, schools, the Police and the justice system in order to deal with the conditions that generate crime.²²

At present there are considerable resources directed to the promotion of safe and healthy communities, and thus crime prevention in its broadest sense.²³ In the narrower sense of the concept, the Police have traditionally played an important preventive role, as have elements of the correctional services, such as probation and psychological services, through their treatment programmes.

In line with international developments, the approach to

crime prevention favoured by the Department of Justice has been one which is centred on the partnership of central and local government, and between iwi authorities²⁴ and local government. The Department recognises that these partnerships must be supported by adequate resources, and appropriate educational and information strategies. Above all, effective crime prevention projects must be attuned to the cultural and social setting in which they are applied, with the aim of fostering diversity and avoiding uniformity for its own sake. It is crucial that each community decides for itself what crime prevention approaches are to be adopted.

Another essential element is that leadership should be provided at the local level which transcends narrow sectional interests. Communities need to know that their concerns and fears about crime and the ill-effects of crime, are shared by their elected leaders. In this respect, effective leadership assumes a bipartisan approach, both at the local and the national levels.

With regard to funding, it should be noted that the wide involvement of government agencies in crime prevention in the broadest sense, means that there are already considerable resources going into programmes which are of general social value. In view of this it was felt that a crime prevention strategy aimed principally at greater co-ordination and more precise targeting of such services could be achieved within relatively modest resource limits. The Department of Justice, and the Police worked together on the development of a crime prevention strategy based on this approach, leading to the formation of the Safer Communities programme.

The plan has drawn on the models pioneered in France, and Britain, and adapts them to the New Zealand situation. A peak council headed by the Prime Minister of the day and including representatives of local government provides the basis for political leadership and commitment to the idea that through partnerships, and the recognition that the prevention of crime is not just a central government responsibility, reliance on traditional enforcement and corrections agencies can be reduced.

In July 1990 the Labour government convened an inaugural meeting of the Prime Ministerial Safer Communities Council, a body consisting of key Ministers of the Crown,²⁵ and Mayors of four municipalities to preside over the development of a pilot programme, for an initial period of two years, in the promotion of safer communities, and a strategic approach to crime prevention. The impetus for this development on the part of the government of the day at that time had arisen when several ministers of state who had visited either France or the United Kingdom, or both countries, and been impressed with what they had seen. In addition, the Department of Justice had been keen to see some progress made in this area.

A Crime Prevention Administrative Unit located within the Department of Justice (Policy and Research Division) at Wellington services the Prime Ministerial Safer Communities Council, and provides a link in the relationship between central and local government. The Unit is also concerned with facilitating the development, monitoring, and evaluation of the pilot programmes.

Four pilot programme areas are operating under the auspices of the relevant local government body.²⁶ Each of the Mayors in these four localities have set up a Safer Community Council to promote crime prevention initiatives,

and to encourage the development of projects that best suit the communities they serve. The membership of the Safer Community Councils is drawn from the community, and representatives of key public service agencies operating in the Safer Community Council areas. The Mayor chairs the Safer Community Council²⁷ and generally provide the political leadership and commitment necessary at the local level. The Police play an active role on each Safer Community Council.

Each Safer Community Council has the services of a full-time Coordinator, employed by the local City, or District Council. Central government meets the greater part of the Coordinator's salary from moneys contributed by the Police, and the Department of Justice from their discretionary funds. In addition, modest seeding money has been distributed or is available to each Safer Community Council to be used to promote or foster safer community, or crime prevention projects.

Although central government has provided limited funding, (for the employment of the Coordinators, and for some project work), local government councils have had to meet some costs themselves, and to devise ways of raising additional funds for specific projects, and promotions. Sponsorship from commercial, and charitable organisations have been used to acquire funding for the Safer Community Councils.

The position of the Coordinator is pivotal to the exercise of the pilot programmes. They not only maintain a network of community contacts, and a database of local resources, but also have the responsibility to make things happen at a project level. In addition, the Coordinator maintains liaison with the Crime Prevention Administrative Unit, and helps to monitor and provide information for the evaluation of projects.

Proposals for specific crime prevention projects are usually submitted first to the Coordinator for presentation to the Safer Community Council. The type of project suitable for support, and funding, will depend on the perceived or known needs, locally. The Crime Prevention Administrative Unit does not assume a role for vetting project proposals, although proposals will often be referred to the Manager of the Unit for independent comment, and for assessment as to suitability for monitoring and evaluation.

The point that should be stressed in the selection of suitable projects for sponsorship or promotion at local level, is that the initiatives should arise within the communities, and that it is not for central government to determine what constitutes an appropriate crime prevention project, or whether the objectives of a particular project are crime preventing. In a real sense, the responsibility for determining what constitutes crime prevention, and how crime prevention might be defined, is a community responsibility. For its part, central government needs to determine whether it wishes to support, or provide resources for local initiatives, according to its own definitions. In the New Zealand context that will be determined through the Prime Ministerial Safer Communities Council, (and the Crime Prevention Administrative Unit), consistent with current public policy.²⁸

Considering that most projects were not initiated until late 1990, or early 1991 there has been some pleasing progress in the type and range of projects being developed. It is too early to draw conclusions from the information available to date. The monitoring and evaluation process is still to be

developed, and what comments that can be made must be tentative, and subjective. However, the early signs are very encouraging.

Section Three

There are several possible reasons why the development of a concerted, and comprehensive approach to crime prevention has been slow to emerge. The economic situation has been depressed in recent years, and the onus on governments to trim their spending has been intense. Yet, the demand for protections and services provided by central government persists. A news media preoccupation with crime, and crime related issues in the past 10 years or so has helped to create a climate of opinion, and belief that what is needed is a 'harder line' toward criminals and criminal behaviour.²⁹ For the politician, the realities of the three year term of Parliament tend to make law and order issues one of the platforms for electioneering that is attractive. The possibilities of making law and order issues bipartisan are thus reduced, and the likelihood of developing comprehensive strategies in the field of criminal justice are inhibited. In any event, crime prevention is no quick fix. Politicians have to be committed to it for the long haul. And, because the criminal justice system is not centrally administered the chances of integrated approaches being advanced are further diminished.³⁰

Another reason for the slow development of crime prevention in the New Zealand context is the traditional mind-set that persists when the role of the state is considered. There is a marked tendency for people to look to central government for action, instead of providing it themselves. This attitude of dependency toward the state has been referred to as the 'superannuation effect'.

But, as daunting as these hurdles to progress are, the logic of developing a strategic approach to the development and administration of criminal justice that is inclusive of a strong, and complementary crime prevention component is apparent. The formation of the Prime Ministerial Safer Communities Council has provided the focus for at least a crime prevention strategy to be born. The Safer Communities programme will undoubtedly add weight to the argument that new directions, and new solutions are possible.

A number of policy considerations need to be addressed. These include: What costs the community is prepared to bear to create 'safer communities'? New Zealanders have enjoyed lifestyles characterised by relative personal liberty, and freedom from fear of being victimised. High density, urban living is almost unknown. Safety achieved at the expense of some of these freedoms and living conditions is likely to be unacceptable. A comprehensive Police advertising campaign sponsored by commercial interests in highlighting the problems of crime in our communities. Ironically, the campaign is probably contributing to a distorted perception about the incidence of crime, and heightening feelings that personal safety is at grave risk. While this may generate a strong motivation among sections of a community to want to participate in crime prevention activities it could also be counter-productive in the longer term. An innovative and imaginative communications policy needs to be developed as part of a wider crime prevention strategy.

The term crime prevention, indeed the whole language associated with crime prevention, needs to be more precisely defined. The Safer Community Programme has been predicated largely on the belief that communities should take

a greater responsibility for preventing crime, and, to some extent, that 'community crime prevention'³¹ is a preferred approach. Crime prevention can mean all things to some people, and be interpreted to embrace a wide range of activities. So much so, that it would not be difficult to imagine that crime prevention could not only be a meaningless catch-phrase, but also a substitute for basic social policy development. In the New Zealand context the worry is that crime prevention could become a rationale for allowing central governments to minimise their traditional, and responsible approach to social policy development, and to shift the onus to local government to provide safety-net measures, of which crime prevention might be one.

If the definition of crime prevention embraces what is now thought of in the literature as 'social crime prevention'³² it could be argued that policy makers were more concerned with preventing crime than with promoting social cohesion, organisation, and integration. While crime in our communities is an important problem area, it should be viewed in a balanced manner. The primary motivation for good social policy development should not be crime, or the concern to somehow rid our communities of crime. Instead, crime prevention policies should support wider social policy developments, not lead them.

It is going to be extremely important in the development of crime prevention strategies in New Zealand that policy decisions are made on the basis of contributions and views of Maori and non-Maori alike. It is not just an ideal; but a necessity if the spirit of the Treaty of Waitangi is to be honoured, and if a bicultural harmony is to be achieved in the future. The process of developing bicultural policy has never been simple, and local governments, and iwi authorities will need to be given an opportunity to play their parts.

There are signs that the Government is inclined to entertain approaches to social policy development that seek to make resource investments that might make positive returns in the medium to long term.³³ The Prime Minister, himself, has taken a personal interest in the Safer Community Programme³⁴ and is briefed on progress. It will be important in the months ahead, in policy development terms, that keen attention is shown to the developments in other social policy areas. If the formation of social policy is to proceed on the basis of the key principles (of fairness, self-reliance, efficiency, and greater personal choice) enunciated by Government, and the constraints of fiscal direction are to be honoured, then it is clear the case for crime prevention will need to be well argued, and well presented to make an impression.

References

- 1 Boston, Jonathon (1991) *The Theoretical Underpinnings of Public Sector Restructuring in New Zealand*, published in Boston et al, *Reshaping the State*, Oxford University Press.
- 2 For a discussion see Easton, B (1980) *Social Policy and the Welfare State in New Zealand*, Sydney, George Allen and Unwin.
- 3 It is recognised, however, that there have been some important advances in social policy development, in such areas as the Abolition of the Death Penalty Act, 1989; the Domestic Protection Act, 1982; the Homosexual Law Reform Act, 1986, the Victims of Offences Act, 1987, to name just a few that are administered by the Department of Justice.
- 4 NZ is now 19th of 24 OECD member countries, as measured by Gross Domestic Product per head of population.
- 5 Rt Hon J.B. Bolger, Prime Minister, in a speech accompanying a statement on Economic and Social Initiative – (December 1990).
- 6 Extract from the speech of the Prime Minister. *Ibid.*
- 7 Literally, 'the people of the land' – the indigenous Maori iwi, or tribes of Aotearoa, or New Zealand, who, together with the Crown (in the form of the

- British Government) were the signatories to Tiriti o Waitangi (1840).
- 8 State Sector Act, 1988, section 56 (2) (d).
 - 9 Government policy statement (November 1988), "Te Urupare Rangapu" or "Partnership Response".
 - 10 Koopman-Boyden, Peggy Social Policy: Has There Been One? Published in Holland and Boston (Eds) The Fourth Labour Government: Politics and Policy in New Zealand (Second Edition) Oxford, (1990).
 - 11 Norris and MacPherson Offending in New Zealand, Department of Justice, (1990).
 - 12 Two organisations, the Family Violence Protection Coordinating Committee, and the Victims Task Force have been established by government to provide special advice, and direction in these areas of concern.
 - 13 The figures quoted have been estimated from published accounts, but must be treated with some caution. Government expenditures are not categorised in a way which enables the crime prevention component to be readily separated out. This is particularly so when trying to determine expenditures in the area of community development. (The Police enforcement costs do not include the costs of the Serious Fraud Office.)
 - 14 One of the difficulties arises because there already has crime prevention in the law enforcement and corrections sense and there are community development programmes in existence. The definition of crime prevention is likely to emerge, as it were, from the experiences of the current programmes.
 - 15 The Police conduct their own prosecutions in District Court jurisdictions, but not in the High Court, or Appeal Court. The distinction is governed by the seriousness of the offence, and the elective rights of the defendant as determined by statute.
 - 16 The value of social work qualifications was down-graded during the 1980s. However, studies have shown that only about 5% of a probation officer's time is allocated to community development activities.
 - 17 Examples such as the NZ Prisoners' Aid and Rehabilitation Society, Outdoor Pursuits organisations, security firms, insurance companies, and the work of sporting clubs come to mind.
 - 18 It has been noted that crime prevention is not a definable set of techniques, but still a concept struggling to be born. (Tuck M (1987) Crime Prevention: A Shift in Concept - in Graham J (ed) Research Bulletin: Special European Edition, HORPU No 24 London HMSO.
 - 19 Kaiser G (1988) Kriminologie: Ein Lehrbuch - Heidelberg: CF Mueller Jurischer Verlag describes crime prevention as including: "... all those measures which have the specific intention of minimising the breadth and severity of offending, whether via a reduction in opportunities to commit crime or by influencing potential offenders and the general public."
 - 20 See Brantingham and Faust (1976) "A Conceptual Model of Crime Prevention" published in Crime and Delinquency (July, 1976).
 - 21 In essence, the classification is as follows: Primary - activities directed at modification of criminogenic conditions in the physical and social environment at large; Secondary - activities directed at early identification and intervention in the lives of individuals and groups in criminogenic circumstances ('at risk' groups, for instance); and Tertiary - activities directed at prevention of recidivism - for persons already 'in the system'.
 - 22 The important point here is that such co-ordination and cooperation is one of the means by which the objective of crime prevention is given expression.
 - 23 It is difficult to determine, but it is estimated that in excess of \$350 million of tax revenue is expended on community development funding per annum.
 - 24 Iwi, or tribal authorities recognised as the descendants of the signatories to the Treaty of Waitangi (1840) and for all intents and purposes are the 'partners' with the Crown. Iwi authorities have a representative function, as well as providing services to their people.
 - 25 Chaired by the Prime Minister, and including the Ministers of Police, Justice, Labour, Housing, Education, Transport, Social Welfare, Health, Internal Affairs, Youth Affairs, Womens' Affairs, Maori Affairs, and Local Government.
 - 26 These are Manukau City Council (south Auckland cosmopolitan area); Wairoa District Council (provincial, east coast North Island); Christchurch City Council (metropolitan, South Island); and Ashburton District Council (provincial, South Island).
 - 27 Except at Christchurch where the position has been deputed to a City Councillor.
 - 28 For a list of projects see Appendix I.
 - 29 This is a major factor. It is hard to be convincing and committed to crime prevention when serious crime is on the increase and people want results.
 - 30 The administration of the Police, the Department of Justice, and the Judiciary, is quite distinct, with no formal over-arching co-ordinating mechanism. Each element has considerable autonomy.
 - 31 Defined as measures which improve the capacity of communities to reduce crime by increasing their capacity to exert informal social control.
 - 32 Crime Prevention Strategies in Europe and America - Graham, J (Ed) Helsinki Institute for Crime Prevention and Control, Helsinki (1990).
 - 33 During the last general election campaign (Oct 1990) the National Party promised 900 more Police (the current level is some 5100) over the next three years.
 - 34 The Prime Ministerial Safer Communities Council has not been convened under the National Government, to date, but the Prime Minister has confirmed that the pilot programmes will run their full two-year course.

Appendix I

The following list is indicative of the range and type of projects initiated as a result of the Safer Communities Programme. Space has not allowed for a more detailed description of each project. It is hoped that such descriptions will be available when evaluations have been completed.

- * A pilot scheme to assist children with deficient reading skills
- * A short term campaign aimed at reducing the fear of crime
- * Seminars on shop thefts
- * Drug and alcohol information
- * Policing of 'dog nuisance' in one community
- * A trade show on home security
- * School programmes about crime prevention
- * Promotion of an Age Concern programme
- * Support for Maori Wardens
- * The employment of 'grey power' Community Support constables for the elderly
- * Working with gangs
- * Revival of Neighbourhood Support programmes in specific areas
- * Provision of programmes for 'at risk' children
- * Assistance with the provision of indoor sporting facilities
- * A programme for the elderly
- * The promotion of ethnic tribunals
- * A variety of youth programmes, including a poster competition, song contest, theatre promotions, a forum for secondary school students, organising a 'Krypton' competition, and safer community awareness programmes
- * A anti-graffiti campaign, coupled with a targeted confidence/leadership programme
- * The development of a youth-ethnic programme - associated with a truancy programme
- * The organisation of a 'safety week'
- * A youth incentives programme
- * A concerted approach to environmental design
- * Patrols of a town centre (ravaged by vandalism) by Samoan community, backed by local business association
- * Ensuring that the target groups have a say on the Safer Community Councils
- * Developing networks, and maintaining communication
- * Profiling a district to better target crime prevention programmes
- * Incentive weekends for 'at risk' youth
- * Targeting rugby, and rugby league clubs regarding excessive use of alcohol at clubrooms



**MACHINERY
HANDLING
SERVICE**

Our skilled team offer careful and reliable service for the installation and relocation of all types of Machinery
 • Shipping Terminal to Factory Floor • Storage and Container Handling Facilities • Specialised Machinery Storage • On Site Relocations
 • Crane Trucks and Forklift to 18 Tonne capacity (with crane jibs)

L. ARTHUR PTY LTD

Servicing Melbourne's Transport needs for over 80 years
76 CREMORNE STREET, RICHMOND
PHONE: (03) 429 3244, (03) 429 1744 • FAX: (03) 429 6926
Contact LOU ARTHUR, MARK O'SHEA or KEVIN RITCHE