

85. T Hobson

**From:** Australian Law Reform Commission [<mailto:web@alrc.gov.au>]

Full name: Trevor Hobson

Proposal 4.1:

Proposal 4-2 :

Proposal 5-1 :

Proposal 5-2 :

Proposal 5-3 :

Proposal 5-4 :

Proposal 6-1 :

Proposal 6-2 :

Proposal 7-1 :

Proposal 7-2 :

Proposal 8-1 :

Proposal 8-2 :

Proposal 9-1 :

Question 9-1 :

Proposal 9-2 :

Proposal 9-3 :

Proposal 9-4 :

Proposal 9-5 :

Proposal 10-1 :

Proposal 10-2 :

Proposal 10-3 :

Proposal 10-4 :

Question 10-1 :

Proposal 10-5 :

Proposal 10-6 :

Question 10-2:

Proposal 10-7 :

This should not be limited to Internet intermediaries. This should include all intermediaries that were not willing participants in the invasion of privacy. For example if someone were to send private information about the Plaintiff via a postal or courier service, that service should also be entitled to the same protections.

Unnecessarily specifically narrowing the scope to Internet intermediaries would mean that it would need to be updated when future mass distribution methods become available.

Question 10-3 :

Proposal 11-1:

Proposal 11-2 :

Proposal 11-3 :

Proposal 11-4 :

Proposal 11-5 :

Proposal 11-6 :

Proposal 11-7 :

Proposal 11-8 :

Proposal 11-9 :

Proposal 11-10 :

Proposal 11-11:

Proposal 11-12:

Proposal 11-13 :

Question 11-1 :

Proposal 12-1 :

Proposal 12-2 :

Proposal 13-1 :

Proposal 13-2 :

Proposal 13-3 :

To me this proposal really gets off the point. The point is the **disclosure** of private information, not the collection of it. It seems that the intent of this proposal is to prevent the publication of private conversations or activities, this should not prevent individuals recording them, provided they have no intention of and take necessary steps to prevent the disclosure of the recording.

An individual should have the same "rights" as a workplace to protect themselves via surveillance, a bank may have unmarked hidden cameras to identify theft, there is no reason why an individual should not be able to do the same. While the bank could record their staff members interacting as consenting adults, they should not publicly disclose that, the same applies to an individual who sets up a surveillance device to protect themselves.

There should be no law preventing someone from recording everything that happens in their life, however if they then **disclosure** private information obtained by that recording then they will have committed an offence.

Proposal 13-4 :

Why limit recording "matters of public concern and importance, such as corruption" to journalists? If someone happens upon, and records, a person participating in corrupt activity but they are not a journalist are they in the wrong?

Question 13-1 :

If there must be surveillance laws then the Commonwealth should enact the legislation.

Proposal 13-5 :

Question 13-2 :

No. Individuals should not have regulation over the installation and use of surveillance devices.

Under Proposal 13-2 Surveillance device laws should include a technology neutral definition of 'surveillance device'. The definition of a surveillance device will be very broad, this would place a heavy burden on councils in terms of regulation or create different regulations in each council area.

Proposal 14-1 :

It seems that section 13 Surveillance devices was attempting to aim at preventing harassment by use of surveillance. Harassment and privacy are separate things, it is possible to harass someone without invading their privacy. Following someone around all day when they are in public is harassment, but does not disclose anything private about them. Setting up a camera aimed through your neighbours window could be (you may be recording them harassing you) using surveillance to harass, publishing the video would be a breach of privacy.

Proposal 15-1 :

Proposal 15-2 :

Question 15-1 :

Question 15-2 :

Proposal 15-3 :

Other comments:

File 1:

File 2: