

From: Crispin Travers
To: [Select Committee on Personal Choice and Community Safety](#)
Subject: Personal Submission to Select Committee on Personal Choice and Community Safety
Date: Monday, 10 September 2018 1:17:12 PM

Hopefully this is the correct format to communicate with the Committee. Please let me know if it isn't.

On a personal level I follow all the recommended procedures on personal safety (eg wearing a bike helmet, wearing a PFD when kayaking etc) regardless of whether it is mandatory or not. While I have no great concern if others don't, I do object to the notion of having to pay their costs if they are injured by their failure to do so. I would therefore only endorse the removal of mandatory measures if there were mechanisms to ensure that those foolish enough to ignore them were made responsible for their own costs. Eg if you become disabled through not wearing a bike helmet you should not be eligible for NDIS support.

Further to this, and I'm not sure if it comes within the guidelines of your inquiry, I am a strong believer that the full social costs of unhealthy behaviours should be met by taxes on those behaviours.

For example the full medical, legal and social costs of excessive alcohol consumption should be met by taxes on alcohol and the full cost of obesity should be met by taxes on fats and sugars. As a moderate user of such substances I could then make a choice as to whether I took the risk of overindulging and meet the cost of that, not expect the rest of the community to do so.

Finally, and again I'm not sure if it comes within the terms of your inquiry, the one aspect of the "nanny state" that most infuriates me is the increasing need to pay a substantial fee for a criminal record check for just about every employment permit, often on a recurrent basis.(Alcohol service, bus driving, working with children etc.) As someone who took heed of my mother's advice that a criminal record would limit my opportunities I have spent my life avoiding getting one, only to find that I am penalised by paying the same cost to demonstrate I don't have a record as I would if I did. I strongly believe that those who don't have a record, should not be required to meet any cost in demonstrating that. Fees should only apply to those who do have a record.

Currently I can check without cost, whether my vehicle is licensed just by entering the rego number online. Surely a similar process could be established to demonstrate that I have no criminal record. Privacy concerns for those who do have a record could be met by the record not being available online and them having to pay to demonstrate whether it is serious or not.

If your Committee can effect changes to this situation then for me personally, I will feel that you have provided a really useful public service.

Feel free to contact me if you require any clarification regarding my views.

Regards
Crispin Travers