

“ PPP ”

## People for Proper Policing in North Wales

### ANPR in Birmingham from the contractor's who installed it

The link below is of interest.

<http://www.edsuk.com/item.php?id=119&qclid=CPqE2qynjZYCFRLEugodakUIFQ>

We have predicted that these systems will be installed across the country. We recently reported the loss of a memory stick that contained vehicle data relating to terrorists in the Birmingham area. This and many other similar data losses tells us that these powerful tools and the data they collect will be in the hands of incompetents in Police forces and government departments. We know from recent history that surveillance of the private citizens by governments can lead to a deadly Police state. We do not imagine this situation, it is happening NOW. A member of the PPP attending a meeting with North Wales Police in the Colwyn Bay HQ was told that he had been tracked driving across North Wales by CCTV. We are not sure how serious they were, it appeared to be intimidating!

Below is a **verbatim precis of CC Brunstrom's blog** on the subject, posted Thursday, June 26, 2008

*Have you noticed the **bizarre hue and cry** in the national media recently about the **alleged misuse of CCTV** and surveillance powers by local authorities? For anyone, like me, who has actually spent time talking to real people it really is rather disappointing. Research clearly and repeatedly shows that **our citizenry in the UK is very comfortable with today's surveillance society; CCTV makes people (including me) feel safer**. The research also shows the importance of local issues – a clean and tidy environment has a much bigger impact on most people's quality of life than does the burglary rate. The government's funded CCTV expansion programme has been a very considerable success over the last decade or so. **The clamour for more cameras, and the active surveillance which logically follows, is deafening**. We can, should and will use CCTV systems and **associated surveillance powers** to detect and prevent antisocial offences and to tackle the offenders. Of course in a democracy governed by the rule of law it is absolutely essential that the **use of surveillance powers is regulated by law**, and it is – and UK law is very good indeed on this. A sophisticated arrangement of checks and balances, supervised by **the independent Surveillance Commissioners** (all highly experienced retired senior judges), is absolutely meticulous in ensuring that surveillance activities are proportionate and necessary. **I spend a considerable amount of time dealing with police surveillance activities (I have to authorise the most intrusive operations personally, by law)**. You can have confidence that we have a reliable set of safeguards. It's in the Crime & Disorder Act 1998 and **the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000**, both Acts of which Parliament should be proud.*

You can judge yourself whether the safeguards are adequate at

<http://www.tardis.ed.ac.uk/~james/politics/RIPbill.html>

In the Peter Bolton saga Brunstrom used these **associated surveillance powers** on members of the press and his own and Police Authority staff for his own purposes. We understand his enthusiasm. Speed cameras were introduced with a complex set of procedures and regulations to prevent their misuse. Most of these regulations have since been scrapped. Please enter **quotation** into our News article **search**.