

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING



Commissioners:	Commissioner Kim Wood (CW) Commissioner Bronwyn Fredericks (CF)
Presenters:	Karyn Walsh (KW) David Cormack (DC) Paul Mazarolle (PM) Chris Connors (CC) Keith Hamburger (KH) Marissa Dooris (MD) / Debbie Kilroy (DK) Michelle Denton (MD) Questions/Comments - various

Inquiry into Imprisonment and Recidivism

Brisbane Public Forum
conducted at QPC, Level 27, 145 Ann Street, Brisbane
on 3 May 2019.

QUEENSLAND PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION

CF: Good morning everybody, I am Commissioner Bronwyn Fredericks and Commissioner Kim Wood to my left and we will be leading the process for the day. Before we begin the day I wish to acknowledge the country that we are on and the formalities that are taking place today. We will acknowledge elders of this place, past, present and also emerging leaders that are coming through, emerging elders that are coming through systems now and also that are yet to be born.

Today will be a formal process, we will be having seven presentations overall. Please be aware that some people may come in and out through the day so some people may come in just to hear one presentation or present while others may stay for the entire day and including doing, undertaking presentations. We will also during the day have a lunch break and a bit of morning tea and afternoon tea as well. The presentations will be videoed and they will be recorded so when we move to open discussion times after the presentations and after Commissioner Wood and myself have asked questions we will ask for comment from the floor. If people, before they give their comment can state their name and if you're a community member or an organisation it would be appropriate to state that at that time too and then go into your comment at that point. That helps us identify you when we go to do the notetaking, transcription, but also for the purpose of the video recording.

Presentations have been called for today. This is one of four public hearings. We had another public hearing just this week on Tuesday in Cairns. We have this one today. We have another one early next week in Townsville and then a second one in Brisbane next Friday so there will be four public hearings in total. And as I said presentations will be today, there is seven and they will be 15 to 20 minutes roughly each, some can be less and then we will have a bit longer for question times as well.

Please be aware that public hearing process, that the presenter will speak and followed, as I said by conversation with Commissioners and then calling for comments. Oath's are not required in this process so people who are undertaking presentations, that's not a requirement, we just ask people to be truthful. And just a word of caution for everybody here please stick with the issues, we don't want to have people mentioning other individuals name or moving into personalities or personal attack in any shape or form. Unlike Parliamentary public hearings speakers are not covered by defamation or by Parliamentary privilege. So I just need to give people that warning because it's sometimes the concept of a public hearing is not well understood.

For the purposes of the transcript as I said people will be asked to say their names and if there's any members of the press here, please identify yourself to QPCC staff and I

also ask that no recordings be made of today's hearing. As I said there is a recording being made of the session and that recording will later be available and loaded up onto the website with the other material. So we would prefer to keep only the formal recordings available as the endorsed or authoritative recordings. Similarly for phones. If people can make sure your phones are on silent. It would be really distracting if the presenter is at a really crucial moment and a phone goes off, okay thank you.

For logistics around the place, restrooms are out that door at the back down the hallway and just on the right there is both male and female toilets there. If a fire goes off, fire alarm, we will go out through that door. There is two fire escapes in this building. One is down this corridor to the right and the other one is out through the front but if the preference is to go out through the doors here, down the corridor past the toilets and then there is a set of stairs. We are on the 27th floor so should that fire alarm go off, I ask if anyone would have difficulty with 27 floors to let the staff know so you can get assistance.

Alright everyone is welcome to have lunch and we might just kick off now in terms of the process. The first speaker for the day, or presenter is Ms Karyn Walsh and she is the CEO of the Micah Projects, welcome Karyn.

CW: Karyn welcome, if you could just state your name for the record and you have got 15 to 20 minutes. We will ask some questions and have a conversation and then there may be comments from the floor. Thank you.

KW: My name is Karyn Walsh, I am CEO of Micah Projects, a not for profit organisation based at South Brisbane providing services across Brisbane. I want to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet and elders past and present and from the outset the overrepresentation of indigenous people in both homelessness and in the justice system. What I am presenting today is just some of the evidence that we have from a campaign that we did for three years called 500 lives, 500 homes which has also been backed up by some national data analysis which was collating the four cities that had undertaken campaigns as well which also sort of reflects the extent to which homelessness, the criminal justice system and particularly rough sleeping are linked and that people are caught in a vicious cycle because we are not providing the right solutions at the right time. So I would like to both give the evidence of the issue but also the solution around support of housing and making sure that we are providing service system that ends people's homelessness rather than manages their homelessness so that they are on a cycle of emergency accommodation, prison, hospitals and short-term homeless services. So basically we believe that there is money to be saved for the taxpayer even

though the systems that that money is costing a lot more in, probably don't think they get any savings but if we put better interventions in people's homelessness would actually be ended and their interactions with the criminal justice system has been proved to go down.

So over the 2014, 2017 we surveyed 2694 individuals or families, that was the adults in those families but of those families 1522 children were present, they weren't surveyed. So you know children are part of the equation in terms of people, the displacement of their parents in terms of homelessness and imprisonment. The interaction with the justice system was 1268 adults had been engaged in the previous six months. So it was self reporting which is a valid way of reporting and it is indicative. So we're not saying it is actual service utilisation, we are just saying it's indicating. 25 percent of that 1268 were females. 74 percent were males. One percent identified as transgender. 50 percent were sleeping rough. 22 percent were indigenous and 10 percent identified as lesbian/gay/bisexual. The average age was 42 years and the average time of homelessness was 4.7 years.

The indicative costs for the criminal justice system was 5,941,107 and the health system was 16,172,014 (??) Which you have got that data. The solution that we put forward is that supportive housing which is providing housing that is affordable at 30 percent of people's income, not a percentage of market rent because people do not have more than Newstart and when people get out of prison they don't even have a full Newstart payment for the first two weeks. So basically it is combining that affordability, whether it's in the private market through subsidy, public housing or community housing with the support services. I don't know what the figures today are about the number of people in prison because, of no fixed address who are eligible for parole but very clearly if those people were offered housing with the services they need to reintegrate into the community and a pathway which is really important to permanent, stable housing then the cost would definitely go down. However, a word of caution I don't think everyone should only get a service just because they have been in prison or exiting prison, we should be providing them so they don't go in in the first place. So through court programs or even before court. Our goal is to end rough sleeping in Brisbane so that no one is living on the street. Clearly we haven't got there yet.

But supportive housing, Brisbane common ground is the example that the data has been based on 41 people with service utilisation costs where the researcher actually looked at what was the service utilisation of the criminal justice system, the hospital system and the cost of providing the housing and the support. 12 months while they were on the

street and the 12 months while they were in housing. And that showed a 13,100 per tenant saving after the cost of housing and support work. It looked at, it also showed a really big decrease in nights in custody, use of the watch house. Appearances in court were down by 50 to 24. People were less victimised. You know 50 percent of people rough sleeping have reported victimisation themselves as well as people who may be offending and most haven't accessed services for that trauma. There is also obviously the comorbidity of mental illness addiction and chronic disease that about 70 percent of people on the street often have.

So basically we would say that if we were investing in a) we should be increasing Newstart so that people actually have more income to pay for their housing but from a state perspective if we were investing in housing and for those who need it, providing the appropriate support. So not everyone needs the same kind of support. Some people may need more clinical support. If they have a mental illness people who have been in prison the longest obviously need assistance in re-entry. People who are offending for minor offences need assistance to look at stopping offending. So the, you know in the UK there is a program that was referred to as supporting people and basically it was an investment by the government into supporting people in whatever housing they were in and with the dosage of support they needed and the individualised support which is more so a form of you know a scattered site in the outreach in the community or on site, if it was in hostels or high density buildings. That investment which I can send you the program on that. But it was really not having to wait until people were leaving the hospital or leaving a prison, it was people could self refer, so early intervention as well as referrals for when people were exiting.

So I think a lot of Queensland's investment into social services is at the tertiary end we need to make sure we put some of it at the early intervention end where people can, as citizens seek the services they need before they get referred through a criminal justice system or a tertiary hospital system. Any questions or?

CW: So that's the end of your, the formal part of your presentation Karyn?

KW: Yes only to say that the rate of youth detention and the correlation between youth detention and imprisonment is quite high and that indigenous people it's very high, it's much more than non-indigenous.

CW: Let me kick off with the first question. You have indicated there is a substantial saving available potentially after meeting client's needs there is still money in the kitty. You have consulted widely and your sample size sounds representative. Have you had any

interaction with service providers or government in the process and articulated your findings?

KW: Of course.

CW: And reactions?

KW: Well I think that we are in a stage where the tertiary costs are outweighing the preventative costs. Housing should be infrastructure, not, and a right, it shouldn't be a service as such and services should partner with housing providers or the government as a housing provider for that matter in order for people's needs to be met so that they basically have a physically safe home. That they have the individualised support which they need which we would say is only about 30 percent of the people who come through homeless services. Other people need short-term and then those who need it long-term, there is cost savings instability, not moving people through short-term accommodation, prison. And people are getting so much debt, like they have got to pay debt, they have got to pay a court fee when they go to court. They have got SPER debts for move on powers. Some of those fine are more than their weekly income. So then those SPER debts mean they have to be paid off then people can't sustain their tenancy because they haven't got enough income because they are paying off a debt as well as trying to pay their rent as well as trying to access services. So more and more people have to pay for services and there is an enormous health inequality. Some people get better health services in prison than they do in the community.

CW: Yeah sure.

KW: Which isn't acceptable really.

CF: Just wanting to know Karyn did the survey reveal whether for example somebody was homeless and then committed their first offence or were they coming out of...

KW: No it was their interaction with the criminal justice, so in the past six months have they had an interaction with the watch house or the criminal justice or been in prison.

CF: And similarly have they then come out of prison and then found themselves homeless? So perhaps not homeless but...

KW: We have people come to our service regularly who have just been released from prison and within the first fortnight or you know when they don't have much income. We had a man released from prison who presented who had three weeks to live. He, he had been diagnosed, he had oesophageal cancer and he basically had been told that he had a month or so to live. You know luckily we could get him into housing quickly so that he

died with dignity but he was released with no links to any health service. There isn't a referral system from the prison really, people, like the health practitioners don't always know when people are going to be released so the referrals to health services in the community, you know they are minimal. And certainly people's ability to automatically be able to pay rent is really compromised because they just get a half payment. And even a full payment is not enough. So usually they have to go into emergency accommodation which some people don't want to because they are large congregant places and just being from prison they might choose to sleep rough to experience that, a bit of freedom and fresh air is what someone said to me recently.

CW: Karyn what is the link between people that find themselves in these circumstances and then recidivism or going back to prison, offending again and going back?

KW: Poverty and no support and we would say had not been housed.

CW: So if we could solve some of those....

KW: Like if you don't have a safe place to live all sorts of things happen when you're on the street and conflicts occur. You know a lot of people are robbed regularly, you know people have addictions that they're not getting treated for. People have suicidal ideation which they're not being treated for. We tend to be screening people out of our health system, not into it and you know so people are very unwell and all sorts of minor offending can occur as well as very serious offending.

CW: Could you amplify the point a little that you made about screening people out of the health system rather than screening in?

KW: Well if people present I think it's 25 percent of people have presented prior to a successful suicide within 72 hours. So if they are not at a threshold for a hospital to respond then they should be being referred somewhere for another intervention. So I think that you know it's a bit of a cycle around the pressure that is on all the tertiary services but instead of continuing to constantly invest in those services we need to invest in community based diversity. We need a diverse range of services. We need indigenous managed services. You know we need women's services. So we shouldn't just have one service that does it, it needs to be, the services in the community need to reflect the diversity of the community.

CW: So this isn't a one size fits all solution but if there were a range of services, the appropriate services could be selected for particular individuals needs?

KW: Oh definitely and people can self select their service which I think is something we are losing because of such controlled referral pathways. Like our, we are over emphasising

referral and case coordination and not actually having case management. Like people need, if they don't have family, if they have been incarcerated for a long time, even if they are short term incarceration they have got to go back. Like they have got their court date. Sometimes they just get a house and often we pay their rent if we know it is going to be short term to prevent them losing that house. So strategies that really plan with somebody, well how long is this likely to be, can we prevent them from losing their housing. Can they come back to housing. But most importantly get the support they need. I mean people leave prison 15, after being in there 15 years and it's a huge issue to be able to reintegrate into the community if they don't have permanent housing and if they don't have the support they need. And there are prison support services. Often there is a time limit on how long those services can be provided. The real benefit of what is referred to as an intervention of support of housing is that you give the amount of service a person needs ongoing if they need it. All our service models and programs are focused on short-term quick interventions but we know that, well 30 percent we would say of the people who access this survey for example, they need ongoing support but self-reliance isn't achievable because they don't have family, they may not have capacity. The number of people with intellectual disabilities who are before the courts and going to prison and coming out without the right support is significant and underreported. Like it's not, and certainly those people aren't getting NDIS so.

CF: Yeah I was going to ask you about people that may have intellectual disability, what happens for those individuals who may be coming out of prison or those individuals who are homeless and then going into prison in terms of some service pathways for those individuals?

KW: Well often we are not assessing people's disability appropriately and you know I think there is a real issue about people being assumed they may have an addiction rather than understanding what their capacity is in the first place. And some people with intellectual disability have lost services and unless they will go through the process of assessment with NDIS you know there is a barrier to then getting the support they could get from NDIS. But mostly there's a significant proportion of those people who need case management services, not just individualised plans yeah. And they need services that will focus on how do you be a good tenant, how do you maintain your parole. How do you stop offending as well as really looking at what are their aspirations in life, what is their health needs that can be responded to. People have significant chronic illness and they are not being screened early, they are preventable diseases and they are dying in their forties. So you know there is a whole piece of work around how you could provide these services in a more thorough way earlier so that people can access them voluntarily

versus having to go through systems that are more complex and you are either in or you are out.

CW: Karyn where are the biggest gaps as you see it at the moment with the sort of clients that you were dealing with, that you are...

KW: We believe housing is foundational to a quality of life and that a quality of life for people is different around their particular needs. So obviously people with intellectual disabilities need particular kinds of supports. People with chronic disease, we need a lot more screening of people so that we can, so that the health services can intervene earlier. They all go together and I think basically our service systems are way too silo for people to actually be able to navigate, trying to navigate you know the health system for a chronic disease or what can they do for recovery for addiction as well as self manage their mental illness, they need assistance with that because that's three systems in one. And then on top of that you have got well how do you manage your housing and be a good tenant, how do you understand your obligations as a tenant. How do you you know understand the mail that comes about what your obligations are if you are being breached. And often these things are left unattended to unless you have got intentional support that is going to really work with people in supporting them, not doing it for them but supporting them to maintain their tenancy and to access the services they need to be healthy and well. And if they can have meaningful activity all goes to employment and training.

CW: With the way government services are configured there is a department responsible for housing, another one for policing, another one for health, another one for education. How could those services be provided in a holistic way given essentially the nature of government is to have individual responsibilities?

KW: I think it starts at the top, we need better collaborative budgeting by government and really looking at well what is the cost benefit of building a prison versus how many public housing we're not going to build because we are building that prison. What is the consequences of high end tertiary interventions when we not putting a balanced investment into housing and getting people support for employment or meaningful activity. You know reducing social isolation is a critical issue to preventing offending and recivism.

CF: Karyn I wanted to ask you in terms of your client's particular needs in regards to say women with children or men with children who may be homeless and may be at risk of offending.

KW: Well that's an everyday occurrence.

CF: Yeah I just want to ask in terms of any particular needs or gaps in service delivery?

KW: Well clearly that's where some silo work could be you know addressed in so that where people lose, their children are removed and the cycle starts all over again, the rate of out of home care and juvenile justice, that has been shown in adults, we should be now paying attention to how can we prevent this generation from having that same trajectory and housing is critical to that. People lose their income when their children are removed so then they have got to try and rebuild their life without the necessary money to be able to pay the rent you need to have for a three-bedroom house versus a studio or one bedroom. But I think early intervention around supporting families and letting families nominate the support they need before they get to be a matter of concern. Certainly there could be more targeted support to families who have a member of the family in prison. You know the high rates of children are significant who have a father or a mother in jail and I think the services for those households and those families could be more targeted in a way that can support those, predominantly woman and children manage you know what needs to change. How can they get stability, how's the reintegration when their partner comes out of prison going to happen. Clearly we need a lot more services available for drug and alcohol, for recovery and for opportunities for employment for families because often they are younger so they do have the pathway for employment if they can be supported to get the work that they are going to get a job, not something that is just ticking a box to say they have done a program. Some people have done heaps of training but never actually get into the job market.

CW: Karyn somebody turns up to Micah as a client, fresh out of prison say, no job, relationship is in trouble, no housing. Housing is a priority clearly. If they contact the Department of Housing what happens? What does it look like when somebody comes out, they need accommodation urgently.

KW: Well the first, the easiest thing to do is the housing application form but not everyone does it so people have to be referred to an agency that will do the housing application form. People will need assistance to get ID, people will then be prioritised according to need. People may not have high need, or not, it depends on how they fill out the form.

CW: So days, weeks or months could go by.

KW: Oh years.

CW: Years.

KW: Yes so but there are, there are opportunities to get into the private rental market which some people take, they are just not as sustainable as social housing in terms of affordability because the market is up and down. You know people may sell their properties or, we are seeing a lot of stress after about 18 months because rents go up or the house has been sold or, so I mean the cost saving is instability, not in people going through systems all the time. But there are things that people can access so if people come to our service or any other homeless funded service they would get assistance to be referred to those sort of products they call them. So whether it's rent assistance or a bond loan. But people you know have to go through well what has their history been, what is their tenant history so we have to help them document that. And then of course you know some people are discriminated, certainly indigenous people can't get into private rental market as easy. If people have a criminal history it can be an issue. So you know the odds are against them. It is a lot of navigating multiple systems.

CF: Thank you.

CW: How many people are sleeping rough by choice?

KW: None as far as I'm concerned. People may answer that question that yeah I don't want a house. They don't want a house as they perceive it is being offered and what they have lived in before or that they don't feel they can navigate, or they are unwell and sometimes it's about working through that process with them and certainly working with them what is the kind of housing, it's not just one size fits all but what would work for them. Because it's really hard to get, some people are still on the streets for five years or more that we know and it's getting the right housing type that is going to suit their circumstances, their behaviours, their you know abilities in some cases. So it's really making sure that we do a much better job of matching the right housing with the right person and the right level of services that people need.

CF: Thank you Karyn. Are you finished?

CW: I have got one or two more questions. People that are significantly cognitively impaired is there hope at the end of the day for somebody that really is struggling to manage life, sleeping rough, accessing services from time to time but may also be battling significant chronic illnesses of various sorts. Is there a place for them?

KW: There is definitely hope, we just need to fund it right like so it's about the housing with the services. You know and don't expect one social worker to have all the skills, like you will need clinicians. You will need people to, most people who are rough sleeping who have intellectual disabilities, they have had experience of abuse, there has been

significant abuse of power. 25 percent of the people that are on the streets were in and out of home care and experienced abuse. From people who are 17 today to people who are 80. So people who, as the Royal commission into institutional responses to child abuse has demonstrated that this is a much bigger population and I mean Queensland has one of the highest rates of people going to the Royal Commission in the prisons because of their experience of childhood sexual abuse in detention centre or if they were in as a 17 year old in an adult prison. So those experiences don't mean that people can just rock up and trust you so we have to have the ability to work with people to gain their trust and also to problem solve together so that the right solution for them can be found rather than an imposition and saying well you have got to take this or it is nothing and recognise that some people need constant support because their abilities are different.

CW: Over the next say 12 months, if there was funding out there, if things were different what are the building blocks we need to put in place over the next 1 to 2 years. What are the first major things that you would do if you....

KW: Well we definitely have to address housing and make that housing as stable as it can be or a pathway. You know there is some evidence in other countries that transitional housing does have a place with post release as long as when it's finished there isn't a pathway to, there is a pathway to secure tenancy and housing. And that would be true of a lot of areas. I think there needs to be you know services obviously with a number of people going in for breaches of domestic violence, there needs to be more issues around how people are going to resolve that and the relationships that they've got. How are they going to resolve living in the community even though they have got protection orders. You know people need to navigate that system so that they are not breaching all the time and they need to know that violence is wrong, that you know relationships need to be safe. And it's about getting the investment that isn't so quick that you have got to be, finish it within six months because that's just not going to happen but we have got to get the capital investment alongside the services investment and as much as possible join them up because at the moment we have got a lot of fragmentation. And you know really looking at the data and looking at well what is the data saying about what people's needs are and then across the government have a collaborative plan that says which department will invest how much money and how do they work together and then how do the programs that are funded work in a multidisciplinary way versus a whole lot of silos.

CW: I can't argue with your answer, that's a pretty strong view of the world. Do you have anything?

CF: No I have got no further questions.

CW: Are there any comments from the floor on what we have heard so far? Would anybody care to make a comment?

AUDIENCE: I probably will.

CW: Please.

AUDIENCE: Hi Bronwyn.

CF: Good morning.

AUDIENCE: I think the other thing with people living in poverty(?) is the homeless too and trying to find accommodation is what do they do with their pets and often those pets are family, they are the only form of protection that people have if they are out on the street living rough yet the housing markets can often deny people access to housing because of the pet. And with the young people I have worked with they have often said my pet can't come with me, I will stay where I am and I think that's another area that we need to be looking at as well.

KW: Well that's just a rule that can be changed like...

AUDIENCE: But it's an important thing for people.

KW: Yeah it is yeah. And I do think we need investment into indigenous managed services that are connected up with the health systems as well because people need to reconnect with culture as a basic protective principle, it's not just about someone being culturally competent. It's you know people are being really disconnected to it and it's trauma upon trauma and those issues need to be resolved within the context of self-determination and indigenous managed services connecting the dots with what they already have, you know the systems that are already in place. Like a fantastic primary health care system and making sure that those you know connections are maintained over time.

CW: Thank you. We have definitely heard about housing, access to services and health matters multiple times from multiple contributors to our body of work here. There is no question you are hitting the main issues out there.

KW: I'd just like to say that I think it needs to be a partnership approach with the community sector, that it isn't something government can do alone and a referral pathway doesn't do it on its own. That the design of the programs is really critical and then the voluntary engagement, the time and relationship building which we are sort of losing in our community services procurement processes these days and I think they need to be really valued that you know you need a safety net, you don't just need a referral.

CW: Could you unpack that just a little further when you say you think we are losing it. Are you able to provide examples?

KW: Well I think a lot of us get funding now where you know all referrals have to come from this prison or all referrals have to come from this hospital or, a person can't come in and say I want a service, I want to work with you unless they go through - like you know there would be examples. You don't want people to have to offend before they can get a service.

CW: No.

KW: You don't want someone who has served their time for a crime that they have committed and been accountable and to be labelled an ex-prisoner all their life. Like we want to maintain healthy levels of citizenship that allow people to have the safety net they deserve as a right and that includes health care and housing and individualised support if there is disability or mental illness that is ongoing. So I think there has to be a bit more trust in government and not for profit sector working together to design those programs, to get those outcomes because you are never going to get it just by a database that says well we are referring from here to there and you finish within six months. That's not going to achieve the outcome you need. We are talking about generations of poverty and trauma and you know as the evidence has shown people being in and out of the criminal justice system so we have to put the same investment into the solution. And often the investment that goes into the solution is half the price and so we need to value this as something that a healthy society needs, like a healthy society needs people. And in the end it saves money because people are healthier and supported and have a place to live whereas I think all the evidence is showing the more we cut these things, and some of them are Commonwealth issues in terms of the way our income security is no longer a safety net, it's very punitive. If people don't keep a set of rules and regulations they lose income and then that means that there is a whole set of consequences. So the state can't solve all of those things but the state could choose to do rent subsidies if they want to or put in more money to support people earlier to navigate that income system so that it doesn't end up that basically people have no income for three months and they have to live on the street because they have been breached of their income. That's not a safety net. And that is blaming the individual versus looking at what are the foundational blocks we need as a society to have a healthy society for everyone and not leave people behind, not have the inequality grow. That's what we have fundamentally got to look at, not you only get this service if you are meeting the obligations or you are excluded because it's not, that's not going to work for the people we are talking about.

CW: No, I am so glad that you are out there and others like you worrying about people that are vulnerable and in need so keep up the good work and I hope that we can be of some assistance throughout the process here.

KW: I thought your paper was great.

CW: Thank you Karyn.

CF: Just on the draft paper, the draft report. There is some data and our previous public hearing and our consultations to date people have said you know there was components not in there, there was some components around indigenous data not in there and some other cross linked data. At the time of the draft report we hadn't received some of that information, we have now so that will be in the final report so I wanted to assure people here today that will be in. And just as Karyn has highlighted in her presentation around some correlations between you know people who have had their children removed or in fact been, resulted in being removed as a child are now grown up, along with women or men and people with mental health issues is direct and we found in the data there is significant combinations of those now and factors relating across the groups as well. So if someone has been in child protection or had children removed and have a mental illness they are more than likely to end up in the criminal justice system so the data...

KW: Which isn't a great outcome for that investment.

CF: Well the data speaks to that now so we have the data.

KW: Yeah so thank you for doing the report and the commission because I think it's really critical part of evidence that we all need to get the investment rebalanced.

CF: That's right.

CW: We hope that the final report which will include a comprehensive data analysis and provides some pretty confronting statistics by the way from the data we are seeing so far, but we now have that where we are currently going through the unpacking process. We will flesh out, we think considerably the current state of play and we will help refine the recommendations. It should be said that we don't come up with the recommendations out of thin air, this public consultation process is crucial for us and the sorts of evidence we will hear today will shape and drive the recommendations we make. You did a great job Karyn.

KW: Thank you.

CW: It's much appreciated, keep up the good work.

KW: Thanks.

CW: Thank you.

CF: So we have 10 minutes at this time. The next speaker will be on at 10 o'clock. We are going to keep to schedule, we are not going to move people up in the line to go early because there will be people that may come in specifically to hear speakers so we will take a short recess of about 10 minutes and then reconvene to hear the next speaker, thank you.

(BREAK IN HEARING)

CF: Just a reminder to turn your phones off or on silent if you had them on during the break so it doesn't pick up on the video. The session is being video recorded. The next speaker undertaking the presentation is Mr David Cormack and David is the chairperson for the Prison Fellowship Group so I will hand it over to you David and state your name, where you are from for the purpose of the video and then go into your presentation thank you.

DC: Yes good morning. My name is David Cormack, I am the Chair of Prison Fellowship Queensland which is part of Prison Fellowship Australia. We have provided two submissions to the enquiry and to understand I guess our second submission you really have to have touched base on our first submission. Our first submission was in relation to a restorative program that we conduct in prisons and principally it's been conducted in the Southern Queensland Correctional Centre since 2011. And that program involves taking crime survivors or victims of crime into a custodial setting such as that centre out at Gatton and over an eight week program meeting with offenders and working through a range of topics. And the people involved are not the actual offender and the actual victim but people of like offences so for instance we have taken in people who have lost loved ones to murder, we have taken in people who have been the subject of violent sexual assaults, armed robberies, those sorts of things and then they meet with people who are serving sentences for those sorts of offences. And then they work through a model of trying to get to know each other and then working through the effects of the offence from the crime survivors perspective, we call that the ripple effect and how that has changed their lives and then there is also a process where the offenders talk about how they have got to that point and then there's an opportunity for some healing where there is an option for people to write down a letter as if they were writing to for instance their offender. So the victim writes a letter and sets out where they are at and the inmate does the same thing.

Appreciatively these letters can't be sent to the actual people but it literally takes two weeks and it is near the end of the course for them to be able to undertake that task because it is a monumental task for people to reflect about that from each perspective.

And then they share those letters in the group and all of this is undertaken in a group setting and it's heavily reliant on dialogue and storytelling basically. It's not a program where people work through a manual and watch PowerPoint slides and that sort of thing, it's heavily reliant on engaging with each other. And then at the end there is a graduation and a celebration and we have had you know numerous members of the judiciary participate and as a parliament as well as members of the community who come to the celebration service to see how this actually works. They have the opportunity to speak to the crime survivors and they have the opportunity to speak to the inmates as well. And there is videos on You Tube and other resources that are included in the submission that are publicly available if you want to see how that all works.

So our initial submission was about that and then we noticed in the draft report that there was a recommendation that there would be a restorative aspect to the sentencing process and how would that work. So where we have been engaged is because there is no mechanism for that to happen under our current model because we have been engaged with people generally right at the end of their sentence. So they may be looking you know to be released in the next two years. The course that we undertake is not for parole, it's not accredited for parole so it has the benefit of, and the people the way they are selected are genuinely involved because it's not just a course that people complete to be able to you know put on their material for the parole board. But it has the disadvantage that it is happening you know 10, 15 years after offences and so when the draft paper suggested well how would this work if we actually included it in the sentencing process sort of front end, we put in another submission about that. And I will touch a bit about that today.

And it's appreciatively a novel area, I mean other jurisdictions, the ACT, Victoria have similar concepts and engage in that way so we have sort of touched from there. But from our perspective it would have to do be included as part of the legislative framework so you have a piece of legislation called the Penalties and Sentences Act that governs the principles that you know judicial officers would have to apply when sentencing an offender. We suggest that it should be incorporated in that legislation if it is to have any teeth so that judicial officer would then be able to consider the relative principles that are set out in the Act as to what needs to happen.

As to the mechanics of how all that would work I guess as they say the devil is in the detail because you would, in our opinion you would need to be engaging people that have intimated they will be entering a plea of guilty. That's in our opinion the only way it could appreciably work, it couldn't work in any setting where the offender was contesting

the offence because in our experience the key to any restorative process is that there has to be some acknowledgement of fault and so you would need to be engaging people who have indicated that. And as to the role of the crime survivor or the victim, it's a little bit tricky at that stage because many, many crime survivors at that stage are very raw, they still are very impacted by what has happened and they may not be in a position to engage in the process, they may not psychologically be up to it. There are those that are in a position and for that reason there would have to be a support base to provide a screening as to those people who would be able to realistically participate and to provide support for them as they go through that process by way of counselling or other measures. There are a variety of groups, I guess the most notable group is the group called Blue Knott, they are working in the space of the historical sexual abuse, they are providing training for people who are involved in trauma informed care, groups like that. And there are others obviously are engaged already with people who have been subject to horrendous criminal offences. So they would need some sort of support through that mechanism as well. But if you have an offender who is indicating a willingness to want to participate and you don't have a crime survivor or victim which is what we find often the case is you would have to consider in our opinion the use of a surrogate victim, so not the actual person involved in the offence because if you are, and it depends you know the focus, if the focus is that you are looking to reduce recidivism and you are looking to engage with the offender then you can still do that with a surrogate victim so that that person has to go through that process where they, they understand the effect of their crime and engage and develop empathy for what has happened because that is the key marker from our reviews of reducing offending is that you have to do build empathy and offenders don't have empathy and that's one of the matters that I guess was a bit surprising for us is that it took you know until probably week four or five of the course for the offenders to start the process that what they had done actually was a huge deal for the victims. And a lot of offenders who may have committed armed robberies and that they haven't shot anyone, or they have broken into someone's house and you know they have just taken stuff, they don't, they don't process the way we process and say well you know that actually really, really affected that person. That person can't leave their home anymore or they have lost their relationships, their marriage has broken down or they haven't been able to interact with their kids because they say oh you know I didn't hurt anyone, I didn't shoot anyone. I, they have got an insurance policy to cover what I took and they don't really process because the dysfunctionality of their lives up until that point in time has calloused and hardened those parts of their brain and their emotions to actually register empathy. And it's not until they are in an environment say

in the course that we engage in where the person there is not there to judge them, they are there simply to engage in the process and dialogue with them that they start to understand this person's life has been horrendously affected and it's been affected by something that I have done to someone else. And that means that that person whose life would also have been affected.

So in that respect we think that a surrogate victim would be useful if the actual victim wouldn't participate and wasn't in a position to participate if you're looking to actually engage the offender and reduce the risks of the offender reoffending. As to the agreement that they reach which is part of the draft report as to you know the victim and the offender can reach an agreement in relation to the sentence, again that's going to be a very sticky issue because there will be as, invariably there are in situations where you get to know someone and speak to them with fairly intense subjects, there is going to be an imbalance in terms of I guess you can call it power but there is going to be an imbalance in the ability to actually find the correct sentence. So for that reason we suggest that the agreement that the offender and the victim reach still has to be subject to review of an independent body so you know ordinarily you would have a prosecutor involved in these matters and it should either go before a like type body to see that there is some parity in the options you know because when matters go before courts they like to keep you know some sort of guidance to well if this sort of offence happened these are the sort of sentence you can receive so you would need to keep some sort of parity for sentences but still to give the offender the benefit of having engaged in the process and a reduction in the sentence. They should in our opinion still be entitled to that because they are saving the resources, they are assisting the victim if the victim is actually participating and they are hopefully going to cost society less in terms of reoffending which is obviously an enormous cost.

In terms of you know the balance there is just an enormous array of support that needs to take place. After that who engages in the facilitation between the victim and the offender. You know these people would need a mediator or a facilitator to help them navigate that process. You would need to obviously have qualified people to do that should those people be part of you know the Attorney General or the, you know another arm of the government or should they be an independent body that needs to be clearly thought out. Because in our experience working in prisons the one advantage we have is that because we are a not-for-profit organisation we are accepted by both sides because we are not there as part of the system, we are not being paid. We are there because people accept that we genuinely want to be involved and so there is a potential that if, it just becomes another arm of government that people will, and even if it's the

wrong perception, people have the wrong perception that it is simply going to be part of a process and another bureaucratic step that's engaged in and the person isn't really engaged in what I'm trying to do or listening to me. So there is the option we suggest of engaging not-for-profit organisations to do that and the benefit of that of course is they tend to be able to deliver services in a more affordable way. They have you know the use of volunteers for many aspects, they have the use of other networks that allow them to actually deliver services very efficiently.

So that is one of our recommendations that needs to be considered as well as you know the training of the people and whether you sort of settle on a facilitator type model or a mediator type model. These are matters that require considerable thought. There is, I guess a range of other matters but I might take a breather and allow for questions before I get into the other substance.

CF: Thank you David, that was really comprehensive in terms of some of the work you are doing, your organisation and thanks too for the submission from your organisation to the enquiry. I just want to ask we, and also make a comment that we have had, and we can see from the information available really low traction in terms of restorative processes. Why do you think that is in terms of also what do you think the barriers are then to bringing those into play because certainly there are barriers in the past and we have a low incidence of seeing those and that's going to be something we need to address in going forward.

DC: Well the biggest barrier is that people perceive anything other than locking up people for long periods of time as being soft on crime and it is very unfortunate that that message is very, is the default message, whether it's you know on any media you look at, whichever politician, whichever side of politics. It is always when these issues come up you know we'll be tough on crime, we will increase sentences, we will increase minimum parole periods. We will introduce mandatorily sentencing, we will do this, we will do that. And as soon as you say well you know maybe there is an alternative or you don't do that they say that is soft on crime. My response to that and we have got videos where our crime survivors have spoken to us and we have recorded those is it's not soft on crime. When we go into the prisons and engage with the inmates they are literally petrified. You know this is the first time they have had to have any sort of serious dialogue with a victim you know and they are mortified. You know these are people who are accustomed to doing violent offences or a range of other activities and they are just absolutely mortified because they have to do deal with issues, and it's not just the victim impact statement where you know it gets read out and, or the victim speaks for 10 minutes and 15 minutes

of that is that and they tune out. They have to be engaged for eight weeks, they have to see this person you know for lengthy periods of time. And until people understand that that is a tough process and it is by no means soft on crime people will just go to the default option which it can sell in 15 seconds we will increase this sentence, we will make that sentence mandatorily. But to be able to discuss this issue you know you have got to engage people's attention for you know 30 minutes and that's almost impossible these days. So that's your single biggest barrier is persuading people that if you engage in this process you are going to reduce your risks but people have to be willing to listen and I would invite you know as part of that process that they engage with the victims and, that have participated in our course over the years and say well what was your perception of the inmates and did you see the inmates taking on board what you are saying and actually making a change in their lives. So that's you know the tough on crime barrier is going to be your single biggest barrier from my perspective.

CF: Thank you David. I am just wondering also if you had, or do you know of or you visited maybe some of the New Zealand programs or Canadian programs at all? Are you aware of those?

DC: Well they are, yes I am. Our model which is the Zigmortary(?) project is based on an international model and our training was done by New Zealand. So New Zealand who have been delivering this project for decades so our facilitator, a fellow by the name of Martin Howard went to New Zealand, was accredited in training and has now since become accredited to deliver the training here. But yes, the New Zealand model is largely what we have modelled ourselves on.

CF: Yeah because I am aware that that model allows for some regional differences, rural and remote differences as opposed to urban or high needs and also it depends on in terms of different types of crimes as well.

DC: Yes and so for instance you know one of the barriers we have identified is working with indigenous inmates so for instance in Lotus Glen outside of Mareeba we would need to change our model and have stories from people in a video content because of the difficulties indigenous inmates have in dealing with things face-to-face. So there are matters that would have to change depending on the matters involved.

CF: Thank you, Commissioner Wood?

CW: David are there some crimes that just aren't appropriate for this method of justice? For instance sexual crimes, rape, things like that? It's a question, not a majority statement, I'm really just interested to see what your response is?

DC: We have found that because historically any sort of sexual offence was off-limits when we first got approval from Corrective Services but we have found that it is not a barrier. It really does come down to I guess the screening of the people willing to participate so we don't randomly engage people to participate in the course. We are a faith-based organisation, we have volunteer chaplains and the chaplains will submit names. Those names go to management, the management check that there is no reason why those people can't participate, they haven't breached various conduct or other matters and then those people engage in the course. So key to any participation is making sure that the offender genuinely wants to participate and he is not simply doing it for some other reasons and that would be a significant hurdle I guess in any you know restorative justice at the sentencing end because it would be quite difficult to screen that but you really do need to engage with the offender just to see how genuine they are in wanting to participate in the process.

CW: Thank you for that. I have another question. How scalable is the process? This will be resource and time intensive and look you know in a system where the legislation supports formally the process and potential allows for some discount of sentencing if you go through a process, there is some costs to be saved. How scalable is it? Can it be applied to a wide range of participants or is this, will this be a niche type activity?

DC: It will be very difficult to mainstream it simply because it is resource intensive. What we have recommended in our submission is that a pilot program is undertaken in places like obviously Brisbane, Southport and other hotspots like Townsville to see what the wrinkles are. We undertook a pilot study to commence our course and as part of that pilot process we had one of the clinical psychologists from the centre you know observing how it worked for the eight weeks. So you would need to develop protocols for your pilot study before I think you took further steps of how to roll it out.

CF: Just wondering David in terms of the screening and you have talked, mentioned screening a number of times. I mean the importance of screening participants to ensure they are suitable. What about in terms of currently we have delays and we have you know a lot of time where people are waiting to be sentenced. So is there instances where screening could be fast tracked or where screening is not as, maybe not as intensively needed as other times?

DC: And again I think this is where you know the use of not for profit groups might be a bit of a band wagon because you know I have seen the work they do but it allows you to engage in that process, there's plenty of groups that could undertake that screening process for you at an affordable cost to see whether the person, including you know both

the offender and the victim were in place to engage in it. And you're right you know, nothing happens quickly when it comes to sentencing. So you would have that, the benefit of that. And then obviously there is a cost, who is going to pay for it all.

CF: That's right. Commissioner Wood, did you have any further questions?

CW: I do. David it has been to, it's been mentioned in some of our interactions with the judiciary, the Department of Justice and others that there are, there is some scope for restorative justice within the current legislative framework. Do you have any comments about that?

DC: I think you know what you have is, and I guess this was picked up in the first draft report about, they're really just hotch potch and they're not really designed for, to be engaged with the criminal offence and there is no support mechanism to enable it. I mean I know there are mediators that can engage in restorative justice but there is no real pathway for a criminal offence to go you know through that in any sort of structured way. It's just you know we have got a couple of sections in this Act and we have got another couple of sections in another Act and you know maybe you can find a pathway through all of those. That never works and it hasn't worked because it hasn't been used. People don't know about it and don't know what the mechanism is and how you put it all together. So none of those, you know I think there is four other pieces of legislation that was in the draft report and it hasn't worked.

CW: I think you have been clear. Another question. If the legislative framework did exist and if the mechanism was there, what is to stop an offender from gaming a system like this? What would the mechanisms need to be to stop gaming for reduced sentence? You know if there is an incentive for a lower sentence or a shorter sentence I assume there would be some attraction for having a go at it, whether you are serious or not.

DC: I guess you know that's part of, and you know they are imperfect but that's part of the screening process and it's also part of I think the role of the independent body for whatever agreement is reached. How engaged that body becomes is another issue and it's hopefully if you have the right facilitators and mediators then I think you would need to have them involved, they would be in tune with whether the person was engaged or just trying to tick a box as part of the process. They might game the mediator and facilitator but you know there is, you need the appropriate checks and balances in place for that. Because ultimately what you're trying to do is reduce the person reoffending so you know if the person isn't interested in the process but is only interested in the reduced sentence then it's not going to be beneficial.

CW: I guess that leads then to a follow-up question. What is the evidentiary base like internationally to support restorative justice process? As you noted one of our draft recommendations supports restorative justice process. And I guess our visits to Murri Court. We see echoes of restorative justice to some degree. It's really encouraging and really positive. Is there an international evidentiary base that is compelling?

DC: There is a variety of studies and they all have different outcomes. There is no sort of accepted evidentiary based that says you know you get X percent. What you do get is you do get a, generally a significant reduction in the reoffending. Now that may range in percentage but the other outcome and I guess one of the main outcomes that have driven our participation and work is that the changes to life of the victim that participates. So we sort of see our role fairly uniquely in that we are working with inmates but we are very conscious of the impact of the offence on the victim and we see the benefit to the victim just as much as the benefit to the offender. So for that reason we think that there is a cost benefit to society, not just in terms of that person will hopefully not offend again but that there will be less cost to society for the broken lives of the victims.

CF: I might open up to the floor. I am going to swing back across now to the floor and ask if there's any comments from people on the floor. Yes please state your, remember to please say your name and where you are from.

WS: Wayne Sanderson, I am a Clinical Psychologist most of the time and I am the Uniting Church Minister entirely retired and I have been working for seven years with the Balance Justice Campaign which is addressing totally the youth justice system in Queensland over this reform process but I am very curious, everybody (ui) of course. I am very curious to hear from you. Does your work also, is your work also done with people on remand as well as people who have been sentenced?

DC: No, no they won't, Corrective Services won't let us anywhere near people on remand.

WS: Because I had in mind some people spend a long time in remand.

DC: They have to have been sentenced.

WS: Thank you.

CF: Any further comments? Yes.

PR: Can I make a comment that...

CF: Please, please say who you are.

PR: My name is Peter Russo, I'm the State member for Toohey.

CF: Thank you Peter.

PR: And a member of the Labour Party. I just want to pick up on this tough on crime debate that goes on. I just invite people to have a look at what happened in Parliament this week. The LNP introduced two bills asking for increased penalties in relation to the firearm offences, they also asked for increased penalties for trespassers in relation to the protesters that are going onto private farms. And they are actually running a campaign, this gets personal but we are supposed to be tougher than this they tell me. But they are actually running the campaign against me because of, my former life I was a defence lawyer and I think anyone who knows me, knows my stance in relation to penalties. And so we have got a real issue in this state when you have one particular part-, and I'm going to have to get political and I apologise for that in advance for the non-believers but. But when you have one particular political party that is going to push this law and order agenda the public really don't, without being disrespectful to the great work that happens here but selling that message out in the public is really difficult. I will give you another example. In the Courier Mail this week Sarah Fogel, she wrote an article about basically get out of jail free referring to the Queensland sentencing authorities inquiries into basically prison time et cetera, I am paraphrasing. And that was picked up on and what then, the next retic that was coming on WeChat and social media was never vote Labour because if you vote Labour this is the type of thing you will have. Now I know we're not without sin, we, and you know all I can tell you is that I argue very strongly in caucus and...

CF: I am going to interrupt you Peter and refer that we are taking comments on the presentations and I ask people...

PR: Well the...

CF: People to comment on what the presentations are and not to enter into other spaces thank you.

PR: Yeah well what I'm trying to say is if you are going to sell this idea of doing the restorative justice there are a lot of other, the retic that will be run that this is another example of people being soft on crime.

CF: Thank you Peter for your comment. We take any further comments from members. I have got one over here and then you. So please remember who you are and where you are from and then talk to the issue.

DD: Yeah David Dundas from Anglican Prison Ministry. David thank you very much for your presentation today, for your submissions. Thank you also for the work that you're doing

out at Gatton and the work you do there with the prisoners. I work with a lot of high profile prisoners and my concern is that when victims are informed that they are about to be released the victims often call for public support that they be returned to prison despite having completed their term of offence. It continues to show that their grief has not been dealt with and one of the issues I have with that is that in our court system, we have a court system which tries to remove the decision about if the sentence the perpetrator needs to have taking out the emotion of the situation for the victim, I understand that but the consultation process that we're talking about in restorative justice, how can we extend that do you think so that consultation starts earlier in the process and does it always have to be with surrogate people so that we avoid, so that the community can be more involved in the process of discussing sentencing and overcoming, and dealing with the grief as it occurs? Do you understand what I'm saying, trying to say David?

DC: Yeah it's all very hard.

DD: It is very hard yes, I think it works with the historical justice issues.

DC: It's, you know I guess it's, it will take an enormous shift in public perception to move away from immediately wanting retribution or always wanting to penalise someone even though they have completed their offence, especially if you know they are a dangerous prisoner, sexual offence and they are coming back into the community. We have worked with notorious prisoners in those circumstances to provide some sort of refuge for them and also to provide an alternative so that the police don't have to be in constant supervision and use the police powers to you know monitor these people. But to change you know that default mechanism where people simply want retribution is going to take enormous process because that is so easily the natural inclination and it's what gets media attention. This person is grieving, this is a horrible person, here is what they have done, why should they be allowed back into my community, my school's you know two kilometres down the road. I don't want this horrible person around. When the reality is that those people are at more risk of an offence against them from someone they already have in their community and who is known to them. We have dealt with sexual offenders who are so well-known that the prospect of any offence, new offence taking place is zero because they are severely monitored, not severely but constantly monitored and you have people in the same community living with family members who were more likely to commit an offence of that nature in the same community. And it fails to understand the risk analysis of what is taking place but for people to engage in that process and

understand that this person despite all the horrible things they have done is unlikely to be a risk to them doesn't sell, it's not a news item.

CF: We're going to wind it up I think.

CW: I think we have got one final question.

CF: One final comment and if you can be very brief please because we are now over time.

PB: Paul Bryden, an Anglican Chaplain at Woodford. Thank you for your presentation. I think an aspect of it which is very important is that it is community-based and I am involved in Kairos Prison Ministry which is also community-based and I know that the men really appreciate seeing people from outside of the system taking an interest in them and I would certainly encourage the authorities to look for opportunities to invite local community members, maybe the local librarian to come and help the library, anything like that to help the men feel that they are in contact with the community. Thank you.

CF: Thank you. We are going to close that there. I am going to finish the session now, we're going to then enter into morning tea for a short break. We are due back at 11 o'clock. We will have the next presentation then okay so please enjoy and have a short break.

CW: Thank you David, well done thank you.

(BREAK IN HEARING)

CF: Right people can resume their seats, that's great. Just to remind people the session is being taped. When we move to opening to comments for people to please state their name and where they are from, it's really important for the taping. I just also want to remind people, because I was asked earlier around how people get a copy of the draft report since it has been referred to by presenters this morning and it will be no doubt referred to going forward from now until this afternoon, later today. The draft report as all of our other documentation in terms of submissions, information sheets, details around our consultation process is all available on the QPC website and as per all enquiries undertaken by the QPC, information is all made available to the public or anybody who has interest. So just to be clear on that. There is no secret information reserved away from anyone, it's all put out there so that people can look at what has been said and also the submissions that come in are also put up onto the web unless someone specifically says they don't want their submission to be made public or it has information in there which may compromise individuals.

All right we now have Professor Paul Mazarolle.

PM: That's right.

CF: Who is going to present his presentation now to the audience and myself and Commissioner Wood, thank you Paul.

CW: Thank you Paul, take a seat.

PM: Yeah thank you and thanks for the opportunity to speak to you today about this topic of imprisonment and recidivism. My background, I am the Pro Vice Chancellor of Arts Education Law, Griffith University. I direct the violence, research and prevention program and I am a criminologist by training and have been active in that area since almost 30 years. So what I, I would like to begin by talking about some general comments to my submission but also focus more specifically on the imprisonment impact on recidivism and the opportunities for reform going forward.

I have got seven points by way of general introduction. Firstly is in relation to the key causes and risk factors for offending. I think we need to start with the proposition that the causes and the risk factors for offending are multiple. They span individual, social, familial, educational, peer relationships, community context as well. And so we need to recognise that if we are talking about changing offending behaviour we need to understand how it is caused to begin with. If we are talking about changing, whether through intervention or prevention we need to understand the whole gamut.

Secondly is the recognition around the role of offender typologies and different pathways. There is increasing evidence that if you're talking about who becomes a young person on an offending trajectory, there is at least two dominant pathways in the evidence, in the literature. Terry Moffat's work is the best work I have seen in the last 25 years that have clearly documented what are kind of more analyst(?) and limited pathways of offending versus what are called life course persistent, they have different causes of their offending trajectories and they require different kinds of interventions. So one size fits all doesn't always respond to the underlying causes.

The third issue, most people who offend avoid prison, I think we need to recognise that. If you look at the crime funnel for, only about 2 to 3 percent of offending generally across the community ends up in an institution. So if you're talking about changing behaviour, changing what happens in prison can have an impact on recidivism and the crime rate but it won't affect everything because most people who offend don't end up in prison. So I think we need to recognise that. However most people who are in prison are the more serious offenders and it makes sense to be targeting their criminogenic needs and risks because you can have a big impact on the crime rate, particularly if they are high rate offenders.

Fourthly most people who offend eventually desist from offending and so and that's been documented in the literature for quite some time even though we can have a sole subset of persistent offenders, usually about six percent of any birth cohort up to 15 to 20 percent of the delinquency cohort but most people actually desist over time. Even high rate offenders can slow down over time and those periods of desistance, even for the serious offenders you know are seen through opportunities for marriage and intimate relationships, connections to other people, social integration, access to education, job skills and jobs. Those are some of the protector factors for the twenties and thirties which redirect peoples criminal offending.

Recidivism rates are high, we know that, there is good evidence to, to demonstrate that. When I used to work at the CMC we did a project called project Astor which was a Queensland based study which demonstrated that, which looked at pathways from the juvenile justice system to the adult justice system, it was a very well done, very comprehensive study but it showed that if you were a young male, indigenous person with a child protection involvement in the child protection system you had about a 90 percent chance of being involved in the adult system. So there is very strong connections from juvenile justice system involvement and adult system involvement. So we know recidivism rates are high but that doesn't mean that we can't do something to address that.

The sixth general comment before I keep moving on is the importance of effective policy responses. There are opportunities to address and to change the situation. It's not easy, there are not a lot of short-term fixes but there are long-term approaches that have a battery of dimensions.

Firstly we need to avoid the quick fix common sense approaches which I have spoke about previously, that kind of focus on what's called correctional quackery. The belief that there is easy solutions to the complex responses to crime, there is not. Secondly there is a need to embrace evidence informed approaches, not necessarily approaches that are entirely evidence based, but things that have evidence backing them up, evidence informed approaches. And thirdly there is a need to understand the role of the individual, the familial context, the ecological context and the institutional context. So if you're talking about policy responses to crime what we need to understand are the individual risks, we need to know the familial risks, we need to know the ecological nesting. If they are leaving prison and going back home well what does home look like, which neighbourhood is it in? Do they have access to services, are they surrounded by the criminogenic influences which lead them to get in trouble in the first place. And then

what is institutional context where the institution, be it employment, institutions, familiar institutions, access to services et cetera. Number seven by way of general introduction is, I think a recognition that there are multiple perspectives in understanding offending behaviour and also by definition there is multiple perspectives for thinking about how you reduce recidivism. So that's thinking about the individual risk factors, the social risk factors, situational dimensions which cause offending and then the life course approach, I am what is defined as a life course criminologist so I look at what happens in the early years, the adolescent years and the adult years. So that's all of a general background.

The next heading of my submission is about what comes before prison matters. So before people end up in prison, whether it's a juvenile institution or if we target adults institutions, what happens before that occurs is very formative to why they end up in prison, I think that's obvious. So, and I have mentioned it before, the context or an individual, familial, educational, employment and peers, those contexts shape offending. So we know that kids, many kids on this life course persistent pathway are born at risk. That is that they, their, and there is pretty good evidence from Moffat's work that shows that young kids who have low birth weight or are born in families that are under stress and risk, they don't thrive as well in terms of their early childhood development, hence the need for early childhood support for those families at risk.

We know that those young kids on those pathways tend not to do well into preschool and school because they're not prepared because they have had starting points which place them at risk. And so we know that they are at a greater risk of truancy, dropout and associating within their social peer group. So there is that, what happens before prison is really really informative. Secondly in relation to juvenile offending and juvenile justice involvement we need to think seriously about what is called the dimensions of criminal careers. Onset age, chronicity, persistence, versatility, high risk offenders. So we know that the high risk offenders are ones who start earlier, usually before age 13, there is documented evidence of that so you are early onsetting young people, people who are starting fires at 11 and 12, who are stealing stuff at 13. These are risk factors for a long career in offending but also there are opportunities for intervention. These people are most likely to be at risk for chronic offending, persistent offending and what's called versatile offending, they are not just using drugs and stealing, they are also exhibiting violence in other forms of diverse offending behaviour.

And then that brings me to again just to reinforce the issues of the different typologies but also to think about a term that's used in criminology called persistent (ui) state dependence. And what that means is is that there is some conceptualisations of why

offending reoccurs, i.e. recidivism because the issue of persistent individual differences or risks for offending. So if you are 14 and you have certain risks that make you more likely to offend, those risks might still be there in five years time and they might be very difficult risks to change so whether it's personality or persistent poverty. There are persistent risks over time.

And then there is the interpretation of what is called state dependence and that says your offending leads to responses to create more opportunities for crime. So if your offending leads to you to be marginalised from school or not be able to get jobs then the offending experience is actually leading the responses that perpetuate your risks for offending behaviour in future. Both of those interpretations are relevant and can contribute to why recidivism occurs going forward.

The third point I have already made which is about major typologies, I just want to reinforce that. We have got good evidence that there are different pathways, there are different risks. Some of them involve peers, a lot of them involve peers but with the life course persistent the peer involvement is incidental to the risks whereas for adolescent limited offenders the peer influences are formative to the risks. So there are different pathways. So peers matter for both but on the former one, life course persistent offenders have the risks and they are drawing peers into the anti-social pathways.

Number four is a theme around effective interventions. We know that there is good evidence that shows early intervention can work. If you look at David Old's work out of Minnesota, the early nurse home visitation programs have had long-standing evidence on reducing violence and offending risks over like I think 20 years. So targeting and working closely with women who are about to give birth for instance and giving them background information about effective parenting, nutrition, how to look after their own health to help their young unborn child.

Parent training, Triple P, there is other parent training around the world. Out of New Zealand David Ferguson's program highly effective at giving parents the skills to deal with young kids who are presenting major, major challenges. And these challenges can be behavioural, they can be social. But having effective knowledge as a young parent to be an effective parent is really crucial. There has been evidence around the Perry Preschool program which is three years running now out of America which shows targeting kids at risk to prepare them for school is really formative and I would suggest that Ross Humbles work with the Create Program that he has been working on, Pathways to Prevention for the last 20 years is also a really local evidence-based program that can target families at risk and kids at risk with the transition to school.

The other thing I say around interventions is about targeting high-risk juvenile offenders. If you are talking about people beyond the early intervention thinking is someone who is already 14, 15 or 16 and is heavily involved with offending and on a risk for a chronic offending pathway, there are things we can still do and I think the best evidence we would find, could point to is the MST work of Scott Henniger, Multiple Systemic Therapy, approaches which are multi-focused on different ecological systems, familial educational, economic but it's a systems approach which has good evidence behind it. The second thing I would say around early, about effective innovations is that timing matters. So if you're talking about not thinking about early intervention i.e. dealing with children before school and we're not thinking about responding to 15-year-olds who have established offending repertoires but if we are talking about 10, 11 and 12-year-olds who are exhibiting seriously antisocial behaviour, lighting fires and whatnot there is a real opportunity early in the pathway before that escalates. Unfortunately our juvenile justice system responses in Queensland, in Australia, in western worlds generally have a bit of a misguided approach to this. They think that interventions are going to lead to further labelling. And I think there is good evidence that that is not the case. I think there is pretty good evidence that if, if a young child 11 or 12 is doing something antisocial they actually, it's a proxy for I need help. There is an institutional breakdown and I need some kind of intervention. Not institutionalisation but maybe the family needs support, maybe the young person needs some accountability. Maybe the young person needs some redirected social learning but what we tend to do and what the courts have shown over time is that we just go light touch, light touch, light touch. And all of a sudden two years later that young child has said well this is a toothless tiger, I can get away. And they have learned to adapt and they actually don't get messages of accountability for those two years where they have escalated in their risks.

So I think that it's based on an understanding of labelling theory which has been around for several years and it's a really important theory but what people don't realise is that those young people have already been labelled. They are already labelled as young people as antisocial so they have already escalated to antisocial, what's called secondary deviance.

My third theme is about what happens inside prison really, really matters. I know that's the main focus of this enquiry but we need to understand what happens before as well. The first point I would like to make is around access to rehabilitative programs. Rehabilitation treatment can work. It's got a really important place in institutional context. So access to effective treatment is important, access to education is important. And access to picking up skills because we know that post incarceration among the many

risk factors but access to the job is one of the biggest protector factors. Unfortunately many of the people in prison have major educational deficits, skill deficits and if they are released from prison and they don't have employment or deficits, if they don't have skills to get jobs their risk for reoffending goes through the roof. So on the issue of rehabilitation and I know that in Queensland and indeed other parts of Australia correctional authorities would be well familiar with the principles of effective intervention that have come out of Canada and North America in the last 30 years, the work of Paul (ui), Don Andrews, Jim Bonte and others, that have bought in the risk need responsivity principles you have probably heard about through this enquiry. I think the weight of the evidence is that that is still the best framework to embrace with respect to the risk principle, target the high risk offenders for the most therapeutic intervention that has evidence behind it because if you target the high risk offenders you have the biggest impact on recidivism reduction.

Secondly your need is again having programs which target criminogenic needs, so targeting things which lead to offending. And there's lots of good evidence of programs that don't work because they target things which aren't linked to criminogenic needs. Empathy is a good example. I mean I have published on the empathy, the importance of empathy before but it's not a strong risk factor for offending, lack of empathy, it is more of an incidental risk factor. And so programs that target empathy don't tend to have any impact on recidivism reduction.

The third principle is what's called responsivity and that's actually tailoring treatment programs, rehabilitative programs to the learning styles and needs of offenders. So some people might have different learning styles, they might have cognitive deficits so actually having a cognitive, a cognitive based treatment program that can be delivered to people that understand is really important. So it's all, it is not a dark art, there is real skill sets in developing treatment programs linked to principles I think that really, really matters. The other issue, I am just checking the time, I think I have got three or four more minutes.

CW: It's all right, you have got time.

PM: The second theme on the rehabilitation I would mention is in the last 25 years there has been a push particularly in America, less so in Canada, a little bit in Canada to what is moving towards correctional program assessment audits. And there is a group out of Cincinnati and Lotessa, Chris Loancamp, Alex Holsinger and others who have worked with some of the leaders in rehabilitation in the last 30 years to develop audit frameworks to go into prisons and say let's look at your treatment programs and let's have a

systematic audit of do you have the right skill set staff, do you have the right leadership, is there a correct implementation, and they actually audit correctional programs and they can rate them on low, medium, high with respect to their efficacy in light of the principles of effective intervention. Now what they find through studying, the impact of the correctional program checklist approach is that program switch have high fidelity, that have a good leadership that are rated highly on the assessments actually lead to recidivism reductions. So if the programs, it's not just about having an effective program, it's about making sure you have the right leadership, the right resources, the right staff capability et cetera. So there is good evidence that shows that assessments and audits of programs can identify programs that aren't working.

The next issue I would quickly mention about prison, there is good evidence now that misconduct in prison is highly predictive of recidivism. So what actually happens in prison, technical infractions, misconduct activity of people who are in prison, offenders in prison is highly predictive of their future recidivism risk. So the point is is that people who are heavily active of misconduct in prison is highly predictive of offending outside. And then the third theme, third and final theme under what happens in prison is about release decisions. Release decisions from prison are so important informative for recidivism, I think it can't be overstated. The role of the parole boards are really, really important.

The, one of the problems that we have seen internationally with the move away from parole board discretion and move toward mandatory release is that it leaves offenders in prison very little incentive to change so if they know that they are going to serve a longer time in prison under mandatory release, fine but there is no incentive to change the behaviour. So if you know that you're there for 10 years and you might get out after nine and a half versus getting out after six you would have a greater incentive to access treatment programs, deal you're your issues of drug addiction et cetera.

So I think the role of parole boards is very, very important in terms of creating incentives for offenders to change, to sign up to effective programs. The other challenge with parole I would say, and I have seen this in Queensland and I am certainly not an expert at it but I have seen challenges with it and I think it doesn't fit offender change behaviour is the idea of judicial and post parole. That makes no therapeutic sense in my view that you would be opposing parole decisions at the time of sentencing without giving a person at risk in prison an incentive to change because they know when they're released a decision's going to happen. So I think that's probably a quirk in Queensland, maybe in other jurisdictions which I see as majorly problematic.

The next, the fourth theme that I would say is what happens in the community after prison is also incredibly formative so there is really good evidence and I submit to you some of the major reports done over the last few years around study out of America called Returning Home looking at the challenges of prisoner re-entry so it's about family. So people who returned to a strong familial with support, that's the formative, issues of employment so access to work. It's a huge protective influence and we know that folks in prison have educational deficits and employment skill deficits so there is a chance to readdress that.

Thirdly is around clustering so many people are returning to areas of disadvantage so it's not only socio economic disadvantage but it's also disadvantage and access to peers. So in socially disadvantaged neighbourhoods where people are returning from prison they're often returning to the same environments with the same peer groups, the same criminogenic risks. So how do we protect them from getting back in crime, it's very, very difficult. The fourth issue I would say is that success in the community for community corrections turning around recidivism et cetera, it is very much dependent on the interaction between the individual, the family, the community, the role of parole supervision and employment prospects as well as access to other services. So are they going to be accessing educational services, drug treatment services? How do you do that in a regional, remote area, it's very, very challenging.

So I have listed six areas for reform and then I will stop and am happy to take questions. The first one I would argue is the pro-release mechanisms. I would strongly suggest to maintain the role of parole board discretion, in fact reinforce that as an important lever for creating incentives and motivations for offenders to change and access effective treatment in prison. I think that really can't be overstated. Secondly is the focus on the delivery of effective treatment programs in prison targeted to offenders with high risk levels. I know that probably happens but sometimes there could be slippage. So, which is not to say that people should be ignored in prison, but if you're talking about accessing the most effective, the most expensive therapeutically cognitive behavioural change programs you have to target the people at the greatest risk for recidivism.

I think related to that is a commitment to assessing program effectiveness through established audit programs such as correctional program inventory or checklist I think would be going a long way because it would allow an institution or a system to say we have 40 programs, which ones are most effective. I think you need to do that through a systematic audit.

Thirdly is a renewed commitment to the development of community correction programs which are effective. So we need to ask questions about are the programs that we are delivering now and are they really effective? How are they delivered, who is delivering them? Do those folks who deliver them understand offender change models, are they well versed in the therapeutic approaches to target criminogenic needs. Are effective treatment programs available in areas of need, et cetera. Are programs assessed as effective meaning are we evaluating these programs. If you take domestic violence which is just one area but is so important, and I do work in this area. Right now we tend to take a one size fits all with respect to domestic violence perpetration and there is good evidence that they don't work. The best evidence shows that Gondoff's approach is targeting a select group of offenders but we know with domestic violence there are at least three different typologies so people might address some of the domestic violence risks but they don't address the other risks which leaves them to recidivate.

So fourthly is a, I would argue an enhanced focus on education and skill acquisition for offenders with a view toward educational employment pathways for incarcerated offenders. One of the biggest protective factors will be getting a job, having an intimate relationship where there's commitment and love, access to education. So if we can give people more access to education, better skills to get a job and deal with some of their personalities challenges which make relationships difficult we would go a long way to insulating them from recidivism. You are effectively giving them more reasons to conform than reasons to offend.

Fifthly is about staffing capability, they need to be boosted. Boost staff capability in effective interventions, risk assessment, offender change models, program evaluation. We need to have organisations where staff are committed to (ui) therapy. What I mean by that is reading literature, reading what works, reading what effective treatment programs are and so organisations need to have models where they can make this information available. Not just to the people that work with the treatment program but the frontline officers that they become well versed. And wow, we can actually help this person so we won't see him or her back again in two years time. And lastly is really an enhanced commitment to research innovation and evaluation. So we talk about research, we talk about evaluation but we don't do it as well on the ground. We create a lot of bureaucratic hurdles for developing research partnerships, whether they are in prison. 10 years ago I led the Australian homicide study which collected data on 302 people who have killed somebody across Australia and Queensland was the major participant in that and they were terrific but across the country you could see how difficult it was to actually do research in partnership with correctional systems and authorities

because of the hurdles. So how do we actually minimise the risk, develop ways to leverage research expertise externally but also boost up internally commitments to evaluation and working in partnership and trying to minimise the risks and focus on what are we trying to do, we are trying to change lives, we are trying to change behaviour, we are trying to change communities so we have got to do that in partnership. Why don't I stop there Commissioners. Thank you for your time.

CW: Thank you very much. I will kick off with the first question. The last point intrigued me greatly, partly because of the journey we have had in accessing data. It's not necessarily smooth.

PM: It's terrible.

CW: Being blunt. Your experience no doubt was similar. What would work better, what would help?

PM: I think, I think, and I understand why data access can be difficult. In a previous life I worked at the Triple C as the research director and we had certain levers at that organisation to access public data. University researchers and non-university researchers had higher hurdles and I think it goes to trust and it goes to risk mitigation. So I think what would help is if institutions could develop a mechanism where they had some fellow travellers and people were, they said okay you have got to go through this hurdle of signing up to be in the inner circle where we can trust you with this data and hold you accountable. I know the correctional authorities have been burnt in the past, I have seen that happen where somebody accessed data, they publish a paper without coming back to the authorities and say I would like to publish this. They don't give them credit and so, but there is ways to minimise that. So I think if you had a system that said okay, if you want this, and this is what we would like in return, we would like to be part of the, what gets published and produced, we would like to see a report back to the correctional authority but if you can get in this inner circle we trust you. So that could free it up and make it a bit easier.

CW: Thank you.

CF: Just around that Paul, looking at what is collected, how it is collected, how could some of that also be better fed to policymakers because there is a bit of a dis-juncture between those people who are crafting and making policy, making policy decisions and those people also undertaking some of that research. So how could that relationship be improved or what do you see some of the solutions there could be around informing practice?

PM: Yes, I think it's a really good opportunity and in some ways it's a really big question because you think how do you redevelop a system that says we can enable policymakers to access the right information in a timely way. Because one of the complaints from policymakers is well if we give it to the academics we have got to wait 18 months because they are going to produce a 200 page report, they want to publish all the time. So we need a way that says let's get some, policy makers need a quick answer to this question. You know does home detention work or does community correction programs evolving day reporting centres, are they effective. So I think the way to do it is to create some incentives. So if you look at say the Institute of Criminology in Canberra they have had these short little five, six page reports. We used to do this at the CMC when I was there from '02 to '05, we would have five page reports that were focused on prevention pointers or here's the issue, here is what we did and here is the findings and here is the implications. Don Weatherburn at Bureau Crime Statistics in Research of New South Wales does that as well. He produces short reports which are methodologically rigorous that have policy implications and they're available on the web, easily accessible but people need to know about it so how do you actually get into the policymakers and the, the professionals to access that. So you need to do more than just produce the information, you need to have, well let's have quarterly round tables where people are accessing these, building this community of practice around effective treatment so in trying to educate people that they have a role to play. So making that available. In Queensland we are very fortunate, Griffith, well actually in Queensland generally in Brisbane we have got three fantastic criminology programs, UQ, QUT, Griffith. As a community in Australia we have got the biggest concentration of people interested in crime and justice research. We are fortunate in Griffith we build, built what is called SAL, which is the social analytics lab where we house administrative data, it has taken two or three years to do it. There is chances to actually, so we have a data hub of secure data. That can be built on and it's accessible to researchers around Queensland and so trying to build on that to say here is the police data, here is the corrections data, here is the health data. There are certain protocols to access it and oh by the way if you do, it's not just about producing an academic paper, you have got to produce a five-page paper for policy relevance.

So there is a suite of things we could do as a community to say we want to access this data to help inform people to make better decisions.

CF: Yeah and in the same way perhaps could be those five pieces, five pages of documents could be generated too for community organisations.

PM: Absolutely.

CF: About particular things or you know NGO's.

PM: Yeah put it on the web as well and then...

CF: Just following on from that is there evidence available that you are aware of in terms of all the work that's happening that you do and are engaged with others in that contradicts what policymakers thinks works?

PM: Oh yeah, tonnes yeah.

CF: So things like? So policymakers or perhaps...

PM: Well I mean domestic violence is the perfect example and I'm very happy to put this on the record, I have put it on the record before. The programs based on the Gondoff model have not shown to be effective, we see that all the time. And the reason is because it's not consistent with the evidence around the typologies of batterers. Amy Holsmithman wrote on the best evidence, the best research internationally that shows that people who batter a partner, male perpetrator, in a partner violence in particular are one of three typologies. But the treatment program was targeting one type of typology. So, so it's not going to work. And there has been randomised controlled trials of court mandated treatment programs which have shown they are not effective. But, because this is our time of domestic violence it is a major social problem, we want to address it but we don't have enough programs in the suite for governments to say we have this and we have that. What we have is a one size fits all approach. Yes, we need specialised courts, there is good evidence that they matter but it's the treatment programs for turning around perpetrators of domestic violence. What we have available, and there's millions of dollars going into rolling them out. The evidence is demonstrable, they do not work.

So what we need is a commitment to evaluate and develop some new programs that says well if somebody is going to bash a partner or control, you know if they are committing partner terrorism they could be this, this person who also has versatile offending. So some batterers of domestic violence are also committing versatile offending, they are stealing, they are robbing, they are using drugs. Some of them have major mental and personality problems and they are different than the stereotypical batterer where the program is targeting the stereotypical batterer that is using power and control and has insecure attachment. So I guess my point is there is really good evidence they don't work but we are throwing millions of dollars at a program which is only going to work for maybe 20 percent of the people that are engaged in a partner with violence.

CF: Thank you. Commissioner Wood?

CW: Well the evidential base sounds quite strong.

PM: Sorry?

CW: The evidential base, both internationally and in Australia is quite strong and I know your university has a large and deep database of material now. How engaged is your university or other academics been involved, been with governments of all persuasions to encourage them to take a more evidence-based approach?

PM: Look I think that's a really important question and I have been in Queensland for 20 years and I would say that there has been peaks and valleys with respect of the relationship between university-based researchers and government. When I first moved here in 2000 I was at the University of Queensland and I was really struck that there was parallel universities going on. The University academics were doing their own thing and government policy people were doing their own thing. I have been encouraged, we have had a couple of periods where it got a bit off track but I have been very encouraged and I have seen, we have had strong partnerships at Griffith, I know UQ has very strong partnerships with the Queensland government doing some very innovative research. The partnerships with the Queensland police are very strong, historically we have been very strong with the Department of Communities and juvenile justice. If you look at Ross Humbles work, Anna Stewart's work, Lorraine Mazarolle's work, I could list a dozen researchers who are doing really meaningful things. Where we probably come unstuck is the translation from research then to policy and practice on the ground and to thinking - and I do recognise that the commission where I used to work years ago had a very formative role at criminal justice policy innovation, you know we did some great work back then on high speed pursuits, we worked on police beats. Another commission probably does that but you don't see it as much in terms of driving crime and justice policy reform and innovation. So maybe it's happening behind the scenes but in terms of that upfront evaluations of what works and police and domestic violence, responding to a serious and organised crime. What are the innovative models, there are still great opportunities and gaps.

CW: Our terms of reference requires us to consider indigenous communities as well. We have done a body of work on that recently. How applicable is the research that you cite in terms of remote discrete indigenous communities here in Queensland?

PM: Highly relevant and so all of those issues of (ui) responsivity for instance are highly relevant for indigenous offenders. The issues of timing of interventions, highly relevant. In fact one of our great failings is I think, and I have seen this when I have done work in juvenile justice in Queensland, worked with the Department. It's those missed

opportunities for interventions with 10-year-olds, 11-year-olds because we think too much system involvement will lead to bad outcomes. Well then we are ignoring opportunities to address criminogenic risk that will escalate over time. So all of this is highly relevant for indigenous. In fact I would say it's actually more crucial to have evidence informed approaches. And these kinds of approaches you know they work in New Zealand, they are applied in the Murri populations, first nation populations in Canada and the States so they can absolutely transcend to populations that have even more risks. So for me that almost reinforces the need to be even more systematic and more targeted and more motivated because the risks are so high for those communities.

CW: That's a really encouraging response, thank you. Commissioner Bridget can I have a final question. You mentioned the time is right for domestic violence discussions, it is right. You mentioned the three different typologies, that sounds like a very persuasive case for reopening domestic violence programs and re-examining them. And you know it is the right time. Is there an impediment for that happening? Is there fertile ground for pursuing that?

PM: Well I think so, I would like to hope so. The discussions I have had with senior members of government have been encouraged to say we are looking for some new models. There is a very strong voice and I know there is different voices in the domestic violence community and I am one of them because I am really committed to domestic violence research and prevention but I know there is very strong voices that this is the only way to proceed because it's all about power or you know the Gondoff model and I think that is part of it but it is much more because people that exhibit violence have other risk factors as to why. It's not just about power, it's not just about insecure attachment and jealousy, it can be because some people are really antisocial, they're bashing their partners, they're bashing their friends on Friday night when they're drunk. You know so they are antisocial people, they are committing different types of crime. And then there is other people who have this deep seeded psychological mental health issues which need to be addressed as well. So if we can have a spirit of let's explore different options, let's trial some new things, let's see what happens. But I mean I have staff who work and colleagues who work in the NGO sector and said I am implementing this program but I actually know it doesn't work so I'm really disillusioned. And I can see it's not working to this group of domestic violence offenders so there is more we can do.

CF: We have got time for one or two comments. Yes please remember to say your name and where you are from.

MD: My name is Dr Michelle Denton, my area of research has been in qualitative on the transition experience of mentally ill prisoners. I have interviewed prisoners inside and followed them out into the community to see what happened to them and did in-depth studies of some of the first work that's been done in Australia specifically around mentally ill prisoners with co-occurring substance abuse and transition experience. I agree with you know most of what you say but I would like to, and I will be speaking later on this afternoon but I would just like to make a quick link between some of the things that you are saying and some of the things that Karyn Walsh said earlier. So from my research and also from the international literature that you know the young men that I interviewed and almost all of them had worked in prison, in the furniture shop, in the kitchen, as cleaners, a whole range of activities and they had taken a lot of pride in working in prison so clearly capable of working and also they had done certificates and training and literacy and all of these good things and they done treatment program. They come out of prison and they can't, there is no supported employment, they were all unemployed. There was no hope really of them getting a job because there wasn't...

PM: Nobody would hire them, is that the issue?

MD: No one would hire them, yeah. And so I am also on the parole board and I am seeing a lot of cases where men are coming out of prison who had been involved in domestic violence and you know that's obviously very complex and you know all of the things that you have been saying about that but those men, they may well have done programs and they may well have had a change of attitude and what they're going into is often because they don't have anywhere to live and they don't have any supported accommodation, they are going into hostels, very impoverished environments where there is no support, there is no ongoing support. So again the sort of, the way that the community is resourced to support people when they come out, no matter what, whether they have had all the bells and whistles in prison it doesn't make any difference if you are going into a very impoverished environment where you have got unstable accommodation, where you don't have emotional support, where you are lonely, using substance abuse....

PM: I couldn't agree more and that's that whole community context where you are returning to areas of risk, not accessing support and no good services, where is your familial support, where is your chance for a job and a chance for a bright future. We have got to get that part of the puzzle right if we are going to reduce recidivism.

MD: My concern is that in my interactions with Corrections who I know are doing the best job that they possibly think that they can is that, and also in much of the criminology literature

the emphasis is on the individual, the individual responsibility on what happens inside prison and there's very little attention on understanding about the broader social context that people are coming out into and there...

PM: I think there is emerging literature on that, if you read Todd Clear's work out of the States and Bruce Weston who is originally from Queensland.

CF: I am going to draw it to a close there, we don't have time for another comment or for a full response Paul from you. We do have someone who is skyping in for the next presentation so we are really keeping to that schedule. Are you hanging around, sorry to put you on the spot but are you going to be around a bit later or you have got some other appointments?

PM: I would love to hang around, maybe for 15 minutes but I have got, I have got to fly to Canada.

CF: So if anyone does have any, anything burning they want to add please talk with Paul up the back or just outside but we need to move into the next presentation.

CW: Thank you Paul, much appreciated.

PM: Thank you very much.

CF: And I'm sure if anyone wants to make a comment they can find Paul at the University, at Griffith University?

PM: Absolutely yeah, at least for another six weeks.

CF: Through the website thank you, thank you Paul.

(BREAK IN RECORDING)

CF: We do have Chris Connors this morning who has been connected through to Mount Isa. We understood we were having a Skype session however that is not feasible for Chris this morning so we're going to try to do this on the phone so people may just need to be a bit patient who are in the room about how we play this, this is new for all of us. And for Chris who is there on her own in Mount Isa. So thank you Chris for booking a time to undertake a presentation with the public hearings today. I just remind people in the room that we are videoing the session and when we move to comments later for people, or if you want to speak to please identify yourself with your name and where you are from. Chris as you, as I hand over to you to do the presentation just be aware that Commissioner Kim Wood and I, Commissioner Bronwyn Fredricks are here right next to the phone so we will hear you clearly. If there is a time when people don't hear you so well I might just say please repeat that or could you speak up a bit louder because

sometimes when we are presenting our voices tend to go a bit low after a period of time. And when you start please say who you are and where you're from. Thank you. I will hand it over to you Chris.

CC: Oh good morning and thank you for this opportunity. I hope you can all hear me well.

CF: Yes we can thank you.

CC: Okay so my name is Chris Maree Connors. I work for the Mount Isa Family Support Service and Neighbourhood Centre. I have been there for seven years, the service itself has been in the community for 30 years in its present form and we submitted an application to the Commission to have some comments basically to sort of reflect what needs to, what we feel needs to be done in our community. So we weren't speaking for the whole state or trying to bring about sweeping reforms across the state, it's really, for us we applaud the Queensland government on adopting a place based approach to developing communities and we think that that's a really good idea. That local people understand the local issues and have the best chance of finding the best solutions for their community.

I'm not, I wasn't really made aware of what the format was Commissioners, would you like me to go through my submission or speak to other general...

CW: Chris you have got 15 to 20 minutes, it's Commissioner Kim Wood here to really, you can do whatever works for you. You can talk to your submission, you could amplify or provide some you know additional material to that submission or essentially based on your experience, and seven years is a good time in that role, talk to us about the issues you have there but probably the most effective way to do this would be to summarise your submission for us this morning.

CC: Okay to summarise the submission we looked at basically what the draft report was saying and talking about point by point adopting more effective ways to deal with offending. We were happy to look at more non-custodial sentences wherever that wouldn't compromise community safety. We are aware that a lot of people are living in fear and that there is a high incidence of youth crime especially but most of that is property crime in our community. We believe that that's, (ui) violence is not evolved but that probably allows a fair scope to allow people to do things like community service, home detention or be sent off to drug or alcohol rehabilitation. We certainly support a more victim focused system including restorative justice and restitution. We believe that the scope of criminal offences should be reduced where there is no obvious victim. For example with non-payment of fines or low legal drug offences. In the second point

breaking the cycle of reoffending. We support better coordination of accountability to effect more successful rehabilitation and reintegration of prisoners into the community. We would like to see more professional case management. We understand from discussions that were held here in Mount Isa that in some cases it was prison officers that were doing some of the case management, we didn't think that that sounded like the most effective way to be doing that. Especially as it was highlighted that overcrowding in the prison system meant that prison officers may be moved around at short notice, changing shifts and whatnot and may not be available to the prisoners that they are supposed to be supporting. We thought that there should be removal of unnecessary restrictions on work release orders, if that would lead to improved rehabilitation. We also think that rehabilitation should be the primary goal of prison facilities and support things like early rehab, early access to rehab, completion of rehab before release. Not mixing low security and high security prisoners and maintaining better connections of prisoners to their community.

We looked, we have looked long and hard at for example the indigenous horsemanship program and a way to deal with young indigenous offenders in the community. We understand that young indigenous men especially are probably committing the bulk of the, if we said property crime and we thought that this particular program which is run by indigenous groups that have been trying to get funding for some years now and is supported by groups like Amnesty International in their bid to try and reduce incarceration rates. Something like taking people out onto properties and giving them some actual skills in something they are interested in would be a good first step. Even if it was done as a trial and you know properly evaluate it and see if it works. But I think that indigenous communities should be given a chance to solve their own problems in the way that they see fit.

To point three reducing interactions with the criminal justice system. We did make a point of saying that there were opportunities but lack of funding to teach life skills to at risk families. And I'd go off, slightly off my presentation there, our submission there and just state that my experience even before I was working at the neighbourhood centre I spent a year in a homeless service and as team leader of a youth service, Reconnect it's called. It's funded by the federal government. And what we were finding with the youth is that they were actually enjoying the idea of being incarcerated. Some of them considered it as an opportunity for like an initiation, you are a real man now, you have been off to the big house and others, the bulk were expressing attitudes that they were having their needs met. There were things to do in prison, they were getting three meals a day. They were getting a hot shower, clean clothes and a comfortable bed and actually

telling our youth workers that those were things that they wanted and that they weren't getting at home. So I guess I want to really reinforce that point that just the lack of routine, management of budgets, regular meals. Having the electricity on so that people, or the gas, so that people can have a hot shower. The electricity on so that people can have access to air-conditioning in our extreme climate. All of these things seem to be contributing to an attitude amongst, particularly the indigenous youth that they you know would prefer jail to their own homes so and that's a really, really sad thing to have to say but we believe that there is scope for prevention in trying to work with those families on those basic issues.

And I have listed a bunch of life skills type courses and things that we have done in the past but which we no longer have the funding to do. As a neighbourhood centre most of us are only funded for 1.3 something full-time staff or full-time equivalent staff so one full-timer and a part-timer and mostly these things it's not feasible to try and run these types of programs with the funding that we have. And I'm not prepared to speak for other services but you know I would like to think that if people wanted help and could you know avail themselves of childcare or transport to get themselves to courses like this that those would at least be on offer. Public transport is a significant barrier. We only have taxis in the town, it's extremely expensive and people will not walk in the 40 degree heat or they try not to.

We had discussions with experts in their field, now I'm not a psychologist or psychiatrist but I am told that there is difficulty in obtaining diagnosis for foetal alcohol syndrome and other disabilities. Possibly because of our remoteness, I understand some training has been done recently by the health services into the first issue but there are other you know issues about how to assess indigenous kids. They seem to come to school, seemingly quite smart kids seem to score quite low, things like IQ tests. I think that the tests that there, what people are saying is that the tests need to be more culturally appropriate to truly measure the intelligence of those young people.

We have an issue with lead poisoning in town where nobody is really sure of the scope of it I don't think. I wouldn't like to say I am any sort of expert on it but there is lead generally through the town regardless of whether we have a mine or not, it is present in the soil and in the dust and perhaps having a mine adds to the amount that people are exposed to. My experience has been that the lead alliance in town is very keen to tell people what they can do about lead but not why and a public health message probably should be notifying people first and then telling them what to do. Now the motivation would be to tell people the sorts of brain damage and lower IQ that can result of

particularly children being exposed to lead and leading to them making poorer choices later in life, that's long-term brain damage, it's permanent brain damage and it's not just about exposure, there's many things that people can do to reduce absorption of lead. So it's one thing for a child to put lead into its mouth by you know chewing on a toy for babies and toddlers or playing in the dirt or not washing their hands before they eat, that's one thing but what we need to understand in our community is that a child with an empty stomach will absorb it seven times more of the lead that they ingested into the bloodstream if you know because they are hungry. So trying to get our indigenous folk to understand how lead works, the fact that you get it into your system and then whether you actually absorb it into your blood. This is a complicated issue and it requires culturally appropriate messaging and it requires a willingness to say out loud that lead will cause brain damage and there is a reluctance to do that in the community. We don't want to scare away people who want to come here for work or tourists or anyone else but I think probably we have to bite the bullet on this and accept that this is possibly related to what is going on in some of the households.

And regular meals is not a thing that we observed in a lot of our clientele. Now there is possibly 3000 aboriginal people living in Mount Isa, I don't want to speak badly about them. I hold them in the highest respect and I work very closely with them but we do see you know, and in programs that we have run in the past we do see children going to school without breakfast and we are aware that they are not bringing lunch so these children up possibly injecting a great deal of lead.

To point 3.3. Young people are not being safe in their own homes. We understand that there are children wandering the street at night. We know that some of them are getting into mischief. We understand that some are simply out because they are not safe in their own house. We understand in the past the police have picked them up and taken them to the watchhouse for their own safety because there was no other alternative. Now we really really strongly urge that that be changed. I understand the Queensland government made an announcement about some sort of diversion this week but the other points apart from a place to take them was to have a night patrol that is culturally appropriate and to be fully funded which the indigenous community have been strongly asking for and state that they have had before and it was defunded. And apart from some sort of safe house at night somewhere for rest and recovery for children who have used substances. So in the past we have had problems with sniffing of various substances and I understand now they are reporting children as young as eight who may have smoked marijuana that are out on the street. We don't think that they should be exposed to the criminal justice system or criminals or getting used to being in the lock-

up at young ages, we think that alright I can only congratulate the government on the announcement this week.

I have talked more there about universal systems for health and education. Public transport once again so that people can access education and go to work. Cultural safety for children being able to choose a school that they prefer rather than having to go to the nearest one in their sort of zone. Mount Isa is quite unique in that a number of indigenous communities have been settled here apart from the Kalkadoon people, the traditional owners. Some of those groups historically do not get along and they have all been forced, or many of them have been forced into social housing in one area, namely Pioneer or the surrounding areas of that. When they are then forced to go to a school with these groups that they don't get along with that makes them even worse so it's really not my opinion, it's their opinion that more should be done to try and facilitate safety for those young children going to school.

Also talked about childcare. There is a shortage of that and it does cost too much. We would like to see families engaging in employment and training, doing something with their lives and have hope that they can achieve those things.

There have been issues, to point 3.5 about police, I do get indigenous women come to talk to me on a fairly regular basis about what's going on. They do feel that they are racially profiled. I don't really, I understand that Chris Mitchell from the police is working hard on issues through the Community Connect program that (ui), probably that is outside of your scope so I will leave that one there except to say that we need to have more positive interactions between police and the young indigenous people for them to respect the law and hopefully stay out of the justice system. And finally we do support a better decision-making architecture. I would like to be an independent body, by the way this isn't just my submission alone, this has been approved by my executive, my management committee, we are a small charity of course. And we do want to focus more on rehabilitation, greater focus on victim and evidence based approaches which are depoliticised with a focus on community safety.

To just highlight the experience that we have here, our service is non-targeted and I just want to explain that there are a number of services in Mount Isa, quite a lot in fact. And most of them are targeted at one issue like domestic violence or mental health or whatever or they're targeted at a group like youth or homeless people for example. Being non-targeted we think that we may see a broader scope of people across the board, the types of services that we offer are emergency relief so we are seeing a lot of the economic disadvantage where people are coming in for food vouchers or fuel vouchers.

We also offer a no interest loan scheme so we see quite a lot of people there that have been for generations that have been on Centrelink benefits. They can't afford to save to buy basic furniture or household appliances so we see quite a lot of, you know we get quite in-depth with doing budgets and loan applications with them for that. So that's where kind of a lot of the experience that we have comes from. And just to my background I initially had a Bachelor of Business and did a Master of Social Science in International Development so I kind of, there is more in third world countries but we have kind of got a third world country in our own country if you understand what I mean with our indigenous folk. That's about all I have to say so are there any questions?

CW: Thanks Chris, between Commissioner Fredrick and myself will have some questions and we, if we have time we will ask the group here whether there are any comments based on what you have said today. Bronwyn would you like to kick off?

CF: Yeah just, hi Chris it's Bronwyn speaking. With regards to you mentioned in some cases you know Corrections do the case management and then other groups are taking on other kinds of services. I'm just wondering from your organisation's perspective and even your personal perspective as a worker with the organisation who may be best placed to address some of the problems that you highlighted? Is it like private industry, volunteer groups, community based NGO's, even local government in terms of the council there or state or federal agencies? Who do you think is best placed to address some of those issues you have mentioned?

CC: Within the correctional facilities I think I was kind of imagining government employees as like social workers or you know trained professionals, at least like a Cert IV in community services or something like that.

CF: Yeah, yeah. But even in such like looking at those people if you are saying about you know removal of unnecessary restrictions or looking at time reductions in times or there could be people on corrective orders who are in community. Who do you think would be best placed to manage some of those individuals? Just seeking your....

CC: In community?

CF: Yeah.

CC: I kind of have a bit of a philosophical approach to corrections that I would like to see it in house of government, as an actual public service and that's because I have seen that there is kind of this thing called the person industrial complex or something that has been developing around the world where it has become a full profit activity for some

organisations to promote more imprisonment, more custodial sentences. I don't know if you understand me Commissioner.

CF: Yeah because they perceive that the...

CC: I'm trying to elaborate and I thought that I had but yeah I just, I don't want people making profit out of other people's misery and even though I do work in community services my personal goal in our organisation, (ui) goal is we actually want to do ourselves out of business.

CF: No you make sense, you do make sense in terms of conflicts of interest and there could be, they could be compromised in that regard.

CC: If people were paid on the basis of how many cases they had they would be reluctant to let them go. You know that type of thing yeah.

CF: Yeah thank you.

CW: Chris it is Kim Wood. I attended the forum in Isa several weeks ago and I have to say I have never been anywhere where there was such a single minded focus on addressing issues that face kids as the primary catalyst.

CC: Yeah and my primary goal was to speak to, hello are you still there?

CW: Yeah.

CC: I might be losing battery. Especially the indigenous community were united in their voice but I felt that probably a lot of them wouldn't have the ability to put a formal submission and I just wanted to add to their voice. You know with all respect to the traditional owners et cetera.

CW: You did a great job. I walked away from Isa well aware of the terms of reference of our enquiry but there were some issues that looked really basic that won't necessarily result in recommendations from us that might make a profound difference up there and they were as simple as lack of public transport which you reflected. An indigenous mum talking about the difficulty in getting one of her children to a school and I think you have explained why, she chose a school on the other side of town. Food programs and there is some really, fairly basic issues that look like...

CC: Well if we wanted to go right back to the core of the problem, we're talking about social and economic disadvantage. We know where it is, actually, I hate to say it, I mean we can call it a concentrated area of social and economic disadvantage in Pioneer or we could name for, you know the day-to-day vernacular is a ghetto. We are, not just generation upon generation of people have experienced this disadvantage, they actually

don't know how to live in our society, I am saying the non-indigenous society. They look all around and they see people like them where no one, all up and down their street no one has been to work.

CW: Chris it sounds like...

CC: You know and if we could get the stats and we probably, I can't but probably you can. If we went right back to the grassroots we would know that our criminal element mostly comes from that social and economic disadvantage where there are all these issues in those houses of alcoholism, of domestic and family violence, of children living very, very insecure lives and not having their basic needs met. Basically attachment issues if you want to go back to the root of psychology. You know if we could address the social and economic disadvantage and have people having basic things like transport I feel that a lot of the other issues would disappear and the need for big expenditures on new prisons in the next five years would be unnecessary. I recognise that Queensland government knows some of these issues are generational issues and they have got to plan out for at least 2030 and so they know how hard the work is and they seem to know the money that needs to be spent on it. But you know when I first arrived in Mount Isa in 2011 someone did a community survey of the study from Centrecare and found about 35 commuter buses around town you know all been funded probably by something like the gambling community benefits fund but nobody having enough funding to fund a driver full-time to go around and help those people.

CW: No.

CC: And we did a viability study last year of whether we could use our bus and just provide a basic service but there were all these barriers of red tape and bureaucracy and insurance and could we provide a service to a non-client or a non-member, our tax accountant told us we had to have you know, we had to join people up as members of our organisation in order to give them a lift otherwise we would have some sort of tax implication.

CW: Chris I can hear the frustration. There is some, there is potentially some simple solutions which give me some optimism about some of the issues you articulate. Look I have got another question for you. I know that people typically when they are incarcerated are sent away from Isa because there is no prison there and it is somewhat a badge of honour with some young people. But you also talked about the opportunities of better connection of prisoners to community. Given the imprisonment is not in Isa but it's elsewhere and perhaps it's an attractive option for some of the young kids what would better connection to community look like? How could we help that? How could we improve it?

CC: I think that what, what the community talks about is things like a Local Healing Centre to recognise that these children aren't criminals, there actually is something wrong with them usually. If we could put them into a place where they could reconnect to their culture, still stay and be visited by their family regularly, maybe be diagnosed before they are sent off to prison. That was one of the issues that the community was very angry about that children often, or young people often ended up in prison and then got a diagnosis and found that they actually had a disability, a permanent disability that they couldn't kind of help their behaviour, that they probably just need medication like Ritalin or something. You know it seems like it's just an enormous waste to send them off to these places so far away where when they come back they are strangers you know to their family. Their families can't call them, you know I think there are very strict limitations on them being able to call their family and our experience with things like running small loans, we know how chaotic some of these households are for them to be able to hang onto the same phone from week to week and the same phone number. So I can see how these kids could get kind of lost and not be able to contact their family from prison. If they were here and could actually be visited you know is what, is what the you know what the community really wants.

CW: Thanks Chris, that...

CC: If not here, somewhere reasonably close.

CW: Thank you. We had a compelling presentation on FASD at our consultation in Cairns earlier this week. It sounds like there is some good signs and there certainly are some people in Australia that are well engaged and working well and it was really compelling and it just showed the sadness of putting FASD affected people in prison and treating them as criminals and not having effective programs to manage them. Is that an issue in Isa, is foetal alcohol syndrome you know an issue there as it is in other places?

CC: Look people say it is, yes I believe it is but I would add to that that we have a new, a more unique situation with the lead and we do not know how to measure that, how to find out if a child has had a high blood level concentration in childhood, somewhere between the age of say zero and seven or even in the womb. And then what happens on into early adulthood, possible contact with the criminal justice system and then once they are in there it seems unlikely that they are going to be able to learn a new way because their brain is so affected that you know they are simply incapable. They are going to need a lifetime of support in other words.

CF: Yeah or the mother was, the mother had issues with the lead and then it was in the uterus so. We are going to just conclude there Chris. I am going to just swing to the floor and

see if there is any comments from any of the people here in the public. We do have some. So it's just comments Chris, it's not actually questions to you but they, we do give people the opportunity to comment on your presentation.

CC: Thank you.

CF: Yes please identify who you are and where you are from thank you.

WS: Thank you, Wayne Sanderson, Balance Justice Campaign and I am Vice President of ANTAR Queensland as well. Chris I appreciated hearing from you about the challenges faced in engaging with young indigenous kids for whom home might not be a safe place, and others too for all sorts of related reasons. I am wondering is there anything coming out of the family responsibilities commission that happened on Cape York, five Cape York communities led by Commissioner David Glasgow? The reason I am raising it here is that it seemed to me that a lot of the skills, development and accomplishment in local authentic indigenous workers that was built up there might be transferable to some extent into the sort of situation that you are dealing with there. Just a thought for now because we are going to hear a lot from David Glasgow I think in Townsville next week and that might be of real value.

CF: Thank you Wayne. Anyone else that is here in the audience today? No.

CW: Chris that ends your time presenting. Look you did a wonderful job. The Mount Isa situation is both sad, it's compelling. As I said I think there is some reason for hope and optimism and look we thank you for the good work you are doing. Keep it up and we need good people like you doing these things in tough places.

CC: Thank you very much too for your time and for listening.

CW: Thanks Chris.

CF: Thank you Chris, we are going to end the line now.

CC: Okay thank you bye.

(BREAK IN RECORDING)

CF: Alright so we are going to reconvene and this, as I said earlier this morning is the second hearing of four public hearings of Queensland Productivity Commission and the current enquiry looking at imprisonment and recidivism in the State of Queensland. Just a reminder to everybody please no videoing or taping, we are taping the session ourselves and it will be loaded up onto the web at a later date. If you are press in the room please identify yourself to staff of the QPC and just a reminder when we move into people making comments that you identify yourself by name and your organisation or that you

are a community member, whichever status you wish to identify as and we will come to that later. We have a series of presentations this afternoon and the process is that we have the presentation and both Commissioner Wood and myself as Commissioner will ask any questions that we have and then we will throw it across to the audience for any comments that people might have in terms of the public hearing presentation we have just heard okay.

I will also remind people to turn your phones down or to turn them off so it doesn't interfere with the sessions this afternoon thank you. The next speaker we have up and I will ask you Keith when I handed over to you, please restate your name and your organisation so we have Keith Hamburger, Principal Knowledge Consulting. Thank you Keith.

KH: Keith Hamburger, Managing Director Knowledge Consulting. Thank you for the invitation to be here this afternoon. I am proposing some recommendations for change to the structure and content of your draft report in some areas. I do this with respect as I believe that it's a very valuable report and I am well aware of the enormity of the task conducting an enquiry of this nature. However I fear the draft report as currently presented will not excite the attention of the wider community and decision-makers for urgent and practical action to address the very tragic social and economic problem we face in Queensland of which imprisonment is, and recidivism is a symptom, not a cause. I believe that your report has the potential to be the most important catalyst for macro-structural change and the functioning of the criminal justice system and human service delivery agencies that I have seen in my more than 40 years of working in roles in criminal justice and family welfare systems. Potentially it could place Queensland at the forefront of social and economic change in lower socio-economic communities and in particular in First Nation communities and I feel this opportunity must not be lost.

I believe the report needs to depict the tragedy, emotion and the awful social and economic cost inherent in the issue of crime and recidivism as well as the passion and the ideas for change that practitioners across human service delivery and criminal justice systems have. If these elements are not presented for the readers of the final report I believe the report's impact will be diminished. In responding to your draft report I recommended a starting point for your final report should be to address who are the people who commit crimes, go to prison, become recidivists, their demographics and where do they go on release from prison.

This data is readily available and much of it is referenced in the draft report however the report does not extrapolate this data to clearly identify what I see as the elephant in the

room and that is the significant causal factors that most crime, imprisonment and recidivism are dysfunctional families in communities beset by poverty, unemployment, neglected and abused children, violence, substance abuse and with the majority of community members lacking in self efficacy and agency to do something about this real state of affairs.

If we were to identify the postcodes of all prisoners in Queensland, juveniles and adults we will find the significant majority come from lower socio-economic communities including First Nation peoples communities where they are exposed to trauma caused by the circumstances I have just described. Therefore it is no surprise that people in these circumstances commit crimes, often against their own family members. Often against members of their own dysfunctional community or the wider community and they ultimately go to prison. In terms of recidivism following their incarceration many returned to their dysfunctional family and community circumstances and of course there is no surprise they become recidivists and reoffend.

I think that clear identification of the above elephant in the room would allow your report to draw attention to some key issues. For example these communities should not be demonised. They have been locked in a cycle of depression, hopelessness and dysfunctional behaviour over many decades. For a range of reasons the challenges they face have not been addressed. Through your report all of us must be confronted with the awful fact that these causal factors have created a human tragedy of immense proportions that is destroying the life chances of thousands of children and hardwiring an increased juvenile and adult crime and recidivism rate inflicting enormous pain and cost on victims, on the community for the next decade and beyond unless we change our approach.

I believe your report must create a sense of extreme urgency in the minds of people in the general community, in senior public servants and in the minds of our law makers that we must approach this challenge in a new way. More of the same won't cut it and your report can be the catalyst to achieve this. If this was a natural disaster we would act with extreme urgency. For example a cyclone, a flood or a bush fire and everything possible would be done to rectify the situation as quickly as possible. What we have here is a human social and economic disaster of immense proportions that needs to be treated with the same sense of extreme urgency. Right now in many identifiable communities we have large numbers of homeless people, we have 10 plus people living in houses with one toilet. No wage earner in the family. Families going without food. Women and children being shockingly abused. Children roaming the streets at night, tragically many

of them are safer there than at home. Places where substance abuse is rife. Many hundreds, perhaps thousands of children across Queensland not going to school. This is where crime and recidivism is bred.

School truancy is endemic in a number of Queensland communities. In a First Nations community recently elders told me that around 100 primary school children do not go to school at all. I saw evidence of this with groups of young people wandering the streets during school hours. Clearly there are significant system failures. Preschool and primary school teachers in Queensland have said to me that they can identify children in their classrooms who are in grave risk of going to juvenile detention and prisons in their future life. I believe your report needs to reflect the emotion, the pain and suffering of these Queenslanders, in particular of the many women who desperately want change to their violent and neglectful circumstances. Of the neglected children and also the people who work at the bleeding edge of this terrible social and economic problem. Such as teachers, social workers, police, correctional officers, magistrates, physical and mental health professionals and the not-for-profit agencies who do a lot of good in these circumstances.

I feel deeply ashamed and frustrated when I visit these communities that as a society we look away from them. We have not acted with extreme urgency to address this intolerable situation. To capture the attention of the wider community and the decision-makers I believe that your report needs to identify why we are in this mess and present practical solutions to the challenge that can be enacted urgently. Your report must demonstrate the massive social and economic benefits of these solutions. Do this and I believe you will capture the imagination and support for action to address this terrible situation. I fear that if we miss the opportunity created by this enquiry then such an opportunity may not present for many years and the human tragedy will continue.

Clearly we need a paradigms shift in the way we address the challenges posed by dysfunctional families and communities, social breakdowns, crime and recidivism. If we look internationally for inspiration we find two completely different models, the USA and Northern Europe. It is fair to say that to date in Australia we have largely followed the USA experience under the false notion that we can somehow punish crime away. A notion that is completely blind to the causal factors I just mentioned of poverty stricken, dysfunctional families and communities.

Offenders from these communities are not deterred from being criminals by the thought of going to prison. Sadly, prison for many has been a part of their family's existence for generations, often it is a welcome respite where for a period they are well fed and have

medical issues attended to. For many women they are safer in prison than in their communities. When I last visited the USA to study corrections I was appalled that in some states the corrections budget exceeded the education budget. Sadly we are heading down this awful train wreck path.

I spoke to a teacher in a juvenile detention facility in one of the southern states. I asked him whether he enjoyed teaching in this environment, he replied I really do Sir, in these classrooms I know they have been searched before coming in. They don't have knives or other weapons like when I taught in schools outside. I am sure none of us wants to see our society go down this path and sadly that is where we are headed. Alternatively in Northern Europe where the lowest imprisonment rates in the world exist, human service delivery and criminal justice system agencies work together to address family and community dysfunctional crime and recidivism. Under an overarching goal to preserve peace in society. So we have got a peace goal, not a punishment goal. We can learn a lot from the Northern European approach.

Our current policies ignore evidence that the most effective way to lift impoverished families and communities out of this function is to build and support their capacity to help themselves. Build their self efficacy to create empowered families and communities. The evidence is that we have to stop doing things to and for people in these circumstances and instead support them to build the capacity to own and deal with the challenges and importantly reward them for doing so. This is a decent and cost-effective approach.

In my submission to you I suggested that if your final report commences from the position of identifying the elephant in the room that I spoke about, the causal factors of crime and recidivism then logically the report needs to address two specific questions. Question one. What is the most effective place-based approach to strengthening or building self efficacy in families and communities so they development commitment and capacity to address their dysfunctional circumstances such that social breakdown and crime is significantly reduced. And if we have addressed question one then question two is what changes do we need to make in the structure and functioning of human service delivery agencies and the criminal justice system to support such a place based approach.

In my submission to you on your draft report I have provided a model for a place based approach to strengthen families and communities to reduce crime and recidivism and for structural changes at the macro level to support such an effective place based approach. The model I propose incorporates your draft report recommendation 18, for a justice reform office which I strongly support. I suggested that this office is tasked as lead

agency for implementation of the holistic place based approach that I propose then to achieve structural reform at the government agency level to eliminate the siloed service delivery we now have.

My proposed model has support from senior public servants, First Nation leaders in Queensland and other states. First Nation community representatives across Queensland, members of the judiciary, senior academics and professional bodies involved with the criminal justice system. I have provided you with 11 recommendations that in my view are practical and achievable and when implemented will result in the overarching goal for the criminal justice system to contribute to keeping peace in our society to facilitate the justice system working in a holistic way with human service delivery agencies. A coordinated and holistic response across agencies to social dysfunction and crime and structural reform to replace the silo service delivery with a holistic place based response that is owned and driven by local communities. Your proposed justice reform office should be tasked to be the lead agency for structural reform that I proposed.

There should be a change in the sentencing policy such that secure prisons are used only for offenders who are sentenced to more than 12 months or for being dangerous offenders. This will achieve massive financial savings in forward estimates for secure prisons. It also allows for phasing out of large prison precincts which is a totally failed concept. This will also provide comfort to the community that serious and dangerous offenders are being securely held and appropriately punished. That needs to be complemented by the creation of 24/7 supervised community custody options for offenders who otherwise would have received sentences up to 12 months because they no longer go to prison. With these facilities either being on traditional lands or in other agreed and appropriate locations.

Currently these offenders do not receive rehabilitation programs in Queensland prisons, that's the ones under 12 months. If they go into community custody model their rehabilitation will commence from day one. Community custody facilities with a therapeutic community approach would be owned and operated by First Nations and other charitable not-for-profit enterprises under the auspice of child and family centre community hubs in partnership with the Queensland government. These hubs would also deliver services such as special assistance education schools, community mentoring of offenders, housing services, aged care services and engage in rural tourism industries and employment services. Thus people in lower socio-economic communities would be assisted to develop their capacities to provide many of these

services and receive rewarding jobs. Surpluses from the operation of these initiatives would be invested back into their communities and all of this strengthens families and communities.

This holistic treatment approach will have a significant positive impact on reducing crime and recidivism as well as significant operational savings across corrections and the criminal justice system. Community custody facilities would come under the auspice of community corrections. This will enhance the role of community corrections in facilitating rehabilitation of offenders. 24/7 supervised community custody options will provide courts with credible alternatives to use in lieu of imprisonment, they would go there under a probation order with a residency clause. Community custody fills the missing link in corrections architecture between secure prisons and community supervision. If we change the role of secure prisons to be used only for longer sentence or dangerous offenders and utilise the community custody option for the rest then we have a plan that can reduce Queensland's prison daily state by 1000 within three years, that's 1000 less in prison each day in three years time and it could largely eliminate the need for juvenile detention facilities as they currently exist. Beyond the first three years there would be a continuing reduction in use of secure prisons for reduced recidivism. I recommended the creation of a steering committee under the auspice of the justice reform office, of prominent First Nation and non-First Nation people to oversight finalisation of the business case for three pilot projects and for the expansion of that concept to reach our target of 1000 less in jail over the next three years.

Our plan would result in smaller high security facilities which would be safer for staff and more therapeutic for prisoners with improved rehabilitation outcomes. I respectfully suggest that my recommendations if accepted, can be enacted urgently and provide the basis for a new paradigm in the way that human service delivery agencies and criminal justice system functions. This new paradigm will achieve large reductions in crime, recidivism, stronger families and communities and massive social and economic benefits. The feedback I have received from across the sectors of government, the wider community, practitioners and from people in disadvantaged communities tells me that my recommendations will capture their imagination and support for action to address this terrible situation, thank you.

CW: Thank you Keith, that was short, sharp, punchy and supports your submission. Commissioner Fredericks, do you have any questions?

CF: Yeah I do. Thank you Keith for that presentation on your submission and I have read your submission as well. Just wanting to, from you, get a clearer idea as well on the

transition from what we have got now, because you have outlined a model, in terms of the components of the model, in terms of a hub and that hub being community controlled with a number of organisations, not organisations but functions within that hub. Some of those functions that you outlined would be in that hub are currently held in some communities, while most communities that we visited with this enquiry and the last enquiry by other NGO's at this current time. So would you propose they all be wrapped into one hub under one bigger organisation? And also what kind of transitional measures would need to be in place in your thinking through your model that you have proposed for that to happen? And then for the timeframe around that, what kind of timeframe do you think that would take based on your consultation?

KH: Let's imagine that the justice reform office is in place. At the moment we have got individual agencies delivering silo type services and we have got not for profits doing similar things. If, the structure that I envisage would be the justice reform office sitting there. We would need a interdepartmental committee involving agencies from the criminal justice system and human service delivery agencies and the steering committee I mentioned of the aboriginal and non-First Nation people to oversight what I am about to describe. The next, so if we had those sort of things in place the first thing is a co-design model to work out the best way to do it and we need some pilot sites to work on. We have got a potential pilot site or a locked in pilot site in the Charleville Augathella, Mount Tabor(?) station region. Another one at Cherbourg and one here in Brisbane which would service certain areas. What we would do in conjunction with, and we have talked this through at Queensland Corrections, we would have set up a co-design team and we would work then with the various agencies to look at the functions. Say if we take the Charleville example, what functions would be put into that child and community hub that we have set up. This is the full suite in my submission but we might vary from location to location. And then we would do a business case for that particular model and for the other two places. So the timing would be, we estimate between the time the starting gun was fired that around 4 to 6 months we would have at best (ui) business cases for those three pilots would go to government for trial. A steering committee sitting over the top of that with the justice reform office we would then move into implementation under their oversight with corrections and police and other agencies working to make, get this fired up and going. And then once it's open the courts in those regions would start diverting prisoners from the courts. So in other words at the moment, and I have spoken to the chief magistrate, the deputy chief and the magistrate in charge of the Murri Court and they suggested the idea of instead of giving people a prison sentence they would issue a probation order with a community, with a residency clause to go to the

healing and rehab centres we are proposing. So they get diverted at the court, so once the pilot studies are approved that starts to happen and corrections then don't have to process people in and out of jail, they go straight into these facilities which in, which are relatively small compared to the current prisons.

As they start to function and we are working on the anticipation that in fact they will work well they can start rolling out to other First Nations communities and we have got a number lined up who said pick us and that is where the three years comes from, we believe then from, we have say from 4 to 6 months to get the business cases approved then we do probably, we need another 3 to 6 months to get them operational in the sense of recruiting staff, training, getting our stuff in place so there has a year gone by basically and then over the next three years as we spread around Queensland and based on my experience people that I have talked to in corrections and I have dealt with prisoners in the system for years, there is probably more than two and a half thousand First Nation people in jail today and I would suggest from my experience and this is supported by people I have spoken to in corrections that at least a thousand of those could finish up in these sort of alternative options that I've talked about.

We have experience in this. When I was the Director General of Corrective Services from the late eighties through to the late nineties, early nineties we had an earlier version of this with outstations and supervised hostels and various things that allowed us to actually close Woodford prison so we closed that back in the early nineties by diverting people away to a range of community things and we did that pretty quickly, within about nine months we had sort of got all this change happening. So I don't think the three years is over ambitious, I think we can get a thousand out in three years if there is a will and particularly if it is driven by the steering committee under the auspices of the justice reform office who also keeps an interdepartmental committee informed of how this is going. So if there is a will there for that this can happen. We have also worked out the sort of structure of the co-design process which is critical.

CF: In your submission you also referred to what you call a market lead proposal.

KH: Yes.

CF: You talked about that and I just wanted to know where's that at because your submission was you know sent into us some time ago so I just wanted to get a bit of an update from you on where that work is at?

KH: Yeah well that's sort of been a hiatus I guess. The last knowledge I have, it has been in now for a couple of years before government and it did get a tick from the market lead

proposal secretary and was recommended to government to proceed. That was prior to the last election and then it went into caretaker mode and didn't proceed. After that I have now since spoken to senior government minister around December. I was then referred to the Premier's Department, spoke to somebody there. That was in December. And I have heard nothing more.

CF: Right, we might follow that up ourselves. Kim I will refer back to you now.

CW: Thanks Keith, I think you have presented your usual strong case with some really interesting ideas in there. Since we have released the draft report we have received a full data dump from government which will help us create a compelling case for the situation as it is. We hadn't had that data when we completed the draft report. We have got it now and it produces some confronting information, there is no doubt about that. So I think the case for change is there and can be made and will be made in our final report. There is a couple of things that I wanted to dig a little deeper on. I think there is an intuitive appeal with many of the things you have raised. The community may find, the community at large may find it difficult pill to swallow that we are going soft on crime with those sorts of recommendations. Caring community sentiment will probably be crucial to any significant change that the government may feel inclined to make. Do you have any views on how that may be achieved?

KH: Yes. Interestingly over the years, particularly when we embarked on a similar reform program, not quite as ambitious that I have talked about here in corrections. I spoke to lots and lots of community groups across Queensland about the model and we had our local people talking to community groups. And basically, and that's why I like this place based approach because if you go place to place to place you can deal with identifiable communities and talk to the people there. Most people in the community in my experience are very reasonable about this. There is an initial reaction when you see they've got, TV news now at six o'clock, terms, crime and entertainment, you know you have got car crashes, police chase, all sorts of stuff and people are quite concerned that there are horrible things happening out there which there are. But when people are confronted with the circumstances I have described to you and understand that people are going to jail for a few weeks or a few months and they are being churned out again and are coming back and so forth, they recognise that those sort of people don't need to be in high security jails.

When you go to local communities, where we put our Western outreach camps right through Western Queensland, we went there and held community meetings to start with, explained what was happening, the prisons were coming, we asked whether you are

happy to accept this situation, some communities said no so we didn't go there. But when they say yes they get really involved because first of all we start spending money there, buy local food, we do all that sort of thing, we create jobs. People are well supervised and right across Queensland in those camps there are very, very small issues.

CW: So you don't see gaining community support an impediment?

KH: No, no, not for this model because we are talking here in that Charleville Augathella, Mount Tabor we are talking about 62 people in our model for that whole three areas then we go to other places. We are talking between, around mostly 20 person type groups and there is a lot of them to do but once to go there and talk face-to-face with communities to understand what's involved, they understand that there is some local jobs. They understand that what we're doing, these offenders in the main are doing community work in those communities so there's all of that comes into play. If you just went down Queen Street now and started talking about it people would say shock horror but under this model, as I have said dangerous people won't be out there.

CW: Where are your remandees in this situation, where do they fit into the model you have proposed?

KH: Remanded is a very important component of our model because if we take, we have got two pilot projects before the Queensland government, we have had there now for a couple of years as well for women in remand. Now most people on remand have a bail option which they can't exercise because either they haven't got money or they have got no decent place to live or they are a substance abuser or something of that nature. This model is ideal, particularly for women in that situation.

CW: So it solves those issues.

KH: Sorry?

CW: It solves those issues.

KH: It solves those issues there because the legal representative can get up in court and say look we have got a 24 supervised facility, it's in this area. They have got drug rehab and they have got detox, blah blah blah, can we send the person there so they would go there. They would get their bail to live in that place under an order to reside there. And then we have had a relationship with Sisters Inside on that proposal where they would provide legal and other counselling services so when we take the woman back to court then there is a less likelihood of getting a custodial sentence because we have got a pathway planned beyond that supervise custody. So they are ideal in that sense. And

the other thing too, in prisons we tend to put people in large lumps, 50 cell blocks, that sort of thing. And when you get 50 antisocial people in one block and you get 1000 people in the whole prison, the prisoner culture is far stronger than a staff culture I can say. When we are talking around 20 offenders, we can give very individualised treatment for these people and we have a whole different model. We would have welcome to countries and smoking ceremonies and things on reception rather than the sort of nonsense you go through at the moment or have to go through in secure prisons. So it's a totally different approach and behavioural issues drop, we found that in our work camps because it is a much more humane relationship between staff and offenders. So it's ideal for people on remand that are coming in for short periods, particularly when the atrocious thing that happens is a lot of people spend time in remand and stay there for quite a while while all this gets processed and then they get released because they have already served time. It's just a waste of money.

CW: Yes do you have another question?

CF: Not at this time.

CW: Existing legislative framework. Will it allow this sort of proposed model you suggest?

KH: In the discussion I had with the chief magistrate, the deputy and the magistrate of the Murri Court, we discussed this. They couldn't see an impediment because they came up, they said well if we can now give, under our current legislation we can give a probation order and we can apply conditions so they had to do a (ui), it's a residency cause. They made, the only qualification they put on that was just a discussion and they said look we will have to check but we can't see a problem and indeed if there is something we would help draft something to change it you know. But I can't, from my experience I can't see how it would be a problem.

CF: So how close Keith would these smaller facilities be to some communities? Would they be in the community, would they be alongside, the next suburb, the next region, what are your thoughts?

KH: I will give you two examples, three examples. In the Charleville, Augathella, Mount Tabor station community there would be facilities in Charleville itself, on the fringe of the township and there would be another facility at Augathella where we have already had a prison work camp at Charleville and Augathella as well so they are well used to this and the prison work camp in Charleville is right in Charleville so it would be right adjacent to those towns. And then there would be a facility on Mount Tabor station which is an hour and three quarters drive from Augathella up to the back of the Carnarvon Gorge and it's

a 200,000 acre property so it would be sitting in the middle of that. So that's, and we have talked to the Murweh Shire who are actually offering us buildings in Charleville so they are very happy to have us there and likewise the Augathella township, very happy to have us there. If we go to Cherbourg, we did have a facility lined up in the middle of town, that's now been lost to other things in the delay but we have now got a facility just outside of Murgon near Cherbourg which is on a property owned by the First Nations Silver Lining Foundation so we will go there. And the one in Brisbane is over in West End. And once again the community there are accepting so we go around and we, once people understand what it's about and how it's going to be run it's fine. And people in Cherbourg, Charleville, Augathella are very keen to have it.

CW: Keith if you could snap your fingers and this model was in place today so 1000 inmate reduction in existing jails and a range of lower security more holistic type centres out there, what has it done to the corrections budget? Any views at all? I mean you have got a unique background in many regards, you would probably have a view I suspect?

KH: I do. I saw this on a graph in Northern Europe because they went through this process way back. Holland after the second world war said we are not going to build another prison cell, they were just horrified about what had happened and so forth and all that. And what, if you look at a graph, when you implement what I have just talked about you have got to tip some money in the front end because it doesn't automatically take people out quickly and you are stuck with your infrastructure and the churn that is going on. So if you look at the current increase in imprisoned rate I know for a fact between 2006 and 2016 it went up by 90 percent prison population and it's still going up at that rate so we have got this graph with a line like that. If we pour some money in the front-end and I would say it would be 3 to 5 years before we start to see this upward trajectory on the prison stuff start to flatten out. Go out a decade and you were going to see some big things. Now what I put in the market led proposal submission is that this is why we need an investment grade business case. I don't want to just see a business case for those three centres, I want to see this extrapolated, pick up this 1000 beds and run these costs and come up with a proper model so I can see. We have been talking to a big accounting firm to sort of come in and do a proper modelling of that. And I think it's one of the issues that the government is grappling with on this is that they have to find an amount of money upfront to put in.

CW: For perhaps deferring capital later down the track.

KH: Exactly. And at the moment high security prisons cost about \$1 million a cell to build and I just saw a thing in the paper today about juvenile stuff, what the cost of that is. And

I did a big job in the Northern Territory recently where the whole new prison it came in at about \$1 billion for a thousand cells. And that's horrifying in itself but because a heck of a lot can be changed, massive savings in that infrastructure going down if we go down this path. But I can't give you the exact years when those converging lines start to drop.

CW: No, no.

KH: But it is probably a decade out but big money would accrue.

CF: I am just going to call it to a close there Keith and we have got a little bit of time that I can open up to the floor for one or two maybe depending how long it lasts for comments to Keith if anyone does have a comment. Wayne, please identify yourself and where you are from please before you...

WS: Wayne Sanderson representing the Balance of Justice Campaign which is now winding down on youth justice system but also ANTA Queensland are more directly relevant to the topic here today. Keith a question. Given the, some experience that has already been had that could be of some relevance here. Is there anything valuable in the experience of the state of Texas and what they did with their adult prison system over the last 10 years?

KH: Yeah there is. When I read about that what they are doing in Texas at the moment is I guess what we did back in about the late eighties, early nineties with the Queensland Corrective Services Commission and I mentioned the closing of Woodford Prison where they start to bring in a range of community options that can be used. So they are at the early stages of doing that. I haven't seen in what they have done that they are doing a holistic response that we are talking about, I think the big issue here, except on Northern Europe that what's been missed in Australia is we just don't deal with those dysfunctional community circumstances which keep generating. So we, even when people talk about through care and staff, they're not, it's a buzzword but they're not out there doing the holistic change on the work in the communities.

CF: Thank you, I'm actually going to draw that to a close there now because I don't want to (ui) into the next lot of time. So thank you Keith for your presentation and for your submission.

KH: Thank you.

CF: And the team may follow up on that further, that other submission that market led to see if there is something we can find out a bit more information.

CW: I would echo Bronwyn's comments. Your submission has been well thought through and distilled through a lifetime of experience in this and you make some very interesting points so much appreciated, well done.

KB: Thank you very much, appreciate that.

CF: Thank you.

(BREAK IN RECORDING)

CF: We will kick off this next session and just a reminder to people that this is a session for the public hearing and we will have the presentation and that will be followed by questions from Commissioner Wood and myself as Commissioner and then we will move on to open the floor for comments, there is comments that people can make, not questions to you so we have now Marissa Duris and Debbie Kilroy from Sisters Inside. Please state your names and the organisation you are from for the purpose of the video thank you, before you begin.

DK: Debbie Kilroy, CEO of Sisters Inside.

MD: And I am Marisa Dooris, policy officer at Sisters Inside.

CF: Thank you.

DK: So I have just got some opening remarks and then we can open it up for questions.

CW: Wonderful thank you.

DK: Okay so I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land in which we meet, the Tooragul and Yagara people and pay our respects to elders, past and present. We acknowledge the continuing sovereignty of all first nations people and struggles for justice. The extreme imprisonment rates of aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women are a direct result of the ongoing colonisation of this country. Poverty, poor health, family separation and premature death are the legacies of Carceral colonial state for aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women, families and communities. We must dismantle this state if we want to support futures for aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and girls. As you know Sisters Inside is an independent community organisation that advocates for the collective human rights of women in prison and provides services to support women and their families. I am the Chief Executive Officer of Sisters Inside. The organisation started when I left prison in 1992. We have been supporting women in prison for over 25 years. Our comments today reflect both our direct experience supporting women in prison every day as well as our policy and legislative research on issues that affect criminalised imprisoned women and girls. This enquiry represents a

real opportunity for change but the starting point for change must be imagining abolition, a world without prisons. Queensland without prisons.

To actually change the outcomes for the most marginalised women and girls the Queensland government must start imagining abolition and must implement policies that work towards this goal. I know abolition is not something I will see in my lifetime but abolition is not only about the end goal, it is about the practice and policy. When we talk about imagining abolition we are acknowledging that achieving abolition through decarceration will be a process and it will require imagination, creativity and courageous leadership. In fact all policy processes require imagination. The ability to imagine a different future. Abolitionist thinking requires us to be clear about whose future and whose safety we are planning for and what patterns of violence are reproduced if we keep the same old institutions and the same old policy settings.

The reality is that aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women experience the most harm within the current system. In our view therefore the needs and priorities of criminalised aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and their children must be at the centre of all policies that seek to fundamentally transform the criminal legal system. As of March 31st 2019 there were 906 women in Queensland prisons comprising 326 aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and 580 nonindigenous women. Overall almost 40 percent of women were on remand however the proportion of aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women on remand is much higher. 44 percent compared to 34 percent of nonindigenous women. In contrast the proportion of men on remand was around a 31 percent for both aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander men and nonindigenous men.

In our experience the main drivers of remand, particularly for aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women are poverty, homelessness and lack of affordable housing, lack of healthcare services including drug rehabilitation and complexities within the legal systems. Prison itself is criminogenic. It re-traumatises women, it entrenches women in poor health, it separates women from their children and families and it ultimately undermines community safety. The Commissioner's draft report found that at the current rate of growth the Queensland government would be required to spend up to \$6.5 billion on building new prisons by 2025. This money will be wasted on prisons. Imprisonment and criminalisation are failed policies. The only ones that will benefit from this type of funding by 2025 will be the prison industry and the welfare industry. The women will not benefit from this.

The Queensland government must start imagining abolition and implementing the incarceration policies that reduce the numbers of women in prison and in the criminal

legal system. Building more prisons is not the investment needed and if we continue to build prisons we will see the same old, same old and as I always say nothing changes if nothing changes.

So I want to talk about imagining abolition and what needs to change for women in Queensland. Sisters Inside has identified three priority areas for change to talk about today. The first is address the housing affordability crisis. Housing is an enormous gap in the Commissioner's draft report, Commissioners last report sorry, not the Commissioners.

CW: Yep.

DK: Lack of safe affordable and stable housing is a national issue. It is a known issue but governments continue to drag their feet and maintain their silence on this issue. Housing is complicated by lack of adequate income support through Centrelink as well as a lack of essential services or the increasingly punitive operation of essential services that support people to stay in housing. This week Anglicare released their national rental affordable snapshot. The snapshot surveyed over 69,000 rental listings across Australia advertised on real estate.com. It found that 317 rentals were affordable for a single person on the disability pension, 317 out of 69,000. 75 rentals were affordable for a single parent with one child on Newstart. Two rentals were affordable for a single person in a property or share house on Newstart. One rental was affordable for a single person in a property or share house on youth allowance. And no rentals, no, zero, zip, nothing was affordable for a single person on Newstart or youth allowance in any major city or regional centre. Gobsmacking really isn't it.

For most women exiting prison this means that there is no affordable housing available prior to being criminalised, if they are homeless on the street and most definitely when they are released from prison. The commission's report final report cannot be silent on this issue and it can't be a recommendation like other inquiries to set up an internal group of bureaucrats to discuss the issue. There is enough discussion, there is enough evidence, not only here in this jurisdiction, or in this country but around the world about the issue of affordable housing for marginalised and disadvantaged people to end poverty and ensure that affordable housing is there for people to be released from prison. So I urge you, strongly urge you to make a recommendation that is so strong that the government cannot remain silent on this any longer. The 6.5 billion by 2025 would be a place to spend the money.

There are particular issues with women who are eligible for disability support pension as well due to changes in Centrelink policy bought in by the Turnbull government. People

on the disability support pension who remain in prison for longer than 13 weeks are cut off the pension and must reapply once they are released from prison. This process is very time-consuming and clearly limits peoples housing options. Housing issues have an especially harsh impact on women with complex health needs meaning mental health issues. Substance use issues and disability. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women are particularly overrepresented in this group and criminal histories that reflect the trauma they have experienced often from childhood. When we think about our work alongside these women it is an absolute myth that imprisonment prevents crime and keeps the community safer. Who is concerned with their safety, the women's safety. Women continue to be criminalised in prison for offences against corrective services offices or damage to prison property. They are churned through the criminal legal system because of prison. As a result of these charges women's accommodation options become even more limited. Most mainstream or supported services will reject women with criminal histories that show violence in their criminal history. Some services do not accept women directly from prison at all. The result is that women either access substandard and/or short-term accommodation or they remain in prison. Sisters Inside support women with referrals to supported accommodation services or rehabilitation services but we often find that it is easier to get women out of prison initially through short-term accommodation.

Accommodation is the greatest brokerage cost across all of our programs at Sisters Inside. In 2016/17 we spent 32,286.61 on accommodation for women. In 17/18 this figure rose to \$75,558.43 which reflects an increase in our funding but also what we are able to do for women and girls. In this financial year we have spent to date \$56,577.88 on accommodation for women being released from prison. We are not economists but the numbers seem pretty clear in favour of supporting women with housing instead of imprisonment. On average it costs \$107,000 to keep a woman in prison for one year. In contrast, based on rental costs of \$350 a week it would cost \$18,200 to fully subsidise a woman's rent for one year.

The Queensland government must expand its housing program including by building, or acquiring more public housing and/or subsidising rents in the private rental market. Sisters Inside does not support housing accommodation blocks like for example, a common ground where everybody is dumped in together, it just doesn't work for women, they are turned away time and time again and women won't go into those types of properties because of the violence that will be perpetrated against them.

There are some women in prison who may already have public housing and in our experience women are often at risk of losing this housing without adequate advocacy support often due to a lack of understanding of the legal system. For example the Department of Housing is simply given information about a woman's full-time release date and on this basis they often write to the women in prison to end their tenancies rather than exploring options for release from prison either through bail or parole. Serious economic analysis of public housing versus imprisonment is required if we are going to reduce the number of women entering and returning to the prison system. Housing issues also intersect with healthcare. Many women would like to access drug rehabilitation services and or mental health services. If a woman is in prison it is very difficult for her to be referred directly to rehabilitation. Unless women are seriously unwell women are routinely turned away from mental health services even when they seek support. On the other hand there are other women with serious mental health issues who are effectively entrenched in the inpatient mental health system and those women are not consistently supported to transition from the hospital system to the community with support of housing or access services such as NDIS. The NDIS has exacerbated these issues by turning disability services into a market, it has allowed providers to withdraw support for women who become too difficult. Additionally because the NDIS does not explicitly fund housing the costs for women to access specialist services remain prohibitively expensive, if they have been cut off the disability support pension due to their imprisonment.

Two, reduce the scope of criminal law legislatively and in practice. Women with complex health needs such as mental health issues, substance use and/or disability, the criminal legal system undermines the success of health responses. It has become the default response to address social problems especially in relation to aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and girls. Sisters Inside strongly supports reducing the scope of the criminal legal system both through decriminalising certain offences as well as through pre-charged diversionary options.

The following offences and the list is not exhausted could be decriminalised. Begging, fare evasion, public nuisance, public drunkenness, urinating in public, possessing drugs, utensils or use syringes that were for personal use. Breach of bail conditions and failed to appear should also be decriminalised. Alternatively sentences for failure to appear must not be cumulative on other sentences. Mandatory sentences for driving and license offences must also be reviewed. Charging practices for stealing and utags must be clarified. Women must not be charged with stealing if it is possible to charge with a lesser offence of utag. Greater diversionary options must be available for women. The cost of

punishing women for utag or stealing where the victim is a huge company for example Coles, Woolworths, Kmart. It is likely much greater than any harm caused. Women are being in prison for stealing and or fraud charges that involve these large companies. There is a woman in prison today that was sentenced to 3 months for stealing baby formula. Pre-charge diversionary options such as adult cautioning, police custody notification services and police referral to community organisations would assist fewer women to be criminalised. There must be a new approach to domestic and family violence especially for aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women. The current legislation excessively punishes women and does not support genuine identification of the primary perpetrator of violence and zero tolerance policies have failed aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women again and again and again.

We are also concerned about the impact of zero tolerance language shaping policy in other areas. For example violence against paramedics and health workers and harm to children. When we raise this concern we are not trying to minimise the seriousness of these issues and the seriousness of violence however in our view expanding the criminal law is not the appropriate response to these issues. This week the Queensland government actually passed legislation to expand the definition of murder. We are seriously concerned about the flow on consequences of this change for women, particularly women who are victims of domestic and family violence who actually tried to defend themselves in those situations.

In circumstances where the serious violent offence regime could have been addressed the government instead decided to change the definition of murder which carries a mandatory life, mandatory sentence of life imprisonment. The SVO regime operates like a mandatory penalty for sentences over 10 years and QSAC identified that it may be exerting downward pressure on head sentences for manslaughter. In our view all mandatory sentences must be abolished. You must allow judicial officers in the court system to sentence people because they have all the material in front of them. Government, Parliament should not be introducing further or any mandatory sentencing and take away that discretion of a judicial officer.

The third is support women to transition from prison and parole successfully. Currently there are limited options and no accountability for women to progress through the legal system or prison system. There is a serious disconnect between the bail and parole systems. Legislative barriers to release must be addressed, especially for women on parole charges with new offences or women on parole charged for offences that predate their parole orders. Women's success on bail is not taken into account in the same way

as a presentence custody in determining a woman's sentence. Existing leave of absence provisions could be better used to support women to access bail and parole. Additionally leave of absence provisions must be expanded to reintroduce, this was law back in the nineties, resettlement leave and work release and to remove legislative barriers to leave of absence for women on remand who are assessed as having a low security classification within the prison system.

Myself, I benefited from the work release and leave of absence so when I was classified low and moved to Albion, the Helene Jones community correctional Centre I was, I could work from Monday to Friday, I could leave that prison, travel to Woodridge, work Monday to Friday. Come back after work and then on Friday night I could leave to go home to my grandmothers to be with my children through the weekend and come back to the prison at 5pm on a Sunday afternoon. So that reintegration, slow reintegration back into the community was then easy to step into my parole order at time of release but what we are actually seeing is the majority of women are being released from maximum-security with no reintegration into the community. And when women are released into poverty and back to homelessness then why are we surprised that they are re-criminalised and re-imprisoned, we can't really be surprised.

Greater use of leaves of absence would support women in prison to build relationships with external service providers for continue of assistance with health care needs. Legislative and policy barriers that prevent women in prison from accessing main stream healthcare and other social services must be addressed. Advocacy support is essential to assist women to plan for their release including housing, NDIS, Centrelink and healthcare referrals. Other areas that we would like to raise for discussion with the commission include net widening through community-based sentencing options such as home detention and electronic monitoring or what it has known as, e-carceration. Sisters Inside does not support community-based sentencing options that expand supervision or monitoring for women. We are very concerned that introducing home detention and or electric monitoring as normal components of our legal system will have both social and economic costs for women and the Queensland government. We are very cautious about the so-called risk assessment tools. These tools and frameworks have existed for a long time without any proven ability to improve decision-making in the legal system in a way that actually reduces imprisonment. Existing risk assessment tools often can flate(?) need with risk in a criminal law context. The outcome of this is to continue to assess aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women as risky. And an example of that is the operation of the classification system in prison. As of 31st March 2019 according to Queensland Corrective Services custodial offender snapshot, 74 percent of aboriginal

and Torres Strait women have a high security classification compared with 62 percent of nonindigenous women. In contrast only 15 percent of aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women have a low security classification compared with 30 percent of nonindigenous women.

Re-entry services or re-entry as they are labelled including service models and funding arrangements. We have a unique service model for supporting criminalised and imprisoned women with demonstrated success in assisting women to reduce their contact with the criminal legal system. Sisters Inside has only very recently been specifically funded as a transition service to support women in prison and after release from Gatton. Our services are grounded in lived experience of criminalised imprisoned women and girls and that's why they are successful. Further, oversight and accountability mechanisms for the criminal legal system, repeated reports have recommended independent and transfer oversight of the prison systems through the implementation of the chief inspector. These recommendations must be implemented as a matter of urgency. They are supposedly supported by the Queensland government but have not been implemented to date.

We are also, we also support the KPIs that make the police and prison system accountable including some of the measures outlined in the draft recommendation of 16 in your report. Fines are an issue that must be addressed to transition to greater use of fines and the fine system must be reviewed and fines must be based on women's income and there must be accountability to ensure that women are not simply entrenched in debt to the State government. Thank you.

CW: Debbie thank you very much. That is a wide and long deep shopping list I guess granted in quite some years of experience now with your organisation. A lot of that information is confronting so I don't know how you do this every day. Bronwyn do you have any questions?

CF: Yeah I do have some questions. Deb you spoke, and thanks for the presentation, (ui) being here and for meeting with the team, I know you have met with team members prior to today. You mentioned housing quite a bit in a range of things that you said and that the block housing is not suitable. And that is good to get that message and we have heard that from other people too. What I want to know is what type of housing, so what type of housing would be suitable in terms of housing coming out, housing for transition housing, flexible type housing and reintegration housing and I did go and visit Helene Jones so I have seen that facility. But what kind of housing for a whole range of

circumstances would you and your organisation see as suitable because we kind of need to get a bit of a handle on that too.

DK: Sure so over the years because we have been around for some time we have developed our own frameworks of how to work with and for criminalised and imprisoned women and so we have proposed a number of models to governments over the years. One of them we presented a few years ago, a market led proposal around housing model that we believe would work. Now it wasn't funded and implemented in its purity of our model, it shifted a bit at the ministers discretion under this government and so there is two different models that were funded out of that model here in South East Queensland that is not run by Sisters Inside and which is very different to our model that is run in North Queensland out of our Townsville office. So what it is basically is a model where we have staff on the ground and our office in Townsville that are in the prisons every day and we do an assessment if you like, speak to women who, because it's for women coming out on parole which we disagree with, it should be all women coming out but that's what the funding was for. But it was to, we actually seek women's eligibility, if they can go into housing that we support. So how the housing is obtained is through usually the private market because there is not enough government housing and then Queensland housing assist financially for the rent. So that women pay a percentage like they would in public housing for the private housing. Now to be eligible we go through a process of identifying the woman's needs so it's actually driven by her needs not by a system that is already established where she has to fit in it. So Mary may have no children and just need a studio apartment and so that's what we look for and that's what we obtain with the support of Queensland housing public servants that work very closely with us. Jenny might need a three bedroom house because she has four children who are in care. However we have worked with child protection and they have agreed to allow Jenny to have overnights with her children if she has a three-bedroom house so then we advocate for that and get a three-bedroom house in an area that is suitable. Some women want to move from their, you know they used to live on one side of town, they want to go to the other side of town in a two-bedroom apartment so that's what we do and then we broker that in. Now, then we support the women over a 12 month period to maintain that rental property and then assist them in every other way whether it's getting their children back from child protection, whether it is getting training, getting employment, whatever it may be. Reporting to parole like so you know supporting them to be successful in their parole orders and after 12 months there is a guarantee then from Queensland housing that they either can stay on at that property or there will be a public housing property that they can move to for the long-term. So they actually stay in that for 12 months which is

you know quite substantial and then move on or stay in that property. And it is actually working, it's quite successful. So we can do, we have plenty, instead of like having every house out here being a prison with home detention which is very dangerous for women if I can just regress to home detention because if you are a woman that goes home with a violent partner and you are being assaulted you are not going to call the police because then your home detention is at risk and you go back to prison. The other thing, the majority of women are released from prison into homelessness so they can't, won't even be able to get out of prison if they don't have a home for home detention and I don't like the idea that every home can be a prison. The prison industry just continues to expand. So when we look at the housing it is about looking at housing that is available in either the public scheme or the private scheme that fits women's needs so it's actually driven by the women, it is not driven by the market as such. Or the housing market do you know what I mean like of government saying these are the block of units, this is where you stay and you have no choice.

CF: With your housing model that you have put up before if they are available to be provided could they be provided to the commission?

DK: Yeah yeah, yeah.

CF: The previous submissions?

DK: The market led yes, it shifted, our original market led proposal was a three-way agreement because we see that housing arrangements now in the community don't actually work really well because homeless services and housing services, community housing services get funded and then the contract is basically between them and the woman. So and then they have the support but the support is always coming from a position of power over, not power with. Because if Mary hasn't paid her rent or there is a hole in the wall then this person comes over the top and says well where is your rent, why haven't you fixed the hole in the wall you know what I mean. So our market led proposal like simplistically was a three-way agreement. It was to work with aboriginal housing organisations, Sisters Inside and the woman. So then the housing organisation can deal with the rental and issues with the tenancy and if there is an issue they actually talk to us and we support Mary and then we can resolve it instead of her being evicted. What has ended to be funded is Sisters Inside has the support workers, we support the women and identify them to go into properties and there is public servants who are allocated to that program that actually find, assist finding the housing and sign off et cetera. So the aboriginal housing organisations would cut out of the model that we put up. But yes you can have our market (ui) that's not a problem..

CF: The other thing I just want to, and that's probably about some, it includes housing but comes back to women with disability. It has been raised a number of times including when we were travelling around to other communities that when they are cut off and somehow streamlining processes to get women back on disability services or their package. Any ideas about how that might happen in a more streamlined faster, more efficient way?

DK: Okay we have got a woman at the hospital, the prison hospital contacted us about so I will let Marissa because Marissa works closely with her and she was on an NDIS package as well that got cancelled so I will let Marissa talk about that.

MD: Yeah sure. I think, so I would first start off by saying that I think there is a lot of confusion between the NDIS and Centrelink's disability support pension particularly, even within kind of service providers supporting women in prison and criminalised women so it's really hard trying because they are two different processes and they each have their own complexities trying to kind of detangle that is tricky. So yeah the best way to talk about it I suppose maybe is a case study or you know just sharing this particular woman's experience. She had been on the ND, on the disability support pension for quite a while and with the transition to the NDIS did also have quite a substantial funded package. But the issue with that was that it was only for her physical disability and didn't cover any psychosocial or other support needs in the sort of mental health, you know in that kind of area. And so the result of that and sort of how she came to be criminalised was that her health, her mental health and well-being was deteriorating and as a result of that she became too difficult and providers withdrew from, in the NDIS providers withdrew from offering support which then left kind of no other option except for...

CW: Lost it temporarily or permanently?

MD: Permanently so because it's a, there is no obligation under the NDIS to work with someone so you can withdraw, there is sort of no last resort provider as far as I am aware and I know there have been, that is an issue that has been raised but yeah at this stage I am not aware that that is the case. She did maintain her disability support pension payment from Centrelink but with no one to provide the services under the NDIS package is effectively useless and so yeah we see that that contributes then to imprisonment. With the, we have just recently supported her to be released from prison again. The NDIS package is able to be, she had a support coordinator so someone who assisted to identify organisations to provide the actual services that are funded under the NDIS package and so that was really good because that person was able to make arrangements to reactivate the NDIS package after release from prison but because she had been in

prison longer than 13 weeks the disability support pension through Centrelink ended. So, and because there is no, you know those are both federal assistance but because there's no kind of continuity she is released with the NDIS support but lower income support you know, just Newstart. So it does really trap people and the result of that is that if you don't have access to finances or an organisation that sort of understands the complexities of those things then you know you don't necessarily have the funds to be released.

CF: Yeah thank you. Got any questions?

CW: What's, with 900 odd women in jail in Queensland at any given time what is the unmet need out there? I know your organisation's purpose built, it has got a single mission and it gets on with it you know and you do it really effectively, I have been very impressed with Sisters Inside. Is there a unmet need for women in prison currently? Are you able to do everything you want to do?

DK: I think we could double our organisation inside, it still wouldn't meet the need and so you know as a prisoner abolitionists organisation we think, and grapple all the time the complex issues around what needs to happen to work towards imagining abolition, a world without prisons. So you know we grapple with violence because we actually don't dismiss violence, it's actually a very serious issue and so the thing is, one of the biggest issues is you know when we talk about aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and girls is actually the ongoing colonisation of this country that is in the DNA of the structures and systems of government, fundamentally racism. So that is one of the biggest issues and we see that day in, day out when you go in the prison system. One of the other biggest issue is poverty. You know women are living in absolute poverty so when you are living in poverty you can't afford, and we went through what is available which is nothing really in this country, affordable accommodation, you end up on the streets. You have your children taken so you are grief stricken, you are a woman who has been sexually abused numerous times at a very young age into your teenage years and your adult hood so you are dealing with that trauma. You have been in a violent relationship. You decide, you end up self-medicating with illegal drugs because you don't have any money to access medical services so that once you start self-medicating with illegal drugs you will collide with the cops and then you're going to be criminalised and eventually imprisoned. You know at \$107,000 a year to keep a woman in prison we could actually you know all right even from an economic point of view, don't give her the whole 107,000 a year, give her half of that, give her 50,000 a year and she will be able to you know just over 18,000 be able to rent something for \$350 a week, will be able to

buy food, will be able to look after her children, engage them in accommodation. She can do some training you know for \$50,000 a year it's a lot of money. But I mean Newstart to live on \$260 a week is near impossible. Like I just want, would like you know yourselves and people that are in these buildings on this level to actually think about what it would be like to live on \$260 a week because I know a lot of people spend \$260 on a meal and wine every night of the week. So imagine that and how do you live. Well of course you are going to collide with the police and end up criminalised and imprisoned. So poverty is a massive issue. And so we have to alleviate it in a way, the state has to in a way because I know that Centrelink is a federal issue and they are just, the government of the day are not going to increase you know, they are very clear. They don't want to increase because people, well for whatever reasons but anyway. So we have actually got to deal with it in a way like our housing model to subsidise because is actually cheaper to subsidise. It would be cheaper to pay a woman's rent for a year for just over \$18,000 than put her in a prison for \$107,000.

CW: For people that haven't met your organisation or any of your clients probably have a very strong view about an offender that you know they need to be locked up and keep the community safe. The minute you start to interact with people that are in the system and have been through the system you realise what a soul destroying place it can be. How do we change the community's perception in light about these issues?

DK: See I think, I was just...

CW: Because you are spousing very radical...

DK: I don't think it's radical.

CW:theology here.

DK: I think it is absolute common sense.

CW: I agree with that.

DK: It's not, it's not. You know when you say abolition people freak out, and they go oh my God, you are going to let all the rapists and murderers out of prison. Well everyone has a story, like people don't just wake up in the morning and start killing people right, the women who are in prison for murder is usually in the context of horrific, violent relationships and have reacted or you know very few have just committed random acts you know to murder someone. And that's what the community jumps to. The community is not educated to understand who is in our prisons and I spend a lot of my time day in, day out talking to community members, speaking at conferences, speaking at local community groups, speaking at schools. And when you have more than one grab in the

media, right you can actually explain to people in the community who is actually criminalised and imprisoned. And when they understand that absolutely, they just go this is not the answer, this is not the answer. But it's about you know we, in the law, we have been in the law and order campaign that has come from the US for decades. It has taken its bite and it is taking a bigger bite and it has got its grip now where we're just, the numbers are going up and we actually have to stop it because we know that crime rates are down. Crime rates are not up. And when you tell people that they are like what because it's what they are fed in the media and by politicians on that three-year cycle or four year cycle. That's why I talk about courageous leadership. The government has got to be courageous and do something different here now to change, to ship, to steer the ship or the sinking Titanic or rip it out like and move it in another direction otherwise we are going to be sitting here in another decade. I have been involved in this system is as a 13 year old child onwards so over 45 years and nothing is different. I go to those youth prisons, they are exactly the same when I was there. I go to the adult prison, they are exactly the same. What is different is the mass amount of numbers.

CW: You guys are making a difference though, it is different I mean Sisters Inside exists and you are doing good.

DK: But women, thank you for that, but women have to be criminalised and imprisoned, I want to be out of a job, not in a job and so that's why the thing, the other things that I have been thinking about and I think a lot about strategies and how to deal with this is, and I have come up with this model and I need to do some more thinking about it to get the nuts and bolts is like a women's centre. So where women don't get criminalised. So if there is homeless women for example and collide with the police on the street, instead of them being taken to the watchhouse could be taken to a women's centre where they are supported and then brokerage money could be used to you know buy in accommodation so they are safe and then the ongoing supports happen so then that actually stops women coming into the system absolutely in the first instance.

The part of that model which I'm still grappling is it means that the police have to make the call if they have come in contact with Mary to bring Mary to the community, to the women's centre. In smaller communities it would be easier because people could refer or Mary would know about it if it's in a small aboriginal community because they would know that that is there, it's a place they can come to for support. But in you know in Brisbane, bigger cities you can't get the word out and then it is up to the discretion of the police. And we all know absolutely when it comes to the women that are criminalised in prison that we know, the police always take the negative view, they never take a positive

view and they're taken to the watchhouse and left in there and then to be dealt with criminally in the system and off they go.

CF: Just wanted to Deb tease out what you said about, and it's off track what you have just talked about now but I wanted for you to tease it out a bit more. You mentioned fines based on women's income. So I just want to hear around some of your thoughts around that because it's the first time I have heard that. So I want to hear a bit more about what you're thinking is around that. Is that more around than just standard fines...

DK: Yeah standard fines for everybody. So you know if, if you are earning \$100,000 a year and you get a traffic ticket well then it's in the equation of that amount that you earn. If you are on Newstart, \$260 a week and you get a traffic fine well then that actually needs to be in line with that amount of income, so it would be like a sliding scale. So we need to look at the fines system instead of having this amount of fine for absolutely everybody because that actually creates, continues the inequality and ensures the entrenched poverty for the most marginalised and disadvantaged women.

CF: Yeah because we have heard in just moving around we have heard you know people talk about how their son or their daughter or their sister or their brother or their mother or father has in fact incurred lots of fines and then the inability to pay the fines based on, because they are on either Newstart or an aged pension or a disability pension.

DK: Yeah and the other issue...

CF: And even though they want to pay it back and they try to they get themselves into trouble for non payment.

DK: Yeah and SPER is an issue in the sense where, you know I don't know if you know but we have been running a campaign in Western Australia because the law there is if you get a fine and you don't pay it a warrant is issued, court fines and you go directly to prison, you don't pass go, that's where you go. So we have you know over three months have raised over \$400,000 and have paid about 133 aboriginal women's warrants and released 11 women from prison because the prison rings us when the women come in on remand and we pay them immediately for her to be released. And just doing that has made a massive change to women's lives by relieving them of that debt because of poverty. Now here, what we have, the fines are you know sent to SPER, referred to SPER however there is a group of faces, bureaucrats that can make a decision to issue a warrant which we absolutely oppose. Western Australian government is tabling a bill to change their laws around warrants and defines by the 27th of July and one, one of the areas in the bill is that if a warrant was ever going to be issued it must go back to a

judicial officer and that is what we must see here so instead of having entrenched poverty continue over and over again like the people you are talking about that, well one if the department makes a recommendation to issue a warrant then it must go to a magistrate and to be heard and that person comes and makes submissions. The other thing they are doing which I think we need to do as well, you can do it but it's a bit sneaky and behind-the-scenes here, like it's not, everyone doesn't know about it I would say is about the hardship pay. So we have been working, we have got law students working to assist individual women to actually make submissions to SPER to have their debts either wiped or reduced because of hardship because they are on Newstart. But that's going to be, that's like a woman one by one by one where we actually need to look at the system and how it actually continues with the entrenched inequalities.

MD: And I think just to add to that the other sort of enforcement measures that SPER can take including things like suspending your drivers license or garnishing funds from your bank account are also really you know obviously contribute to people's criminalisation, or contribute to people's inability to sort of take you know more practical or positive steps to get out of that debt or navigate that system.

CW: Marissa we have talked to SPER. I think on some issues they would be aligned with your thinking, on other issues they do have fairly broad powers and they are exercising a wide range, or using a wide range of tools to collect that debt on behalf of the state. I think they are more aligned than unaligned so don't give up on this one.

DK: Well you put it in your report.

CW: No doubt we will.

CF: Okay I am going to draw this session presentation to a close, thank you Marissa and thank you Deb.

DK: Thank you.

MD: Thank you very much.

CW: Well done.

(BREAK IN RECORDING)

CF: So welcome back everybody. This is our final session this afternoon for the public hearing into imprisonment and recidivism, Queensland Productivity Commission. And this afternoon we've got final speaker which is Michelle Denton. And Michelle I'll get you to say your name and you know what capacity you're here today. We'll try and have some time at the end for comments and I apologise in the earlier session we didn't have

time for comments from the floor. But that session was so good and I had lots of questions for the previous session. So we might have more for you too. Okay Michelle, thank you.

MD: Okay. So my name is Dr Michelle Denton. I come here from a range of perspectives and thank you for having me. I spent 14 years as the Manager of the Queensland Forensic Mental Health Service and during that time I led the design and implementation of the Prison Mental Health Service and the Prison Transition Support Service and really designed the Prison Transition Support Service model in 2006 and the Forensic Mental Health Court Liaison Service. So that was my career and prior to that I managed the Brisbane North Methadone Program and then the Brisbane, Royal, Brisbane Hospital Alcohol and Drug Service for several years. Then I went on to complete a PhD titled Hoping Against Hope, the prison to community transition experience of men with co-occurring severe mental illness and substance use disorder. And this was the first known qualitative study in Australia to focus on the prison to community experience of prisoners with severe mental illness and co-occurring substance use disorder, with histories of repeated short term imprisonment for non-violent offences. So that was really the specific topic. And the reason I chose that topic is because you know when we set up the prison to community transition support service, the Prison Transition Support Service we looked at the first 100 people who came out and 63% of them fit that criteria. So they had co-occurring substance use, they had a severe mental illness like schizophrenia, most of my participants had schizophrenia or bipolar disorder, a couple of them and severe substance, you know a diagnosed substance use disorder, bio psychosis. So most of them were using IV amphetamines. So serious drug use. And, and they were... And so we looked at the first 100 people who came out of, who were supported by the Prison Transition Support Service and 63% of them fit this criteria which then became the inclusion criteria for my PhD's, so co-occurring and short term and non-violent offences. So that's who I focused on. I thought well you know this is the majority of people that we're dealing with, let's have a really close in-depth look at them.

And so then I interviewed, I did 48 interviews altogether and they were men between 18 and 40. I interviewed them in prison and taped those in-depth interviews. And then I followed them out two weeks post release and three months post release and interviewed them again and looked at what their experience was. I'm also now currently on the Parole Board. So I'm sort of seeing a sort of live group of cases in terms of what's happening now and I've published about the work that's come out of my thesis and also the prison to community transition support needs of people with intellectual disability cope. Authored a book chapter with Dr Cathy Ellam and recently also did an evaluation

of integrated health and housing first model that Karyn Walsh was talking about and the three pronged approach of, and Debbie Kilroy also talked about it that this approach of having tenancy support and social support and integrated health care. So this three way model that we promote as being the best practice, contemporary best practice in terms of supporting vulnerable people. Not only people with mental illness but people with chronic physical illness as well, yeah. And, yeah. So I mean I was really excited really by the you know draft report even though I know that you hadn't got your data fully and that I think will tell a very strong story. And you know particularly the recognition that prisoner integration is a mildly dimensional approach which you know, and that you acknowledge that housing, employment, income and ongoing treatment for mental illness and substance addictions in (ui) with relation to (ui) behavioural changes. So you've captured the main issues. But, and I mean a lot of, has been said today, a majority of which I completely agree with and I'm going to bang the housing drum again...

CW: Thank you.

MD: ...because that's really a major issue for people with severe mental illness coming out of prison. People with mental illness as you will be aware are also criminalised in the same way that the previous speaker talked about and one of the things that came through very strongly in my research was that the people with severe mental illness like you know diagnosed psychotic illness in the main. They weren't in prison because of that, they were in prison because of their substance use issues and the consequences of that. That's sort of what they, what they needed to do to maintain their drug habit which was you know dealing drugs or working in the sex industry or you know stealing to support their drug habit. That's really, was the, the story for all of my, almost all of my research participants.

So they, the focus you know of the system was on the fact that they had a psychotic illness, they had a mental illness but really the reason they were in prison was because of their consequences of their substance use. That came through really strongly and it's consistent with the international literature. But, so what I really wanted to just mention a few points today, it's been a long day so I'll try to keep it as short as I can. But people with severe mental illness and cognitive disability and or cognitive disability, intellectual disability, often almost always accompanied by substance use problems leaving prison, are confronted with all of their complex needs at once. You know and we've heard that several times today but I think that's really the case. And so they're confronted with their housing, their income, their social support and their treatment needs. Okay? And this

can be very overwhelming for them without extensive support and often results in a rapid return to prison as we've, as has been mentioned a number of times.

But this group also, you know a number of participants in my research said that it was so overwhelming. I mean this group have got lower coping, are known to have lower coping skills than even the general prison population who are also a very vulnerable group. But you know what I heard over and over again in my interviews was that coming out of prison with all of those needs at once, it hadn't been planned for, hadn't really in any great way, it was very overwhelming. And the sorts of things they'd say to me would be, well all of my friends are in prison, have a dry bed, three meals a day, you know I hate being in prison, I want to get out but it's really worse in the community you know, like that was their previous experience. Now why I called my thesis Hoping Against Hope is because they invariably have, you know they, the resilience of human beings is amazing really and they'd be like but this time I'm really going to try and make it work because they really want to live out in the community. But their previous experience and my participants on average had been in and out of prison seven times. So they, you know their life over, and they were all under 40. So that was what they were saying. So, but the really, the first major point I want to make is that treatment services are much less likely to be accessed if the person is homeless or living in unstable or unsupported accommodation. Now that's you know a fairly obvious statement that if you are living under a tree at the bayside or under a bridge or in a you know homeless men's hostel or in a really impoverished one room boarding, one room of a boarding house where there are lots of other really seriously disadvantaged people and not a very, you know in a sort of toxic culture and not a very supportive environment then you know prison is, is looking attractive and treatment services are the last thing that you're going to get to. You know your appointment, you'd be lucky to get to your parole appointment but getting to your mental health appointment to get your medication, you then go to the pharmacy to get your medication. These things are not going to happen if you're homeless or in very unstable accommodation. Because what you're thinking about then is where am I going to get my next meal, is somebody going to hurt me in this environment, you know how, just basic survival. So you know treatment needs become secondary.

CW: Sure. Could I interrupt you just briefly there. So if someone's on a methadone program (ui) they are going to make those appointments though aren't they? Because there's a physical addiction at play there that drives...

MD: Yes. I think that's true and I'm a big supporter of methadone actually. I know it's a controversial topic but I think when people are on methadone, I managed a prison

methadone program and we had 800 patients, clients on that program then and that was in the early 1990's actually. So it's probably much bigger now. But they're using other drugs as well, other substitute drugs. But when people are on methadone they do, they do get to the chemist you're right and if they've got their couple of dollars which they have to pay for it usually and they, they tend to stop you know doing break and enters or dealing or whatever else they were doing. And they tend to stay out of prison and they tend to do quite well.

CW: The reason I raise it I was just wondered if there's a chance to couple other services you know with attendance from methadone, visit each day or whatever it is. Anyway.

MD: Yes I think that is a good idea and we did look at that a few times when I was doing that sort of work and I was advocating at that point to try and link in child protect, or you know child support and childcare and other physical health services and we were able to do that a little bit.

CW: I should let you get back. I'm sorry I interrupted you.

MD: That's alright, no worries. So the second point that I want to make is really, is around fragmentation of services and that's been mentioned before today as well.

CF: That's right.

MD: And in my thesis and we've drawn from the International Literature and my own research and I've subsequently written about it is that there's, I mean there's, it clearly fragmentation between services in three main ways. One is the criminal justice mental health interface. So you know and that's been mentioned before today about different philosophies. Like with the criminal justice focus you have, you know I sort of focus on risk and containment and control and punishment sometimes and you know rehabilitation sometimes. Whereas in the mental health there's the focus on you know recovery and strengths based and you know sort of opportunity and you know sort of support and those sorts of things. So those two philosophies don't go together very well and rub up against each other. And also there's a sort of focus I think within the criminal justice system and in criminology and I think that came through with one of the speakers today that there's very much a focus on the individual responsibility, individual risk and individual pathology within the criminal justice sort of paradigm. Whereas in the, rather than a kind of systemic focus or structural or social focus. So those two, criminal justice and mental health can really clash and so it's difficult to work together in terms of providing mental health services in prison and post release and particularly with parole. So parole doesn't really have, parole services don't really have a mental health focus,

they don't do a lot of training with their workers and I think Mr Sofenoff made some comments around the need to strengthen parole services. And I see that in the parole board work I'm doing at the moment that there's, it doesn't seem to be a lot of focus or you know there could be more let's say and a lot of the population have problems with mental illness. A lot of people are coming through parole. So the first is the criminal justice mental health interface. The second interface is between treatment services, physical health, mental health and substance use provided in prison and services provided in the community in terms of continuity of care and that was also mentioned today by one of the speakers and sort of so, you know so people again you know being referred to private agencies and there's all sorts of barriers in terms of not knowing when people are going to be released from prison. And also a sort of a, I think there can be a, a cultural issue in prisons that's when people leave they're no longer our responsibility and so you know that sort of, you know you go out the gate and you know people are in the community and so it's the communities problem. And the communication between the two is not always ideal. And the third interface in terms of fragmented, fragmented services is interface between mental health and substance use services for these prisoners. So that's also been mentioned today but in terms of the waiting for drug rehabilitation there and some of the participants in my research were highly motivated, knew they needed to go to rehab drug rehabilitation and couldn't make the direct transfer. It's very unusual to be able to make the direct transfer and so they were waiting for one or two weeks in a hostel situation or homeless men's hostel where there were lots of other people using drugs. They're highly vulnerable, it's, you know it's a long wait a week or two and when there are people who are using drugs around you and you know or alcohol and you know. And also the availability. So one of the issues is that lack of trans, you know transition system between the two. The second is the availability of drug rehabilitation beds and the third is the suitability of the programs. You know that, one of my research participants said you know I don't go to you know one of the programs because it's like going to church. You know there's often a strong faith based and I'm not in any way running those programs down. I think you know the faith based organisations do a tremendous job but it's not suits, it doesn't suit everybody especially kids who've or people who have grown up in institutions where they may not have been treated ideally and you know they may not respond to that kind of program. And so I think that they're, it's really clear that there's not a breadth of programs to meet the needs of everyone in terms of substance use. And as I said before, not only my qualitative research but the international literature will support that the majority of people with a severe mental illness who are in prison are there because of their substance use. That's

really the, the, you know it's a clear, it's a known fact if you could call it that. That it's really, that that's the biggest issue and you know it's one that we're probably doing the worst at in Queensland providing accessible, suitable substance use programs both in prison and out of, outside and the continuity of care, the transition process and the availability and the, and the suitability.

How am I going? So next is, and I've sort of, I've already sort of touched on this is that this substantial evidence that acknowledges the interaction between the individual and the environment that emphasises the impact of trauma, stress, substance use, homelessness, poverty and unemployment. There's risk factors for imprisonment for the general prison population as well as people with severe mental illness. So the emphasis in the research literature is increasingly on a broader social context and this is what's being said by many speakers today and the interaction between the individual and the community they're returning to. So the community provides resources for people who are coming out of prison. It also has a need for safety and security obviously but problems occur during transition when communities are unwilling or unable to provide the necessary resources to the individual who is then likely to be economically and socially isolated in engaging criminal activity of some kind to meet their resource needs. So it's a no win cycle. And the, so you know I think sort of conceptually we can say that the prison to community transition experience can be, can be viewed as an independent, interdependent process, both of the individuals willingness and capacity to make changes as well as the communities capacity and willingness to support the individual. And so you know I think that's, that's an important concept that we need to support both the individual and the community that's receiving them. And you know I think a lot of the, as someone was talking about earlier about place base initiatives in regional areas but we're not able to do it very well in Brisbane either. So this understanding of the social processes underlying the prison to community transition experience points to the need for wrap around support services that strategically develop individualised links in the community to enhance treatment and community supports. This includes supported housing, supported employment, active community outreach and development, individualised case management, psycho social skill building, integrated mental health and addiction services and a focus on both mental health and criminal justice outcomes. So that's no different from what Karen and a number of other people have said.

CW: It's a good shopping list though just the same.

MD: Yeah. So the extensive body of the international and local research indicates that it will be far more... So one of the comments and that's one of the reasons that I wanted to

come today, even though I realise that I'm sort of repeating what a lot of other people have said. Is that your report says a number of times, about three times that reintegration services are a risky investment. So I'd like to propose that that extensive body of international and local research indicates that they'll, that it will be far more risky to neglect investment in evidence base, comprehensive wrap around services to support individuals with mental illness returning to communities that are adequately resourced to receive them. The much higher risk is in maintaining the status quo of prisons being released to homelessness, unemployment, lack of adequate social supports and fragmented services. This will likely continue to contribute to further rises in imprisonment in Queensland of people with and without mental illness despite falling crime rates. So I firmly believe that statement that it's far more risky to not make this investment. So just briefly the summary is that the needs of people with mental illness, substance use disorders and cognitive disability leaving prison are interrelated and must be addressed with a coordinated integrated set of comprehensive wrap around services, stable supported accommodation using a housing first approach is a fundamental need for this group and is currently severely inadequate in its reach for this group in Queensland. Fragmentation of services between the criminal justice and mental health interface between prison and community services and between mental health and substance use services contributes to the poor reintegration outcomes for release prisoners especially those with mental illness and co-occurring substance use disorders. And both individuals in the communities receiving and supporting them post release need to be adequately supported and resourced. And a fifth point is that there's a strong correlation I think between prisoners with a mental illness in short term imprisonment and this revolving door and those, that group is not getting very much attention. They don't have access to programs, they lose their accommodation and support services when they go in for three or six months and then they come out again to nothing and then it all falls apart very quickly and back in. So if we're even able to address that group of low level offenders with mental health and substance use issues and get them sort of stabilised in the community through whatever mechanisms, either you know through hostels or bail support hostels or you know probation hostels. And if we're able to support community Probation and Parole to become more mental health literate and substance use literate to be able to support people to get to those treatment programs from a sort of relatively secure base then we could probably make some you know wins fairly quickly in terms of the number of people in prison.

CF: Thanks Michelle.

CW: Michelle I have a question. You talked about the shortage of substance abuse programs but the suitability and availability here in Queensland.

MD: Mmmhmm.

CW: Why, why is it? Why are they in short supply? Why aren't they always suitable? Why aren't there always places available? Is this simply a funding problem? Is it that simple or is it more than that?

MD: Look I think it's largely a funding program. I think it's also a sort of, a kind of blind spot problem that mental health services are the powerful player in that space. They're, you know they have the majority of the resources and alcohol and drugs, illicit alcohol and drugs is a problem for mental health services because they don't know what to do about it. Because you can't give people more drugs to deal with their drug issue and the main instrument of psychiatric services is to use medication to treat illnesses. Right? So there's this fundamental sort of difficulty for mental health services.

CW: So if you're a drug prescriber psychiatrist every problem looks like a nail you have to bang with a prescription of some sort?

MD: Well you've said it, I didn't quite. But yes there is a tendency you know, I mean there's a clash between there's a very strong tension between the medical model within psychiatry which is primarily about using medication to treat mental illness and of course medication has a very important role in terms of severe mental illness but there's a whole lot of other strategies also that are very important that probably get less attention and less resource. But the problem with alcohol and drugs in my view and after working in this field for my whole career is that that model when you're primarily focused on using medication to treat life problems and mental illness then what to do about substance use is very problematic because you can't give people, other than methadone and other opiate substitutes which are controversial but you know I think potentially very useful and keep people away from the sorts of you know offending behaviour that gets them into trouble, what else do you do? So you know there's a, but there's, you know there's this whole other body of evidence that would suggest that long term rehabilitation programs that are properly run and properly funded are very important part of the picture. That there's other community based organisations that can support people and provide counselling. It's a difficult area but, but I would say fundamentally it's about this sort of philosophical or ideological clash.

CW: That's a very interesting response. You've answered in a way that I've not heard responded to previously. So that was quite useful thank you.

MD: Thanks.

CF: With regard to the wrap around services Michelle, how do you or who do you envisage would provide them? Do you see that as one entity in a particular area or would it be an NGO, local council, federal or state or a multiple of, multiple agencies?

MD: Look I think the best practice approach in terms of supporting people is to have a case management model which is so it's provided by one agency. But some of the models that have been you know evaluated in, especially in America in pilot projects and there's various work going on around in this, in Australia. Is that they need to be very multi disciplinary teams that have also strong relationship with parole and you know there's been some models that have been trialled where they have parole members on the team. But that's got, that's controversial and there's various opinions about whether that's a good idea because you bring in a sort of control containment issue into the therapeutic recovery model and you get that tension. But look I think there, there needs to be. Like I mean I think the model that was put forward earlier today, not necessarily the residential but...

CF: The hub model.

MD: ...the hub model. But in terms of, so a multi disciplinary approach to a wrap around services with a core case management. But you know with very strong links across all of the different departments. So you know when the model was presented earlier around the need for inter governmental steering committee. So you know I mean it all starts from the top. And when we were trying to put mental health service into prisons and into the court liaison and those sorts of things we spent most of our time working up to try and get people to talk to each other across the departments so that we could then have the support to do the work we needed to be able to do, to work across putting mental health services in police watch houses, in the courts, in the prisons.

CF: Yeah I understand. I guess I'm trying to say are those workers, those case wrap around workers, are they employed by government...

MD: Yeah in the NGO sector.

CF: ...or are they employed by the NGO?

MD: I think probably the NGO sector.

CF: The NGO, yep.

MD: But you need complementary positions in government as well that support that.

CF: The work yes.

MD: But you know the general health system is starting to use positions like navigators. For example you would have heard of that nurse navigators and you know to, because they've got continuity care, of care issues. People coming out of hospital for you know post party cap (?) for example and you know they need to... They're starting to employ people that they call navigators to help people access the sorts of services that they need. You know so they're really a process person, facilitating. So I think there's models that can be drawn from the general health system who are doing it out of desperation because it's so expensive to have somebody in hospital even more than in prison. So they're having to find ways of facilitating those, those sort of processes. And you know we could, I think we can borrow some of those concepts. But look I would envisage that really what you need is, in the NGO sector but that's really well supported but also very, with very strong relationships with local government, with state government, with health, with general health, with mental health, with corrections, with, you know so you need, you know it's very complex and obviously as you've discovered in this review and you need people to be talking to each other.

CW: Absolutely.

CF: Thank you, thank you Michelle. Any comments from people who are here this afternoon? Yes, please remember to say who you are and where you're from. Thank you.

PD: Paul Brown, I'm an Anglican Chaplain at Woodford. A bit of background. I've been involved in the dementia advocacy area internationally, around Australia the last 20 years. So a very important concept that has emerged is that of being person centred. In other words we don't talk about cases, we don't talk about demented people, etcetera, we talk about people and about listening to people. So I think it's just important that we don't talk so much about managing cases or managing, we're talking about helping people. Thank you.

CF: Sure, thank you. Yes, thank you Matt if you can...

MB: My name is Monique Bond and I'm a floater. So I work a bit with Keith and also with ANTAR but it's mainly since Howard's ten point plan when I got interested and since then also going to court and just sitting there and listening to what's happening. So the point I wanted to put forward and may have been talked about this morning was about the difficult for monolingual people to really understand people who speak a different language and which I think is mainly happening with here in, not just here but you know in Australia. And that it's really difficult often to realise how little non-in, first people maybe understanding. Not just the normal words but anything difficult like court experiences and anything that's out of the ordinary. And I really noticed that at the Palm Island

hearings and particularly the coroner's report where my husband and I were sitting there listening and you could just tell that people were not understanding what was happening. There was one interpreter who talked mainly, you know to the court and particularly then after the alleged riots, there were some court cases. And I was sitting at some of those and I'd say to the indigenous people I'm not understanding, what about you guys. Honestly we had no idea most of the time. And I think that's a really important thing if we're talking about the recidivism and prisons to have that in mind and have that quite likely thing that you think you've made yourself really clear and actually unfortunately you haven't.

CW: We've heard exactly that after some of the video conferences, court appearances from the jails. A young indigenous fellow can come out, an officer may say what sort of outcome did you get and he may say he has no idea.

MD: Absolutely, absolutely and that was really clear at anything, anything I've been sitting at. And the other one was again after the Palm Island things, Lex (ui) and five other people pleaded not guilty, about the court, in you know the, I can't find the, I've forgotten the word. But you're understanding what I mean?

CW: Yes.

MD: And only six people, Lex the other five pleaded not guilty. All the others pleaded guilty because they said we won't get a fair hearing anyway. And I think that's pretty shocking.

CW: It's a great chain.

CF: Thank you Monique, thank you.

MD: Thank you.

CF: Yes Keith.

KH: Sorry, I know I've had more than my fair share already but, Keith Hamburger from Knowledge Consulting. I just wanted to build on something that Michelle said about the community hub and bringing those range of services together in a local area. And one of the key things in designing a community hub is to clearly specify the services you're going to use in that location and how it would, they would work, interact and you can do that by specification. And the other thing I wanted to say was that a critically important element in this is that it is run by the local community, a public benefit corporation with the role of the public sector and NGO is changing to be one of a capacity builder rather than the doing. So that there is local ownership of those, for those services.

CF: Thank you.

CW: Point well made Keith.

CF: Thank you Keith. Okay I'm going to conclude that session there. Thank you very much Michelle for presenting today...

MD: Thank you.

CF: ...and for your submission.

CW: Thanks Michelle. Well done.

CF: Thank you. That does conclude the sessions today, presentations and I thank people for attending today, those people who have been in attendance. I thank those presenters as well who've given us really excellent and fulsome presentations today and been open to the questions from both Commissioner Wood and myself and providing materials for us also to follow up with. I'll just remind people that the videos will be uploaded into the system at some point in the future along with all the other material, the submissions, the draft report is there. Our time line is that we will keep progressing along with the next hearings next week. So we have a hearing in Townsville on Wednesday and then a further hearing here, exactly here on the 27th floor here in Brisbane next Friday. And from then we start to compile all the material we've heard from verbal submissions, round table discussions, consultations and written work that we've received into the final report. That final report is due to be handed over to the Deputy Premier, the Honourable Jackie Trad on the 1st of August. So that gives you an idea of our timeline. Okay? Thank you all.

CW: Thank you everybody.