

Division 59: Corrective Services, \$637 999 000 —

Mr M.W. Sutherland, Chairman.

Mr C.C. Porter, Minister for Corrective Services.

Mr I.D. Johnson, Commissioner.

Mr I.A. Giles, Deputy Commissioner, Adult Custodial.

Ms J.T. Tang, Deputy Commissioner, Offender Management and Professional Development.

Ms H. Harker, Deputy Commissioner, Community and Juvenile Justice.

Mr G.A. Doyle, Assistant Commissioner, Corporate Support.

Mr N. Fong, Assistant Commissioner, Aboriginal Justice.

Mr. T.A. Buckingham, Assistant Commissioner, Professional Standards.

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Nedlands.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I refer to the first dot point on page 758. That dot point is about the significant increase in the prisoner population, which is obviously of interest to everyone. My question is: what action is being taken to introduce alternatives to custody, in particular the introduction of back-end in-home detention?

Mr C.C. PORTER: Home detention is an option that is used extensively in other jurisdictions, including South Australia, where in excess of 100 people are on home detention. Historically, there has been the maintenance of home detention in this jurisdiction, but I think the prisoners have numbered 14 to 18 at any given period. It is my intention to proceed down the path of extending the use of home detention in this jurisdiction. The way in which I am intending to do that—this is, of course, subject to a range of approvals that will need to flow appropriately from cabinet—is to have a system of back-end home detention whereby it is not an option at sentencing, but, rather, in certain specified circumstances an individual can serve some portion—a very late portion—of his or her term of imprisonment at home on detention, with the use of electronic monitoring equipment. From my initial advice and briefings on this matter, it appears to me that it might be suitable in this jurisdiction initially for about 50 people; and, if it is successful for those people, it could be extended. Some costings are being undertaken at the moment because of the purchase that would be required of electronic equipment that would ensure that it could be monitored safely. The linchpin of the system would of course be that if someone breached the terms of his or her home detention, that person would be returned to physical incarceration immediately. I am very optimistic that we can have such a system running in this jurisdiction with about 50 people relatively quickly.

Mr W.R. MARMION: The minister alluded to the fact that he is looking at the costings of it. I assume that it will be very cost effective if it works.

Mr C.C. PORTER: An initial capital outlay has to be borne, but there is a significant difference in the cost per day of keeping a prisoner in incarceration compared with the cost per day of monitoring a prisoner and calculating the initial capital outlay. It is much, much more inexpensive.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I note that 55 minutes are left for the remaining two divisions. I would appreciate any efforts that the minister can make to suppress the enthusiasm of his backbench with dorothy dixers.

Mr C.C. PORTER: Their enthusiasm knows no bounds.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I know that the member is a good minister and does not need protection. I refer to the second dot point on page 759 of volume 3 of budget paper No 2, which trumpets the custodial infrastructure program and the 1 657 prisoner beds that are to be built over the forward estimates. I ask, firstly: how many of those additional prisoner beds will be in place by the end of 2011?

Mr C.C. PORTER: By the end of 2011?

Mr P. PAPALIA: Yes, which is referred to in that dot point.

Mr C.C. PORTER: Yes. There are several ways in which I can do this. I can certainly provide the member with the written information on it also. The way in which we have gone about that project is to look at the completion dates for each of the prisons. What I have done is get what is our best calculation of the completion of beds at the end of each financial year, so I can possibly give the member the calculations at 30 June 2011 and 30 June 2012.

Mr P. PAPALIA: The reason I asked the question in that fashion is that the dot point states that it “will be completed by the end of 2011”. Therefore, I assumed that the calculation had been done to that date. It is probably best to do it by financial year, I imagine.

Mr C.C. PORTER: I have that document here with me, and I will get it for the member in just a moment. I need the graph.

Mr P. PAPALIA: It is just because the dot point says “a significant proportion”.

Mr C.C. PORTER: Yes. I have it for the member. This is at 30 June of each financial year. For the next financial year, which is 30 June next year, 2010, we will have 4 837 on line.

Mr P. PAPALIA: What is the minister assuming is the starting figure?

Mr C.C. PORTER: The starting figure is 4 217 as at June 2009. At June 2010, it will be 4 837. At June 2011, it will be 4 955.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Can I get the rest by way of supplementary information?

Mr C.C. PORTER: I am happy to provide that. I can break it down to calendar years also.

Mr P. PAPALIA: That is fine. I just want to get an indication. Further to that —

The CHAIRMAN: The member said that he wanted to get something by way of supplementary information. What information is the minister prepared to give as supplementary information?

Mr C.C. PORTER: I am prepared to give information on the anticipated completed bed numbers at the end of each calendar year for the next four out years.

[*Supplementary Information No B11.*]

Mr P. PAPALIA: Further to that, based on our experience since the introduction of changes to sentencing legislation, is the minister now able to give an anticipated additional prisoner population by the end of not this financial year, but the next one, to which we are referring? I want a reference to how effective the increased number of beds will be in meeting the new model demand as a result of changes to legislation.

[9.10 pm]

Mr C.C. PORTER: I have worked quite hard on developing such a model, going back to our original truth-in-sentencing modelling and then adding to it with patterns of natural growth—what we expect to be truth in sentencing. We have also factored in the effect of increased police numbers, including auxiliary police, and taken into account time for their training and when they come online. We certainly have that information and I can provide it to the member in diagrammatic form if that is of assistance. I can tell the member now that with respect to those, for instance, two years that I have decided to use, we expect in June 2010 to have 4 837 completed and we expect the population to be at about 4 514; in June 2011, we expect to have 4 955 completed and the population to be at 4 809.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I would appreciate it if I could get that diagrammatic representation as supplementary information.

[*Supplementary Information No B12.*]

Mr C.C. PORTER: I am very pleased to provide the diagrammatic representation. However, I will preface that provision by saying that this is an inexact science and we have worked very hard to be as accurate as we can to give ourselves some kind of planning mechanism around which to work.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Given that, as a further question, is the Minister for Corrective Services comfortable that by the end of the out years, at which time we hope the eastern goldfields prison will be online and all the additional capacity will be in place, we will exceed that growth by an adequate margin to be sure that we have enough, or should we be looking to increase expenditure in coming years?

Mr C.C. PORTER: “Comfortable” is a very interesting word. What is very bad and irresponsible in terms of the budget is if we build excess capacity. It is safe to say though that any excess capacity would be utilised for the purpose of de-double bunking, so that if we found that we were above our target, it would mean that there may be institutions in which a prisoner would be by himself in a room that provided for double bunking. Therefore, what I can say is that the member will see from the diagrammatic representation that it is very tight, but it is planned to be tight because we do not want to build overcapacity.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Further, as part of our planning, are we aiming to get back to a situation in which we are not double bunking so that despite the 600 additional double bunkings that will occur and those that are already in place, the objective will one day be not to have people double bunked, or will we concede that prisoners will be double-bunked forever?

Mr C.C. PORTER: That very much depends on what the actual prison numbers will be. If it is the case that actual prison numbers are somewhat below what we have predicted, there will be less double bunking in the system. If they are over what we have predicted, we will have to revisit the plans and there will be more double

bunking in the system. However, I think it also feeds into this question of how we go about characterising capacity, overcapacity and undercapacity, because we have used a measure of original design capacity, and then we have looked at how many prisoners there are and at modified capacity. I have discussed this with the union and with the Inspector of Custodial Services, and it seems to me that there has to be some area in which we as a government can redefine what the appropriate capacity is without reference to original design capacity because there will be some facilities at which double bunking is not inappropriate. For instance, for what we are doing at Pardelup and Karnet Prison Farms and the use of demountables in refurbishing existing facilities on existing sites, it is quite appropriate in my view and that of the department to have some level of sharing of units of accommodation. There are other places at which it will be less appropriate and at which the effects of that will be more deleterious on the ability to deal with overcrowding and program delivery, such as in a place like Casuarina Prison.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Or the Pre-release Centre at Bunbury.

Mr C.C. PORTER: Correct; exactly. Therefore, there are places for which a level of double bunking can be accepted without having, I think, deleterious flow-on effects and there are other places at which we should try to minimise it as much as possible. However, there is unfortunately no perfect answer to the member's question—much depends on prison population growth. I do not think anyone predicted the natural growth that we experienced from 2001 onward. There might be a range of reasons why that occurred and I have asked a range of experts about it. No-one has given me a perfect empirical answer, but it had much to do with, I think, police and investigative techniques, particularly DNA back-capture, which must have fed in enormously to the growth we experienced over the past 10 years.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: This question may need to be directed to Mr Buckingham. Can I get some figures, and this may need to be provided by way of supplementary information, from the last financial year of how many prisoner-to-prisoner assaults were reported; how many prisoner-to-officer assaults were reported; how many officer-to-prisoner assaults were reported; and how many officer-to-officer assaults were reported and subject to investigation?

Mr C.C. PORTER: That question relates to a specific line item because I know it is in the budget papers.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Yes, it does.

Mr C.C. PORTER: It is a line item under key effectiveness indicators with an increase in serious assaults.

The CHAIRMAN: Can the member point that out to us, please?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Sorry, I should have mentioned that. It is on page 760 under outcomes.

Mr C.C. PORTER: I will hand the member over to Mr Buckingham in a moment, but there are some figures that I can give her. Was that prisoner-on-prisoner assaults?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: A few people have probably lost a bet, minister, I suspect.

Mr C.C. PORTER: Yes. There have been 22 prisoner-on-prisoner assaults up to the third quarter—essentially now—in this financial year. There have been four prisoner-on-officer assaults in that same period.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: And officer-on-officer assaults?

Mr C.C. PORTER: I will ask Mr Buckingham or the commissioner whether there has been one. There is apparently an allegation of one such assault, but no more than that at the present time.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Further, what is the average time in which these investigations are now resolved?

Mr C.C. PORTER: I think those investigations would be undertaken by the professional standards division, but I need to hand over to one of the advisers in that respect. The commissioner might have an answer.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I would probably like to talk to Mr Buckingham, if the minister would not mind, because he is the person in charge of that area, as I understand it.

Mr C.C. PORTER: I am pleased to have Mr Buckingham give the member an answer directly.

Mr. T.A. Buckingham: The short answer is that it is dependent upon the circumstances. I have been in this portfolio for only a very short time, so I will not be able to give the member much information in respect of that, other than to say that each investigation is conducted on its own merits depending upon the allegations, how many witnesses are involved, what evidence needs to be gathered and all those other factors of the investigation and considerations of disciplinary action. Therefore, I cannot give the member an exact time frame that each investigation would take, other than that we seek to undertake those investigations in a timely manner with the resources we have.

Chairman; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Paul Papalia; Ms Margaret Quirk; Ms Andrea Mitchell

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Further, how many allegations in relation to officers are before the Corruption and Crime Commission at the moment? That answer may be provided by way of supplementary information.

Mr C.C. PORTER: We can, but I will preface that undertaking to provide it by way of supplementary information —

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will shoot myself after I have read the information, if the minister would like.

Mr C.C. PORTER: Yes, we do not want to shoot ourselves or have the member shoot herself. There might be some reasonable limitations to that, but —

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I imagine some people on the other side of the room would quite like to shoot me.

Mr C.C. PORTER: There might be some limitations, but to the extent that it is not contrary to the Corruption and Crime Commission Act or any other relevant provision, we will provide the member with that information by way of supplementary information.

[Supplementary Information No B13.]

The CHAIRMAN: Can the minister just give us a short statement about the information he will provide.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Allegations referred to the Corruption and Crime Commission relating to officers.

Mr C.C. PORTER: I will give information of allegations referred to the CCC with respect to employees of the Department of Corrective Services; is that broad enough?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: That is correct; I thank the minister.

Mr C.C. PORTER: I add to that: we will provide that information in instances whereby we are lawfully able to do so.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I have a further two questions. In terms of the period up to June 2009, how many instances of smuggling by officers have been recorded or how many times have instances of smuggling by officers been detected?

Mr C.C. PORTER: Sorry; was that recorded?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Detected.

Mr C.C. PORTER: By “detected”, I presume the member means investigated.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Or detected, and presumably they may well still be in the pipeline, according to Mr Buckingham.

Mr C.C. PORTER: I will have to take that question by way of supplementary information, as well, unless Mr Buckingham has —

Mr. T.A. Buckingham: I just need some more clarification in terms of allegations that might be made or investigations that were commenced or reported; I am not quite sure exactly what —

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Allegations and actual detections, I suppose.

Mr. T.A. Buckingham: Actual detections?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Yes.

[Supplementary Information No B14.]

[9.20 pm]

Mr C.C. PORTER: May I just clarify what that question is. If we phrase that in terms of matters for which an internal review has been commenced, would that cover the instances that the member is looking at or concerned about?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: It might not, minister, if they are referred to the police, so there might not necessarily be an internal review, but it could be both.

Mr C.C. PORTER: I will use the word “detected”, and we will do our best

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I thank the minister. In relation to the case that the commissioner mentioned concerning the allegation about an officer assault, when was that allegation made, and at what stage is that investigation?

Mr C.C. PORTER: I will have the commissioner answer that directly.

Mr I.D. Johnson: The allegation was made, from memory, last week or the week before; I cannot be exact on the date. The process thus far has involved my writing to the alleged offender asking that person to show cause as to why the officer has currently been suspended, and I have asked him to report back to me as to whether I

should vary the terms of that suspension. That letter was actually received by my office yesterday and is currently being processed.

Ms A.R. MITCHELL: I refer to page 759, dot point three. Can the minister advise how the department plans to increase the delivery of offender programs to prisoners to reduce re-offending?

Mr C.C. PORTER: I thank the member for the question. On taking up this position, there were a few areas in the Department of Corrective Services in which I was very keen to achieve significant improvements. One of those areas is the delivery of offender programs. I have observed that there has been a significant decrease in a range of categories of offender programs over the past five to six years. I have engaged in a process with the department of setting internal targets for the department for the delivery of programs. We have already achieved some considerable success in the past six months in the delivery of programs. What I am intending to achieve is a significant upward trend in the delivery of programs—sex offending programs for Indigenous and non-Indigenous prisoners, violent offending programs for Indigenous and non-Indigenous prisoners and addictions offending programs for Indigenous and non-Indigenous prisoners—and set targets over the next several out years. I think we can do better even than the targets that we have set at this preliminary level, but we will work on the targets for 2009-10, and after that it may be that we need to be even more aggressive in the way in which we go about having new programs on our roster. We have already undertaken some contracting out of some of the programs, but we have set quite aspirational targets for increasing that area over the next four years.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Further to that question, I have had it suggested to me that were superintendents devolved more responsibility, particularly more financial control, they would be able to source programs in their locations more effectively than perhaps is currently the case. Is that under consideration as a way in which we might head?

Mr C.C. PORTER: Yes, it is, but that would need to be subject to fairly rigorous standards control, if I can put it that way. What is observable, and I think instructive in this area, is that while we have had a decline in program delivery in terms of persons and hours in the public system, Acacia Prison has done very well. Acacia goes about delivering its programs in a manner that it generally sees fit, subject to certain standards and guidelines that are provided pursuant to its contract and generally by the department. One example is the addictions offending program trends. In 2007-08, the entire public sector enrolments were 78 persons, and at Acacia they were 96 persons. So Acacia, in addictions offending program trends, was outperforming the entirety of the remainder of the public sector. That shows us, I think, that with some form of devolution, and by allowing superintendents to control their own budgets in this area, we can adjust more rapidly and we can emulate that Acacia model and get the program delivery up. I have not been able, in the six months that I have had so far, to get to a point at which I consider there is appropriate standards control for such a system, but in terms of the next financial year cycle—after the 2009-10 range of programs—we will certainly be working towards ways in which we can more usefully empower superintendents to go out, with a defined budget and within defined parameters, and engage in program delivery.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I would suggest that within the state system, Boronia Pre-release Centre for Women might be a similar model. It is not just Acacia. If we can provide a bit of flexibility, they appear to be capable of going out and sourcing the resources and being more flexible in the provision of services. I am not sure what the data proves, but I understand that anecdotally that seems to be the case. I know the minister is trying to compress down the number of programs that are provided for efficiency and to maximise the effect, but beyond those five or six key programs that the minister is working towards, is the minister also considering some of the other programs that we have discussed, such as Sycamore Tree or the alternatives to violence program, that are not for profit and perhaps might provide a bigger bang for the buck if we were to fund them more adequately than we are doing currently?

Mr C.C. PORTER: I appreciate the member's views on the Sycamore Tree project. I have not reached a concluded view on the cost efficiency of that project.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I am probably of a similar mind in that I would like to see it analysed, but they cannot do that without additional moneys.

Mr C.C. PORTER: That is right. I would say that the way I am approaching the problem is not program at a time and not institution at a time. It seems to me that if I have the next financial year to work up some parameters and try to rebuild a model that could be applied equally to Greenough Regional Prison as to Boronia, where superintendents are empowered to an extent to engage in budget expenditure for programs, that would be a very good thing. It would be a very labour-intensive exercise to do it for just one institution. That is not to say that there might not be an alternative way of going about it. We might pick one model and succeed in one year and see whether it can be duplicated. However, my information in terms of the structure of the programs, in terms of shortening them to reasonable levels, and in terms of the way in which they are delivered, is to do it all at once, simply because time is limited.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I refer to page 761 of the *Budget Statements*, the last two dot points under the heading “Custodial Infrastructure Program”. I understand that a key component of expanding the capacity of the program revolves around work camps. I am very supportive of that. What is the situation with the new classification system; and when will that have an impact? How confident is the minister that as a result of implementing that system, he will get adequate numbers to fill these work camps, and, for that matter, also the minimum-security prisons that are to be expanded in capacity?

[9.30 pm]

Mr C.C. PORTER: That is obviously an important question to ask and one that I have been working through. Perhaps the way in which to commence answering that question is to say that obviously the member would be aware that the Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services undertook a full review into classifications in February last year and in effect concluded that the current classification system is not fit for purpose and that a new system should be adopted; and, indeed, suggested the parameters of that new system. We are in the process of determining exactly what model of classification will be adopted, and we are getting very close to the point at which that classification will be adopted. What I am not doing is working backwards from what we anticipate will be, in three or four out years, the total number of prisoners broken down into categories of maximum security, medium security and minimum security, and then designing a system around that. But I am conscious of the fact that it is appropriate to have, in a new construction, a good fit to what can be at least hypothesised to be the breakdown of the total number between minimum, medium and maximum. The Department of Corrective Services has taken a sample group of 84 offenders and ascertained what the ratings would be under the Offender into Custody system, unmodified, and under various versions of a modified OIC system. There were several recommendations in the custodial inspector’s report which we do not intend to adopt; I am not going to go quite as far in some areas, and less far in others. But looking at the sample of 84 people that we have worked with, there are two points of classification: there is the management and placement of sentenced prisoners—MAP—which is the initial classification; and then there is a classification review, which is on the checklist, which occurs within six months and then 12 months. Some prisoners may only undergo that review once.

I will outline the comparative outcomes. After reading the data, one of the deficiencies that the department and I agreed on about the original OIC system is that it did not allow for much movement based on a prisoner’s good behaviour after six months or 12 months. It was much better than the system that presently exists, but it was a little too static. The system that I believe we will eventually adopt will allow for greater reward—or punishment—of a prisoner in terms of their classification ratings depending on their performance six months and 12 months out. I will use the results from the sample 84 prisoners to give the member a picture of where it is going. If we look at the present ratings for a sample group of 84 people, the number of people classified as maximum security is 20 of that 84; the medium classification will be 54 of that 84; and the minimum security will be 10 of that 84. That is how things presently stand. If we were to use the OIC system unabridged, as recommended, based on that same sample size of 84 prisoners, that system would produce zero people in the maximum security category, 56 in the medium, and 28 in the minimum. At first instance, the model that I favour at the moment but have not reached a conclusive decision on would produce a rating of eight people in the maximum category, 68 in medium, and eight in minimum. But when we look at the reclassification under the model that I presently favour but have not yet reached a decision on, the result would be that, after six months, of that same sample of 84 there would be one person classified as maximum security, 32 in medium security, and 51 in minimum security. Whether or not we adopt the modified system that we are close to settling on, or the OIC system, either system produces—either immediately, or in the case of our more cautious system in the longer run—a greater number of minimum-security prisoners. I think there will be sufficient minimums to fill what will be the constructed minimum beds.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Further to that answer, below the minimum, to enable prisoners to go to work camps, does this classification system have another level, or are minimum-security prisoners allowed to go to work camps under this?

Mr C.C. PORTER: My understanding is that not every minimum-security prisoner would be assessed as suitable for a work camp. There are certain rules in place around that at the moment. There might be some modification to those, and that is being looked into at the moment—again, that is not settled on. Whether it be the new OIC system or the system that we are proposing, the existing rules around which of the minimum-security prisoners are suitable for work camps rather than other institutions would not need to be changed in any substantive way to ensure enough minimum-category prisoners, or work-camp ready prisoners, for the number of beds that we are envisaging building.

Mr P. PAPALIA: We are sure of that, are we?

Mr C.C. PORTER: It depends on the system we adopt.

Mr P. PAPALIA: It just seems that at the moment there are unfilled beds at work camps.

Mr C.C. PORTER: That is true. One reason for that is that the type of work camps that were built—I will use Millstream as an example—cannot house a prisoner direct from sentencing. However, the sort of work camps that we are intending to build at a place like Warburton, because we are spending more money on them, will have the facilities to be able to receive what are historically more volatile prisoners—that is, prisoners straight from sentencing. They can have their assessments and so forth done at a work camp that looks quite different from work camps at the moment. The construction of the new work camps will allow for a greater number of minimum-security prisoners as well.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Further to that answer, is it intended that Pardelup, for instance, will almost become a minimum-security prison, rather than a work camp?

Mr C.C. PORTER: That is one option for Pardelup. For a long time Pardelup was a minimum-security prison. What is presently envisaged is that it will be a prison farm.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Before, we stuck fences around them, I think!

Mr C.C. PORTER: That is right. The fences around minimum-security prisons at Wooroloo and so forth are not massive edifices. There will be adjustments along the way, but in terms of the way in which we envisage the final classification system working, we may need to play at the margins with issues like Pardelup. But there is no big disconnect between the classification, the rates, and where the beds are being built.

Mr P. PAPALIA: It has also been suggested that part of the problem is getting the prisoners willing to go there—encouraging them.

Mr C.C. PORTER: Yes.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Is it intended, through what the government is planning, that we entice volunteers to work camps through some sort of benefit to them beyond just being in a different environment?

Mr C.C. PORTER: Yes. There will be less discretion able to be exercised on the part of a prisoner with respect to a work camp. The one area where the identification of a minimum-security prisoner who is ready for a work camp will change is that it will be a matter of choice far less in the future. It is safe to say that choice will feed into an assessment on a case-by-case basis as to whether a prisoner is suitable for that form of incarceration. Prisoners who go willingly are more likely than not to behave in a fashion that is expected of them in that environment. My personal view, and one that I intend to drive into the assessment process, is that sometimes people do not necessarily choose what is best for them. There is no doubt, in my mind at least, that properly constructed work camps are a much better way for people to receive skills training and spend time in incarceration in a meaningful way. There is too much choice on the part of individual prisoners at the moment as to whether or not they go there.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I have a final further question one!

The CHAIRMAN: I am only doing this for the member because he needs my protection! The member can ask another question.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Does the Attorney General know where the work camp in the wheatbelt will be built yet?

Mr C.C. PORTER: It has not been finally determined. I have been in discussions with the Minister for Regional Development.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: What a surprise!

Mr C.C. PORTER: In a perfect world, I probably would have undertaken more lengthy consultation and had a direct consultation period, but I want to identify a site and get it built quickly. One of the overarching factors in my mind is that the existing camp in the wheatbelt could stay open if it is close enough to the new camp, and that will have some bearing on the decision. I have not finally determined it, but I imagine that will happen in the next month or so.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I will return to the end of the line.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I refer to page 760, where it states —

Outcome: A safe, secure and decent corrective services which contributes to community safety and reduces offenders' involvement in the justice system:

I have two related issues that I want to ask the Attorney General about. The first relates to Hakea Prison. I understand that the hostage response team at Hakea has been disbanded. Is that something that the Attorney General will confirm?

Mr C.C. PORTER: I do not understand that to be the case. I visited Hakea recently and went out to the firing range and watched the hostage response team shooting guns. I understand that it is still active and that there are not any plans afoot to disband it. I will certainly inquire as to whether there is any even embryonic policy view that it should be disbanded, but it does not seem to me that it would necessarily be a good idea.

[9.40 pm]

Ms M.M. QUIRK: The Minister for Corrective Services will understand why this is a related issue when I ask the question. Prisoner Paul Keating is currently in the special handling unit at Casuarina Prison. I understand that when sentencing him, the judge might have made some remarks along the lines that no female staff members should be working near him, for obvious reasons. I understand that a plan or proposal is to reintroduce female staff to the SHU. I want to know whether the minister is aware of it.

Mr C.C. PORTER: I recall being in court the day that Mr Keating was sentenced. I think Carmel Barbagallo was the prosecutor. Indeed, I recall that very statement. My understanding is that no plans are afoot to introduce female workers into the special handling unit. I would certainly advise against it. Very interestingly, I do not know what would happen if we met with an equal opportunity claim from a female who wanted to work in the SHU. It would be a very interesting development, but at the moment there are no plans afoot. It would be unwise to allow that to occur.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I refer to page 761, and the second dot point under the “Custodial Infrastructure Program”. Will the minister explain how the proposed young offenders prison will be different from other elements of the custodial infrastructure program?

Mr C.C. PORTER: I will deal with that quickly, because I know my friends want to get back to some other questions. This was an election promise that emanated from the now Minister for Police. I think it is a very good idea. The best way that I can describe how it will be different is that the one modification that is being made to Rangeview Remand Centre to allow it to become a young offenders’ prison is that a very large work shed will be built. That is the only piece of the building that will require the perimeter fence to be moved and extended slightly outwards to take that into account. If we can take 18 to 22-year-olds out of the general population and prevent them from having to associate with the people found in the general prison population, statistically speaking we will have the best possible chances of reducing their return rate to prison within a two-year period. One thing that is notable and interesting is that while we have had very significant increases in the adult prisoner population, the increases have been less severe for juveniles. Our juvenile centres have been effectively under muster. One of the ways in which we can inject an 80-bed facility into the mix of adult custodial prisons is by retrofitting Rangeview Remand Centre and by changing Banksia Hill Detention Centre to cater for the entire juvenile population. It is a very quick way of getting an extra 80 beds in a prison, which I think will make something of a difference. I am also very keen to make sure that when we do put 18 to 22-year-old male offenders in this prison, we monitor very closely what happens to them and indeed try to keep some data and records of what is happening to 18 to 22-year-olds in the prison system now, because I would hope that we can measurably improve the recidivism rates.

Mr P. PAPALIA: It is good to hear that a workshop is being put in the prison, but is there an intention to have a focus on education as well, noting the relative youth of these prisoners, and perhaps compelling education rather than having it on a voluntary basis?

Mr C.C. PORTER: The education will be tailored to the type of prisoner. I think the education for Indigenous prisoners will be different from that for some of the other prisoners. Yes, it will have a large educative component and a large skills training component. The concept will be to try to fit people for employment at the end of their sentence. We will try to manage a cradle-to-grave system for employment. It will be per head of prison population. It will be one of the more expensive prisons in the mix, and that will be because of the intensive nature of the programs that we will deliver. That brings me to this point: I have received a number of questions from the member of which some notice was given. I saw that he had an interchange with the Minister for Local Government about how the member wanted to deal with those questions.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Subject to the view of the Minister for Corrective Services, if he is happy to allow us to have those considered to be read and for us to receive them as having been read into *Hansard*, that would be okay. If the minister is not, I would rather that they be taken as supplementary questions or, at the worst case, on notice.

Mr C.C. PORTER: I am happy to do what the member asks, save that I have read the questions and the answers that the department has naturally provided. Some of them are of that ilk where the question is not quite the right question.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I did not write all of them.

Mr C.C. PORTER: If the member is happy to receive a written answer and then have another question on notice —

Mr P. PAPALIA: I can always do that.

Mr C.C. PORTER: For instance, one question asks us to look at those 655 full-time equivalents. At the moment we have not been able to divide the information between adult and juvenile, but we can do in due course I think.

Mr P. PAPALIA: That is fine; I appreciate that.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 15 minutes left and one division to go.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Referring to budget paper No 2, volume 3, page 759 and dot point 4, is the department intending to tighten the supervision of community-based orders and reduce latitude given before breaching? The minister has said that in Parliament, so I know that to be the case. In view of that, has any additional funding been allocated for achieving this goal?

Mr C.C. PORTER: No. Let me explain why I think we can make significant changes in this area without necessarily spending more money. I have just finished a process of setting by hand myself what will be the new policy for breaches both in supervision in areas such as parole and in supervision for community work. If I may give a core summary, the system that previously existed required, before breach action was presumed to take place, three consecutive omissions. That means people could miss every third turn—so they could miss two in a row 50 times if they wished. As long as they went to the third one, they were not even in jeopardy of being in breach. The policy is being finalised but that will be changed to a policy by which there will be a requirement on one omission that they give an explanation within a period of either 24 or 48 hours. On a second omission, which need not be consecutive, there will be a presumption in favour of a breach. On a third omission, there will be a requirement for breach, which can only be reversed at a senior level. Even before we institute those changes, which are just changes in policy, we have gone into each of the departments to try to ensure, since the beginning of this year, that individual case managers are applying the existing policy. I asked for these figures today because we are trying to keep them on a regular basis. If we look at the adult community work compliance rates, they are up from 24 per cent in January of this year to 51 per cent as of April, and in the regions from 16 per cent in January to 35 per cent in April. That compliance rate means essentially people turning up to the appointment that they are supposed to be turning up to. All that has brought about that change is imploring our staff to meet their own existing standards. One of the restructures that will take place is that there will be a separate division, so FTEs will be moved around slightly to ensure that one division is about compliance and is centralised in that respect. I am quite pleased with that, but I would expect that we can achieve even better than that over the course of the next financial year with rewriting the policies. I think this will initially result in a greater number of breaches; in fact, if one looks at breach action from what will be the central breach unit, in January of this year there were 133 breaches completed and in April there were 171 breaches completed. There will be more breaches, but I would rather have a system where we have a higher threat of breach, even if in the early days it is a greater actuality of breach, which is an incentive for greater completion of requirements under whatever court order it is they are under. At the moment, no, if I am not getting the results that I want, it may be that it will require some internal reallocation of FTEs to try to ensure them. At the moment we have seen some results without the necessity of spending more money in that area.

Mr P. PAPALIA: That is commendable, and the outcome already is good. I was concerned because my natural expectation would be that the workload as a result of the activity being more efficient might be raised for individuals and that demands placed on individuals would be greater.

[9.50 pm]

Mr C.C. PORTER: That is a possibility in the sense that there are quite stringent standards about how many files each community corrections officer is able to have at any time. However, each file needs to be dealt with strictly in accordance with policy; otherwise, there is no point in having a policy. It may well require greater attention and focus, which is sometimes difficult, but that is where we are at.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I refer to budget paper No 2, volume 3, page 759, dot point five. How much money has been allocated to the objective of improving delivery of custodial and community-based offender programs?

Mr C.C. PORTER: Over time, I recall—without looking at the document—that for 2002-03, or 2003-04, the budget was approximately \$9.5 million, and it is now approximately \$11.58 million. There were some one-off expenditures in the past financial year. I am happy to provide this information to the member; I think that will be of greater assistance than simply reading it out. There have also been some one-off increases in expenditure, but I perceive that it is an area that, even within a limited budget, we can do considerably better by contracting out our services and reconfiguring programs. I notice on the figures I have received that monitoring and compliance

Chairman; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Paul Papalia; Ms Margaret Quirk; Ms Andrea Mitchell

in the middle management sector of that work unit in the Department of Corrective Services has expanded steadily, and that might be an area in which there might be some reconfiguration.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I refer to page 761, under the heading, “Juvenile Offender Services”. It states —

The estimated decrease in budgeted expenditure for 2009-10 compared to 2008-09 reflects the impact of the Efficiency Dividend; internal movements in depreciation and unfunded cost pressures.

Could the minister explain the impact of the efficiency dividend a little?

Mr C.C. PORTER: I can go through the various components of where the cost savings are coming from.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Yes, a general explanation of it.

Mr C.C. PORTER: After that I will invite the commissioner to add anything he wishes. This is as broad a summary as time will allow. I will look at the cost savings specifically referred to in the member’s question of which some notice was given—vacancy management, overtime, maintenance, travel and Acacia Prison. The savings facilitated from Acacia in 2009-10 of \$1.95 million is an estimate based on the increased number of prison beds that we are putting into Acacia, and those prisoners not being in the public system. There is a cost saving per head of prisoners in Acacia. That is where that saving has been generated from.

There is a \$659 000 saving in travel over the next full financial year. Ninety per cent of travel for the Department of Corrective Services occurs inside Western Australia. This affects travel both interstate and intrastate, but the bulk of it is intrastate. For most divisions other than the Community and Juvenile Justice division, there is a target of reducing travel by 20 per cent; it is 10 per cent for CJJ. That effectively meant that there was not much in the way of managerial controls over travel. Travel now has to be notified up the chain of management, and in some instances it will be refused. That is not something that has occurred before, but there now has to be line management approval for travel in relevant divisions.

Some maintenance has been moved over into the next financial year, and all maintenance savings of \$400 000 have occurred in this half financial year. They have been deferred into 2009-10. Some of the savings have been affected by virtue of the fact that we did not maintain into this financial year institutions that we were about to refurbish pursuant to the custodial infrastructure program. Some of the savings have come about after identifying areas in which prison labour can be used in construction; it is not a large saving, but there it is.

Historically, there have been high levels of overtime in the Department of Corrective Services, particularly for prison officers. The commissioner will correct me if I am wrong, but we have had overtime bills in the vicinity of \$19 million a year. The department operates 12-hour shifts. The overtime budget has been comparatively large in relation to other parts of the public sector for two reasons. Firstly, as we have failed to reach full staffing levels because of the economic boom, overtime has been used as a mechanism to cover for the fact of not having FTEs in positions. Secondly, there is a level of overtime in 12-hour shifts that is apportioned to late cancellation due to things like sick leave, which is at a comparatively high level. That targeted saving is based around a target of reducing overtime by 20 per cent. Some of that will be because we now have much better rostering of staff as a result of economic circumstances and recruitment, and we will not have to use overtime as often to fill positions that have now been filled. We will be working very hard to ensure the minimisation of a system in which a person who is about to work a 12-hour shift will ring in sick, and someone who is just completing a 12-hour shift will be required to work an extra shift on the basis of overtime. My view is that such a situation is not good for the person who is working a double shift. It might be monetarily satisfactory, but it is very bad to have people working for such extended periods. We are confident that we can squeeze down savings in that area.

It has been asked in previous divisions whether we can precisely identify which positions will not be filled. It is very difficult, because we will consider each position as vacancies arise. The commissioner has gone about this by looking at three tiers of workers inside the Department of Corrective Services, and priority will be given to not filling vacancies in the first tier, which is as far back from front-line services as we can manage. We consider that that will be a \$4.549 million saving.

If a greater level of detail than that is required, the question is probably best directed to the commissioner. I am sure that he can provide some assistance on that matter.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: This is a custodial question. I refer to page 760. I suspect the Attorney General may know the answer, but I will accept an answer as supplementary information. Does the Attorney General consider it appropriate for a superintendent in the department to also hold a position as a steward of a racecourse? Does he consider that to be an incompatible combination?

Mr C.C. PORTER: A superintendent of a department who is also a steward of a racecourse—I am not aware of the situation the member refers to. I have not given any thought to the matter until this moment; it may be that there are circumstances in which that is an unhelpful situation. If I can avail myself of any information about that

Chairman; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Christian Porter; Mr Paul Papalia; Ms Margaret Quirk; Ms Andrea Mitchell

and undertake to get back to the member about any view that I might formulate, I will do so. I will, on a gentleman's basis, undertake to look into the situation. If there is such a situation, I will receive a briefing on it and correspond directly with the member to give her my view about whether the situation is appropriate or inappropriate.

The appropriation was recommended.