

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

Division 60: Corrective Services, \$472 535 000 -

Mr P.B. Watson, Chairman.

Ms M.M. Quirk, Minister for Corrective Services.

Mr I.D. Johnson, Commissioner.

Mr B.J. Cram, Acting Deputy Commissioner, Offender Management and Professional Development.

Mr G.A. Doyle, Acting Executive Director, Corporate Services.

Mr I.A. Giles, Assistant Commissioner, Professional Standards, Integrity and Compliance.

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

Mr R.J. Holding, Deputy Commissioner, Adult Custodial.

Mr M. Kuzminski, Finance Manager.

Mr B. Yearwood, Assistant Commissioner, Corporate Support.

The CHAIRMAN: I call the member for Nedlands.

[10.20 am]

Ms S.E. WALKER: The fourth dot point on page 1060 states -

The number of adults in prison on remand continues to rise, as does the length of time held in custody on remand. Over the past year, the length of stay on remand has increased by 8 per cent, resulting in a 25 per cent increase in the number of remand beds required. The number of adult remandees has risen from 500 in June 2004 to 694 in March 2007, and now accounts for 19 per cent of the adult prison population.

How long is the average length of stay of prisoners on remand? Can that figure be broken down into the shortest stay and the longest stay?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will ask Mr Holding to provide the member with more detailed information. There has been a 24 per cent increase in remand numbers from March 2004 to March 2007, and the average time spent on remand has increased over that period from 83 days to 93 days. That has led to a 25 per cent increase in the number of beds that are required for remand, at a cost of \$4.2 million per annum. Obviously, our capacity to influence those numbers is limited, but I am exploring with the Attorney General some ways in which we can reduce those remand numbers, which are undesirable.

Ms S.E. WALKER: As a supplementary question, why has the number of people in remand risen?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: There are a number of reasons for that. We will do some research into it.

Ms S.E. WALKER: Does the minister not know?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: We have some anecdotal evidence and ideas but the information we have must be evidence-based. We are looking at commissioning the Crime Research Centre at the University of Western Australia to look at that. Chief Judge Antoinette Kennedy has written a paper and has proffered some reasons for the increase, but it is occurring not only in the District Court, but also across the whole justice system. I will ask Mr Holding to provide the member with more information on the anecdotal evidence.

Mr R.J. Holding: To answer the member's question specifically about the shortest and longest periods, some prisoners will be on remand for a matter of hours or even possibly minutes from the time they are remanded in custody to the time they are granted bail. One of the issues we are working very hard on is putting in place bail coordinators in the courts and in our receivable prisons to try to assist offenders who have trouble getting surety for their bail to enable them to get bail and be released from custody. At the other end of the scale, clearly some prisoners will be in custody awaiting trial and sentence for a good length of time - possibly for even longer than year. I do not have to hand information on how much time the longest serving prisoner has spent on remand. As the minister said, we are conducting research into the increase in the number of prisoners on remand. Although the information so far is essentially anecdotal, I will put it slightly more strongly than that. A greater number of offenders are appearing in courts for offences that have a high rate of refusal for bail. Those offences include violent offences, breaking and entering, and stealing. Given the increase in the number of these types of offences, there is also a greater inclination for the police to oppose bail because of the violent nature of the charges against the offenders. There is little more I can add to that.

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

Ms S.E. WALKER: As a supplementary question, is one of the reasons these people on are on remand for a long time that the Attorney General refuses to appoint two more judges to the District Court?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I would not want to proffer an opinion on that.

Ms S.E. WALKER: It is probable, is it not?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: There are a range of reasons.

Ms S.E. WALKER: We have just heard the minister's advisers say that they could not get through.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I am sure that they would not want to proffer an opinion on it either.

Ms S.E. WALKER: He did.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I was made aware of a case the other day whereby the police refused to allow a person to arrange a \$5 surety from the East Perth lock-up. The prisoner was transported and admitted to Hakea Prison, by which stage the surety could be arranged. That is administratively scandalous and we are working closely with the police to try to eliminate some of those types of problems. In general terms, I agree with the member that the efficient working of the judiciary and the capacity for it to deal with cases to their conclusion is desirable.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I refer to the juvenile accommodation strategy under "Works in Progress" on page 1066. Reference is made to the Banksia Hill Detention Centre. The minor expenditure on this item is recorded as far back as 2004-05.

Mr A.D. McRAE: Point of order. I ask the member to speak more distinctly. The microphones are not picking him up properly and I cannot understand what he is referring to.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I do not care if the member can hear me or not. I am speaking to the minister.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I cannot hear the member either.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a problem. I am having problems hearing members from the chair.

Mr A.D. McRAE: Stupid, ignorant person.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Will you accept that, Mr Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: Members, it is early in the morning and we have a long day today, tomorrow and Thursday.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I know that he is under pressure.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Point of order. I ask that the Chairman instruct the member for Riverton to withdraw his comment about a member of Parliament.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not hear the comment, but if the member for Riverton feels that he has made an incorrect comment, he will withdraw.

Mr A.D. McRAE: I withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I am having troubling hearing some of the advisers. I do not know whether the microphones can be turned up. If we all listen very intently, I am sure we can hear what members have to say.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I get the impression that the government is dragging its feet on this issue. Why is only \$990 000 being spent on the juvenile accommodation strategy in 2006-07 when last year's budget set the figure for this year at \$3.75 million?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will ask Mrs Heather Harker to answer that.

Ms H. Harker: I do not have that detail to hand, but we certainly could find out.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Can Mr Yearwood answer it?

Mr B. Yearwood: Our current program serves to increase the women's accommodation from eight currently to 24. We are doing some planning and design work on that this year. The essence of that program is to increase the number of female juveniles who can be accommodated at the centre from eight to 24.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Is that at Banksia Hill Detention Centre?

Mr B. Yearwood: The women are currently at the Rangeview Remand Centre. We have separated them from Banksia Hill Detention Centre.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: They have been taken away from Banksia to Rangeview. Is the intention to move them back there once the extra site has been developed?

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

Mr B. Yearwood: As I said, we are working through the design, which will include the operation philosophies and other detail as we work through it.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It looks like a backflip on the juvenile centres in Geraldton and Kalgoorlie. The current minister and previous ministers responsible for corrective services have been making these types of announcements but nothing has happened. Is this more government spin?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: The member knows that I would never engage in spin; if anything, I am a mistress of understatement. The member is familiar with the background to the Geraldton and Kalgoorlie remand centres. The government gave a commitment during the 2005 election that it would build \$12-million remand centres in Geraldton and Kalgoorlie. The member is aware that community reference groups were set up in relation to those two projects. When I became the minister about a year ago, I travelled to both centres in Kalgoorlie and Geraldton. I asked members of the community reference group why they believed the remand centres were necessary, given that the problems identified by the community were much more diverse than just having to lock up a juvenile overnight or the limited number of trips to transport a juvenile to Rangeview.

[10.30 am]

When I drilled down into what the community identified as the problems, we saw that they were much greater than just a matter of kids being in a police lockup overnight. They related to youth homelessness; antisocial behaviour; kids being on the street at all hours without necessarily having committed any criminal offence; and the prevalence of young Indigenous kids apparently being aimless and congregating. So there was a range of issues which would not necessarily be solved by the building of a remand centre. At that stage the capital costs had gone up substantially; we also estimated on the initial plans that the recurrent cost would be about \$5 million a year. With the concurrence of the communities in both Kalgoorlie and Geraldton, particularly the reference group, we worked through what alternatives might better address this range of issues. I have made some preliminary announcements about that and I hope to make some announcements shortly about a site or premises for the Geraldton facility. I have certainly made a commitment to ensure that the amount of money we had allocated to spend on the remand centres would be spent on these other programs to address a diverse range of issues.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Is it fair to say that in the six and a half years of Labor government it has not made one extra facility available for juveniles?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: No, I do not believe that to be true.

Mr I.D. Johnson: I think with this issue far too much focus is on detention centres or places for young juveniles to be put in detention. The emphasis for the department is certainly related to an alternative model, which sees far more work happening with the families of these offenders, more of the intensive supervision-type programs, and also finding responsible persons in the community rather than trying to build a facility that will house all the juvenile offenders throughout the state. That is an impossible task. For us it is very much about looking at how we can best manage these juveniles within their community, where their support partners are, rather than just locking them up.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That does not actually answer my question. The question was: is it a fact that the government has not provided one new facility for detaining juveniles?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: That was not the question the member asked a minute ago.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: it was; it was worded slightly differently, but it had the same theme. The government has not supplied any extra facilities for housing juveniles who are supposed to be serving detention. Is that correct or not?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: It is self-evident, member, that Banksia Hill and Rangeview are the predominant sites at which juveniles are held. We have not built any additional sites.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: In the last six and a half years?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Yes.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Thank you.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Can I also say that 85 per cent of juveniles do not return to detention following sentencing, so we are exploring a lot of alternatives. The intensive supervision program is particularly successful in diverting kids. To some extent, once kids are in custody we have lost the battle. Community justice is much more about getting those kids at an early stage when they are at risk and before they commit serious offences.

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

Mr P.W. ANDREWS: I want to ask the minister about the escape rates and rates of absconding from custody. I refer to page 1062, under “Outcomes and Key Effectiveness Indicators”. Obviously, the target for 2007-08 would be zero escapes, but what are the actual figures and is there any indication of improvement in this regard?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I thank the member for the question. Clearly, as I have said in this place on a number of occasions, any escape is one too many. During 2006-07 there has been a continued decrease in the escape rate despite an increased adult prisoner population. I think this reflects a number of strategies we have successfully implemented to do with the security, care and wellbeing of prisoners, including identifying who might escape early, and improved prison intelligence and so on, which was identified in the Mahoney report. For the 10 months to 30 April this year, unlawful absences from Broome and Eastern Goldfields, which are termed open prisons, accounted for 72.7 per cent of all unlawful absences. However, elsewhere it has been a much better story. The sustained reduction in the rate of unlawful absences reflects the effort applied by the department to address the underlying causes of escapes. The opportunity for escapes to occur has been reduced. Prisoners are placed within minimum-security prisons after individual assessments against strict criteria have been undertaken, and that is only those who pose a minimal threat to the community. Those prisoners are usually serving shorter sentences or are nearing completion of their sentence and are to be released into the community within a short time. We have also implemented some initiatives to improve security, and we have structured activities during periods of increased tension and stress within the present system, such as Christmas activities of sport and recreation events and additional family visits. We use personal identification devices and electronic monitoring at Wooroloo, and they have been very effective and stopped opportunistic escapes. We have installed secure perimeter fencing at Wooroloo and Karnet. We have also recently introduced improved risk-rating intelligence systems, which has identified cohort groups and areas of potential conflict in prisons. This has enabled staff to take evasive action and reduce the potential for escapes. Over the past 12 years, the worst years for escapes under a Labor government were 2002-03 and 2004-05, when there were 53 escapes each year. That is still far better than the record under the previous government. There were 63 escapes in 1999-2000, which was its best year, and our record is nowhere near the former government’s 1996-97 performance, when almost four per cent of prisoners escaped from prison. I can demonstrate this more clearly with this graph, which I prepared earlier. I have a spare copy here. The red line shows the increased prison population, which is going up, and the bar graphs show the number of escapes. In percentage terms, for the year to date the number of escapes is 0.74 per cent of the total prison population. Under the previous government, the rate had got up to 3.99 per cent or four per cent. I take this opportunity to commend the department for its very hard work in getting that rate down considering the enormous pressure. I table that graph.

Mr A.D. McRAE: Can I ask a question in relation to that chart?

The CHAIRMAN: No, the member cannot.

Ms S.E. WALKER: I refer to the fourth paragraph under “Capital Works Program” on page 1065, which states that work will continue on the construction of a secure 40-bed self-care unit and new entry building at Bandyup Women’s Prison. Recently, a decision was placed on the Parole Board website in relation to Catherine Birnie. She had not applied for parole but the Parole Board took it upon itself to say that she had been assessed as low-risk. The recommendation was that she should be released at some time. As far as I am concerned, Catherine Birnie has always been held in the maximum security section of Bandyup Women’s Prison. Judge Valerie French said that she had been assessed as low risk of reoffending in the absence of her co-offender, David Birnie. In my view, that is a softening up to try to get the Western Australian public to think that she should be released. Is it the minister’s intention to keep her in strict security at Bandyup Women’s Prison or will she be sent off to the new Boronia Pre-release Centre for Women at some time in the future?

[10.40 am]

Ms M.M. QUIRK: As far as I am concerned, Catherine Birnie is staying where she is.

Ms S.E. WALKER: The minister’s government also said that about Robert Excell.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: With all due respect, I did not say anything of the kind. I am saying that if we receive directions from the Supervised Release Review Board, we act on those. I do not want to speculate on hypothetical situations at this stage. We have assessed Catherine Birnie as being not appropriate for Boronia, as I understand it. She is housed at Bandyup Women’s Prison and will stay there.

Ms S.E. WALKER: Is she still in the maximum security section?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I am not sure where she is.

Mr I.D. Johnson: She is held in the maximum security section. There is no intention of removing her from there.

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

Ms S.E. WALKER: Has there been a request for her to be moved?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Not that I am aware of.

Ms S.E. WALKER: Is there a request to move her to any other section of Bandyup Women's Prison?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Not that I am aware of.

Mr I.D. Johnson: Certainly not.

Mr A.D. McRAE: I refer to page 1060, on which the last dot point of "Significant issues and trends" relates to juvenile detention services and the increasing representation of very young children on remand from remote locations. I think this must be an action of last resort. What has been done to address the trend of the increasing remand of young people from remote areas?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: One example I will give is really problematical. Assistant Commissioner Yearwood will be able to give the details. A young girl was remanded to Perth from Broome. I understand that she was released within a day and sent back to Broome. This is another issue in which I think we need to have greater dialogue with stakeholders, such as the courts, so that they can appreciate the implications of actions such as that. We would obviously have preferred some due inquiry to have been made of whether some responsible adult could have acted as surety for the child rather than the state being put to the expense of sending the child from Broome on remand for less than 48 hours, as I understand it.

Mr A.D. McRAE: How old was that child?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I understand she was 13 years old.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The last line of the works in progress on page 1066 shows an estimated expenditure in the current financial year of \$746 000. What was that money spent on?

Mr B. Yearwood: We are planning in the metropolitan area for custodial purposes. We have started an extensive process to evaluate the opportunities to find additional land. We have been assessing findings from the State Planning Commission and have worked up a full sustainability model for that, and we anticipate that, within the next two or three months, we will be presenting those findings to the minister and we will see how we will go from there. We are trying to plan for the future of custodial services within the Perth metropolitan area.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Therefore, that \$746 000 has not been used to facilitate the purchase of any land but has gone in such expenses as fees?

Mr B. Yearwood: We have commissioned through the Department of Housing and Works for all our works. We have no authority to maintain or construct, so we have done that through the Department of Housing and Works. It has been a planning exercise. We have brought in planning people to do that and have collected all the data. We want to come back with a well-researched and well-balanced decision before we take it to the minister.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The department has spent three-quarters of a million dollars on consultants, has it?

Mr B. Yearwood: We have brought in a number of service people through the Department of Housing and Works to assist in that research. They include town planners and environmentalists. A number of people on that team are from other government departments. We have extensively used the services of the Department for Planning and Infrastructure and the Department of Environment and Conservation. The team is blended with a number of people from different sources.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: In bulk terms, the minister's department is giving other government departments money for advice, surveying work and all the rest of it; it has not spent any money on any acquisition of land for further development. Is that right? Can the minister give me, by way of supplementary information, a breakdown of that three-quarters of a million dollars of public money that is either going out the window or to another government department, which will use it for some other project?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: To put it in perspective, the decisions are not just for today but for the future. Clearly, the member will have seen from the earlier graph that prisoner numbers are trending up. Prisons do not evolve like mushrooms on the side of a hill. They require a fairly substantial amount of planning. This is a major enterprise, because a lot of the capital infrastructure is ageing. To get professionals costs money. I believe that quantum is not out of sync with other areas where a substantial amount of planning takes place before a project proceeds. I can undertake to provide by way of supplementary information a breakdown of the costs involved in the \$746 000 expenditure for the planning of the new metropolitan prison complex.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The line item reads "Prisons".

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

Ms M.M. QUIRK: It is a prison complex, so it is anticipated there will be a kind of campus, if I may put it in that way.

[Supplementary Information No A2.]

Ms M.M. QUIRK: As has been said by the assistant commissioner, we are working very closely with the Department for Planning and Infrastructure. We have embarked on this planning enterprise exercise, which will enable us to identify a suitable site for adult custodial facilities. We must obviously look at environmental issues, such as water management and flooding, reservations of land, Bush Forever and air quality. We must think about the social and cultural aspects, which include such things as transport, emergency services and cultural significance. We must look at economics, the cost of utilities, human and support services, land use and the cost of acquisition, and institutional issues such as the planning scheme, the compatibility with other land use, native title and other planning considerations. As the member will appreciate, this will be a greenfield site. We must take into consideration the surroundings, so that whatever site is chosen is compatible with the nearby land uses. The member for Hillarys will be pleased to know that we are not looking at Hillarys!

[10.50 am]

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I refer to the outcomes and key effectiveness indicators on page 1062. At the top of the page it refers to "Outcomes: A safe, secure and decent corrective services which contributes" etc. The range of points below that relate only to "safe". The other two, "secure" and "decent", do not get a mention. The seventh dot point on page 1060 is about mental health. From following the system pretty closely, I would have thought that mental health problems in our institutions were a serious problem. Is that correct?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Yes.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: What is happening with funding? Why are there no key performance indicators in the budget on the mental health of prisoners?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Thank you, member. Things like out-of-cell hours relate at some level to a decent system, if you like. I agree with the member.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I do not want to waste the time of the committee; I want to know what services are being provided in prisons now to deal with mental health problems. We hear that one in five Aboriginal children in Western Australia has a mental health problem. Unfortunately, the prison system has a few of them. What can we expect in the areas of mental health in this coming year? What proportion of services will be provided in-house, and what proportion will be provided by not-for-profit agencies?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Thank you very much for the question. I concur that probably the most pressing problem in our prisons today relates to mental health. The estimate of prisoners who have some mental health problem ranges from 20 per cent up to 40 per cent. It is closer to 40 per cent if we refer also to people with intellectual disabilities. If we are really serious about getting the prison muster down, we need to address mental health issues more effectively than we have done in the past. In July 2005, Attorney General McGinty visited the United Kingdom and looked at the services for prisoners with mental health problems, and those with dangerous and severe personality disorders. In February last year, a detailed business case was prepared in light of the need for a mental health facility and mental health service between 2007 and 2010. That has been costed at over \$100 million, with about \$30 million in recurrent costs. Unfortunately, the timetable has blown out on that. The business case has been prepared and pursuing that is obviously high on my list of things that I need to do. Of increasing concern is not only mental illness but also acquired brain injury, and, of course, solvent abuse is producing a lot of offenders who are very difficult to deal with, are prone to violent outbursts, are not amenable to any programs that are delivered and have limited prospects of rehabilitation. An increasing number of them are entering the prison system. They are an incredibly difficult management problem, as are people who have significant addictions, such as methamphetamine addictions. If offenders are sufficiently addicted and suffer brain damage, they present a huge issue for us.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: Have any extra resources been allocated in this budget for this area? In light of the skill issue, is consideration being given to using some of the better not-for-profit organisations to assist in this area?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: We are certainly canvassing whatever options we can. With regard to the need to attract good personnel, the pay for nurses, for example, in our prison system is not on parity with pay for nurses who work for the Department of Health. That is something I want to address. If we are to attract people who are dedicated and proficient, they need to be remunerated accordingly. All I will say at the moment is that it is a challenge. If we get the mental health issue right, we will address some of the supply issues in terms of prison numbers. We are looking only at the demand, but I think we must look at the supply also and see whether we

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

can divert some of those people away, while at the same time keeping the community safe, which is, of course, paramount.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I still have not received an answer from the minister on whether any further financial resources have been included in the budget, particularly for mental health or dependencies.

Mr I.D. Johnson: I will run through a few of the things we are doing, to give the member the sense that quite a few things are in place. We have done a review of the mental health provision throughout the service. At the moment we are piloting a system of screening at the Greenough Regional Prison to make sure that when people enter the system their needs are identified and a treatment program is provided to address those needs. On that front, however, this is not a problem that is unique to Western Australia; it is a problem that the rest of the country is grappling with. There is a national project on which all jurisdictions are trying to work together to identify a universally accepted screening tool that will allow us to identify these people. The other aspect of that is identification at the court appearance. A dedicated person is there who deals with the assessments at that stage. We try to identify them before they enter the prison system. The mentally impaired accused legislation is awaiting priority for drafting. Case management of approximately 87 offenders is being undertaken by the manager of disability services.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Some of which we fund.

Mr I.D. Johnson: That is correct. We work very closely with the mental health people on that. The department is putting up a comprehensive proposal for how we can better provide a mental health business case. A disability access and inclusion plan is being endorsed by the department and submitted. In relation to treatment in prison, there are qualified mental health nurses but, of course, the member will be aware that they are difficult people to employ. There are not that many of them around. Like most departments, we face challenges there. However, they are employed at Bandyup, Hakea and Casuarina prisons. We have an arrangement with the Department of Health to use beds available at the Franklin centre for people with severe mental health illnesses and to provide treatment from the mental health professionals.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I asked if there were any more resources in this year's budget for either dependencies or mental health.

Mr I.D. Johnson: Not that I am aware of, no.

Ms S.E. WALKER: I refer to the seventh dot point on page 1063. How many prisoners became pregnant while in custody last year; in what prison; and what was the outcome? Are any contraceptive devices issued to prisoners, including medication, such as the pill?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: It was not me! I will leave this to the commissioner.

Mr I.D. Johnson: I could not answer the first question with certainty. My understanding is that there are two, but I cannot give the member a definite answer.

Ms S.E. WALKER: Do you know what prisons?

Mr I.D. Johnson: Broome.

[11.00 am]

Ms S.E. WALKER: What was the outcome?

Mr I.D. Johnson: Certainly one of the prisoners had a baby. What was the second question?

Ms S.E. WALKER: Are contraceptives issued to prisoners; and, if so, what sort and in what quantity?

Mr R.J. Holding: Condoms are available to prisoners without their needing to request or get a prescription. They are freely available. Concerning other methods of contraception, I am not able to advise in detail. I will have to take that on notice.

[Mrs D.J. Guise took the chair.]

Ms S.E. WALKER: Can I have that as supplementary information?

The CHAIRMAN: Does the member wish to ask another question?

Ms S.E. WALKER: I would like provided to me information on how many prisoners became pregnant while in custody last year and in what prisons?

The CHAIRMAN: Is the member seeking supplementary information?

Ms S.E. WALKER: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the minister happy to provide supplementary information?

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

Ms M.M. QUIRK: The supplementary information that the member is requesting is the number of prisoners who became pregnant in the 2006-07 financial year and the location of the prison at which they were held?

Ms S.E. WALKER: What was the outcome and what are the contraceptives -

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I am not sure what the member means by what was the outcome.

Ms S.E. WALKER: Did the pregnancy go through to birth?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Yes.

Ms S.E. WALKER: That is what I want to know. I also want to know whether any contraceptive devices are issued to prisoners?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I think that question has been answered.

Ms S.E. WALKER: No, it has not. I want some more information.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Maybe the member can tell the committee what that is.

Ms S.E. WALKER: If the minister will let me say what I want, then I will tell her. Are any contraceptive devices, including any kind of medication; for example, the pill, issued to prisoners; and, if so, in what quantity and in which prisons? Can I have that as supplementary information?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Some of that information I do not believe we have available. I will defer to Deputy Commissioner Holding who will be able to tell the member what information the department is able to provide.

Ms S.E. WALKER: He has already answered it and cannot give the details.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind members who is in the Chair and we will not be having that, let me tell members! If there is a debate in this place it will be through me and in the form of a proper question. I need to ascertain from the minister which part of the question can be answered or which, if any, she is prepared to supply as supplementary information.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: That is what I was trying to ascertain by asking Deputy Commissioner Holding to indicate what information the member requested can be provided.

Mr R.J. Holding: We can certainly provide complete information about pregnancies and the outcomes. We can provide detail about the provision of condoms. Concerning the issue of the pill, I suspect there may be a medical confidentiality issue between medical practitioner and patient. I can certainly consult my colleagues and provide what information we can.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the minister happy to confirm that information as supplementary information?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I am providing by way of supplementary information, the number of pregnancies, location of prisoners who were pregnant, the outcome of those pregnancies and the number of condoms issued and the location they were issued.

Ms S.E. WALKER: And any other contraception medication.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I am not prepared to provide that because I believe it is a matter of medical confidentiality.

Ms S.E. WALKER: The minister will not be -

The CHAIRMAN: Member for Nedlands!

[Supplementary Information No A3.]

Mr A.D. McRAE: Could I ask whether we will have a morning tea break this morning?

The CHAIRMAN: It is entirely up to the committee whether we take a break. I will take members' advice on that.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Certainly not yet.

Mr A.D. McRAE: What time are members thinking - 11.30 am?

The CHAIRMAN: Members can discuss it among themselves.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I am happy to continue at this stage, but my urologist would not thank me if I went through to one o'clock. I might require a short break in half an hour or 40 minutes.

Mr A.D. McRAE: Let us agree on 11.30 am.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: No, not 11.30.

Mr A.D. McRAE: Not 11.30 - well, 11.31 or 11.32?

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

The CHAIRMAN: Members can have a quiet chat about it while the member for Collie-Wellington asks his question.

Mr M.P. MURRAY: As members are aware, I am a bit nervous about asking a question on corrective services! However, I will ask this question.

The CHAIRMAN: I look forward to seeing the member when the fisheries division is debated. Please continue.

Mr M.P. MURRAY: I refer to the second dot point under “Major Initiatives For 2007-08” on legislative reforms. Can the minister please advise what legislative reform has taken place recently and what other reforms are planned for the future?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I thank the member and I will not say anything about the other matter for obvious reasons.

A number of legislative reforms were recommended by the Mahoney inquiry. The first tranche of those reforms is the Prisons and Sentencing Legislation Amendment Act 2006, which came into effect last month. The major reforms were a more flexible framework for managing temporary absences from prison; information exchange provisions to facilitate offender management; research and victim support; enhanced provisions for the rehabilitation and wellbeing of prisoners; establishment of work camps as external facilities to prisons; and the ability for community members to request that a prisoner not send them mail. We are currently working on what I call a legislative code, which will require a corrective services bill, that will amalgamate the Prisons Act and the Sentencing Administration Act. It will update the prisons legislation by including purpose and guiding principles to promote integration across the corrective services system. The proposed legislation will transfer prison officer employment from me to the commissioner, so that all departmental staff have the same employer. It will reform the system of prison discipline to clarify the distinction between misconduct and criminal acts. Other administrative amendments will be made to improve prison administration.

The other thing about which I have had some concern is the inability to take action against prison officers and other officers within corrective services who abuse the trust of their position by engaging in sexual conduct with prisoners. Since 1987, there have been 72 investigations of improper sexual conduct between corrective staff and offenders. The majority of these involve prison staff and prisoners. The current disciplinary procedure is quite inadequate and allows prison staff who are under investigation to vary potential outcomes through resignation prior to the conclusion of any proceedings against them. After careful consideration, I have decided that the imperative is to have a deterrent against this type of behaviour, given the number of incidents and the inadequacy of the existing disciplinary process. I believe that warrants the creation of a specific offence and this will enable action to be taken even if the prison officer resigns. New South Wales and Queensland have provisions in their criminal law that define when consent is not fully given. These provisions include being in a position of authority over a victim as a circumstance of aggravation for sexual assault and by an exercise of authority respectively. I have discussed this legislative reform with the Attorney General and he agrees that the current situation is inadequate. We need to facilitate criminal prosecution where appropriate. Therefore, I have sought the Attorney General’s agreement for an amendment to the Criminal Code to clarify that consent is deemed not to be voluntary if it is obtained through exercise of authority. I expect to be able to introduce this amendment after the winter recess.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Before I ask my question, we are happy to have a break at 12 o’clock provided we can ask a reasonable number of questions in that time.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: If I turn blue in the meantime, the member might need to revise that time.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: If the minister gets desperate I am prepared to adjourn for five minutes if she needs to go somewhere.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Thank you.

[11.10 am]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I refer to “Other expenses” which is the last line of the income statement under “Expenses” on page 1068. The estimated actual is the same as the budget estimate. It is a remarkable piece of budget forecasting to have the exact same dollar amount for something that is loosely classified as “Other expenses”. How can such precision be achieved?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will refer to Mr Doyle.

Mr G.A. Doyle: With regard to the amount listed against “Other expenses”, as there are no known variations from our budget for 2007-08, we have reported no variations against that line. In the income or financial

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

statements, we report variations only when there are known variations. There are no known variations against "Other expenses"; therefore, the amount is the same.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: To the last dollar?

Mr G.A. Doyle: Yes.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can the minister explain why this year's figure for "Other expenses" is exactly the same as the figure approved by the Parliament last year? Honestly, it stinks of fudging the figures, or laziness. It reflects a complete breakdown in proper accountability.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Can the member tell me exactly what he is pointing to?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The minister may not have last year's figures -

Ms M.M. QUIRK: No.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Last year, a similar exercise took place, because exactly the same figure was written in for "Other expenses". Frankly, that is not good enough. That is just fudging the figures. There must be an estimated actual for the amount that has been spent. For both those figures to be identical is some sort of miracle in accountancy terms.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I am not an accountant; therefore, other than to say that they are just projections, I cannot assist the member any more in that regard.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: We are talking about a lot of money - \$17 million. Can the minister provide by way of supplementary information a list of where that money has been spent?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: The member would need to be more precise. I still do not understand what the member is talking about. Can the member point me to the page?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I have already done that. It is page 1068. The last line under expenses for the 2006-07 budget is \$16.938 million. In the next column, the estimated actual is also \$16.938 million. In the forward estimates, the figures are also the same, at \$17.150 million. Has any thought gone into how the actual money has been spent? I would like a breakdown of that \$16.938 million. It looks as though someone has just plucked a figure out of the air for the estimate and then used that same figure for the actual.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will ask Mr Doyle to say what is included in that figure.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: May I have a list?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will ask Mr Doyle to give the member an explanation now, and we can supplement that with whatever the member may need more information about.

Mr G.A. Doyle: Obviously, I do not have in front of me the full details of what makes up that amount. With regard to why the amount has stayed the same, the budget allocation is going forward. We are allocated cost escalation going forward. We apply that cost escalation to the supplies and services line, which is why that increases year on year.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The escalation, if I can cut in there -

The CHAIRMAN: The member cannot do that. The member can ask a further question through the Chair.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It is a further question, but I thought I would ask it now. The escalation that we are talking about is from \$17.075 million to \$17.150 million. The same amount has just been carried through in every forward estimate in that line for "Other expenses".

Mr G.A. Doyle: I am sorry, but I do not have that detail with me. We will be able to provide a list of what makes up that amount. That \$17-odd million across the forward estimates is made up of very minor types of purchases. As the member has said, we do not apply escalation provisions to those minor purchases. We apply escalation provisions only to major purchases, which is primarily the supplies and services line.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I want to ensure that that \$17 million - which is a large amount of taxpayers' funds - is being spent in an appropriate manner. I am concerned that the budget estimate for 2006-07 is the exact same figure as the estimated actual. That seems to be a miracle. I want to know how that money has been spent. I would like the minister to account for that \$17 million.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will provide by way of supplementary information details of "Other expenses" on page 1068 of the budget papers. Does the member want to know just about the second column in the line for "Other expenses", or all the columns?

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am interested in the estimated actual for 2006-07 under “Other expenses”, which totals \$16.938 million. I would like to know how that money was spent.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Certainly; so it is the make-up of that \$16.938 million. I am happy to provide that by way of supplementary information.

[Supplementary Information No A4.]

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I refer to page 1062, “Outcomes and Key Effectiveness Indicators”. The outcome states in part, “A safe, secure and decent corrective services”. The minister will have heard me make this speech before. I do not believe the key effectiveness indicators are satisfactory. I would ask the appropriate adviser to look at that matter. The public is interested in the hard-core issues in the agency, such as escapes. The points listed below that outcome relate to only one part of providing a safe, secure and decent corrective services. I suggest to the agency that the key effectiveness indicators should be rewritten to include the other hard-core issues that need to be addressed, such as mental health and other personal outcomes for prisoners.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I would not disagree with the member. If the Attorney General gets his human rights bill into the Parliament, it may well be that we will need to add a key effectiveness indicator to say that it includes compliance with certain basic standards. We are certainly working on some standards at the moment. However, they are not reflected in the key indicators. We are happy to look at that; that is not a problem.

Mr A.D. McRAE: Point of order, Madam Chair. I asked earlier whether we could break for morning tea. The dining room is now shut. It actually has set times for morning tea; that is, between 10.30 am and 11.00 am.

Ms S.E. WALKER: You missed out on a bun!

Mr A.D. McRAE: It is okay. I just want to make sure that members understand that a designated time has been set for morning tea.

Ms S.E. WALKER: I refer to page 1062, service 1, adult offender services. One of the aims of this service is to provide timely offender services. I refer the minister to the Dangerous Sexual Offenders Act, and the case of DPP v Mangalamara. The minister mentioned in response to a question earlier that the Attorney General went to England in 2002-03 to look specifically at other legislation that relates to that act. Page 40 of that decision refers to evidence from Michelle Myers, a senior community corrections officer based at Hakea Prison, that as far as she is aware, no funding has been provided by the state for people affected by orders made pursuant to that act. She states also that no infrastructure has been put in place to facilitate the making of supervision orders, and there is no specific provision for liaison between agencies. I am sorry about that long preamble. The Dangerous Sexual Offenders Act is supposed to ensure that paedophiles and serial rapists, and other people who are a danger to the community, are kept in prison. Has any funding been provided in the budget to provide the infrastructure and other facilities that are required to implement that act?

[11.20 am]

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Yes, funding is provided. As the member would be aware, the dangerous sexual offenders legislation is new. It is administered by the Attorney General. However, the Department of Corrective Services has a significant supervisory role and also regularly assesses those prisoners who are incarcerated. The commissioner will expand on the detail of the funding. For example, under the legislation these offenders must be assessed regularly. That cost has been borne by the Department of Corrective Services. We are currently working through some other issues. I will ask the commissioner to talk about them.

Mr I.D. Johnson: The community correction officer was acting in good faith but was wrong at the time. Funding has been made available for the management of dangerous sexual offenders, which will allow the department to proceed on two fronts. Firstly, offender management professional development will allow proper psychiatric assessments and clinicians to assess these offenders as they go before the DPP for application. Secondly, resources will be available on the community correction side of things to do up these supervision plans and monitor the process of managing these offenders as they come through the system. The department will be able to identify them early in the piece and make the proper applications through the DPP. Once the applications are either approved or disapproved, we will receive the outcomes of those applications as they relate to supervising the community etc. Approximately \$5 million per year is being made available.

Ms S.E. WALKER: The minister’s adviser said that \$5 million will be made available. What will it be available for?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: To administer our role in the scheme, which both I and the commissioner have described. Heather Harker has some additional details.

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

Ms H. Harker: Community Justice Services is responsible for providing an assessment report on accommodation and support networks as part of the community supervision plan. The funding that is being provided will be very much directed to making sure that those services are provided consistently. Importantly, that is being done in conjunction with other agencies within the community, particularly the Department for Community Development, the Department of Health and the Department of Housing and Works. I am sure the member is aware that housing in particular is a significant problem in being able to link sexual offenders safely in the community. The other matter that we are taking forward, again as a result of this additional funding, is that we are beginning to develop multi-agency public protection arrangements. That basically means that the Department of Corrective Services, the police, DCD and agencies such as that will work together to try to manage these offenders safely in the community. We have already met with the police to start this pilot moving. We anticipate being able to bring it together later this year.

Ms S.E. WALKER: I presume there will be more applications of this type. Mr Mangolamara had nowhere to go. Ms Murray said that there was no infrastructure and nothing was being built to ensure that when these people were released into the community, there would be a supervised place for them to stay. Nothing that the minister or her advisers have said indicates that any funds will be available for supervised infrastructure. One of the minister's advisers said that there will be extra funding for psychiatric assessments, but there was a very detailed psychiatric assessment of Mangolamara by a couple of psychiatrists. When these dangerous sexual offenders have nowhere to stay, what is the minister doing to ensure that infrastructure is in place so that they can be supervised, and how will they be supervised - without giving me a motherhood statement?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I am unsure what the member means by "motherhood statement". I have been frank and forthright throughout this hearing. If she has a particular problem, she can ask a supplementary question. I do not intend to sit here and listen to that sort of garbage.

Ms S.E. WALKER: I ask for supplementary information. Can the minister please provide me information on the infrastructure funding that was referred to in the case of DPP v Mangolamara for dangerous sexual offenders who are on supervision orders?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will provide that by way of supplementary information.

[Supplementary Information No A5.]

Mr P.W. ANDREWS: My question might be better directed to the Minister for Health but I will ask it anyway. Hepatitis is a major problem in prisons. Are any special initiatives being carried out by the department to handle the treatment of hepatitis within the prison system? I am referring to "Outcomes and Key Effectiveness Indicators" on page 1062, which indicates a safe corrective service.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will refer that question to Barry Cram shortly. Hepatitis is particularly prevalent in the prison system. It is highly infectious, as the member is aware. It is a major concern that we do everything we can for prisoners while they are inside. It is relevant to relate to the past history of prisoners. We need a quality health service within the prison system so that when these prisoners are released, they do not pose an undue threat to the community. This is an issue that the Inspector of Custodial Services has raised on many occasions. I am in active discussions with the Minister for Health on the future of the prisoner health service. It is worth noting that prisoners are not covered by Medicare. We actually meet the full cost of prisoner health care while prisoners are incarcerated. I will be raising that issue at the Corrective Services Ministers' Conference in June. Given that we have a responsibility to make sure that prisoners leave jail in the best health that we can possibly arrange so as to not impact on the community, it would be terrific if the federal government would in some way contribute to the cost and actually permit PBS and Medicare funding. In relation to the specific hepatitis programs, I will defer to Barry Cram.

Mr B.J. Cram: I simply confirm that the health services directorate within the department has a specific program to address the prevention treatment of hepatitis C, particularly within prisons and linkages to community agencies when prisoners actually leave prisons to follow up on that treatment. We could provide details of the specifics of that program if required.

Mr P.W. ANDREWS: I am advocating the treatment of hepatitis while prisoners are in prison; for example, carrying out biopsies in the prison system itself rather than taking prisoners to Fremantle Hospital or wherever. I thank the minister for her answer.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I refer to the second paragraph on page 1066. What sites has the department identified as future prison sites?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I would prefer not to answer that question. As there are issues of conflicting land use in certain areas, I do not want to scare the horses. There is one in the north and there is one in the south in the

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

metropolitan area. In relation to regional prisons, I have identified that Derby will be the location for the new Kimberley prison, but we do not have a particular site yet. We have also identified an additional work camp for the east Kimberley. A site has not been located for that, but Halls Creek may be a possibility.

[11.30 am]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: When does the minister think that she will be in a position to be open, accountable and transparent and tell the people of Western Australia where the sites will be located?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: When all the planning and environmental approvals have been made, I will be happy to make that announcement. The member will appreciate that hyperbole and beat-ups can occur if people do not have the all the information. I am reluctant to say that there will be a new prison in Hillarys, for example, because of the impact that would have. I am more than happy to be frank and accountable when the planning and approval process is forthcoming.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I ask that they not be built in residential areas as such.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: That is part of the planning process.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Casuarina Prison and Acacia Prison are well away from residential areas.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: That is part of the planning process. They will be located on greenfield sites. Having said that, we must be mindful that they will be located near public transport so that family members can visit prisoners. The sites will not be greenfield to the point at which there is nothing there.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Will they be maximum, medium or low-security prisons?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: We are looking at a fairly comprehensive plan. The member will be the second to know.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I would not have thought I would be the second to know. The minister referred to a security upgrade for the prison staff and everybody else. Will the security upgrade eradicate the existence of blind spots?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will ask the commissioner to answer that.

Mr I.D. Johnson: It is virtually impossible to relegate blind spots throughout a prison, so the answer is no.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Is the minister 100 per cent certain that Robbie Wheeler and Victor Urquhart have never been in one of those blind spots together?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I recently visited the crisis care unit at Hakea Prison again and I was particularly mindful of the member's identification of blind spots. I had a very good look around that unit. It is all covered by closed-circuit television, which is staffed by an officer. I am not a trained eye, but it looked to me as if everything was evident and that nothing could be hidden in that unit.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Is the minister stating that there are no blind spots in that unit?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I am stating that I did not discern any blind spots but I was mindful to look for them. The commissioner made a statement about blind spots in the prison system generally, but not about that particular unit. I visited it in the past week and I did not see anything that would constitute a blind spot. I was assured by an officer of some experience that he believed there were not any in that unit.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: If that is what the minister is saying, I will have to accept that. I have one further question on that subject. In which prisons are there facilities available for psychiatric and psychological assessments to be undertaken? The minister said that Wheeler and Urquhart had to be assessed at Hakea Prison. I have been asked by many members of the public whether similar assessment facilities exist in Casuarina Prison. I understand that those facilities do exist there.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: As I have said previously, Hakea Prison is a remand prison whereby during the normal course of events prisoners are held pre-sentence and they undertake an assessment for the purposes of production to the court of pre-sentence reports and the like. More importantly, an assessment is made about not only the psychological assessment of a prisoner but also the ability to hold a prisoner at the unit. Also, an assessment was made about whether there was a significant risk that either of those individuals would self-harm. Under all the circumstances, it was considered best to keep them there, bearing in mind that their opportunity to consort inappropriately was virtually nil.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The minister is not denying that one of them could quite easily have been sent to Casuarina Prison to the protected unit that would have protected him from the other prisoners. The other prisoners would obviously tear them apart, and I can understand that. I am asking the minister whether one of

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

them could have been housed in Casuarina, which is not a million miles away, at the protective unit so that those two lovers could have been kept apart.

Ms S.E. WALKER: As they did with the Birnies?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: The Birnies were of a different gender. That comment is not helpful. I defer to the commissioner.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The minister understands the question that I am asking. It would have been just as simple to have housed one of the prisoners in Casuarina Prison in a protected area. I have seen prisoners there who are protected from the mainstream prison population.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will go so far as to say that it is feasible. I relied on the advice that I was given by the department. They are professionals of longstanding. It would have been singular and unusual to do it. In my view, it would have been a matter of jumping at shadows. The allegations that were made were patently untrue. I defer to the commissioner.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Some of them came from within the prison service.

Mr I.D. Johnson: During the 85 weeks that those prisoners have been in custody, they have been held in separate prisons for all but four weeks. The minister is correct about the standard assessment procedure. Hakea Prison is the main receivable assessment facility for prisoners on remand. Therefore, transports to prisons are typically carried out from Hakea. It is also where a prisoner's individual management plan is worked out. A prisoner's future placement from the day that he is sentenced is also calculated at Hakea Prison. As a result of this incident, it is fair to say that the minister has asked me to look at the procedures and whether we can learn lessons from it. The answer is that we can. I will put up my hand for that. I think we can do it better. We must make sure that those two prisoners are not together for any longer than they have to be. The minister also asked me to make sure that their individual management plans, which usually take about 21 days after sentencing, can be done prior to that occurring. The day they attend court - Thursday, 24 May - will be the last day they spend together. Could we do it better? We can always do things better. Do we listen to feedback? Yes, we do.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: Acacia Prison and the Wooroloo Prison Farm are not in my electorate, but a good westie would put them into my electorate. Many of the people who work in those prisons live in my electorate. Some people are asking me about the supplementary services that are provided to those prisons. I would prefer it if the minister provided that information as supplementary information so that we do not drag out the process. I would like to know whether there have been any changes in the services supplied to prisons, particularly by the not-for-profit and government agencies in Northam. Many of the agencies in my town deliver services to those two prisons. I would appreciate it if the minister would provide information on any alterations that have been made between last year and this year regarding the services that are provided to those two prisons, and whether those changes were positive or negative.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will clarify that. Is the member asking for information on services provided by the Department for Community Development or on the services that are provided to the inmates of Karnet and Wooroloo Prison Farms?

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I am interested only in Acacia Prison and the Wooroloo Prison Farm because they are a stone's throw from my electorate and many people who live in my electorate work in those two prisons.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I am happy to provide supplementary information, but I am still unsure about the specific information the member is asking for.

The CHAIRMAN: It would be helpful if the member could point to an item in the budget and be more specific about the type of information he would like the minister to provide.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I refer to the table of costs under the heading "Service 1: Adult Offender Services" on page 1062. I want to know the purchase of services rather than the in-house services of those prisons. What services have been brought in? Has there been any change from the last operational year to this year? Will there be any positive or negative changes?

[11.40 am]

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I am happy to provide what is available. By way of qualification, the member will be mindful that Acacia is a private prison and the new operators have operated for a year so there are likely to have been some changes in operations. To the extent the information is available to us -

Ms S.E. WALKER: It is a privately run state prison.

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

Ms M.M. QUIRK: To the extent, member for Nedlands, that it relates to the enforcement of those contracts, we have monitors on site and I am sure we will be able to provide information about differences in services and the like, if that is what the member is after.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: It really peeves me, this bit, but I will not get angry with the minister: do I require the minister's permission to visit that prison?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: It is standard procedure but I am always happy to do that for members who are interested. I always accede to any request to do so.

[Supplementary Information No A6.]

Ms S.E. WALKER: I refer to the seventh dot point on page 1063, which relates to prisoner case management. How many prisoners died in custody in 2006-07, and in which prisons? Did any -

The CHAIRMAN: Can we deal with one question at a time, member? I am happy to explore a line of questioning. What was the first part of that?

Ms S.E. WALKER: How many prisoners died in custody in 2006-07?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will have to get that by way of supplementary information. I think it is two or three, but I am a bit concerned that I do not forget one that died of natural causes, or whatever.

[Supplementary Information No A7.]

Ms S.E. WALKER: In that case, I guess the rest of my questions will be supplementary information. I wanted to know in what prisons they died; were there any suspicious circumstances; were there any suicides; and were any of those the result of pregnancies?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I can say in relation to the last question that I believe all the deaths were males, so they were not in relation to pregnancies, as I understand it. We will provide the details by way of supplementary information.

The CHAIRMAN: For the purpose of *Hansard* and for members, I indicate that we will treat that information as part of the original request, so it is allocation number A7.

Ms S.E. WALKER: There is one further question. What amount of taxpayers' money was spent on contraceptive devices or medication, and what type and at what location? Could I have that by way of supplementary information?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: That is a completely different question. In relation to the first question, we are getting information on deaths in custody, the sites of those deaths, circumstances of the deaths, which ones were suicide and which were other than suicide -

Ms S.E. WALKER: And pregnancy.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I have told the member already that I am not providing that by way of supplementary information because my understanding is that all the deaths were males.

Ms S.E. WALKER: Yes, but I am asking now if the minister would provide by way of supplementary information what amount of taxpayers' money was spent on contraceptive devices or medication, and what type and what location, as a result of prisoner case management, which is the seventh dot point.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Fine, but I am just not sure what comes within the definition of contraceptive devices. Is that devices for -

Ms S.E. WALKER: Anything.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Dental dams, for example?

Ms S.E. WALKER: Just what amount of taxpayers' money has been spent on those devices.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I do not know what is defined as contraceptive devices. Dental dams are a device that is used but, let us face it, that is not their primary purpose, and their primary purpose does not stop conception. Would the member include them, for example?

Ms S.E. WALKER: Everything that is a contraceptive device.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: So, the member would not include devices that are meant for disease prevention?

Ms S.E. WALKER: Everything that is a contraceptive device. The minister can put the list.

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will not provide that by way of supplementary information because I do not believe we collect the information, as I understand it. We have a program to give a small number of condoms to prisoners who are leaving prison. I am happy to give the member information on that. We can probably give the member some other information on what is spent on condoms within prisons, but “contraceptive devices” is so broad as to be illusory, and I cannot answer the question. Therefore I cannot give the member any supplementary information.

Ms S.E. WALKER: Can the minister give me supplementary information on what amount of taxpayers’ money was spent on contraceptive devices such as condoms or medication, and what type and what location?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: By medication does the member mean either the contraceptive pill or Depo-Provera, that sort of thing? Again, there are some issues in terms of patient confidentiality -

Ms S.E. WALKER: I am not asking about patients; I am asking the minister to give me the amount of taxpayers’ money spent -

Ms M.M. QUIRK: We would get that information through a medical officer or a nurse. We can certainly give the member some ballpark figures but I am concerned they will not be accurate.

Ms S.E. WALKER: Whatever the minister can give me about taxpayers’ money being spent - if it is being spent - and on what devices it is being spent. That is what I want to know.

Mr P.W. ANDREWS: I have a further question on that.

The CHAIRMAN: I will see whether the minister has a response and then the member can ask his question.

Ms S.E. WALKER: Excuse me, it is my question.

The CHAIRMAN: Members!

Mr P.W. ANDREWS: I thought the Chairman gave me the call.

The CHAIRMAN: I was waiting for the minister to respond. I think we probably have got that response.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: The supplementary information is all the information I have listed previously in relation to deaths in custody and now in relation to so-called contraceptive devices and medication. Is that what the member wants?

Ms S.E. WALKER: No. To make it easier for the minister, I think the minister already has the list prior to my asking what amount of taxpayers’ money was spent on contraceptive devices such as condoms or medication, and what type and what location.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I do not believe that information will be available.

Ms S.E. WALKER: The commissioner was nodding his head; he understood.

The CHAIRMAN: Member, give the minister a chance to confer.

Mr I.D. Johnson: The minister is right; we would have a collective view of what we provide on an annual basis, but actually drilling down to the detail would be extremely difficult, if not impossible.

Ms S.E. WALKER: Collective will do at the moment.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Oh, right.

Ms S.E. WALKER: If the minister can give me the information about spending taxpayers’ money on the pill - give me a collective amount to start, that is fine.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: The other problem I have, member, is that things are often prescribed for reasons other than contraception.

Ms S.E. WALKER: You can explain that.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: We cannot quantify what is for contraception and what is not.

Ms S.E. WALKER: All I want to know is how much of taxpayers’ money is being spent on it.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: It is illusory and I will not answer it.

Ms S.E. WALKER: I just want the answer.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, members! It is actually up to the minister to decide how she responds. The member may not like the answer but I think she has just received it. I will move on.

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

Ms S.E. WALKER: On a point of order, am I going to get that information? You have not given me a number for that information.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no response from the minister to give the member that information. I am moving on. There is no point of order.

Ms S.E. WALKER: On a point of order, you have not given me a number for that other information I asked about.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, I have - A7.

Ms S.E. WALKER: What am I not going to get?

The CHAIRMAN: The minister has indicated she is unable to provide the information you require, so we were moving on.

Ms S.E. WALKER: On?

The CHAIRMAN: On the contraceptive issue.

Ms S.E. WALKER: I will put it on notice.

[11.50 am]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I refer to “Key Efficiency Indicators” at the top of page 1063. The 2006-07 budget figure for the cost of keeping an offender in custody is \$248 a day for each prisoner. This is adult prisoners in adult prisons.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I did not hear the question; I am sorry.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Sorry?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I did not hear the question. Could the member repeat the question?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The minister was not listening again. I will say it again. Page 1063, top of the page -

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Yes, I have got that. I heard something about the costs of keeping prisoners in custody. I did not hear the last line. Member, I was listening.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Okay. The 2006-07 estimated figure was \$254 a day. Listed underneath that figure is the cost of managing offenders through community supervision of \$23 a day, so obviously it is much cheaper to have them out -

Ms M.M. QUIRK: It is \$22 a day in my book.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Sorry, I am looking at the 2007-08 target figure. The minister is quite right; it is \$22 a day. I added a dollar there and I should not have. It is obviously much cheaper to keep a person out of prison than it is to put him in prison. Can you give me a breakdown of the full-time equivalent staff in relation to offenders who are kept in custody, and the total number of FTEs in relation to offenders managed through community supervision? In other words, there are staff who are looking after -

Ms M.M. QUIRK: We will provide that by way of supplementary information. It is not a problem.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: A follow-on to that, Madam Chair -

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Do we want to give that a number?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, we should before we move on. I will not put words in the minister’s mouth, so if she could just reiterate what it is she will provide.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: The breakdown by way of FTEs of community supervision staff and custodial staff.

[*Supplementary Information No A8.*]

The CHAIRMAN: Further question, member for Hillarys.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It is linked to the previous question, and I refer to the top of page 1065. Members may ask how could this possibly be linked, but it is because it deals with juveniles kept in detention and juveniles managed through community supervision. It is a similar situation. The cost of keeping a juvenile in detention is \$565 a day, which is a helluva lot more than keeping an adult in prison. I would like to know the reason why. However, before I come back to that, the cost for supervising juveniles in the community is also a lot dearer at \$74 a day. Can the minister give me a breakdown of the FTEs in both of those areas as well?

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I can provide that by way of supplementary information; that is, the juvenile detention staff and the juvenile community supervision staff FTEs.

[Supplementary Information No A9.]

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Following on from that, the reason I am asking that is that a total number of full-time equivalents is listed, and I want to know how many are in each section. Can the minister give an explanation of why it is so much more expensive to keep a juvenile in detention than an adult? I know it is not a hard question, but let us get the answer on the record.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I ask Heather Harker to answer this question.

Ms H. Harker: The reason it costs significantly more to keep a juvenile in detention than adults is their relatively small number compared to the number of adults. It is also because of the nature of the regimes that are in the juvenile custodial establishments; a significant number of programs are provided. The ratio of juveniles to members of staff is significantly lower than it would be in an adult establishment, hence the costs are obviously significantly more.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Just to clarify, did Ms Harker say the cost of looking after the juveniles is significantly less?

Ms H. Harker: More.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I am sorry. I obviously misheard Ms Harker. Following on from that, can the minister also give a breakdown of the ratio of the number of FTEs for the number of offenders that are either in custody or under community supervision? In other words, how many officers are needed for each detained person, whether the offender is an adult or a juvenile? I just want the ratio.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I can provide the ratio of supervision for juveniles and for adults in custody and under community supervision by way of supplementary information.

[Supplementary Information No A10.]

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, members. I indicate that if members wish to take a break at 12 noon, that it is now 11.55 am. I have three members remaining on the call sheet, and members still have three other divisions to do by 1.00 pm. The member for Avon is next.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I refer the minister to “Outcomes and Key Effectiveness Indicators” on page 1062. There are two lines: “Successful completion of community correction orders - adults” and “Successful completion of community correction orders - juveniles”. I will ask a small range of questions. Is the department getting more or fewer orders from the courts in this area?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will have to ask Heather Harker for that answer.

Ms H. Harker: Our figures at the moment indicate that for community-based orders the numbers are continuing to dip, and obviously custodial sentences are continuing to rise.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: One of the reasons for this is that the employment situation is so buoyant at the moment that many people are not able to release themselves for community work orders. That sort of factor comes into play, and also there is a difference in the sentencing patterns of the judiciary. However, there are other external factors that influence the sort of order that is appropriate. Most people are now in a position to pay fines if they are in employment, and they do not want to do community work orders because they would lose their other job if they did that.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: There has been considerable research, particularly English research, which says that if community-based orders are not resourced properly, judges do not like to apply them. If it is possible, I would like to have a regional breakdown of orders for both adults and juveniles, and what is happening to the orders. I have a concern because in my own electorate I have seen some very successful processes and some very ordinary ones at the same time. I think it is good for the public to see offenders correctly doing community-based work orders, particularly the larger orders, but they do need to be successful.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Member, we can provide that by way of supplementary information. Having said that, I make the point that the cohort of prisoners in regional areas is slightly different, so if the member compares compliance rates between metro and regional areas, it would be worse in regional areas for reasons other than resourcing.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I understand that, and that is the reason for my questions.

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Yes. Also, we are having major problems with recruitment in the regions, so even though we might have FTEs allocated, we are actually down substantially in some of our regional areas. We are making a concerted effort to attract staff, but it has been difficult.

The CHAIRMAN: I will come back to the member, but I wish to clarify whether there was an agreement to supply information.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will supply supplementary information about community supervision staff in both metropolitan and regional areas.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: Just regional areas.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Regional areas.

[Supplementary Information No A11.]

Mr A.D. McRAE: I propose that we take a break.

The CHAIRMAN: The member proposes that we take a break.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: Are we able to continue with corrections after the break?

The CHAIRMAN: I still have three members on the call sheet, so I assume members wish to come back to division 60. I notice that members have actually dealt with one division, so there are two remaining. It is members' call about what they do with their time when they come back. How long do we wish to take a break for?

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: 2009.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think the member will get that wish.

Mr A.D. McRAE: Until 10 past 12.

The CHAIRMAN: Ten past? All right. No bells will be rung, so please be back at 10 past 12.

Meeting suspended from 11.58 am to 12.11 pm

[Mr P.B. Watson took the chair.]

Ms S.E. WALKER: I refer to the rate of serious assault per 100 prisoners under "Outcomes and Key Effectiveness Indicators" on page 1062. How many weapons were found in Western Australian prisons in the 2006-07 financial year? How many prisoners tested positive for or were found with illegal drugs and contraband?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will defer that question to Roger Holding.

Mr R.J. Holding: We do not have the precise figures to hand. The issue is that our justice intelligence system is less than 12 months old. Therefore, our year-to-date information is accurate, but with the comparative data against previous years we are not measuring like with like. We can provide information on the number of weapons found. Can the member remind me of the second part of the question?

Ms S.E. WALKER: How many prisoners tested positive for or were found with illegal drugs and contraband?

Mr R.J. Holding: Again, that is information we can readily provide.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is seeking supplementary information.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: The supplementary information will include the number of weapons found, the number of prisoners tested positive for drugs and the number of prisoners found in possession of drugs.

Ms S.E. WALKER: Illegal drugs.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Illegal drugs as opposed to contraceptives.

Ms S.E. WALKER: Contraceptives are given readily. I wonder whether they are given drugs as well.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: We will provide also the number of assaults.

Ms S.E. WALKER: And contraband. I did not ask that. I asked: how many prisoners tested positive for or were found with illegal drugs and contraband?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: And contraband as well. We will do our best, member for Nedlands.

[Supplementary Information No A12.]

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

Mr P.W. ANDREWS: The second paragraph on page 1066 refers to the upgrade to staff safety. At the end of that sentence reference is made to improved gatehouse access control systems. My question, which is about the staffing of gatehouses, comes from a number of my constituents who are prison officers. In the past there was an issue about having specialised gatekeepers as opposed to general staff. What is the department's approach to that; for example, does the department employ staff who are specialised in that area or is there a rotation policy through the gatehouse?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will ask the commissioner to answer that.

Mr I.D. Johnson: At the major prisons we have specialised staff. The major prisons are prisons such as Casuarina and Hakea, particularly Hakea, where there is a high volume of people coming through the place. Typically, Hakea could have up to 70 000 visits a year. Specialised gatehouse staff are used at high-security prisons. At the minimum-security prisons, such as Wooroloo and Karnet, staff work on a rotating basis. The answer in brief is that we have specialised staff at the high volume prisons and at the less than high volume and minimum-security prisons the staff operate on a rotating basis.

Mr P.W. ANDREWS: Is that currently well established or is work ongoing on that?

Mr I.D. Johnson: We recently carried out a review into some of the core business and that was included. It has not been determined whether we will make a decision to change that, but it is certainly something that we are looking at, particularly in specialised prisons.

Mr P.W. ANDREWS: Such as Hakea?

Mr I.D. Johnson: Yes, such as Hakea.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I refer the minister to the last line under "Works in Progress" on page 1066 which states -

Site Acquisition - Prisons - Metro Site Acquisition - Prisons

I refer to the estimated expenditure for 2006-07 of \$746 000 and ask the minister to provide a breakdown of that figure. Obviously, that allocation will be purely for consultancy, surveyors and the like and payment to other government departments. What staggers me is that there is an expected expenditure in the next financial year of \$1.86 million, more than double the estimated expenditure for this financial year. Will that buy one brick or one sod of earth or will it be spent on consultants, other government departments and so forth?

Mr B. Yearwood: We are hoping to put to the minister in the next couple of months the result of the planning review which, as referred to previously, has been an extensive process. I remind the committee that there is an extensive planning process in Western Australia through the Western Australian Planning Commission. On two occasions I have presented to that commission. The result, obviously when the minister has made a decision, will go back to the WA Planning Commission, as per the agreed planning process in WA. Once that decision is made, we will move towards the purchase of sites, which is what some of that funding is set aside for.

The minister has alluded to the department looking for a site in Derby. We have started an extensive planning process for that. We have also been working with the City of Kalgoorlie-Boulder on the likelihood of extending the prison site. At the end of the day we are certainly hopeful that we will have increased capacity in our system for additional land. That land is a fairly substantial tract of land to protect the custodial purposes within the metropolitan and regional areas. We are trying to preserve that for the next 100 years. We are taking a long-term planning view on this. It involves an extensive tract of land on which the facilities will be built.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That does not give me a great deal of comfort, because the entry is for "Site Acquisition - Prisons", which, I presume from the answer that one of the officers gave, involves not only metropolitan site acquisition. Metropolitan site acquisition is part of that line item, but reference is also made to prisons. Am I correct in presuming that the answer that was just given was in relation to the prisons at Kalgoorlie and Derby, and all the rest of it?

[12.20 pm]

Ms M.M. QUIRK: No. The metropolitan planning is for more than one prison. That work is currently being undertaken.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: My point is that the answer just given referred to prisons outside the metropolitan area.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Yes, I am aware of that.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Is that correct?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: That we are acquiring sites there?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: No, that the \$1.86 million refers to the acquisition of land, or infrastructure, for future prisons, whether they be in the metropolitan area or elsewhere in Western Australia.

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will ask Mr Yearwood to clarify that.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I want to know whether that \$1.86 million will be spent in the same way as the \$746 000; that is, not for one brick, and not for one sod of earth, but for consultancy, planning and surveying, and all those sorts of things, other than actual infrastructure.

Mr B. Yearwood: That money has been set aside for the purchase of land in the metropolitan area.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: What money has been allocated next financial year for things other than the acquisition of land; that is, for the actual cost of the land? I take it from the answer just given that the \$1.86 million is for the land. Does that include the \$746 000 that has been expended this financial year on interdepartmental payments for things such as consultancy, surveying or architectural work? Are any infrastructure costs included in that figure?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Presumably, once the initial work has been done, the land can be acquired. Other things will then need to be done. I will ask Mr Yearwood to clarify that so that we are not at cross-purposes.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Is that \$1.86 million being spent on actual infrastructure, such as bricks and mortar?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: It is a continuation of that expenditure of \$746 000.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Is that the answer the minister wants to give?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: No. I want to know whether that is the question.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I thought I had made the question quite clear.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Is that for things other than land and capital?

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes. Are any other costs included in that amount; and, if so, what are they?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will ask Mr Yearwood to answer that.

Mr B. Yearwood: That money is simply for the purchase of land. It is not for additional infrastructure, such as bricks and mortar, fences, or whatever.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Is any part of that \$1.86 million not for the purchase of land? In other words, does it include any intergovernmental fees and charges? If so, I would like a breakdown of that. I want to know what is being spent on intergovernmental fees and charges, or whatever, and what is being spent on the purchase of land.

Mr B. Yearwood: It certainly will include some other costs, because once the land has been identified, we will need to go through the planning process with the Department of Land Administration and Landgate, and costs are associated with that. It is a combination of the purchase of land and the services associated with the final planning and dedication of that site.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Those costs will be incidental to the purchase of the land.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes, but those costs are contained in that \$1.86 million, as I understand it. How much will be paid for the actual land? Perhaps I will come at it from that angle.

Mr B. Yearwood: We are at the stage of working through which site we want. That will be very dependent on which site is chosen by the government. Therefore, I cannot answer that at the moment.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Can I progress this a bit further?

The CHAIRMAN: The member has had four cracks at it. I remind members that only 36 minutes is left for this division.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Okay. I do not want to be greedy!

Mr D.F. BARRON-SULLIVAN: I refer to page 1061, service 1, "Adult Offender Services". That refers to the amount of money that taxpayers are paying to keep offenders incarcerated. Can the minister give an unqualified assurance that there is no-one in custody in Western Australia who has previously been found guilty of killing a child, or participating in such an act, while resident overseas?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Not without notice. There are over 3 700 prisoners in the system. I do not know their full criminal histories. I am happy to provide that information by way of supplementary.

Mr D.F. BARRON-SULLIVAN: A yes or a no, and the numbers, will be fine.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: That will be provided by way of supplementary.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the member please repeat the question.

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

Mr D.F. BARRON-SULLIVAN: Can the minister give an unqualified assurance that there is no-one in custody in Western Australia who has previously been found guilty of killing a child, or participating in such an act, while resident overseas? I would have thought the minister could just have asked the commissioner, and we could have sorted it out straightaway.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I did ask the commissioner, and he does not know either.

[Supplementary Information No A13.]

Ms S.E. WALKER: I refer to Mr Simon Rochford. Mr Rochford was questioned by the police in relation to the murder of Pamela Lawrence, and he was put on suicide watch for a few days. However, he was subsequently taken off suicide watch. A few days later, the Commissioner of Police, Karl O'Callaghan, released a statement to the media saying that he had been questioned.

Mr A.D. McRAE: Point of order.

Ms S.E. WALKER: There is no point of order.

Mr A.D. McRAE: Mr Chairman, I would like clarification of what page number in the budget papers the member is referring to.

Ms S.E. WALKER: I am sorry. It is page 1063, the seventh dot point concerning prisoner case management. Mr Rochford was being questioned in relation to the murder of Pamela Lawrence. Did the Commissioner of Police, Karl O'Callaghan, telephone Mr Ian Johnson about the effect that the media reporting would have on this man, and to ensure that Mr Rochford was put on suicide watch?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I will ask the commissioner to answer that, because I do not have personal knowledge of that. Clearly, that death in custody is subject to a coronial hearing. I would welcome a very comprehensive investigation of that case. There are a number of aspects about that case that I am very unhappy about.

Ms S.E. WALKER: I thank the minister.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I look forward to a very robust scrutiny by the coroner. I will ask the commissioner to answer the specific question.

Ms S.E. WALKER: Yes. Did the Commissioner of Police telephone Mr Ian Johnson to tell him that he was going to put out the media release that Mr Rochford allegedly saw on the night he committed suicide, and to find out whether Mr Rochford was on suicide watch?

Mr I.D. Johnson: No.

Ms S.E. WALKER: He did not telephone the commissioner?

Mr I.D. Johnson: No.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Just to clarify, the information that Mr Rochford had been questioned by the police was not released by the department. The first I became aware that that information had been released was when I heard Sue Short on the ABC news.

Ms S.E. WALKER: I ask a supplementary question.

Mr A.D. McRAE: Does the member mean a supplementary or a follow-up question?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will be the judge of what is happening here, not the member.

Ms S.E. WALKER: Was Mr Rochford taken off suicide watch after a few days?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Again, I think that will be a question for the coroner to look into. As I recall from my briefing on the matter, assessments were made. He was assessed after he was questioned by the police. He was also assessed after his name was mentioned in the media. Staff were of the view - as it has turned out with the benefit of hindsight, incorrectly - that he was quite happy. He was not overly concerned about the release of his name publicly. Clearly, in hindsight, they were wrong. Some inquiries were made, as I understand it, subsequent to Mr Rochford's name being made public.

[12.30 pm]

Ms S.E. WALKER: I have a follow-up question. I am wondering why he was not deemed a suicide risk after his name was mentioned in the media, thereby putting pressure on him, when he was put on suicide watch after the police questioned him.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: The commissioner can probably answer this question better than I can. Staff use a checklist to assess whether someone needs to be placed on suicide watch. It remains to be seen - no doubt the coroner will

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

have something to say about this - whether the checklist was completed in full or whether a cursory assessment was done. Nevertheless, an assessment was made about Mr Rochford. Despite the publication of his name, he did not exhibit any behaviour that caused staff any concern.

Mr I.D. Johnson: I confirm what the minister has said. It is always difficult to determine whether a person is of a mind to commit suicide. That decision can be made at any given time during a 24-hour period. Mr Rochford was very well-known to the Albany prison staff. The staff have an excellent relationship with prisoners and are therefore very attuned to how people are dealing with situations. When Mr Rochford was initially interviewed by police, he gave no indication that he was at risk or suffering as a result of that. The staff took the proactive decision to determine that he was at risk - suicide watch is an improper term - and to monitor his behaviour. As I said, that was a proactive stance. He was then thoroughly assessed during that process and as a result was no longer deemed to be at risk. Again, when it was made known that he had heard his name on TV, a prison officer personally sat down with him to see how he was coping. Questions were asked of his associates at the prison to determine how he was coping. That night is when he allegedly committed suicide, subject to the coroner's inquest.

Ms S.E. WALKER: I have one final question. The minister said that Commissioner O'Callaghan did not call her to say that he was releasing Mr Rochford's name. Did anyone from the commissioner's office call Dr O'Callaghan to say that that release would be made?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: As I said earlier, we were not aware in advance that that would occur. The commissioner may be able to tell us otherwise. I certainly was not aware and I was concerned when his name was released in that way.

Mr I.D. Johnson: Again, I confirm what the minister said. I have no recollection of being made aware that this person's name would be announced on TV.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: On page 1066 there are three references to Wooroloo Prison Farm, which I have an interest in. The figure given for fencing costs is unbelievable. When the department next puts out a contract, could I win it please? The amount shown is \$7 938 000. What was the cost of the fencing?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I agree with the member. Brian Yearwood can give the grand total.

Mr B. Yearwood: The fence was constructed around Wooroloo prison. Security is attached to that fence, so that is an internal detrusion system. Anyone trying to move out across that fence will be detected through a system. Cameras have been placed on that fence as well. That is another level of security. In addition, we built a new gatehouse at Wooroloo prison. Lights have been placed on that fence. We have kept the lux of those lights down to a minimum so as not to impact on the environment and neighbours. All that information is fed from a master control room at Wooroloo prison, which is monitored 24 hours a day by additional staff who were allocated to that project at that prison. I could provide details of each line item.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I do not want line detail. What is the complete total cost of fencing?

Mr B. Yearwood: Just over \$15 million. That is for Wooroloo and Karnet. It is about \$7.5 million for each site. That is for the entire project.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I wish to ask a question about the minimum-security accommodation expansion at Wooroloo as referred to on page 1066, at a total cost of over \$8.5 million. Does that figure relate to the fourth dot point on that page, which refers to an 18-bed self-care unit, prisoner reception and health centre etc? Is that a full description of that work?

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

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: Does that alter the designation of Wooroloo? Is it still a minimum-security detention centre?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Yes, it is. I have asked the Inspector of Custodial Services to do a complete review of prisoner classification. We expect that to finish in October this year. It is my feeling that the cohort of prisoners at Wooroloo and Karnet would not change markedly from what they are now.

Mr M.W. TRENORDEN: I was particularly perturbed that the fence was built. It just shows what publicity can do to a government agency. Nevertheless, I might want to visit that prison, seeing that this work has been done, and familiarise myself with what is there now.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: That is fine at any time, if the member lets us know. Wooroloo and Karnet hurt our impressive numbers a few years ago as shown on that impressive graph that members saw earlier.

Mr A.D. McRAE: I wanted to return to page 1066. Under "Works in Progress" is the line item "Site Acquisition - Prisons - Metro Site Acquisition - Prisons" and \$1.86 million is allocated for 2006-07. Firstly,

Ms Sue Walker; Ms Margaret Quirk; Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Tony McRae; Chairman; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Paul Andrews; Mr Max Trenorden; Mr Mick Murray; Mr Dan Barron-Sullivan

there is a significant rise in the estimated expenditure for 2006-07. Can the minister explain the increase? My second question relates to the point that the member for Hillarys was trying to understand. How much planning, including analysis of local community impact and infrastructure services, is necessary before the land can be identified and the acquisition can be made?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: In short, substantial. Mr Yearwood can expand on that.

Mr B. Yearwood: It is not a recurrent expenditure; it is a project focus. Each year we are allocating the money in terms of what we anticipate to spend in a further year in front of that project. Hopefully, that answers that part of the question. An extensive review has been undertaken of available land within the metropolitan area and all the aspects. We have developed what we call a quintuple bottom line. It is really based on five key elements of sustainability right across the whole area. We certainly have all the infrastructure people. The Water Corporation, Main Roads and a number of other agencies have been working with us on this project. It is a very extensive and proper analysis for what will be a very significant planning project for the state.

[12.40 pm]

Mr A.D. McRAE: I note that the estimated expenditure in 2006-07 was \$746 000 but the expenditure to 30 June 2007 is \$1.2 million. I do not understand the difference between those two figures.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: It is the estimated expenditure that was carried forward. That is what was assumed would have been spent this year but which was not. If it had not been spent, the figure would be \$746 000.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Is that correct, Mr Yearwood?

Mr B. Yearwood: That is correct.

Mr A.D. McRAE: Why is that?

Mr B. Yearwood: With regard to where the project is at and what has been achieved and the major achievements and the milestones set against the project, sometimes we miss the milestones and sometimes we must carry forward that money. That is particularly the case for a project like this. We do not do many of these. The assistance of other government agencies, such as the Department for Planning and Infrastructure, has been immensely valuable in this endeavour.

Mr A.D. McRAE: Are some of the unspent funds from 2006-07 carried forward into 2007-08?

Mr B. Yearwood: Yes.

Mr A.D. McRAE: Therefore, it is not related to just a single discrete project; there may be a number of projects running concurrently?

Mr B. Yearwood: Yes.

The appropriation was recommended.