

TRANSCRIPT

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL LEGAL AND SOCIAL ISSUES COMMITTEE

Inquiry into Victoria's Criminal Justice System

Melbourne—Tuesday, 19 October 2021

MEMBERS

Ms Fiona Patten—Chair

Dr Tien Kieu—Deputy Chair

Ms Jane Garrett

Ms Wendy Lovell

Ms Tania Maxwell

Mr Craig Ondarchie

Ms Kaushaliya Vaghela

PARTICIPATING MEMBERS

Dr Matthew Bach

Ms Melina Bath

Mr Rodney Barton

Ms Georgie Crozier

Dr Catherine Cumming

Mr Enver Erdogan

Mr Stuart Grimley

Mr David Limbrick

Mr Edward O'Donohue

Mr Tim Quilty

Dr Samantha Ratnam

Ms Harriet Shing

Mr Lee Tarlamis

Ms Sheena Watt

WITNESS (*via videoconference*)

Dr Marietta Martinovic, Senior Lecturer in Criminology and Justice, Australian Inside-Out Prison Exchange Program Manager, Australian Prison and Community-based Think Tank Leader, RMIT University.

The CHAIR: Hello and welcome back, everyone. As I am sure you are aware, this is the Legislative Council Legal and Social Issues Committee's public hearing for the Inquiry into Victoria's Criminal Justice System. We are very pleased to be joined by Dr Marietta Martinovic, who runs a whole range of programs, but we will hear more about those in just one moment.

Marietta, if I could just let you know that all evidence taken today is protected by parliamentary privilege, and that is under our *Constitution Act* but also the standing orders of the Legislative Council. This means that any information that you provide today is protected by law. You are protected against any action for what you say during this hearing. Of course, if you were to repeat the same statements outside this hearing, you may not have the same protection. And any deliberately false evidence or misleading of the committee may be considered a contempt of Parliament.

All evidence is being recorded, and we have got Hansard in the background busily listening to every word you say. You will receive a transcript of this hearing, and I would encourage you to have a look at it and make sure that we have not misheard or misrepresented you.

As I mentioned before we came online, we are joined by Kaushaliya Vaghela and Ms Tania Maxwell.

Thank you so much for your submission, Marietta, but also for the work that you do. If you would like to make some opening remarks, that would be terrific, and then we will open it up for committee discussion. Thank you.

Dr MARTINOVIC: Thank you so very much, Fiona. It is a real pleasure to be part of this inquiry, so thank you so much for calling it and letting me have a say. Everything that I say in my submission is led by the voices of incarcerated people. Over the last six years I have run many prison programs across five prisons now. They are called Inside-Out Prison Exchange Program and think tanks. Most of the work has been based in prisons, so they are maximum-, medium- and minimum-security prisons, both private and state, and encompassing both men and women throughout Victoria. To date more than 400 people have completed these programs, both on the inside, so incarcerated people, and outside. The outside participants in programs are university students. So the two groups work together. They study together a subject called comparative criminal justice systems, and from there on they are involved in advocacy work. All of our advocacy work is supported and done in partnership with Corrections Victoria. That is what sets us apart from other advocacy groups: we work alongside the system to make improvements to the system. We do not just provide critical feedback; we talk about what practical improvements can be made. And, yes, some are very easy to do, which is great, and some are more challenging. and that is, I suppose, the best part of what I do.

Our submission is once again made up, like I said, and driven by the voices of the people inside, and it is all about reducing the reliance on prisons, as we have said in our inquiry. I will not talk very long, just another few minutes. I suppose the first half of what we wrote about was for there to be a reinstatement of alternatives to imprisonment. We are one of the only jurisdictions in the Western world that does not have clear alternatives to prison, so home detention, suspended sentences and intensive corrections orders—they are all gone, and I think that they were absolutely invaluable incentives for people to not be incarcerated and to have an opportunity to prove themselves out in the community.

The other thing that a lot of people in prison talk about is that they no longer have an incentive to do well whilst in prison because parole has become quite difficult to get, and a lot of people end up serving time in prison as opposed to being released on parole. All the research that I have ever done says that parole is wonderful. Some of these people end up going on parole for two or three months and are saying to me things like, 'I wish I was there longer', because that supported release into community is of vital importance for people's long-term success. The third part of that first step is reducing the high remand populations. I am sure that other people have talked about that too at length.

But the second part of our recommendations is what I want to also really talk about, and that is—and I have certainly learned a lot about this over the last 20 years of my involvement in the criminal justice system—how

to humanise prisons. I think it is one thing to be making decisions about people in prison and a completely different thing to actually be there with them and to listen to them and to be part of their life and their story. I always learn so much in this environment, and therefore the second part of our submission is absolutely critical: that people who are policymakers, who are judges, magistrates, come and spend time with people who are incarcerated—you know, have general, normal discussions. We certainly would absolutely welcome an opportunity to come out with what that could look like, but we feel that that is absolutely imperative, because you know, a sentence of five years on a piece of paper has a very different meaning to a person who is actually serving those five years.

Look, all we want is a dialogue. There do not have to be any changes, but all we would like is just a dialogue to be open. It is not set up by the general manager of the prison and it is not a tour of the prison where, you know, you go to only specific places that look very beautiful and neat and green. No. This is a real discussion with people who are incarcerated. I will stop there, and thank you so much.

The CHAIR: Thanks, Marietta. Just out of interest, how long have you been running these think tank programs?

Dr MARTINOVIC: Six and a half years now.

The CHAIR: Great. I think it is really innovative. Certainly when I was first elected I actually went out and visited prisons, because I knew I would be passing legislation that was establishing prison sentences and I had no idea what that meant. That has had a really important impact on the way that I have thought about it as well, so I entirely endorse that.

I wanted to start by touching on one of your recommendations around these alternatives to imprisonment. The first one you talked about was home detention and electronic monitoring. I was interested in what prisoners said about that, to start with.

Dr MARTINOVIC: I did a PhD on home detention and electronic monitoring, so I could tell you all about the best practice et cetera, but that is not your question. Your question is: what do the prisoners say? When they are wearing the technology, they are not happy, I can tell you that right now. And I know that the technology's use has been increased over the last few years, at least in Victoria, for serious violent offenders, sex offenders et cetera, and I think that is a really good thing.

The CHAIR: But that is mainly in post release, isn't it?

Dr MARTINOVIC: Correct. But I think it is a wonderful sanction, to be absolutely honest, if it is home detention as part of prerelease. In other words, it is like that carrot-and-stick approach that if you do well—

And I feel that all of the incentives have being taken away, like I said, for people to do well. And that is when you get problems in prison, because people feel, 'What's the point of me doing everything correctly when no-one's going to listen to me or care about me'? And people are really kind of upset about not having an ability to speak to people on the parole board, and they feel very much abandoned by the—

The CHAIR: Sorry, just to interrupt, can you just expand on that? Because I think for many of us we see television, and we see people going into a room with a parole board and the prisoner speaking directly to them and that kind of watershed moment. But in practice what does it look like?

Dr MARTINOVIC: In practice nothing happens like that, especially now due to COVID. What happens is that an external person prepares a report, and they usually have very little say in what goes into that report. And it sort of goes nowhere. There is very little communication that happens, and very often—this is the worst part of the process, according to them—they get a no and there is no explanation why the no is given. And that is what they say—'I'm not part of anything. I have no control over anything'. And that is a very difficult thing in life, because at some point most people get out. When they exit the system there is a huge expectation. When you are not well, when you are this and you are that, you go and get help, but you have taken away all this autonomy all the way through the process. How on earth can a person then all of a sudden walk out of the door and say, 'Yes, now I can do everything'? It is impossible. So there is a lot of, I suppose, anger, because they feel very much unheard and not part of that process. If it is a no, they want to know why it is no.

There are reasons why it is a no. For example, the address that they have provided is not suitable; Mum, who said she will take them on, has changed her mind once she has heard what the conditions are; or say they were a gambler and then there are some TAB places nearby et cetera. Those are some of the reasons, but they never communicate to the people on the inside. I think that there needs to be more communication, and there needs to be a more streamlined process. We always hear about the backlog. Why couldn't there be some kind of a real chance where people can put their views forward and have a Zoom conversation with the parole board or somebody on the parole board? There has got to be someone willing to give them 10 minutes. None of that happens.

The CHAIR: Yes. Look, thanks, Marietta. I will come back. We will go to Kaushaliya, then Tania.

Ms VAGHELA: Thanks, Chair. Thanks, Dr Martinovic, for your submission and for your time today. In your initial remarks you mentioned a little bit about the Inside-Out exchange program. I would like to know a little bit more, so if you can outline some of the learnings from your Inside-Out exchange program.

Dr MARTINOVIC: Yes, of course. Thank you for your question. The Inside-Out Prison Exchange Program is an American program established in 1997 by incarcerated people. They came up with the idea that people who are going to be working in the sector—for example, criminal justice students—need to be aware of the impact of the prison system before they engage in work in the criminal justice system. In other words, what happens is that the outside students—university students—bring their textbook experience and the inside students bring their lived experience. For 13 weeks they learn from each other. Every class is different because there are different people in class every semester. It is just so rich and wonderful. Now it has gone beyond RMIT, so we also have students from La Trobe and Monash engaged in the Inside-Out Prison Exchange Program across five prisons. Corrections Victoria does not contribute any financial assistance to the program—that is all done by RMIT—but provides in-kind support of all kinds. That is what it is about.

The university students, like I said, get to see the practical experience: just how important it is to think about the person at the end of that chain receiving the policy, the treatments, the authority. And the inside students, they get to see hope: 'There are people who care about what happens to us; there are people who want to work in the system for the right reasons'. A lot of them lose faith in the system very quickly because they do not feel part of the process, and the more we empower people throughout the incarceration experience, the better—and the better outcomes we are going to have at the end of the day.

Ms VAGHELA: In your initial remarks you mentioned the number 400. What I would like to know is: how many students have been through this program and what have their outcomes been?

Dr MARTINOVIC: I think that is a really good question. For the outside students, the vast majority have continued on to work for the department, so the department of justice, in corrections, prisons, community corrections, youth justice—so generally in that reintegration space, the vast majority. For the inside students, anecdotally between 70 and 80 per cent have gone on to some kind of education, which is incredible. Basically the program gives them the ability to say, 'People can see me for more than my criminal record', because we do not discuss the criminal record, you see; that does not matter to us. We are only talking about the criminal justice system and what happens. Why people are in prison does not matter. I do not even know why people are in prison, because once again, they are my students. There is something really powerful about that, that builds self-esteem. People see that—'I would like to do this; I could take up that short course on building and construction that I never thought I could'. It sort of ranges from music to art to social services, but there is a huge, huge, I suppose, increase in people wanting to be lived experience case workers, and Corrections Victoria for the first time is listening to that, which is great.

Ms VAGHELA: People who have left prison—you mentioned, I think, 70 to 80 per cent study. So if it is 70 to 80 per cent who have studied, out of those how many of them have used that study to build a career outside?

Dr MARTINOVIC: Great question. I would love to be able to provide you with that information, but we do not track that kind of information. The other thing is that I also could not tell you how many of those people have come back to prison, because at the end of the day the program is voluntary, which means that even by the likelihood of somebody putting their hand up and being chosen by the prison to do the program, it could well be that they are the kind of person more likely to want to do the right thing and more ready for re-entry. So I could not really say, 'It was really my program that made all the difference in this person's life'. That would be

too difficult to say. Re-entry is so complex. Who I would describe as my poster child ended up reoffending and coming back into prison, for example. He is still my poster child, because he had a grade 4 education and was the top student in that class. Do you see what I mean? It is very difficult to gauge success.

Ms VAGHELA: Thanks, Dr Martinovic. If time allows, Chair, I will come back for the second round of questions. Thank you.

The CHAIR: Thanks, Kaushaliya. Tanya.

Ms MAXWELL: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Doctor, for being with us today and for providing your submission. Doctor, I am just wondering what consultation has been done with victims, if any, who may not agree with some of the recommendations that you have made in your submission—for example, home detention, monitoring, rewarding positive behaviour et cetera? Do you consult with victims?

Dr MARTINOVIC: Look, I do not as part of my role, and that is the honest-to-God truth. However, in the conversations that we have we do always talk about the victims and how other people in the system see it. Like I said to you, we are not an ordinary advocacy group, because we look at practical solutions, and they are all about, at the end of the day, reducing recidivism. If we reduce recidivism, it will be less likely that there will be more victims in the future, so it is a safer society anyhow.

When we promote things like home detention and more community-based alternatives, I am of the firm belief, backed up by a lot of research done everywhere around the Western world, that the more people you push into prisons, the more crime you are going to have and the more reoffending and recidivism you are going to have; the more people you try and divert into community-based dispositions and the more you, I suppose, prepare them for release by early release, the more likely they are to not reoffend. So at the end of the day we are all on the same page. The page that we in the think tanks are on is not about an easy ride for people in prison. They are all very aware that they have broken the law, and they are very aware that they need to change as people. But how do we make the transition a better one? How do we make it less likely for them to come back into prison and reoffend? That, I think, is the biggest challenge.

Ms MAXWELL: I am just interested: if you do not evaluate or track who has been re-incarcerated, how do you determine that the programs per se are actually reducing recidivism?

Dr MARTINOVIC: You cannot. You could not possibly do that.

Ms MAXWELL: Okay.

Dr MARTINOVIC: And the purpose of, say, the programs which I run is not to reduce recidivism. I was talking more generally about the strategies that we put forward for Corrections Victoria and for the various departments that we work with. But the purpose of the programs that I run is to make it more inclusive, increase awareness and increase self-esteem—you know, measurable things, like I said to you. I could not then possibly draw the line, like I said, that my program stops recidivism. Look, it is highly likely that it contributes to that, and there are many studies that would cost millions of dollars all around the Western world that show the power of education. The power of education amongst disadvantaged communities, particularly incarcerated people, is enormous. A person who has, for example, completed a degree has a 3 per cent chance of reoffending, versus anybody else who has not at 43 per cent. There is ample research on that.

Ms MAXWELL: Thank you, Doctor. I am just wondering: what crimes would you deem to be suitable for the home detention program specifically? Or are there crimes that you would not determine suitable for home detention?

Dr MARTINOVIC: Look, that is a fairly complex question. It would depend on whether we are talking about home detention as pre prison, if you know what I mean—as a diversion from prison at the front end—or if we are talking about home detention as a back-end option.

Ms MAXWELL: Well, maybe both, Doctor, if you can elaborate on those.

Dr MARTINOVIC: So at the front end I would say something like offences punishable by one or two years of imprisonment or something like that—so fairly light on, if I can put it that way. And then back end I would make it bigger and wider—you know, saying things like maybe in the last five years or three years, depending

on how long a sentence is. I mean, there would have to be some kind of deeper thinking associated with that, but I would be rewarding positive behaviour. I think there are so many people in prison unnecessarily incarcerated for the entire duration of their sentence. It is just such a wonderful way of that staged release back into society that every single person who has been incarcerated would tell you it is so important for long-term success.

Ms MAXWELL: Do you think that we have enough support systems and services available to people when they are released?

Dr MARTINOVIC: No, I do not.

Ms MAXWELL: Thank you.

Dr MARTINOVIC: And I will just elaborate on that. I think that there is an enormous willingness by people in the sector who work in the reintegration space. I think there is a lack of resources. That is the first problem. The second problem is burnout of extremely good staff, and the third problem is that a lot of people do not ask for help until it is too late. So in other words, it is not an easy-fix solution.

The CHAIR: Thanks, Marietta. So you do not know how Corrections selects participants for the think tanks, or do you?

Dr MARTINOVIC: Yes, I do. Look, it depends from one prison to the next, but what I say is I want a variety of people, so a variety of backgrounds, a variety of ages and a variety of offending patterns, because that produces a really rich discussion. On top of that they select people who are well behaved. So they are not going to select somebody who has had three positive urines in the last three months; there is no way. They are also not going to select somebody who has engaged in violent behaviour and who goes into the slot every so often. So they look for good behaviour. They look for a sign-off by their clinician, if they have one, as well as their case manager. And also they look for people who are not enrolled in study but they have this inkling, I suppose, that they will do well and that they can grow further, but they do not believe in themselves. And that is why it is so rich and so good.

The CHAIR: Just following on from Tania's questions around things like home detention and that coming in, coming out, and conscious of victim's views on this, would you be leaning more towards those that have committed non-violent crimes or the type of crime is not important; it is more about the attitude and the behaviour of that prisoner in the lead-up?

Dr MARTINOVIC: I think that is a brilliant question, Fiona. In the past, when I started doing research 20 years ago on home detention, I was all for non-violent, low-risk offenders being diverted, right? And that was five years into my study. Then I heard that in the United States all these very violent post-sentence people are being placed on the technology, and I was horrified, to be absolutely honest—horrified—because I am like, 'What? They are in the community? Are you serious?'. So, anyhow, all the research that I have ever come across has been positive of high-risk people on these sanctions, and initially that was very counterintuitive. However, the research is out there that these are good options for both people who are violent and non-violent and that whilst the person is wearing the technology—and I have worn the technology myself—they feel like somebody is watching, and that is a very powerful feeling. They feel, 'Somebody will know if I do something wrong'. You know, there has been a big shift in the department of officers—community corrections officers—actually liking the technology, because it is keeps offenders honest. Also, they like the possibility that they can do all kinds of algorithms to find out, 'Why is this person spending every Thursday on this particular spot when he or she is not supposed to be there?'. There are so many fascinating things that can now be provided that it is so powerful. The parole board did not like it very much at the start. Now they love it.

So I think the technology and the way we view it and use it has come a long way. The offenders wearing the technology do not like it, but in all honesty I do not think that matters too much to me. It is about community safety. It is about better reintegration into the community. And both of those boxes are ticked. So I would go probably even with violent offenders—to answer your question, Fiona—depending on, you know, whether a person has ticked all the boxes that they are supposed to. But I do think that something more needs to be done about parole. It could well be that if the parole is fixed up in a way that we have discussed, where people have a real chance to contribute and where people can automatically go on parole if they tick all the boxes, for God's sake. It just makes sense, right? And there is a real incentive for people to do the right thing. It could be that if

the parole system is operating properly, then home detention could be for non-violent people—if you see what I mean. That probably will be more likely something that other people will give a tick of approval?

The CHAIR: Yes. And I guess that that relies on them being able to access the programs, being able to complete the programs and probably have those more nuanced conversations with the parole board or someone representing the parole board.

Dr MARTINOVIC: Look, the worst thing that we can do is sort of say that the mentality of people in prison is okay if they say things to me like, ‘It doesn’t matter how I do; I won’t get out anyway. What’s the point of me doing everything right?’, because that sets a very dangerous precedent.

The CHAIR: Yet that is not what we want to hear. In going through this inquiry and reading the submissions, the decline in parole is alarming.

Dr MARTINOVIC: And that is only ever since the Harper review and those changes. That was never the case; I never heard that, and I used to work in the sector myself as a community corrections officer. So I think we have come a long way. I think some of the changes have been positive, but I do think that some of the changes did not turn out the way that they should.

The CHAIR: Thank you. Kaushaliya.

Ms VAGHELA: Thanks, Chair. Doctor, my question is a follow-on question from what the Chair asked. It is regarding the electronic monitoring. What can you tell us about the use of electronic monitoring in Australia and how does it compare globally? I know you mentioned a little bit about the USA, but if you can tell us a little bit more about how it compares globally, it will give us a little bit more sense of how it could work.

Dr MARTINOVIC: Yes. I always look towards New Zealand. New Zealand, I think, has really good ideas that are outside the box. I think the place we should not be following, which we follow very often unfortunately, is the United States. I think we need to stay away from following the United States because they are a failed experiment in criminal justice policy, full stop. I say that with absolute honesty here. Moving along, the use of electronic monitoring has increased drastically in Australia over the past few years. I suppose the difference is and the challenge is that it has mostly increased for violent sex offenders, so in that post-release space—so either as part of parole or extended supervision orders, okay? I think that is really good, and that has happened across the whole nation. But what I think is really missing is that whole aspect of home detention just on its own, where people are wearing the technology, they are released early from prison or they were given home detention as part of being diverted from prison in the first place. What you can add to that sanction is a number of really good things like: you have got to go to drug testing, you have got to go to counselling, you have got to go to employment. You can add so many prosocial aspects to it that it makes so much sense. And also these days the technology does not mean you have to be on a curfew at home necessarily. Some people could be on a curfew. Others you have got GPS tracking on them all the time anyway, so you can say, ‘You have to go to work 9 to 5. What you do after 9 to 5 does not matter as long as you are home at 10’. Other people you will say, ‘Oh, no, no—you have to be at home 24 hours a day’. So in other words, the possibilities are enormous. You can really structure it based on what you are expecting from each person, and I think that is absolutely invaluable and very much under-utilised, but it is utilised quite well in New Zealand. They use it as post-sentence diversion, part of bail—everything. And I think it is very, very clever. They are the world’s largest user of the technology on a per capita basis.

The CHAIR: Okay. Interesting.

Ms VAGHELA: Thank you.

The CHAIR: Tania.

Ms MAXWELL: Thank you, Chair. Doctor, I am just wondering: have you had the opportunity to read the TILES report, which is around family violence perpetrators? The study was done in Tasmania in conjunction with one of the universities, and it is about releasing violent offenders using monitoring. It has not been released publicly as yet, but I hear that it has been a very, very successful trial, so I guess that supports a lot of the evidence that you have given us today. Do you think that our corrections staff are trained in a way that is conducive to being able to encourage positive support to those prisoners incarcerated?

Dr MARTINOVIC: That is such a good question.

The CHAIR: And none of them are listening, so it is all right—speak openly.

Dr MARTINOVIC: I will have to be careful what I say here. In all honesty, look, I have not had a chance to read the report that you are talking about, but I have seen those types of reports from other jurisdictions and I have seen very similar findings like the ones that you are indicating. So that does not surprise me, I suppose. That is the first thing. There is a huge, I suppose, opportunity here. I think that there are cultural differences, and I mean the prison culture really perpetuates the ‘us versus them’ mentality between people who are working as correctional officers and prisoners. I do not see that as their fault because that is what they are trained in. They are trained in security risk management in a prison. A very small part of their role and their training is around case management and empowerment et cetera. So what I would advocate for, Tania, to be quite frank is for there to be a real overhaul of how people are trained and, you know, what do we expect from prison officers and people generally who work in prisons? There is such a review currently in place, and we are contributing to that review.

Ms MAXWELL: And just to touch on terms of reference, what about magistrates and judges in regard to their training to be presiding over specific cases? We have got our different courts—what about them being educated in regard to what they are presiding over in those specific courts? Do you think that their training is suitable or adequate?

Dr MARTINOVIC: Look, I honestly do not know enough about the training that judges and magistrates undertake to be, once again, quite frank. But I do think, and I did talk about that in our submission, that we would love opportunities for people to come and have frank discussions—not with the general manager of the prison or a member of Parliament, but even members of Parliament, anybody, to come and have frank discussions with us on things that go on, and it would be so eye opening. It would be absolutely life changing for people, and I think it would be really, really important. And it would not be a whinge fest. This is the other thing that is really important. I do not think that these need to be a whinge fest, because they are not about that. They are about the stark reality and the future, and the future which has less criminal activity. That is the key, and that is what always drives us.

Ms MAXWELL: Thank you, Doctor.

The CHAIR: I will just take this opportunity, because you speak quite substantially in your submission around the need for diversity in our judiciary and obviously the need for the judiciary to hear from those with lived experience, to say it would be wonderful if our judiciary were more reflective of our community and I think that would certainly create greater trust in decisions that are made there. Do you have any thoughts on how we could do that?

Dr MARTINOVIC: Look, once again this diversification of the judiciary is something that I hear about all the time from people who are incarcerated. They often talk about the judge or the magistrate that ‘sentenced me had no idea what I was going through, couldn’t possibly understand, came from this really privileged background’ et cetera et cetera. I think from my personal experience that people who are judges and magistrates are actually really well read and really aware. That is my personal perspective, but it never seems to be the perspective of people who are on the inside. So I think that there needs to be even quotas put in. Why couldn’t we even have quotas? Why couldn’t we trial something like that where we actually end up having more racially diverse people, for example, more women being placed in the judiciary? So I think that could certainly be done, and other jurisdictions around the world have done this.

The CHAIR: Yes, right. They have done quotas, have they?

Dr MARTINOVIC: Yes.

The CHAIR: Would you take it on notice to send us some links to where quotas have been introduced?

Dr MARTINOVIC: Will do.

The CHAIR: Thanks, Marietta. Kaushaliya, do you have any further questions?

Ms VAGHELA: Just a quick one. You spoke about women. I would like to ask a quick question. Today we have got four women on the screen right now for this public hearing, so let us end with the last question regarding women. Regarding some of the trends that you have seen, how is women's offending distinct from men?

Dr MARTINOVIC: Look, the women's prisons are always full of sadness, so whenever I leave Tarrengower Prison and DPFC I feel sad and my heart aches. It aches because usually their caregiving responsibilities are there but are seldom mentioned, and I think as a woman I associate with that—and as a carer and as a mother. I think drugs are a huge issue for women, low self-esteem, trauma, being victims of all kinds of assaults in the past—by the system, by men in their lives et cetera et cetera. That is kind of the picture of the females in prison. And there are so many issues: homelessness; like I said, drugs; poor relationships. Where do you even start with fixing some of those huge social problems? I think a big part of what we are seeing now is that we want the corrections system or the prison system to deal with this enormous raft of problems that a person brings throughout their life that have built up. It says, 'Well, now it's yours. Now you fix it all', and that is such a hard, difficult thing to do. So the more we intervene beforehand the better, the more people we divert, the more people we give a chance to. We do not want to normalise being in prison, because we know that over 70 per cent of people in our prisons today have been in prison before. We do not want that to be normal. We do not want that to make sense. Yes, I will probably leave it at that.

Ms VAGHELA: So if you have any information regarding the approaches that we can take to reduce recidivism in women, that would be good, because I do not think we will have time today.

The CHAIR: Yes, but our next, Smart Justice for Women, may well take us down that. I think you make a really good point, Marietta, at the end just in finalising that when we look at many prisoners, their history of drug use, their history of mental illness, their history of trauma, their history of intellectual disabilities, we provide that bundle to corrections and say, 'Right, we expect you to fix that'. It is inconceivable that a prison system would be able to fix that, yet we are setting our prison systems up to do just that. I think that is a very poignant point. Thank you.

Dr MARTINOVIC: Thank you so much for your time and excellent questions.

The CHAIR: Thank you. That was a great discussion. I really appreciated it. Thank you for your submission. Maybe there will be an opportunity for us to join one of your think tanks.

Dr MARTINOVIC: I would love that. So we need a line even now, these days. So if you are available, just reach out via an email and you will be an honoured guest.

The CHAIR: Thank you. I think everybody is making a note of that. Thanks, Marietta.

Witness withdrew.