

TRANSCRIPT

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL LEGAL AND SOCIAL ISSUES COMMITTEE

Inquiry into Victoria's Criminal Justice System

Melbourne—Monday, 6 September 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*)

Emeritus Professor Joe Graffam, Former Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Research, Deakin University.

The CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. I would like to declare open the Legislative Council Legal and Social Issues Committee's public hearing for the Inquiry into Victoria's Criminal Justice System.

May I first begin by acknowledging the traditional custodians of the many lands that we are meeting on today—I am meeting on Wurundjeri land from the Kulin nation—and I would like to pay my respects to any elders past, present and emerging who are joining us today, who are watching today, who are here to impart their knowledge. Obviously when we are looking at the criminal justice system and as we look here today, the impact of our system on our Indigenous brothers and sisters is exponential to other people.

We are very pleased to welcome Professor Joe Graffam, who is the Deputy Vice-Chancellor of Research at Deakin University, amongst many other things that we will hear about in a moment.

If I can also introduce the committee who is joining us today: we have Deputy Chair Dr Tien Kieu, Ms Kaushaliya Vaghela, Ms Tania Maxwell, Mr Ed O'Donohue and Ms Sheena Watt.

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

Everything is being recorded today. We have Hansard working remotely. You will receive a transcript of today. I would encourage you to have a look at that and make sure that we did not mishear you or misrepresent anything that you have said. Ultimately that transcript will be made public—it will be on our website—and of course will form part of our report.

Professor, if you would like to make some opening comments, and then I will open it up for committee discussion. Thanks again.

Prof. GRAFFAM: Thank you for the invitation to testify today. I too would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of all the lands on which we are all sitting or standing today—and in my case it is the Wadawurrung people—and acknowledge their elders past, present and emerging.

Look, I will talk on both recidivism and remand but primarily on recidivism—that is really what I know more about. To start on that, at the end of June 2020 Victoria's two-year recidivism rate was 44.2 per cent, and I am sure we are all aware that that has risen substantially over the past 10-year period. In my view what is needed is a paradigm shift. That paradigm shift relates to incarceration in general as well as recidivism, and this is because incarceration is very costly in every respect—to everyone. One element of a new paradigm is the shift in the primary focus of incarceration from containment to correction. There is little question that the primary purpose and function of prison currently is containment. Correction plays a somewhat narrow and secondary part, and it will take a significant repurposing to change this. Another element of paradigm shift is adopting an ecosystem perspective on incarceration and recidivism. This is because incarceration is not exclusively or primarily a criminal justice problem; it is as much a social issue as it is a legal issue. The third element is acknowledging disadvantage as a main driver of incarceration. Characteristics of incarcerated individuals and of the communities from which they come provide strong evidence of this.

In making a shift from containment to correction the focus should be on the full set of conditions that contribute to offending, not only criminogenic variables such as anger management, sex offender treatment, alcohol and drug abuse abatement et cetera. Common conditions of people returning to prison include mental illness, cognitive impairment, alcohol and drug dependence, homelessness, unemployment, low education, family dysfunction and debt. That is not an exhaustive list. Expecting people to successfully return to their community and live crime free in the same circumstances that led them to prison in the first place is not realistic. A correction focus should be individualised, providing a comprehensive correction program plan based on

assessed needs. An appropriate correction model, as I see it, should include three components: treatment, development and what I refer to as equipment.

In adopting an ecosystem approach, it is important to recognise the complexity and the interrelatedness of conditions in the ecosystem. Some of those conditions are intrapersonal, referring to an individual's inherent abilities and skills and their health, education, employment status, development needs et cetera. Some are interpersonal, referring to family relations, social network, local community engagement—or not—and the more general relationships they have with care providers, support providers, service providers et cetera, including possibly parole officers. Thirdly, some conditions might be referred to as impersonal, and they refer to the socio-economic health of their local community and the general community; societal attitudes, laws, informal rules; and societal institutions such as criminal justice systems, government departments et cetera. That is sort of a rough characterisation of an ecosystem.

These many conditions interact with each other and they do so in powerful ways. One common example would be the emergence of a mental illness that can lead to substance abuse, loss of employment, loss of housing, downward spiral and justice involvement; there are many other examples of course. Adopting an ecosystem perspective also includes acknowledgement that when this complex mix of multiple conditions results in offending, remediation cannot and should not be considered the sole responsibility of a criminal justice system. Government departments that ought have engagement in this remediation include—with whatever title they may happen to have at a given time—health, housing, education, employment, family services and justice at least.

A challenge to adopting an ecosystem perspective is knowing what element of the ecosystem is best to focus upon if purposeful change is achieved. In my view, acknowledging and addressing disadvantage as a main driver of incarceration is critical to understanding what takes an individual on a pathway to incarceration and to altering that pathway. Clearly there is a community disadvantage effect. Six per cent of Victorian postcodes contribute 50 per cent of the state's prison population and 2 per cent of postcodes contribute 25 per cent of that total. In order to reduce recidivism and the flow of people into prison generally, we need to resource much more effectively the communities that see so many of their residents being incarcerated. It is axiomatic: holistically healthy communities produce healthy people and healthy people do not generally end up in prison. The socio-economic health and relative disadvantage of communities are highly variable and the gap is widening. For example, in 2018 the Victorian average of students commencing school with language and cognitive delays was 10 per cent. In postcode 3214, which is Victoria's third most disadvantaged postcode, the percentage was 18 per cent in 2009 and 40 per cent in 2019. As an associated condition secondary school completions in that postcode are half the Victorian average as well. The patterns of disadvantage are widening, and that to me partially explains increases in the flow into prison and recidivism in particular.

So to summarise, in my view the best way to address the issue of recidivism is to repurpose what we are doing within prison and shift to a correction rather than containment model and to at least initiate a comprehensive correction plan and process while at the same time resourcing disadvantaged communities sufficiently to enable them to build socio-economic health and equip them to effectively support their residents when they return to community. So I could stop there and then we could talk about that, or I could go to remand right away. That is up to you all.

The CHAIR: Let us stop there and see where this conversation takes us. I think that would be terrific.

Prof. GRAFFAM: Yes. Good idea.

The CHAIR: Thank you. I think this idea of an ecosystem, this idea of this whole-of-government perspective, is really important. And it does not seem to matter what we are looking at; whether it is homelessness or just about anything, it is this. Can you think of practical ways that this might be realised? So to prevent recidivism you are saying we need remediation and that needs to be part of health, housing, employment, education and obviously justice. Thinking about health, what would be one of those practical approaches that health could help in there?

Prof. GRAFFAM: Yes. If I connect this to the recidivism issue, then I am placing the individuals in the institution for the moment, and that relates to this three-part model that I have suggested, and it is the treatment model. So I will say that, again to just quickly summarise that condition, you have got a situation where a very

high proportion of people who are currently in prison have pre-existing trauma—either domestic trauma from early childhood, physical, mental or sexual abuse—and then institutional trauma that they acquire possibly at school but in juvenile justice et cetera. So trauma is an issue. One-third of the people in prison were being treated for a mental illness in the year before they went in and half have a history of psychiatric treatment, and this is something that we need to address aggressively. And I will say if we have got people contained, then this is an opportunity to commence treatment that will continue when they are released.

So getting to the practical side of it, that means that in the repurposing of prison I would expect that we would see a shift in the staffing profile so that we are getting much more effective mental health and general health, and also social health as well, treatment while people are inside so they are better prepared—they are healthier—but they also are better prepared in terms of having a healthcare program and some better self-management skills. But it connects back to a staffing profile change. I am not really clear on whether it would be just more staff, whether it would be a shift in the ratio of—I do not want to use the word ‘clinical’ but—care staff versus custodial staff or whether it is a completely multiskilled workforce that deals with custodial and care issues, like we do as people.

The CHAIR: Yes. I think that is interesting. And just in my final couple of minutes, that postcode effect—the figures are quite startling. Obviously we should be focusing on those postcodes; we have got the evidence, we know that they are responsible for up to 50 per cent of the incarceration. What should this committee say we should be doing in those five postcodes?

Prof. GRAFFAM: I could give an example of something that has been started.

The CHAIR: Great.

Prof. GRAFFAM: In the past 20 months we have been working within that postcode. We have been working on the development of a local integrated support network. That has involved application of a co-design methodology that brings together prospective users of the service—that is to say, people from North Geelong who have prison experience and have knowledge of not just what services are needed, because the international literature tells you that and it is the same all over the world, but the more important element of how you do it, how you interact with people who have recently come out of prison.

And so this project started with a survey of services in the region and their existing knowledge and existing receptivity to working with this group of people. We engaged an expert in co-design to help work this process through, and over the past 20 months we have got Barwon Health, Salvation Army, department of justice, Department of Families, Fairness and Housing, community corrections as well as justice as a whole, VACRO and the Bethany support foundation as a family services unit. So we have got this network in place. There is a governance committee comprising people from those various organisations, and we have an expert reference group, which is former prisoners who are advising on how this thing ought to work. A model has been developed, and now we are looking for funds for it. The point I am making, really, is that it took time.

The CHAIR: Yes.

Prof. GRAFFAM: It took a bit of discussion, with service providers in particular, about ‘What do you need to know and what sort of support do you need to be able to—

The CHAIR: To support those people.

Prof. GRAFFAM: provide this?’, and there was very little resistance.

The CHAIR: Any further information you can send on that, Joe, would be really welcomed. I will move to the Deputy Chair, Tien Kieu.

Dr KIEU: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Professor Graffam, for assisting us in this inquiry. This is very important. And you mentioned that we need a shift in paradigm and that this is not only a legal issue but also a social issue.

Prof. GRAFFAM: Yes.

Dr KIEU: It is very much the name of our committee, the Legal and Social Issues Committee. You just mentioned your work in the last 20 months or so on the local support network, and it may be a bit early to evaluate the outcomes and the success of that. Do you have any other examples elsewhere, large scale or small scale, in the world or some other state that can reduce and is successfully targeting recidivism? Thank you.

Prof. GRAFFAM: Yes. Within Australia I can tell you that out in Albany in WA—

I will go back half a step and say that I have been pushing for this sort of place-based local integration of support services for several years, and it was pretty gratifying to be able to get a trial up and started at least here. But there is an organisation called Pivot in Albany, WA, which has been operating for almost two years now based on this thinking. It is very effective. It has attracted quite a bit of funding. It actually was started when the board of directors of that not-for-profit made a commitment to just do this, and now they have attracted some state funding, which is helping them build a building. Just in terms of mental health savings to the state, it is millions of dollars already that are being saved by the fact that they have got sort of an early intervention and hospitalisation prevention function attached to it, which was not intended—they did not design it that way, it is just that they are able to keep people from serious lapses. Pivot is a good example in WA, and there are quite a few examples in North America as well of place-based, localised programs that are addressing the issues. All over the world—it actually started with—

There is a research institute in Washington called the Urban Institute, and they had a large-scale study of 13 cities around the US. Everywhere when people come out of prison they move back to the community from which they have come, and when you place services like this in a hub or a network that allows them availability and there is receptivity of the service providers, then you do see a reduction in recidivism. So it is something that we know works. It is a question of shifting attention and not treating a problem as generic when in fact it is placed based and the solutions are placed based.

Dr KIEU: Do I have time, Chair?

The CHAIR: Yes, you have got a minute.

Dr KIEU: Thank you very much. We have been talking about support, whether it is mental health, physical health, housing or some other kind of support. I would like to find out more about the job and employment support because that is also a very crucial element for people not to relapse and come back to prison once they have been more stabilised—and more dignity. But there may be a stigma in society against the ex-convicted or ex-prisoners. And also the skills they have may not be appropriate and so on. Even themselves, they may not see themselves as worthy or confident enough to apply for jobs. So can you expand a little bit on that, please?

Prof. GRAFFAM: Yes. I think you are right about that last point, lacking confidence. It goes across everything, not just jobseeking but support seeking in general. Many people feel like they are not worthy to ask or they lack the confidence in how to ask, so it is a pretty blanket problem across the various issues. That is part of what service providers need retraining within. It is learning how to attract people into their service when they are not really well equipped to even ask for help. But when it comes to employment, look, if I start with a figure that is another chilling figure, two-thirds of the people who reoffended and ended up in prison again were unemployed at the time that they reoffended, so this is a critical feature and the simple reality is that employment service providers, commonwealth-funded employment service providers, are not generally well equipped to support people coming out of prison. And those people, in terms of the likelihood of them getting employment, it is a low likelihood of success, so a lot of employment consultants are tempted to put less effort into someone like that than someone who has a much higher prospect of success. I am the chair of a board of a very large not-for-profit employment service here in Australia, so I know the employment industry quite well, and I am happy to say that the one that I serve on is proactive about supporting people into employment who have criminal justice histories. There are good ones but the majority are really just not well prepared, and it is just another one of the big issues we have to address.

Dr KIEU: Thank you very much.

The CHAIR: Thank you. I think the spent convictions legislation certainly had employment very high on its objectives.

Prof. GRAFFAM: That is right.

The CHAIR: Ms Tania Maxwell.

Ms MAXWELL: Thank you, Chair. Welcome, Professor Graffam. It is great to have you here. Thank you for your work, specifically in the reintegration puzzle. I too have jumped online for some events, and it has been very informing. I just wanted to quote some statistics here. We know that the government has contributed millions and millions of dollars to develop and implement rehabilitation for young people on remand, and the data reveals that there has been actually a decline in the number of young people offending in Victoria. The youth offender incident rate in Victoria in the year ending March 2021 was 17 per cent lower than the year ending March 2012. The rate is similar to the year ending March 2020, with a slight decrease of 0.2 per cent—not enormous—and obviously we would like to see that reduce more. But Victoria also had the lowest rate in Australia of young people, 10 to 17 years, per 10 000 of the population, and the number of young people aged 10 to 17 years under youth justice supervision in Victoria has reduced by 40 per cent from 2010–11 to 2019–20. The average daily number of Aboriginal children aged 10 to 17 in youth justice has reduced by 32 per cent—thankfully—between 2016–17 to the comparative years of 2019–20, so that went from 120 to 81, including an 18 per cent reduction in 2019–20. Given those statistics and your opening remarks, what do you see as the most pivotal interventions to support offenders when leaving prison to prevent recidivist offending, and could you send specific details of those programs for us to consider in our deliberations in this committee?

Prof. GRAFFAM: Look, given that a lot of the, I will call it, activity that we see within the system is intergenerational—you know, it is second and third generation—I think that one of the big factors in moving in the right direction is attention that is being given within programs on parenting. I think that is something that has already found its way into correctional programs, and we are seeing some correction. You know, it is good news for me. I think the other thing though that I always have to do is go back to the place-based approach, and I know that in 3214, for example, almost 50 per cent of neonates enter the world with a child protection order around them. You will find that in other postcodes too, but you will not find it in the postcode where I live, you know—and that is of course a good thing. But I think we need to make sure that our attention is focused on the right level. There is no question that parenting training has been underway for a few years now, and I think it is having a positive effect. I had not really thought about this before, but in a way, it supports the idea of shifting the focus from containment to correction, and we start to see a positive effect.

Ms MAXWELL: Do I have time for one more?

The CHAIR: You do.

Ms MAXWELL: Thank you. Professor, I agree. I am an avid advocate and fan of early intervention in that child maternal health space. Having previously worked as a youth worker I have seen the results from families who have had such disadvantage, and it has often led to youth justice. There are so many research publications relating to recidivism and reintegration for ex-prisoners. With the number of those research publications and programs available, why do we still have these exceptionally high rates of recidivism?

Prof. GRAFFAM: It has to do with the uptake of research. Look, I am going to spread responsibility across it. So the uptake of research is a big part of it, but I will also say that a good deal of the research is explaining recidivism. It is about conceptualising what drives recidivism and explaining all aspects of recidivism but not so much focus on: what can we do about it? I think that that combination of a reluctance to take up the issues of addressing it—and I am going to take a swipe at somebody now. If you start from the position that to reduce recidivism requires something like a shift in attention from simple containment to actually developmental, health-promoting activities, then a tough-on-crime perspective starts coming onto that really hard and heavy. I think we need, on a whole other level with respect to the media in particular, to start to promote the notion of ‘smart on crime’ rather than the simple ‘tough on crime’. That to me would probably encourage better uptake of research. But I also think that researchers need to pay a bit more attention to a practical application type approach; that would not hurt at all.

Ms MAXWELL: Thanks, Professor.

The CHAIR: Thank you. Kaushaliya Vaghela.

Ms VAGHELA: Thanks, Chair. Thanks, Professor Graffam, for your time today to appear in front of the Legal and Social Issues Committee’s Inquiry into Victoria’s Criminal Justice System. The Chair just mentioned a spent convictions scheme, so my question to you is regarding that. Your work has focused on the impact of

education and training on recidivism rates. This committee previously reported on the importance of a spent convictions scheme, which has since been legislated. What impact do you think that reform will have on getting ex-offenders back into employment?

Prof. GRAFFAM: It would be very hard to overstate the importance of that. The very first thing that almost all employers do is check that, and when there is a record it does not even matter whether the crime was two decades ago or in a completely unrelated field of activity, it will put the kibosh on employment for people. This was a landmark breakthrough for sure. I do not know how else to put it. There have always been great employers who are willing to give people a chance, but they are far and away in the minority.

Ms VAGHELA: Yes. And I understand that you have also received a grant from the Australian Research Council to undertake a project into how to improve post-release employment options for people leaving prison. What sort of initial findings have you got from that work that has been done?

Prof. GRAFFAM: Interestingly, this was a little while ago, and I am going to be a little bit crude when I say this, but the view of employment consultants generally was that they were dealing with damaged goods but they were doing a great job in trying to sell these damaged goods to employers. Employers, on the other hand, had the view that if someone had undertaken training while in prison and if they had not been convicted of a drug crime—that was something that they could not get past—if they had had training and did not have a drug history, they actually were quite positive about people's employment prospects. And the prisoners had a similar view. The way it broke up was: prison staff viewed prospects as bleak—it was more like the damaged goods perspective—as did the employment consultants, and the employers and the prisoners had more positive views about the prospects. So, interesting.

Ms VAGHELA: Yes. And do I have time, Chair?

The CHAIR: Yes, a minute.

Ms VAGHELA: Okay. Also, Professor, you have done research and have got a publication on experience and expression of anger among Australian prisoners and the relationship between anger and reintegration variables. Can you please talk to us a little bit more about that?

The CHAIR: Briefly.

Ms VAGHELA: Yes.

Prof. GRAFFAM: This looked at anger. The way psychologists look at anger and anxiety both is they look at them in terms of state anger and trait anger—trait being embedded and intractable, kind of. I might be, and people have accused me of being, terminally optimistic, so that might be a trait. But if my optimism is subject to external variables, like whether my football team wins or something like that, that is more state-like. What we found there was that it was not so much an issue of trait anger, it was state anger. And the same thing was true of anxiety—that there are conditions that produce anger reactions. But they are not, any more than the general population, living with an underlying state of anger ready to erupt; it is external variables that precipitate this.

The CHAIR: Great. Thank you. Ed O'Donohue.

Mr O'DONOHUE: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Professor, for appearing before us today. In your introductory remarks you talked about what drives recidivism, and several colleagues have asked questions around that. The recidivism rate from, say, seven, eight, nine or 10 years ago has gone from an average for adult prisoners in the low to mid 30 per cent range and now it is in the mid to high 40 per cent range. What has changed in the last seven or eight years?

Prof. GRAFFAM: I sort of made a reference to this before. I think part of that rise has to do with the widening gulf in terms of advantage-disadvantage. That simple statement translates into situations like 10 years ago the proportion of second- and third-generation involvement in the criminal justice system was smaller than it is now—second generation was pretty common, third generation was not that common. Now, third generation is pretty common and it is more widespread. Part of the explanation, I think, has to do with increased disadvantage in this small pocket of local communities and the fact that—there is another element at play

here—if a large proportion of the population is coming from a small number of local communities, when people get inside they are seeing people they already know. And unless we are correcting the conditions that lead them in there in the first place, what they are going to be doing inside is learning how to interact with each other better, and there is a lot of argument that prison actually increases the amount of crime that people commit post release. So the logic behind that statement to me is that people get inside, they know people because they are from the same local community, they are interacting with each other inside and crime occurs when they get out. So if you do not fix them, you break them.

Mr O'DONOHUE: If I could, Chair, on that point, Professor, we have seen the remand prisoner population balloon over several years but particularly with the slow response to the COVID pandemic, and now it is well over 40 per cent of the male prison population and over 50 per cent of the female. What impact does that have on the ability of prisoners to access programs which can address the cause of their offending behaviour?

Prof. GRAFFAM: Those on remand do not have eligibility for programs, so they are just sitting there. And as far as the access to programs of people who are not on remand, the overall staff activity level impinges on the ability of the prison to deliver the programs that are available and have been made available for years. I would also connect the waiting list issue to this. That is not about remand, but for people who have been incarcerated often the waiting list is longer than the sentence that they have. So if it is a six-month program, as soon as you have less than six months left you are ineligible, so the waiting list plus that rule cut off a lot for people and that is why we need to expand the program aspect of this.

Mr O'DONOHUE: If I could make a comment to follow that. It is a pity, Professor—to follow that point through, the new Ravenhall prison, which opened four, five, six years ago, was designed so that programs would continue post release, but that has been abandoned because of the change from a fully sentenced prison to now a 50 per cent remand prison. So I take your point, and it is a strong one.

Prof. GRAFFAM: Thank you.

The CHAIR: Ed? Are you good? Great. Thanks. Sheena Watt.

Ms WATT: Thank you, Chair. And thank you so much, Professor Graffam. I have learned a lot from your short presentation today. I wanted to ask around prisoners with a disability and if you had any particular comment to make around sentencing options for people with a disability. We have heard some really startling statistics about the number in our prisons that have disabilities, both not diagnosed and then not diagnosed until such time as they are in. So what can we do to assist and support people with a disability?

Prof. GRAFFAM: I am really glad you asked that, Sheena. So I am going to start by saying that I am going to be somewhat generic and then specific. Technically, disability in terms of NDIS eligibility is a very broad category. So all of those people I mentioned earlier with a mental illness are eligible for NDIS packages, and there are people with acquired brain injury; 25 per cent of prisoners in Victoria are acknowledged to have a serious brain injury, but all acquired brain injury together accounts for probably 65 per cent of the people in prison. And then you have got intellectual disability; estimates vary, but it is probably 10 times as frequent in prison as in the general community. So there is a lot of disability in prison—let us start with that point—and there are a lot of people in prison who have eligibility for NDIS packages. I think one thing that we could do for those people is get that sorted out while they are still in prison so that they do not have to wait until they are out to begin the process of getting a support package that they will need when they are in the community. So I would say that would be point number one for me as an objective.

Now, I will get a little bit technical here. I do not know whether this has been repeated recently, but some years ago, maybe 10 years ago, there was a study done within Victoria of intellectual disability testing, and they identified a good deal of false negative tests. That is to say, the tests showed the individual did not have intellectual disability when in fact they did have intellectual disability, and the proportion of false positives was low. So the system at that point was not effectively identifying, with intellectual disability, who in prison has and does not have it, so treatment was being missed because people in need of it were being denied, and that was not helpful. I think we need to make sure that that assessment of acquired brain injury in particular and intellectual disability are effective at reception—really, at reception—if it is not known ahead of time. Often it is known ahead of time. I do not mean having people in protection in the sense of a separate unit, but we should

be ensuring that they are protected when they are incarcerated because of malleability in the case of a lot of people.

Ms WATT: And just to people with a disability applying for bail, what are some of the barriers around people with a disability applying for bail and being successful in that application?

Prof. GRAFFAM: Well, communication is probably the number one. I will probably interject here and say that before I got into this area of research I did largely disability employment research, but it was also community integration of people with disability. I did that research for 20 years before I got into this so my knowledge of this is pretty good. People in particular with brain injury and intellectual disability have comprehension issues that mean that they are often not clear on exactly what the charges were or exactly what the conditions are that they have been convicted of later on in the process, so they do not argue well because they do not comprehend sufficiently. So I think some direct intervention in the form of advocates who are specifically trained—it is different to having a disability advocate, having a disability advocate who is familiar with bailing, and that is what I am getting at now. If you ask a general citizen to go along to court and advocate for somebody, they are not going to do a very good job, so I think we need specifically trained advocates for that.

The CHAIR: Thank you, Sheena. Thank you, Professor Graffam. That was a really great, broad-ranging discussion. We very much appreciate it. As I mentioned at the outset, you will receive a transcript from today. Please have a look at it and let us know if we need to make any changes. Thanks again. The committee will take a short break just to reset for the next witness.

Prof. GRAFFAM: Thank you all for having me; it has been really good. Good luck with your work.

Witness withdrew.