

TRANSCRIPT

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL LEGAL AND SOCIAL ISSUES COMMITTEE

Inquiry into Victoria's Criminal Justice System

Melbourne—Tuesday, 21 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

WITNESSES (*via videoconference*)

Mr Ivan Ray, Chief Executive Officer, and

Mr Kelvin Glare, AO, APM, Executive Chair, and former Chief Commissioner, Victoria Police, Community Advocacy Alliance.

The CHAIR: Welcome back, everyone. As I am sure you know, this is the Legislative Council Legal and Social Issues Committee's public hearing into our Inquiry into Victoria's Criminal Justice System.

I am delighted that we can now be joined by an organisation called the Community Advocacy Alliance. We are joined by Ivan Ray, their CEO, and Kel Glare, who is the Chairman but is also—many of you will remember—a former Chief Commissioner of Victoria Police here. Welcome to both of you.

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

We are recording today as well as being broadcast, so the Hansard team is right behind us listening to every word. You will receive a transcript of today's hearing, and I would encourage you to have a look at that to make sure we have not misheard you or misrepresented you.

So we will open to some opening remarks before a committee discussion.

Mr GLARE: Thank you very much. I served the Victoria Police for over 35 years in a wide variety of capacities. I hold an honours degrees in law from the University of Melbourne and was admitted to practise as a barrister and solicitor, but I give that information simply to set the background for what I am about to say. Over a period of about 21 years I presented a great many cases at magistrates and children's courts—into the thousands—and I actually formed the police prosecutions division and ran that for over three years. During that time, as prosecuting, I prosecuted literally hundreds of committals at the then committals courts of Preston and Prahran, and the Community Advocacy Alliance submits that committal proceedings have outlived their usefulness now, when the defence is given a copy of all evidence. The committal proceedings delay the trial process, traumatise victims—particularly those victims of sexual offences—and are costly; and in any case the Director of Public Prosecutions is well capable of deciding whether a matter ought to go to trial. So we simply say that committals have outlived their life, their usefulness.

Turning to judicial appointments, the CAA further submits that the system of appointment of judges is fatally flawed in that appointments are made at the whim of the Attorney-General of the day, and that too easily leads to jobs for mates. Our view is that the process ought to be that we have judges appointed by a joint parliamentary committee and that judges should also be appointed on contract like everyone else.

Turning to judicial commission: because there is currently no effective system of assessment of judicial officers, the CAA strongly advocates that Victoria must introduce a judicial conduct commission with the power to discipline judges where warranted and the power to set key performance indicators that all judges must meet on pain of being removed from office, because as everyone knows, at the moment the appointment of judges is for life. Each state in the USA now has a judicial conduct commission, as do Canada and New Zealand, and New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory also have judicial conduct commissions. Former Chief Justice of Victoria Marilyn Warren has stated that judges want reforms to ensure accountability and transparency, and we submit that that time has come.

Turning to sentencing, examination of the media over time has clearly established that the general public has lost confidence in judges' sentencing of offenders. The Melbourne *Herald Sun* of 5 May 2021 reported that one offender had received 11 community correction or similar orders without being incarcerated and had breached some of those orders, seemingly with impunity, and was going to be released on bail pending sentencing. This is surely unacceptable. It puts the public at unwarranted risk and destroys any confidence the public have in the criminal justice system. Parliament sets maximum terms of imprisonment for most offences, but I know of habitual criminals who have priors and have been convicted of dozens of serious offences, and yet apart from

murder I have never witnessed a single offender receive the maximum sentence set by Parliament. Judges ignore Parliament. They have established their own sentencing guidelines, and when offenders are repeatedly treated leniently, respect for the law is lost and we end up condoning crime. Compassion for offenders simply cannot outweigh the rights of victims and the right of victims to seek justice before the courts. We submit that only radical sentencing reform will satisfy the community that the justice system is there and it is there for their protection and it is actually working. In many cases there are more viable alternatives to incarceration for non-violent offenders.

So far as juvenile offending is concerned, with your permission I would like Mr Ivan Ray, the CEO of the CAA, a former inspector and founder of Blue Light Victoria to speak to juvenile offending and the age of criminal culpability. Thank you.

The CHAIR: Thanks, Kel. Thanks, Ivan.

Mr RAY: Good afternoon, everybody. From the outset I would like to make clear that the CAA has a strong policy: if it ain't broke, don't fix it. And in many ways the juvenile justice system can hardly be accused of being broken. It can always be improved, and we submit that that should be the focus of this inquiry. When you are dragged out of a deep sleep in the middle of the night and find two or three figures standing over you, the last thing that may enter your mind is, 'Oh, it's all okay, they're only kids'. The victims who experience these horrors must be given due consideration and not forgotten in this debate—very important. What we do know, however, is that the incidence of juvenile crime in Victoria has been relatively stable over the last 10 years, excluding 2016, when the crime tsunami spike we predicted occurred. We know that 56 per cent of young people charged are cautioned, and only 36 per cent of those reoffend, compared with 48 per cent of those that go through the court system. We accept that these figures could be greatly improved, but the focus should be on the upgrading and the effectiveness of the police cautioning program, not the reduction in the conditioning age of culpability, when the data clearly shows the police cautioning program is the most effective process that we have in the juvenile justice system. The other broader issue with raising the age or, more accurately, removing the ability to sanction any child under 14 will feed the ability of criminals to recruit young offenders. Now, we have seen plenty of evidence of that, and, more poignantly, they could be recruited for terrorism, and we see that happening overseas.

The most important question must be: if children under 14 cannot be charged, arrested or processed, what mechanisms will be put in place to secure or bring that child under control who is on a crime spree or worse? Nobody wants to see kids in jail, and every effort should be exploited to avoid that, as it currently is. But to eliminate incarceration of young people entirely is seriously fraught. Children who are incarcerated are incarcerated by the courts, as is appropriate, and as a last resort with the courts exploring every alternative. They should not be interfered with. Some young people need to be incarcerated, and for two major reasons: protecting them from further harm and protecting the community from them. That should not be interfered with. The number of young people at any one time in any form of detention in Victoria in 2018 was 128. That relates to 1.25 per cent of the children going through the system. The danger of interfering in this status quo is extreme. The only alternative would be to resort to some medical intervention and tranquillising errant youth until they are brought under control, and I could not see that happening, and we certainly would not approve of it or support it.

Young people need structure in their life, and equally they need to understand there are consequences for their actions. These consequences can be introduced at an early stage associated with a police caution. They may be as simple as losing their phone for a week, minor curfews and a raft of other non-draconian consequences that would dramatically improve the effectiveness of the cautioning program. Including the child's school coordinators would also be a great move in the right direction so the education component could be ensured to be continued. Reducing the number of children in courts and reducing the number of recidivists will be achieved by building upon what already exists.

In summary, we would implore the inquiry to focus on making the tools that we have better and effectively develop the diversionary function of the police cautioning program. If that was bolstered and built, then I could assure you that that would be a significant move in keeping more young people out of jail but, more importantly, more young people out of trouble and our community safer. Thank you very much.

The CHAIR: Thank you both. That was great. I think a lot of it is echoing what we are hearing, and certainly those statistics around the recidivism rates of those that have gone under a diversion, or who have not been incarcerated, versus those who have been incarcerated are very clear. Could I just start off with a couple of

questions? I was interested in your comments about the appointment of judicial officers, but also you mentioned a sort of assessment against KPIs. I wonder if you could elaborate on what you think would be included in those key performance indicators.

Mr GLARE: Well, one of those would be the level of community acceptance of what the sentences are that judges are handing out, because I am quite positive that the general community now is disgusted at some of the very lenient sentences for very serious violent offenders. I am not saying that people who commit non-violent offences should go to jail, either. In fact I think there is a great amount of room for the imposition of orders that require offenders in non-violent cases, and perhaps even in some violent cases, to pay compensation—not to the state, not in fines, but pay compensation—to the victim. Someone who has a job who has a big chunk of their pay taken out every fortnight or whatever to compensate a victim I think would be far less likely to want to repeat the dose again. They would be more likely to be much more circumspect about their actions. I think we do not use compensation anywhere near enough in the criminal justice system.

The CHAIR: So are you saying that, rather than a fine, certainly rather than incarceration, the fine would be considered compensation and would be going directly to the victims?

Mr GLARE: Directly to the victims. I think the victims would gain some satisfaction from that, knowing that the person who had done them harm was required to pay them for their trouble rather than the state.

The CHAIR: Yes. I mean, it is almost edging into a sort of restorative justice type of approach where there is a direct connection between the offender and the victim.

Mr GLARE: Yes. I think it needs to be something that is not only introduced but enforced by the courts themselves and not handed off to some other authority for enforcement.

The CHAIR: Fair enough, Kel. You were saying that one of the performance indicators would be that the community was satisfied with the judiciary's decision. We have got a Sentencing Advisory Council and part of their job is to assess this. Are you suggesting that they have got it wrong now? And the second part of that question would be: how would we assess community opinion?

Mr GLARE: Well, it is not that difficult to conduct limited opinion polls—

The CHAIR: But you cannot do an opinion poll. There are so many circumstances to a case, aren't there?

Mr GLARE: Well, there are. But the alternative is to simply do nothing and allow things to go on as they are and allow the general public to become more and more disenchanted. In fact the criminal justice system needs the approval of the populace. It needs to be something that people can be confident will work in the general interests of the community. Whatever the difficulty is I think there are means of overcoming them. It is a funny thing, though; in trials where we have juries we allow the jury to determine the guilt or innocence of the accused but we give the jury no part in the sentencing process. I find that quite strange: the thought that juries do not have the ability to make a recommendation even in relation to sentence. I think that is quite wrong. I think that where there are jury trials, the jury has heard all the evidence, they have weighed it all up and they have come to a conclusion of guilt and there is a conviction. Surely they could be trusted to at least make a recommendation in relation to what a sentence ought to be. That way we would get a better feel for what the community view is of the actions of these people who are convicted.

The CHAIR: I think that is interesting. I guess, you know, it would be going back to the Sentencing Advisory Council that also does this body of research into community opinions, but I think you are suggesting that maybe they are not—they are a bit off mark.

Mr GLARE: Well, we could all sit in our studies or lounge rooms and pontificate about what should be, but when you have been at the sharp end and seen some of the impact there has been on victims and so on and moving in the community, I can tell you there is a high level of dissatisfaction. When we see people kill someone with a motor car and they get a community correction order or a sentence of 12 months or something of that kind, the victims—not the victims, they are dead, but their relatives—are absolutely devastated by those things. It is difficult in my mind to find sufficient justification for such a limited punishment.

The CHAIR: Thanks, Kel. If I have got time, I will come back. Kaushaliya.

Ms VAGHELA: Thanks, Chair. Thanks, Kelvin and Ivan, for your time and also for the submission provided. Something that we the committee have heard about in submissions is the gendered nature of many crimes and the harsh impact of incarceration on women prisoners. What are your views on what the government can do to address this?

Mr RAY: Sorry, the impact between female and male—

Ms VAGHELA: Yes, the harsh impact of incarceration on women prisoners.

Mr RAY: That may be so, but that is an area for corrections and not really our forte because it is up to them to provide the environments for those people that are incarcerated. So as police, the incarceration side of it is something that we did not apply ourselves to very much.

Mr GLARE: I might say, though, that women have pretty much a get-out-of-jail-free card compared with men. If you look at the statistics, I think you will find they generally get quite lenient sentences compared with their male counterparts. I am not saying that is necessarily wrong, because there are children involved often and things of that kind. But it does not seem to me that women are treated unnecessarily harshly in the system at all.

Ms VAGHELA: Okay. All right. And the reasons for men and women to enter the justice system—do you think the reasons are the same, or are there different reasons for men and women?

Mr GLARE: No, I think the universal thing is greed. That seems to be behind most of it. Otherwise a lot of the offences are committed in the emotion of disputes, of course—domestic violence. That is not all one-sided, although males are the major perpetrators. So, yes, there needs to be a balance. There is no doubt about that.

Ms VAGHELA: Yes. And your submission advocates for a different approach to traffic offences for young people. Can you explain to the committee how that would work?

Mr RAY: The way that we treat young people and the damage, I think, that we can cause them under the guise of road safety has to be addressed. Young people—and this is not gender specific—when they are on their Ps are subject to all sorts of rules that the average driver is not. But when we penalise those young people, the penalty is disproportionate, because in the majority of cases those young people lose their job, they lose their ability to go to school, they lose so much, and of course what happens is that not having a job has a snowball effect. It means they cannot make the payments on their car so their car gets repossessed. That then leads to their credit rating being damaged, and the consequences keep rolling on.

I am really adamant that what we should be doing is using, again, the police cautioning program far wider. I do not believe we should not take action against young people that do the wrong thing; I think we should. But it needs to be a more balanced approach. If you can imagine the impact, particularly drawn to our attention, of young people in the country, they might live miles from the closest public transport, if they have got any. So they are locked into their property until they can get over their suspended period. Equally, in the city it might be fine for those that can travel to a job which is accessed by public transport, but in all the trades and numerous other jobs people have to travel, and young people have to travel. And if they cannot travel, they lose their job, and that is starting them off on the wrong foot, and that is where it has got to change.

Mr GLARE: Rather than losing their licence entirely, I think there is great scope to giving young people who would otherwise lose their licence a restricted licence, if you like, so that they can go to and from work but not drive socially. I think there is plenty of scope for that. We actually have on our website a plan we call Lose Your Licence Lose Your Life, and that goes into all the issues that we are now discussing.

Ms VAGHELA: Yes. And are you aware of this approach being used in any other jurisdiction? How successful is it over there?

Mr GLARE: No, it is new. It is a bit of innovation for Victoria if it is taken up.

The CHAIR: Great.

Ms VAGHELA: Thank you. Thanks, Chair. I will come back if time allows.

The CHAIR: Thank you. Tania.

Ms MAXWELL: Thank you, Chair. Welcome, Kel and Ivan. Lovely to see you again. I just want to go back to one of the terms of reference. You have briefly spoken about magistrates. I would like to ask you about your thoughts are on the tenure of magistrates.

Mr GLARE: Well, again, we say appointment by contract. Really, no-one should get open slather, no matter what they have done before. I have seen magistrates who would convict everyone who came before them. I have seen magistrates who would bend over backwards to dismiss cases against everyone who came before them. Now, they cannot both be right. But there is no process at the moment for assessing their suitability to sit on the bench. They sit there and they make these decisions year in, year out. I have been embarrassed in court at times prosecuting when a magistrate has simply ignored the evidence and imposed a conviction. I have equally been angry and frustrated when they have ignored the evidence and dismissed the case. So there has to be some sort of accountability and assessment. That is why I say we need a commission—someone who can review the performance of the various judicial officials.

Ms MAXWELL: Okay. Thanks, Kel. In the UK they have what is called an unduly lenient sentencing scheme. I do not know whether you are aware of that. So when a sentence is handed down, the community actually has an option to put forward their disappointment in the sentence, and it is normally done by the victims' families or closest of friends or close associates. That often gives the victims of crime a feeling that they actually have the opportunity to sort of influence the changing of a sentence or that they are actually included in the process.

Mr GLARE: I am sure that helps enormously for them, because they have a voice, and at the moment victims are treated by the whole judicial system as something of a nuisance rather than as an integral part of the process. So anything that gives victims some sort of voice I am sure would do much to allay the angst that now exists.

Ms MAXWELL: And just lastly at this point, what are your thoughts on early intervention and primary prevention so that particularly our young people are not going through the youth justice system?

Mr GLARE: I think it is absolutely essential, and that is why I was so appalled when the police-in-schools program that I introduced in 1989 was abolished in 2006. We were giving young people the tools to avoid getting into trouble and giving them the basic tenets of good citizenship, which, if you like, is a form of early intervention—and I have no doubt. That was backed up by a Monash University study done in 2004 and released in 2006; that said the program was a very good program achieving very good results in the youth space. Unfortunately the program was abolished in 2006. We were in the process of launching a police veterans in schools program two years ago, and COVID put paid to that. I understand Victoria Police are in favour of reintroducing the program, but that is early intervention at the basic level before people get into trouble. Actually Ivan and I spoke to one of the assistant commissioners. He trotted out all the statistics and said, 'It's 11- to 13-year-olds getting into trouble, so we're concentrating on them'. The fact of the matter is that he did not understand their own statistics. If the kids are getting into trouble at the age of 11 to 13, we need to get to them before they get to that age so they do not get into trouble in the first place. That would seem to me just basic, but the assistant commissioner obviously did not understand the message.

Ms MAXWELL: Thank you, Chair.

The CHAIR: Thank you. Matthew.

Dr BACH: Thanks, Chair, and many thanks to both of you for coming to be with us today. I want to pick up where my colleague Ms Vaghela left off. I was really interested, in your submission, to hear about some of your ideas about traffic infringements. Would you mind talking us through exactly which types of traffic offences you feel could be dealt with in that way? Certainly noting your strong views about the need to deal with serious crime seriously—and I do agree with you—are there other areas in addition to traffic infringements, which you have spoken about already and I will seek some more information on, where you think we could do things differently in an effort to seek to divert away from engagement in the criminal justice system?

Mr RAY: I think, with community policing and the attempts by the current chief commissioner, COVID has put paid to it. But the interaction between the police and their community and being able to take ownership of their community and the kids within that community are essential. I would hark back to where we established Blue Light in 1976. That was caused by a number of police sitting around the mess room table who were talking about the fact that every child they spoke to just kept saying they had nothing to do. So the police in

Mooroolbark at that time set up the first Blue Light, and the program went on from there. Now, what that program does, as with some of the other programs, is connect the police and young people so that the relationship is a positive one, not a negative one, and that is where it starts. We should exercise continuity throughout young people's lives. We should not be treating them one way for serious crime and then treating them another way because they have been caught speeding in a car. It just seems to me to be a complete contradiction. We will caution them—and they are cautioned, but for some very serious offences—and they do not reoffend again, and I think that is brilliant. But we do not give them any caution if it is a traffic infringement—minor, serious or otherwise—and that is just wrong, and particularly the damage that can be caused. If a person goes into a cautioning program, they can discuss it with the police and others, and we bring in other expertise to talk to them and to guide them on a better path. And that is what the focus should really be on, not trying to ratchet up penalties at the expense of the kids.

Dr BACH: All right. Thank you, Mr Ray. Can I just pick up on one thing you said. I think you said, when referencing community policing—and I agree with you; I think that model is fantastic wherever it can be enacted—that COVID has put paid to that. What do you mean by that remark?

Mr RAY: Well, the resources that are being applied to COVID must impact on that. It is only logical. The police force, if you like, the 18 000 members or thereabouts, is designed to police the state of Victoria. When you put an additional impost of things on policing, then something has to give somewhere. And I noticed the chief commissioner saying that booze buses, because of COVID, are not out as often as they regularly were. Well, I would suggest that having to find the resources to do the COVID compliance has to impact adversely on operational policing, and the first place that it would impact on would be proactive policing. And I understand that, and that is probably why the police-in-schools program has not started yet. Once we get over this hiatus, then I am really hopeful that the concerted effort that the chief commissioner explained to our group, as to his role and what he saw his philosophy might be, can be then implemented, and I look forward to that happening.

Mr GLARE: If we look at now, we have police stations closed out in the north and north-west—the west—because of the commitment in the city to these violent demonstrations, and police have become the punching bag for idiots who want to cause trouble. I have never seen a large demonstration that did not have an element of people who are simply there to cause trouble, but it is impacting very severely on the police capacity to go about their normal community policing duties.

Dr BACH: All right. Thank you.

The CHAIR: Thank you. Sheena.

Ms WATT: Thank you, Chair, and thank you to you both for being with us and for your submission. Could I just take a moment to acknowledge Mr Ray and your work with Blue Light Victoria. It is an organisation I hold particularly dear to my heart as a previous participant in the disco.

The CHAIR: Me too!

Ms WATT: Yes?

Mr RAY: Don't make me feel so old.

Ms WATT: Well, I must say that my skills at basketball come from my Blue Light years. Can I ask a question that goes to your submission around the drug quarantine program proposal, and in that you envisage a program working to prevent people from returning to drug use upon their release. Can you talk to me a little bit more about that proposal? What have you considered might be particular costs or how that might work? I am particularly interested in that and would welcome some further contributions from you.

Mr RAY: I think I discussed this with the Chair in some detail.

The CHAIR: Yes, we have.

Mr RAY: Sorry?

The CHAIR: I said, 'Yes, we have'. We have had robust conversations.

Mr RAY: Yes, and it is another innovation, if you like, for Victoria, if they were to choose to support it. And what we are arguing is that the current system, where we have drug injecting rooms, is not addressing the problem sufficiently well, and we need to look at a different way of dealing with people who are affected by drugs. Now, everybody talks about rehabilitation, and of course we know with drug addicts they have got to want to be rehabilitated before there is any chance of a success—if there is a position that they can get. We acknowledge that. However, there is no mechanism in between that to help guide people in that direction, and that is what we are arguing. What we are saying is that, when police go out on the street and find somebody clearly affected by drugs and they are called there for a reason, because the community are concerned about it, then what happens is that that person is either arrested or may well end up, if they are unwell, in an emergency department in a hospital. Now, we argue that that should not happen. There should be an alternative to deal with these people, and what we are recommending is that under a health order those people can be secured, either by ambulance or police car, and taken to a facility where medically they can be assessed and dealt with and held there for a period. We are suggesting 14 days, because that will break the nexus that they have got out on the street and that will give professionals the chance to deal with any other health issues those people have got and for them to—one would hope—leave that place in a far better state than when they arrived and better equipped to deal with, perhaps, the issues facing them in their lives.

Now, many will go straight back onto getting their first hit; we know that. However, if they end up in that facility—that break in the cycle, if you like—maybe on two or three occasions, the chances are, with the influence that the medicos have over them, they will be able to say, ‘Well, hang on, I’ve had enough of this. I’m going to go and get something done about it’. It is also taking them away from the emergency hospital areas. That has got to be a positive, as we are all aware of some of the draconian things that happen by people who are off their face in those areas. So it is creating a completely new approach, if you like, where we look after them medically in a secure facility so that they can be focused on their own wellbeing and then use professionals to deal with them.

Mr GLARE: If we can lock down people, as we have over COVID, who have committed no offence and who have followed all the rules, we can surely do something that helps people who are addicted to drugs, without being over top in any way, shape or form. The simple fact is that we are talking about health solutions, and I must say we see injecting rooms as perpetuating the problem rather than dealing with it.

Ms WATT: Thank you for that detailed response to that question. I had just one more, if I have got time, which is about your submission and a suggestion to have some sort of tracking device attached to cars. Can you talk to me a little bit more about what you are getting at with that proposal? What do you really see as the benefits from having that?

Mr RAY: We call it the G-tag.

Ms WATT: G-tag. Yes, talk to me about that one, because it is a new proposal.

Mr RAY: Yes. The technology has been around for 10 years or so, where all the vehicles in the state—and I know it is a big ask, but nevertheless it could be a big answer as well. The benefits of putting GPS tracking devices on the Victorian motor fleet, coupled with the ability to disable that vehicle, would have a monumental impact on crime and disorder in our community. Start at the top: criminals would find it unworkable to steal a car. It is a tool of their trade, but with that facility the vehicle can be shut down and be of no use to them. So they cannot start it up again, it is a piece of junk to them—and hopefully they do not burn it.

The ability to avoid the necessity for any police pursuits—you are simply identifying a car on the screen, if you like, and shutting it down, so that is how the interceptions are done, rather than pursuits. I am sure Kel will attest to this, too, that as an operational policeman you will find families come in most distraught to police stations reporting loved ones they are concerned about. They have taken off in their car, and they have not heard from them for 5 hours or 6 hours or whatever the case may be. They expect the police to search for them. Clearly that would be a waste of time, but inevitably we find them either with a gas pipe through the rear window or some other method where they have gone and topped themselves. If we had the capacity to identify where they were, we may be able to intervene and save some lives. There are so many applications for this technology to reduce crime and social disorder that we cannot understand why it has taken until now for anybody to show some real interest in it. When we are talking about ultimately having to monitor cars to charge a tax for their usage—I am referring to the electric cars—this technology would be part of all that. The government could eliminate the need for registrations and simply charge a distance tax by using the same technology that can be used for the antisocial and crime issues.

And just missing people, missing persons, is the big key. Now, if somebody was located through the GPS system, we are not saying that we would immediately hand all their details to the person who reported it. We are saying that they might be told that these people are well and good but they do not really want to contact the family at this point in time, and that is fine.

People worry about privacy, but when you are talking about 5 million vehicles, there is nobody in this wide world going to sit down and try and track what you might be doing privately in your motor car, because the tasks would be just beyond the ability for anybody to do. But, look, again, it is new, it is innovative, and we would be very happy to sit down at some later stage with somebody and try and work through how this can be got off the ground. It is going to need people like yourselves to push the buttons to get something happening about it.

Mr GLARE: The cost of these devices is under \$100. They could be easily fitted in places that are not easily detected, that guards against someone disabling the device if they steal a car. The cost would be in setting up a centre to do the monitoring, but in fact the overall cost-benefit analysis I am sure would come out as millions and millions of dollars on the positive side, so we believe it is something that should be taken up.

Mr RAY: It would also replace the e-tag, of course.

Ms WATT: Oh, yes. Can I just thank you for having so many innovative solutions for us to consider today. Thank you very much.

Mr RAY: Thank you.

The CHAIR: No. Thank you. Can I just clarify—because you and I have had some robust conversations about this quarantine notion—we just completed the use of cannabis report and we found that I think it is up to 50 per cent of the community has used cannabis at one stage or another—sorry, 30 per cent has used. So that is a hell of a lot of people out there. But you are suggesting that it would not be those people who are in possession of cannabis, for example, but it would be someone, where the police had been called to deal with, who had problematic use?

Mr RAY: Yes. And, look, I have seen it down the end of my street. You know, you have got the 20-year-old something with his shirt off strutting around on the median strip in amongst the traffic and we all know what that means. And how do you deal with those people, because leaving them be—it is a bit like in my early career. The way we used to handle drunks was more to put them in the cell to sober up and to save them from themselves, but that has all gone. But certainly now we have got this new issue and that is how we should deal with it.

The CHAIR: Yes. Look, certainly I think Professor Ogloff from Forensicare was saying that the majority of people with a mental health issue also had a drug and alcohol issue as well.

Mr RAY: I think we have not been doing this particularly well. We keep looking overseas to other examples, and with a number of these issues that we have put before you what we should doing is looking at developing them ourselves and trialling these things, because the current system in that area of law enforcement is broken.

The CHAIR: Yes. Look, thank you both. We had the Police Association Victoria on just before lunch that was really promoting the notion of bringing police back to community policing, and I think you have really strongly reiterated that, and with your decades of experience I think this is certainly something that we as a committee should be considering—as well as all the innovative ideas that are coming before the committee. So thank you both very much. Thank you for appearing, thanks for your submissions and thanks for the work that you do. We will send you a transcript. Please have a look and make sure we did not misunderstand you, because ultimately it will obviously form part of our report but will go up on our website as well.

Mr GLARE: Thank you. We very much appreciate the opportunity, and we thank you all for taking the time to listen to us. Thank you very much.

Mr RAY: Thank you all very much.

Witnesses withdrew.