



COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

Official Committee Hansard

**HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES**

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ABORIGINAL AND TORRES
STRAIT ISLANDER AFFAIRS

**Reference: Involvement of Indigenous juveniles and young adults in the criminal
justice system**

THURSDAY, 18 MARCH 2010

CANBERRA

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

INTERNET

Hansard transcripts of public hearings are made available on the internet when authorised by the committee.

The internet address is:

<http://www.aph.gov.au/hansard>

To search the parliamentary database, go to:

<http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au>

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STANDING
COMMITTEE ON ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER AFFAIRS**

Thursday, 18 March 2010

Members: Mr Debus (*Chair*), Mr Laming (*Deputy Chair*), Mr Abbott, Ms Campbell, Ms Rea, Mr Kelvin Thomson, Mr Trevor, Mr Turnour and Mrs Vale

Members in attendance: Mr Debus, Mr Laming, Ms Rea and Mrs Vale

Terms of reference for the inquiry:

To inquire into and report on:

High levels of involvement of Indigenous juveniles and young adults in the criminal justice system. With a particular focus on prevention and early intervention, the Committee will identify:

- How the development of social norms and behaviours for Indigenous juveniles and young adults can lead to positive social engagement;
- The impact that alcohol use and other substance abuse has on the level of Indigenous juvenile and young adult involvement in the criminal justice system and how health and justice authorities can work together to address this;
- Any initiatives which would improve the effectiveness of the education system in contributing to reducing the levels of involvement of Indigenous juveniles and young adults with the criminal justice system;
- The effectiveness of arrangements for transitioning from education to work and how the effectiveness of the 'learn or earn' concept can be maximised;
- Best practice examples of programs that support diversion of Indigenous people from juvenile detention centres and crime, and provide support for those returning from such centres;
- The scope for the clearer responsibilities within and between government jurisdictions to achieve better co-ordinated and targeted service provision for Indigenous juveniles and young adults in the justice system;
- The extent to which current preventative programs across government jurisdictions are aligned against common goals to improve the health and emotional well-being of Indigenous adolescents, any gaps or duplication in effort, and recommendations for their modification or enhancement.

WITNESSES

MURPHY, Mr Peter James, Chief Executive Officer, Noetic Solutions Pty Ltd 1

Committee met at 10.53 am**MURPHY, Mr Peter James, Chief Executive Officer, Noetic Solutions Pty Ltd**

CHAIR (Mr Debus)—I declare open this meeting of the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs in its inquiry into the higher level of involvement of Indigenous juveniles and young adults in the criminal justice system. I acknowledge the traditional custodians of this land and pay respects to elders past, present and future. This meeting is a formal proceeding of the parliament, so everything said should be factual and honest. It can be considered a serious matter to attempt to mislead the committee. The hearing is open to the public and a transcript of what is said will be placed on the committee's website.

I invite Mr Peter Murphy to make some comments that will assist us in our inquiry into this issue. I have met Mr Murphy on a previous occasion. I should also mention that, though it is the case that he has been responsible for an extensive inquiry into the juvenile justice system in New South Wales, the inquiry report itself is cabinet-in-confidence so, although Mr Murphy may speak about many generalities, it is not appropriate that we ask him to speak in any specific detail about his recommendations. As you will be aware from the meeting papers, Mr Murphy is involved in consultancies that consider issues of relevance to this committee of a rather wide-ranging nature. In that context I expect that the most appropriate way to proceed is to ask Mr Murphy to make an opening statement and then we will have a free-ranging discussion.

Mr Murphy—Thank you for the invitation to be here. This is a very important topic. Certainly my company take great pride in the fact that we deal with important issues for government, and we consult almost primarily for government. As you alluded to, over the last six months of 2009 we conducted a review of juvenile justice in New South Wales. That review was a whole-of-government review, not just of the department. We consulted extremely widely on that. We consulted not just with agencies in New South Wales; we consult with each jurisdiction in Australia and New Zealand. We spoke at length with academia and the non-government sector. We had 70-odd interviews and about 20 submissions from a variety of individuals, organisations and agencies.

As part of our work we spent a considerable amount of time developing an evidence base. I hope that evidence base will be released by the New South Wales government in the fullness of time. It was some 200 pages of analysis of effectively what works and what does not work.

Our terms of reference were quite specific in a number of areas. One was about addressing Indigenous overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system. It will be no surprise to the committee that Indigenous children and young people are significantly overrepresented in all jurisdictions in Australia. It is really, from a national perspective and each state's perspective, truly unacceptable.

When we look at juvenile justice in any jurisdiction, the departments responsible for juvenile justice are actually the last stop on the line. The evidence base is overwhelmingly direct on the fact that children and young people getting into trouble almost commences at conception. The path they take is quite well known. The factors of risk there are quite obvious.

Interestingly, in some of the analysis we did we found that maps of where offenders come from and maps of disadvantage in any jurisdiction are almost identical. The fact is that middle-class kids might get into trouble but they do not stay in trouble. It is primarily people from disadvantaged backgrounds where this occurs. That quite neatly leads into the issue that you are looking at. If we look across Australia, the most disadvantaged group in Australia is the Indigenous people of Australia. Consequently, it is probably no surprise that the greatest numbers of those involved in the system are Indigenous. In New South Wales over 50 per cent of those in custody are of Indigenous background and almost all of those will go on to offend as adults and end up in the correction system. I personally found it astounding that that was the case.

One of the things we did was speak with some young people, all of whom were Indigenous, who had been caught up in the system. While we stayed away from anecdotes in our report, we talked to a young man who has just completed his detention and has his postrelease program, and he admitted quite freely that he would offend again. He was not deterred by being in detention as a juvenile or by the prospect of going to a corrections service if he was caught when he turns 18.

The issue of detention is a thorny one. There is no doubt that some children and young people need to be detained, but detention rates in Australia, in all but perhaps Victoria, are in our opinion too high. Detention is not a deterrent and it does not lead to good outcomes. The evidence is there that that is particularly the case for Indigenous young people.

One of the things we found most difficult in coming to some conclusions and recommendations around how to address high levels of Indigenous offending was that there is a very small evidence base. It was very difficult for us to draw good evidence from overseas. There was some useful material from New Zealand, but the literature on what works, we thought, compared to the more general population was very thin. There is very little good, hard evidence of programs that work that we could find.

One thing that did draw our attention when we looked at all of the various factors was the concept of justice reinvestment. I am sure that has been brought to your attention during your consultations. We firmly believe that this is something that should be considered in all jurisdictions, because, as you would have seen from the ABS reports on corrections across Australia more generally, it is costing the country a great deal and that cost is only going to rise. It is rather ironic, because in general our crime rates are fairly static. In the detail we looked at in New South Wales, juvenile crime rates are quite static.

That is a summary of some of the things we found. It is a very complex subject, so I thought those introductory words might help spark some discussion and questioning.

CHAIR—I would like my colleagues to ask you questions. I will start by saying that the idea of justice reinvestment, though not a new one, has been given a degree of prominence in recent times, not least by the retiring Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commissioner. We would be interested to hear in some more detail how you would see that concept actually being applied in jurisdictions around Australia. And I say that particularly in this context. Perhaps the analogy is the closure of mental hospitals in the 1980s around Australia. You have a circumstance in which there must be a period when a new kind of policy investing in diversion and prevention is being introduced but there remains a substantial population incarcerated. This has quite

significant budgetary implications that are easily ignored. I would be very grateful if you could talk about that as well. In other words, how do you do justice reinvestment practically?

Mr Murphy—I will touch on one related issue. In most jurisdictions in Australia there is a substantial number of children and young people being held on remand. Our analysis across most jurisdictions—I would exclude Victoria from that—is that too many young people are being held on remand and being denied bail unnecessarily. This is leading to significant numbers being incarcerated and held, with very detrimental outcomes. If we can address that issue alone across Australia it will take some of the ongoing pressure off jurisdictions to start building more detention centres.

Mrs VALE—We have heard evidence from time to time from different police who have been before us that one of the reasons children get denied bail is that the police have absolutely nowhere safe to put them; there is no ‘bail house’, if I can put it that way. There is nowhere safe where they can place young people, especially in remote communities, when their families might be totally and utterly dysfunctional and, might I say, violent, so it is not safe for the children to go home. Do you have any thoughts on that? When we look at the high incarceration rate or the high bail rate for people who are in remand, is there any value in having another resource to which the police can release these young people instead of placing them on remand?

Mr Murphy—There are a range of solutions that can be put in place. I am not necessarily sure that it is always the case that bail is refused just for those reasons. I think it is of value to police to have these young people with offending behaviours detained to meet their own targets and the like, but there is no doubt that having a safe place to put a young person is absolutely critical. The more that jurisdictions can do, particularly in remote and regional Australia, to have those sorts of places, the better. It touches quite neatly on the issue that having functional and cohesive families is critical to keeping young people out of the system and, if they do get into the system, making sure they do not re-offend.

Mrs VALE—It is very easy to idealise, but we cannot go back; we have to work with what we have actually got. I am sure these young people wish that they had a functional family, too. If they have a dysfunctional family, there is really nothing they can do about it. I am not trying to verbal the police; it was not just the police who saw a need for something like that. We had a very interesting conversation with an Indigenous elder in Dubbo, and she also said it was a big issue, even for the Indigenous people themselves. The grandmothers who were trying to protect young people did not have anywhere safe to take them either. So, while that was the police’s response, it was also something recognised more generally. I think there was also someone in the detention centre at Orana who suggested that there needed to be what he called a bail house, for want of another name—somewhere safe to send young people.

Mr Murphy—It is interesting. In some jurisdictions I think police practice is quite rigid around that. A young person might not be at home because there has been drinking and there is the potential for violence and therefore they go and sleep in a park or something like that. There are a range of issues with that, but it does touch on justice reinvestment, which goes back to the chair’s question.

Mrs VALE—Yes, and how we do that.

Mr Murphy—As you have identified, Mrs Vale, the dysfunction is such—and you would have seen it yourself—that there is no simple or quick solution. Consequently, I think we need to readjust our time lines and how quickly we think we can get success here. This is not something that we can change overnight, in one term of government or with one quick funding program. The dysfunction, as we have all seen, is such that in some communities it will take us an awful long time. On the justice reinvestment: we are going to keep spending money. If we continue on the same path in whatever jurisdiction, we will be spending more and more money. If we go to the front end of where the problems are, which I believe is around cohesive families, if we can develop and support cohesive families and the infrastructure that is required for that, then we will start addressing some of those root causes and the fundamental issues.

CHAIR—So there is a generation of work involved here.

Mr Murphy—Absolutely.

Ms REA—Chair, that actually follows on beautifully. I suspect you have touched on the very question I was going to ask, which is about transition. Obviously the evidence and the statistics speak for themselves. It is clear that we are putting more and more money into a problem that we are not really solving and that we need to start to think differently about the way we do that. There are people within the community who need to be convinced that we need to look at another way of doing things, because there is that initial reaction that says, ‘Punish the offender and that will solve the problem.’ I also suspect that, when we talk about justice reinvestment, which I think is a really interesting idea, we are not just talking about changing community attitudes, we are talking about generational change in terms of the close family or domestic networks that people have that will support them. We are also talking about a massive bureaucratic and legal change.

I would be interested to find out whether you have thought about how we actually manage the transition, not just of money but of all the other resources, rules, regulations and whatever that go with that. What do we take out of criminal justice, where do we put it and how do we do that in a way that respects community attitude, understands the long-term need and at least starts to make the transition to where we think we would like to get to? I know that is probably not a fair question to ask you in an inquiry like this, but that is what we need to think about. The evidence has been compiled. I think we can talk about the problem a lot more, but we probably need to talk about what the bite sized chunks are that we can start on to get us somewhere else. Have you thought about that?

Mr Murphy—Yes, we have given it some thought. We have positioned that as one of a range of options in our report. I think it is safe for me to say that. Firstly, I would make the point that we are doing an awful lot within Indigenous communities. Different jurisdictions are doing different bits of work in the same communities. We have got NGOs working in those communities. I think that one of the first things is that we probably need to take stock of what we are actually doing. We have been working with FaHCSIA up in Broome and I think there is some fabulous work going on there. In fact, I think there is a great example of a good multijurisdictional team working there. That is actually really pleasing to see. So we have got a lot going on and I think we need to take stock of that.

As I mentioned earlier, we also need to change our timeframes. Programs that just go into a community for 12 months and hope to make a big improvement, are wasting the taxpayers' money. We are deepening resentment in those communities and we are not going to get results. I think our programs need to focus on a number of communities. As I think I said to the chair when we spoke, I have a military background. As I see it, we cannot just take the whole city in one go; we need to do it one block at a time. We cannot do that until we actually work out what works. We need to do that in very close collaboration with the communities.

Ms REA—I understand that. I understand the focus on communities, families and individuals. I guess what I am looking at is the resistance that will also come from the empires that are currently built-up within bureaucracies, government and other networks. It is not just a question of addressing family dysfunction. It is about the way policing occurs. It is about the way the courts operate. It is about the way the legal system works in partnership with other systems to deal with not just the specific legal problem but the whole problem. It is a bit like asking doctors to accept traditional medicine, in a way. We are asking for a whole range of people to change their way of thinking. It is very easy to say it is about communities and families. And we need to deal with that dysfunction; I accept that. It is easy to say it; it is hard to do. But there are a whole range of other people that also needs to change their mindsets and cultural perspectives as well. I wondered if you had thought about that. That is more what my question was about.

Mr Murphy—From a legal perspective, all the jurisdictions have restorative justice type approaches in place. I think that provides all the tools to make sure we do not unnecessarily incarcerate those whom we are currently going through. I do not want to sound defeatist but I think in the current generation we will be experiencing many of the same problems for some time. We have to go back to the front.

Ms REA—That is right.

Mr Murphy—To take some of the agency issues, my experience with juvenile justice agencies in all jurisdictions is that they would probably be pretty happy to put themselves out of business. They find distressing the number of children and young people they have in detention. They are particularly working hard with their diversion programs across all jurisdictions. There is a lot of effort going into those. From that end, I do not think there is a particular problem. As I said, we have the legal framework there that will support what we have. With those agencies involved in Indigenous affairs and the like, if we have some coherent, long-term, targeted strategies that start small and which we can then try to scale my sense in having dealt with those is that there would be support there.

From the police perspective, we would need to work quite closely with them. They are managing the day to day and the fallout from that, but my sense is that there are a lot of good, committed police there. I believe the New South Wales PCYC has done great work with some of their programs. It is no secret that they are grossly underfunded. Given the majority of crime in society conducted by juveniles, I think we should be focusing on preventing it. That is at all levels, from very minor graffiti, which is always topical and annoying but is not appalling. We do need to work with police across all jurisdictions. I think that is a challenge, because they are facing the day to day.

Ms REA—Just to sum up, what you are really saying is that it is possible that the transition, the will to change the way that we do things, is there and that it is now a question of starting to take the steps that will achieve that. That is the positive answer I was hoping you would give.

Mr Murphy—I think most of that is there for us; we have just got to start pulling it together. The hard question for governments, particularly in the current environment, is: are we prepared to spend a bit more upfront—and there are no guarantees with anything—but with a good chance that we will save more later? That is not just in juvenile justice; the *Intergenerational report* highlights the fact that we need every young person that we can in this country as we go into the future. At the moment we are losing quite a lot of young people who become dysfunctional adults and a drain on society.

CHAIR—Inadvertently you have specifically referred to my original question. What we should do is not delude ourselves that we can stop spending any time soon on the present conventional methods and agencies for dealing with the problem. There should be some more money spent on prevention and diversion.

Mr Murphy—Attacking the root causes. In some jurisdictions you would potentially see savings quite quickly, because a number of jurisdictions have plans to build new detention centres. These are expensive to build and certainly expensive to operate. If jurisdictions are able to commit to this, particularly the immediate things they can do around bail, they can reduce that and that money can then be freed up. In some jurisdictions we are looking at almost in the next couple of years having to build more detention centres.

Mr LAMING—I wanted to ask whether it is true that we need to do it block by block in a military sense. What we learned from the NT intervention was that block-by-block approaches did not succeed because they kept eroding behind you as you took a block. Maybe the intervention taught us that unless it is a completely universal approach, where there is no easy opt out, there may be no hope for moving ahead. I first all wanted to note the large sums we are spending: half a million dollars per place to build and \$171,000 per year for every person we detain. With those figures in mind, are some of the lessons from Cape York and Noel Pearson, where we have family responsibility meetings that actually communicate with someone about the obligations that come with being publicly funded through Centrelink relevant? We have different cohorts. We have people who are probably just off the tracks for six months right through to people who are permanently damaged by FAS. They are all in different streams. In the end, if it is block by block, the great problem is that there is no compulsion to do anything, because in the end you go back to receiving Centrelink payments from the age of 16 for life, no compulsion to work and no compulsion to rehabilitate. Don't we need some uniform changes to help these programs work or can we do it without that?

Mr Murphy—I say block by block because we need to understand what will work best.

Mr LAMING—And we don't know at the moment?

Mr Murphy—No. I think if we went into every block at the moment we could spend an awful lot of money and get very poor results. I think I alluded to this at the beginning this discussion: the amount of evidence about what works is not substantial. We need to put things in place for a period of time to make sure that they work and to properly evaluate what we are doing. One of

my pet concerns is that in government we spend an awful lot of money doing pilot projects which we seldom evaluate or evaluate effectively.

Mrs VALE—You are not talking about another pilot are you, Peter?

Mr LAMING—He was criticising.

Mrs VALE—We think as a joke that we should call the report *Oh, no, not another pilot!*, because that is something we have had as evidence. Sorry, I did not mean to interrupt. It was just a thought that we shared.

Mr Murphy—The issue is that we have a million good ideas. There is probably enough out there for us to say, ‘We think this is going to work. Let’s really give it a go. Make sure that we evaluate it properly.’ Once we see that we’ve got results—and we are not going to get them in 12 months—that is when we then need, going back to our city analogy, to move out quite quickly across the city.

Mr LAMING—Just answering that question: when you exclude the cohort that have either foetal alcohol syndrome, severe drug dependence, violent personality disorders or autism spectrum disorders—that is, people who have quite severe problems and are almost impossible to integrate with the community, and where you are dealing, potentially, with lifelong incarceration—and step back from those really severe cases, you are just left with large numbers of people who have either dropped out of or have not had access to education or opportunities to develop capabilities. For those people, if there is no obligation to go down that path—I still come back to this question—then how can you hope, in Dubbo, to have any of these guys decide to break out, if you just have to wait for them to walk into the PCYC? If there is not an intervention-like approach—which is: ‘If you’re not earning or learning, you’re not getting your money’—what power have the police got? I just do not understand how anything works except for the small number of places that you fund, and you just keep funding small programs.

Mr Murphy—You have identified something: kids in trouble generally have the markers of either intellectual disability, mental health problems, lack of education or exclusion from education, a dysfunctional family or parents in jail. They are all the sorts of things they have. You mentioned FAS. I think that that is something that we can do something about. It is not a justice issue; it is a health issue. How do we educate mothers? How do we make sure that we get expecting mothers off alcohol and make sure that they stay off it? As you have said, kids who have these significant problems are lost to us and they then become a drain on society. That is why we keep pointing back to this: as has been successfully trialled in the US, by moving to that front end and addressing what I would describe as the hygiene factors, we can start to make a difference.

CHAIR—But Andrew’s question, I think, is about the 15- and 16-year-olds, the young adults, who are disengaged, who are not chronically ill or disadvantaged—

Mr LAMING—A criminal resume is faster than a training resume.

CHAIR—but who have not been to school much, and he is wondering: do you have a clear notion of the generic policies that may best address their disengagement?

Mr LAMING—Yes—more stick and less welfare carrot.

Mr Murphy—I do not have enough of the background really to answer that effectively. I am certainly aware of the work that Noel Pearson is doing up in Cape York, and it appears to be getting some good results. We have got to work out what works. Jobs are key. Young people need to be kept busy. One of the things that is probably presented to you is that, certainly for non-Indigenous young people, where there is a lack of sporting facilities and those types of things you often find that young people get into trouble more. With my two daughters, my aim is to keep them busy skiing, riding horses—anything, so long as they are busy. But that can be very difficult in rural and remote Australia. How do you provide those sorts of things to keep them busy, and provide jobs? There is no simple solution. Sorry—I am really on the edge of my knowledge and expertise in that area. I am sorry I cannot answer that any better.

Mrs VALE—Peter, I would just like to ask about practical applications of reinvestment. You did mention PCYCs, and we all know that they could do with more investment, and that is an upfront loading, to some degree. But that does not really address the issues of chronic disadvantage that we find. For instance, when visiting Orana at Dubbo we saw there were a lot of Indigenous young people there but there were also young, white, mainstream boys there too, and they had a similar background of chronic disadvantage and poor parenting, with maybe one parent not being there. Do you have any suggestions about how a social reinvestment could be front-loaded so that the families could be supported? Again, I know you are not going to actually change it for this generation, but do you have any suggestions about how we could help families be better families and not quite so dysfunctional?

Mr Murphy—One of the things we have noticed in all jurisdictions is that in remote and regional Australia there are lower levels of service than you get in metropolitan areas or the like. One of the things we have also identified is that NGOs in those areas also particularly lack capacity. They lack skilled people, there is high turnover of people with the skills and they do not necessarily get much funding. I am a strong supporter of the NGO sector. Where they are well prepared they offer very good value for money for government. They are able to do the services far more cheaply than we can and more effectively. People seem more committed there. One thing as a government we might choose to do is see how we can better support NGOs in these areas who can provide the services, provide them in a targeted fashion and have the agility to be able to move, whether it is between Indigenous families or non-Indigenous families. Funding and building capacity with NGOs is something for remote and regional Australia, particularly for NGOs that are made up of Indigenous people who support Indigenous people.

CHAIR—We have had evidence a couple of times of resentment by Aboriginal people of the role of big white NGOs. On one occasion they were called during evidence ‘the usual suspects’.

Ms REA—And ‘BINGOs’.

Mrs VALE—Yes.

CHAIR—Even there, there is a question of the best detailed characteristics of implementation. A complaint that I have heard is that big NGOs are disengaged from their Aboriginal clients, and it may be that the capacity that ought to be built is amongst Aboriginal NGOs.

Mr Murphy—I would agree wholeheartedly with that. They obviously have the cultural understanding. They have the credibility upfront.

Mrs VALE—Indigenous NGOs did say to us that they just did not have the depth, the expertise or the funding to even put in appropriate suggestions for programs that they could do and of course the big NGOs were far more easily able to tick the boxes required by government. But perhaps one aspect of one solution to this may be to require the big NGOs to employ Indigenous people on the ground so the Indigenous folk have the backup support of the capacity that the NGOs have.

Mr Murphy—That is almost a bit of a development model they are using—

Mrs VALE—It is.

Mr Murphy—and I think there is a lot of benefit in that.

Mrs VALE—There could be a requirement that if you get this contract you have got to employ Indigenous people on the ground to deliver the program.

Mr Murphy—Part of the reinvestment is: what is our national strategy and how are we going to make sure that over five years or perhaps even longer we can build the capacity of Aboriginal or Indigenous NGOs and strengthen them so that they have got the ability to actually deliver the services? Your point is well taken. It is interesting that some of the NGOs we spoke to are very corporate. They are big organisations. There are parts that are able to tender and win contracts. If you are a small, half-dozen outfit that has got the ability to do good, I understand that it is very difficult.

Mrs VALE—Peter, it is as easy as the government or the government department saying to an NGO or putting down as a requirement for appropriate award of a contract: 'You have to employ local Indigenous people in this. You also have to capacity-build those individual people. You have got to put them on training. If you want a government contract you have got to show that you are training people up with skills from that area.' Some of the women that we saw, especially the grandmothers, were very powerful, quite articulate and very dedicated to helping their communities.

Mr Murphy—I could not agree more. I think a multi-track approach with many ways to start building that capacity nationally would be hugely valuable.

Mrs VALE—I wish we had had the benefit of reading your report before we spoke to you. I do not know if we will have time to get you back again when your report is made public.

Mr Murphy—That is a matter for the New South Wales government, although the minister had previously made a commitment to do so. We have been asked a number of questions and I think they may be getting close to making a decision on that.

Mrs VALE—Another thing has been put to us in evidence about not just the need to look at the individual young person who is in trouble but the need to look at the whole family. Did you make any recommendations in that regard in your report?

Mr Murphy—Certainly MST, multisystemic therapy, and the like, where you are supporting the family and drawing in all government services to provide a solution, has been found to be very effective. The evidence base that we developed shows that as one of the most successful types of programs.

CHAIR—We had evidence given to us by a team of psychologists and other specialists within the New South Wales Department of Juvenile Justice about that kind of family therapy approach and they seemed to be suggesting to us that it is one of the few areas in which there is quite a lot of evidence of success—and it is international and has been accumulated over quite a few years. But I take it that you actually do accept that that is one important strand in the multi-strand approach that you are speaking of.

Mr Murphy—Absolutely. Those sorts of interventions, particularly post release, are very important for those that have been detained.

Ms REA—It is very interesting.

Mrs VALE—I just wish we had the reports. I really would like to look at those things.

CHAIR—I thank you particularly for giving us your time. We will release you of obligation in time for you to catch your flight. It has been a great pleasure to speak with you. Thank you.

Mrs VALE—There is one last question. In your report, is there a list of successful and effective programs that you have seen work?

Mr Murphy—The second half of the report is all about the things that either work or do not work.

Mrs VALE—Great. That will be very useful when the time comes. Would you inform the committee when your report is released?

Mr Murphy—Certainly. I think it could be released quite quickly by government—there are no recommendations.

Mrs VALE—It is silly to reinvent the wheel. If there has been documented evidence about good programs, we should know about them.

Resolved (on motion by **Ms Rea**):

That this committee authorises publication, including publication on the parliamentary database, of the transcript of the evidence given before it at public hearing this day.

Committee adjourned at 11.38 am