



EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING COMMITTEE

Members present:

Ms KE Richards MP—Chair
Mr JP Lister MP (virtual)
Mr MA Boothman MP (virtual)
Mr N Dametto MP (virtual)
Mr JR Martin MP
Mr JA Sullivan MP (virtual)

Staff present:

Ms K O'Sullivan—Committee Secretary
Dr S Dodsworth—Assistant Committee Secretary

PUBLIC BRIEFING—INQUIRY INTO THE CORRECTIVE SERVICES (EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES AND SECURITY) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL 2022

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, 13 DECEMBER 2022

Brisbane

TUESDAY, 13 DECEMBER 2022

The committee met at 11.02 am.

CHAIR: Good morning. I declare open this public briefing for the committee's inquiry into the Corrective Services (Emerging Technologies and Security) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2022. My name is Kim Richards; I am the member for Redlands and chair of the Education, Employment and Training Committee. I would like to acknowledge that we are meeting on custodial land of the oldest living civilisation in the world. I pay my respects to the Jagera and Turrbal people and their elders past, present and emerging. With me here today on the committee is Mr James Martin, the member for Stretton. Mr Martin has been appointed as a substitute for Mr Barry O'Rourke, the member for Rockhampton, who is unable to attend the committee's proceedings today. Mr James Lister, the member for Southern Downs and deputy chair; Mr Mark Boothman, the member for Theodore; and Mr Nick Dametto, the member for Hinchinbrook, are all appearing via teleconference.

On 29 November 2022 the Hon. Mark Ryan MP, Minister for Police and Corrective Services and Minister for Fire and Emergency Services, introduced the bill to the Queensland parliament. On 1 December the bill was referred to the committee for detailed consideration and report. The briefing today by Queensland Corrective Services is to explain the objects and key provisions of the bill. The committee has also received and published a written brief provided by Queensland Corrective Services on the inquiry webpage.

The committee's proceedings today are proceedings of the Queensland parliament and subject to the parliament's standing orders. Witnesses will not be required to give evidence under oath, but I remind everyone that intentionally misleading the committee is a serious offence. I now welcome representatives from Queensland Corrective Services and the Department of Children, Youth Justice and Multicultural Affairs.

CHEN, Assistant Commissioner Yi, Policy and Legal Command, Queensland Corrective Services

DRANE, Mr Michael, Senior Executive Director, Youth Detention Operations and Reform, Department of Children, Youth Justice and Multicultural Affairs

FERGUSON, Ms Helen, Manager, Legislation Group, Queensland Corrective Services

HALL, Mr Phil, Acting Director, Youth Justice Legislation Projects, Department of Children, Youth Justice and Multicultural Affairs

HUTCHINS, Ms Annika, Director, Legislation Group, Queensland Corrective Services

Assistant Commissioner Chen: Thank you for the opportunity to address the committee in relation to the Corrective Services (Emerging Technologies and Security) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2022. I would also like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet today and pay my respects to elders past, present and emerging as they are the custodians of cultural knowledge of the lands, seas and waterways and their spiritual reconciliation. We walk this journey together. I further extend that acknowledgment to all First Nations people present today.

Today I will provide the committee with an overview of the amendments in the bill and their context. My colleagues are here to assist in answering questions the committee may have about the bill. I would like to start by providing the committee with some context. As you may be aware, in Queensland the responsibility for correctional services is split across two departments, with two separate legislative frameworks and operating systems. Queensland Corrective Services is responsible for the humane detention, supervision and rehabilitation of adult offenders, while the Department of Children, Youth Justice and Multicultural Affairs is responsible for the rehabilitation of young people who offend. While each agency has similar objectives, the delivery of these services in these contexts means that legislative policy, operational and procedural requirements can be very different in each context.

Public Briefing—Inquiry into the Corrective Services (Emerging Technologies and Security) and
Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2022

Queensland Corrective Services takes pride in supporting community safety across Queensland. This includes accommodating over 9,000 prisoners across 11 high-security correctional centres, six low-security correctional centres and 13 prisoner work camps. Further, Queensland Corrective Services has over 35 district community correctional officers and more than 130 reporting locations dispersed across seven regions which oversee the supervision and rehabilitation of over 19,000 offenders in the community. In addition, on any given day in Queensland around 285 young people are in custody across three youth detention centres and approximately 1,310 young people are on community supervision.

The bill delivers amendments to both the Corrective Services Act and the Youth Justice Act. The amendments in the bill are focused on enhancing the safety and security of corrective services facilities where adult prisoners are held in custody and youth detention centres where young people are detained. Specifically, the amendments aim to achieve a number of objectives: first, to modernise emergency response frameworks to better respond to emergencies that threaten corrective services facilities, youth detention centres or the supervision of young people; second, to criminalise the use of drones over corrective services facilities and youth detention centres and the entry onto rooftops of corrective services facilities; third, to provide clear authority to use X-ray body scanners, CCTV, body worn cameras and other emerging technologies in corrective services facilities; fourth, to enhance information-sharing powers to promote prisoner health and wellbeing and support our frontline service delivery and interagency collaboration; and, finally, to update the prisoner classification framework to better align with prison infrastructure.

The bill also includes other technical amendments to clarify adult prisoner sentence matters, enable the effective operation of the official visitors scheme and support the delivery of adult prisoner health services provided by Queensland Health. These amendments will support corrective services officers and youth detention centre staff in responding to emerging threats and technology and ensure those closed correctional environments keep pace with changes in complex work areas.

I would like to start by addressing amendments in the Corrective Services Act and the Youth Justice Act included in the bill which modernise emergency declaration frameworks under each act to better respond to emergency situations. The framework for each environment reflects the different operating environments for adult corrections and youth detention in Queensland. In relation to amendments to the Corrective Services Act, Queensland Corrective Services has faced multiple emergency situations in recent years that have presented unprecedented threats to the safety and security of corrective services facilities. These situations have included bushfires, the COVID-19 public health emergency and flooding. In response to these situations, Queensland Corrective Services has continued to ensure the health and safety of prisoners, corrective services officers and visitors while maintaining frontline operations; however, these situations have also yielded lessons to be learned about how the Corrective Services Act can better support robust emergency planning for such events.

Existing emergency provisions of the Corrective Services Act are contained in section 268. As enacted, these provisions do not appropriately anticipate external threats or other long-term types of emergencies such as those experienced in recent years. Additionally, the framework does not contemplate emergency situations at facilities that are not prisons as defined in the act, including at the Helena Jones Centre and work camps. The bill amends the Corrective Services Act to ensure enabling legislation clearly authorises actions needed to mitigate or respond to the potential impact of an emergency situation or restore order afterwards.

The bill provides for a range of amendments to the existing framework. This includes providing for various types of declarations of emergency, including for a natural disaster or serious health threat, with strict maximum time limits to respond to different threats and clarifying the ability of the Queensland Corrective Services Commissioner to restrict movements to a facility, refuse entry to a facility, quarantine or isolate prisoners and limit or withhold privileges, depending on the emergency situation. It also makes permanent the application of the framework to any corrective services facility other than just a prison and provides that a declaration of emergency must be published. New safeguards have been built into the bill to ensure provisions are only used where absolutely necessary.

Next, I would like to outline the amendments in the bill that provide new emergency response powers under the Youth Justice Act. The Youth Justice Act does not currently provide a legislative framework to respond in the event of an emergency at a youth justice detention centre or include safeguards that must be considered and addressed as part of an emergency response. Temporary amendments to the Youth Justice Act to mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic ceased on 30 April 2022. Permanent measures are now needed to ensure the government can respond to future

emergencies promptly, consistent with human rights and youth justice principles and with certainty, transparency and accountability. These amendments will help protect the health and safety of young people, staff and visitors at youth detention centres and others impacted by the emergency. In summary, the amendments enable the declaration of a youth justice centre as disaster affected and one or more places as a temporary youth detention centre and the appointment of emergency staff to provide assistance at a youth detention centre if the workforce is impacted by a declared emergency such as an epidemic or other disaster. The amendments also enable the delivery of restorative justice conferences by video link or tele link in the event of a declared emergency.

I will now turn to the new offences included in the bill to respond to the evolving behaviour which is increasingly putting corrective services facilities and youth justice detention centres at risk. The first offence introduced by the bill aims to tackle the emergence of drones being used around corrective services facilities and youth detention centres. Drones are becoming more accessible across Australia. Regulation of drones is also becoming more common. For corrective services facilities and youth detention centres, use of drones is growing, presenting an emerging threat to safety and security.

The use of drones above closed environments presents a number of threats. Drones can be used to drop contraband, survey secure infrastructure, be weaponised or used to create a nuisance or distraction. For detention centres, there is the added risk of images or film being taken that identify vulnerable children. To combat this threat, the bill creates new offences in the Corrective Services Act at clause 15 and the Youth Justice Act at clause 46. The new offences prohibit the use or attempted use of drones at or above corrective services facilities and youth detention centres, including the land on which facilities are located, without a reasonable excuse. To limit interference with the use of drones for legitimate purposes, the offence does not apply where the use has been approved by the chief executive or in the context of law enforcement or emergency service functions. The penalty is 100 penalty units or two years imprisonment as a strong deterrent.

The remainder of the amendments address issues specific to corrective services and are not required in the youth justice context. The other offences introduced by this bill to combat evolving behaviour target the increasing incidence of adult prisoners gaining access to rooftops and other restricted areas. Prisoners gaining access to a corrective services facility rooftop and other restricted areas is a consistent issue across all corrective services facilities, demonstrating that existing penalties are insufficient at deterring prisoners from engaging in this behaviour. In addition to risking the safety of those involved, this behaviour causes a significant disruption to frontline operations and can have broader implications for the safety and security of corrective services facilities.

Clause 14 of the bill creates a new offence for a prisoner to be in a restricted area without a reasonable excuse. This offence applies only to prisoners in adult corrective services facilities. The bill defines a restricted area as each rooftop of a corrective services facility. The bill provides flexibility to prescribe in the regulations other restricted areas that are subject to the offence. The offence will have a maximum penalty of two years imprisonment.

I will now turn to the amendments in the bill that capitalise on the use of technology that enhances the safety of the closed correctional environment. The presence of contraband in corrective services facilities poses a significant threat to institutional security, officers' safety, public safety and prisoner safety, health and welfare. X-ray body-scanning technology has the capability to detect non-metallic objects on or inside the body. This is something search equipment currently in use in closed correctional environments, such as metal detectors and ion scanning devices, cannot detect. The opportunity to use X-ray body scanners in the correctional environment also provides a less invasive means of detecting and preventing the introduction of contraband into corrective services facilities. As a result, the bill inserts a new imaging search function into the Corrective Services Act to support a trial of body-scanning technology at the Brisbane Women's Correctional Centre and any future rollouts of X-ray body-scanning technology at corrective services facilities in Queensland. The new search power will operate in addition to other stringent regulatory requirements in relation to the use of this technology under the Radiation Safety Act 1999 and Radiation Safety Regulation 2021.

In addition to supporting the future use of X-ray body scanners, the bill includes a clear head of power for embedded and emergency use of surveillance technology to maintain safety and monitor threats within closed correctional environments. The use of CCTV, body worn cameras and other monitoring technology at corrective services facilities throughout Queensland is imperative to ensure the safety of corrective services officers and prisoners. Whilst some technology such as CCTV has been used within corrective services environments now for some time, the use of devices such as body worn cameras is relatively new. In authorising the use of surveillance devices, the bill provides that the Queensland Corrective Services Commissioner must be satisfied that the use of the device

will enhance prescribed matters including safety, security, preventing corruption and crime and detecting contraband. In authorising the use, the commissioner must also have regard to privacy and include requirements for the use, storage and destruction of any recordings made by the device. These amendments include the flexibility to adopt other technology in the future and will commence on proclamation, alongside regulation to prescribe the specific devices to be authorised.

I will now turn to the amendments in the bill which enhance information-sharing provisions under existing section 341 of the Corrective Services Act. Queensland Corrective Services works closely with partner agencies to safely manage prisoners and offenders according to their individual risk and needs; ensure the safety and security of the correctional environment; and support broader community safety by preventing crime. To do this effectively, this requires a level of sharing of confidential information, including proactively where required. While section 341 of the Corrective Services Act provides for information sharing, existing provisions can be improved to support officers making the decisions. The bill amends section 341 to provide clear legislative guidance for officers to ensure that, where appropriate, confidential information can be shared in a number of ways. This includes sharing information with a health practitioner to support the treatment, care and rehabilitation of a prisoner; with anyone if the information is about the status of a prisoner and is communicated in general terms; and with another correctional agency to support the supervision or management of an offender in that jurisdiction. The bill also enables information sharing with a law enforcement agency for a function of the agency and additional protections for information received from a law enforcement agency. These amendments aim to promote prisoner wellbeing, support our frontline service delivery and enhance interagency collaborations.

Finally, the bill updates the prisoner security classification framework in the Corrective Services Act. Queensland's prisoner security classification framework has been in place since the introduction of the act back in 2006. However, the correctional environment in which it operates has been subject to significant change, system pressures and reform, including through increasing prisoner numbers. Amendments to the prisoner security classification will ensure the framework aligns with existing physical infrastructure of the custodial environment in Queensland and appropriately responds to risk. This includes the ability to establish risk subcategories within the prisoner security classification framework in regulation, expand matters that the Queensland Corrective Services Commissioner can or must consider when deciding a prisoner classification, and take a more flexible approach to classification review periods, including reviewing classification after a significant event or at the prisoner's request.

In conclusion, the amendments in the bill aim to enhance the safety and security of adult correctional and youth justice systems in Queensland with a particular focus on addressing emerging risks and opportunities to strengthen practice and harness new technology. We welcome any questions from the committee regarding the amendments to the bill. Thank you.

Mr LISTER: Good morning, everybody. Thank you for coming to brief us. I wanted to ask about the automatic annual reviews of the risk status of prisoners. I gather that the amendments of this bill propose to remove the automatic annual reviews and have a process whereby they can be requested a lot more frequently by the prisoner concerned. What arrangements and assurances do we have that prisoners would be fully aware of their rights and obligations under that changed system, considering their rights are quite significantly constrained under the higher security classifications?

Ms Hutchins: Queensland Corrective Services does have existing procedures in place. In response to the changes in the bill, if passed, prisoners will receive additional communication and existing documentation will be updated, including documentation provided to prisoners during security classification interviews and in prisoner induction booklets.

Mr BOOTHMAN: With regard to drones, as you alluded to in your opening comments about intelligence gathering and delivery of contraband, did the department consider having a larger exclusion zone? The reason I ask is that some prisons around the state are quite close to private properties—they have close boundaries to the walls—or major roadways. I am curious to hear the department's thoughts on potentially having a larger exclusion zone.

Ms Hutchins: Queensland Corrective Services did consider this in considering the offence. Queensland Corrective Services' high-security correctional centres are deliberately buffered from the community, with strategic placement within QCS landholdings to provide space from the community. These landholdings are designated as community infrastructure for correctional purposes and, as such, prohibit public access without prior permission and allow Queensland Corrective Services to enact legislative control measures in the event that a trespass occurs. Low-custody facilities are typically arranged in a similar fashion; however, certain facilities that provide supported reintegration activities, such as work camps, may be placed within communities.

Mr BOOTHMAN: I am looking at a Google image from Southwood Road outside the Townsville Correctional Centre. I have been up there once before for committee work. It is quite a short distance away. If you did fly a drone from the roadway, you could easily get some type of intelligence material of the layout of the prison and what was going on in there at a given time. I feel it is something that should be considered.

CHAIR: How far do you take it, though, when you think about how far a zoom lens can work these days and the technology that is integrated in them?

Mr BOOTHMAN: I certainly understand that, but it would make it more difficult; that is all. That is not really much of a question; the last part is more of a statement.

Ms Hutchins: We did consider the issue and we considered that in this instance the land on which a corrective services facility is located is included in the land on which a facility is prescribed. At least with all of our high-security centres that is buffered and for most of our low-security it is also buffered, so we thought that was appropriate.

Mr BOOTHMAN: How many times have there been incursions with drones? Does the department have any—

CHAIR: That was going to be my question, member for Theodore. Following on from that, in terms of the numbers, is the bigger issue around the intel provided by drones or the dropping of contraband?

Ms Hutchins: The first thing is that any drone over a facility is a risk. As at 30 November 2022 Queensland Corrective Services had recorded 89 incidents in relation to drone incursions over correctional centres since 2013-14. Most of these incidents, however, have occurred since July 2018. Any drone incident, whether it is deliberate or incidental, will cause a prison to go into lockdown and a search for contraband to be conducted. Adding to that, from the ground it is not possible to identify whether a drone is capturing images, is being used maliciously or has been inadvertently flown over the facility. In this regard, any sighting of a drone, whether it is introducing contraband or just flying over, is considered a risk to the facility.

CHAIR: How do you detect them? How do you know when they are up there? You can hear them buzzing when your neighbours' kids are out playing with them, but how do you know where they are and when they are there?

Ms Hutchins: Queensland Corrective Services has deployed additional anti-drone technology across the state in accordance with the Queensland Drones Strategy. In terms of the actual detail of how that technology works, I am not able to go into detail.

CHAIR: That is totally understandable.

Ms Hutchins: The offence in that regard is one part of a broader framework that the agency is pursuing to address the growing incidence of drone incursions.

Mr SULLIVAN: I have a follow-on question from the member for Theodore's. I am probably coming at this question from a different perspective to the member for Theodore. For the information of the departmental people, I am from the north side of Brisbane, so I know Wacol somewhat and I know that is a distinct precinct. I am thinking of, for example, the Cleveland Youth Detention Centre, which is co-located with the airport. I do not think that is overstating it; it is adjacent to it. Obviously I support these reforms, but has the department put in place implementation strategies for legitimate commercial or private aerial activities that occur when a detention centre is located next to an airport?

Ms Hutchins: Before I pass over to my colleagues in Youth Justice, for Queensland Corrective Services it is 'without a reasonable excuse' and the land around our facilities is clearly signed.

Mr Hall: The Commonwealth regulates airspace, as a general rule. From memory, that is above 400 feet, or 120 metres. We do not have any role to play in that. We let that play out, so the airport does what it does. You are right: the airport is very close to Cleveland Youth Detention Centre. There is also a cemetery, some parkland and some residences that are within 120 metres. This offence will prohibit drones flying over the centre. It was considered a bit of a stretch to go further than that and start trying to regulate what was happening over some of those other uses of land.

Mr DAMETTO: I am quite interested in the drone subject. In practical terms, who will be left to police this? Will it be left to CASA or the Queensland Police Service to police and investigate any drone breaches?

Ms Hutchins: Queensland Corrective Services has a Corrective Services Investigation Unit, which is Queensland Police, and we work very closely with Queensland Police. They will be involved in the prosecution of this offence, like any other prison offence.

Mr MARTIN: Moving on from the drones, I want to ask a question about the X-ray body scanners. I was wondering if you could share a bit more information with the committee. In particular, what is it that the X-ray body scanners pick up that your current system does not? Do you foresee this as speeding up or slowing down processing of visitors? Do you predict there will be an increase in detection of contraband?

Ms Hutchins: As indicated by Assistant Commissioner Chen, the body-scanning technology does pick up other products that are not picked up by traditional search methodologies. In terms of the rollout of the technology, this will be subject to a trial at Brisbane Women's Correctional Centre, and the ongoing operationalisation and rollout of the technology will be evaluated as part of that trial.

Mr MARTIN: Are you predicting that that will be controversial or resisted by people who are coming to visit?

Ms Hutchins: No, I do not think so. It is very similar to the type of technology at an airport.

Mr MARTIN: It would be less intrusive?

Ms Hutchins: Yes. At the moment, though, it is only being explored for use on prisoners.

CHAIR: In this initial period it is just for prisoners, not for visitors?

Ms Hutchins: The first trial is for prisoners. As I said, the ongoing rollout or operationalisation following the trial will consider other suitable cohorts including visitors. Initially, it is targeted at prisoners.

Mr MARTIN: My last question is in relation to the data. What has the department done in terms of securely storing that data and then destroying it? Is it destroyed straightaway?

CHAIR: It is especially applicable at the moment when we think about Medibank and Optus. Data management is really important.

Ms Hutchins: While there are device options capable of storing images, the necessity and capability for storage of images produced from imaging searches is yet to be determined and will depend on the prescribed device. However, if a device with this capability is prescribed, the bill does include a regulation-making power to prescribe other requirements and procedures from the imaging search including the use, storage and destruction of any images produced. In addition, in dealing with images, Queensland Corrective Services is also required to comply with the Human Rights Act, the Information Privacy Act and existing section 341 of the Corrective Services Act in relation to confidential information.

Mr MARTIN: Would those images be evidence potentially, or would the contraband be the evidence?

Ms Hutchins: As I mentioned, that will be considered as part of the trial and operationalisation of the trial in terms of the images captured and stored. It also depends on the type of device. Essentially, it is subject to further consideration.

CHAIR: Interestingly, do you see other technologies coming through potentially? I think this was mentioned. Are we seeing the potential for even further enhancement of security through technology?

Ms Hutchins: The bill itself does aim to try to futureproof the act in terms of the title containing 'emerging technologies'. X-ray body scanners are one device that the agency is considering. In terms of future use, the agency is always looking at how we can be doing our business better.

CHAIR: The body worn cameras are not currently utilised in prisons?

Ms Hutchins: Yes, they are.

CHAIR: This is bringing that into alignment with process on the ground?

Ms Hutchins: That is correct. As of June this year, there are body worn cameras available for use in all high-security centres across the state.

Mr LISTER: I want to ask about the X-ray body scanners. In the explanatory notes—and I am looking at page 3—it states—

The introduction of a new imaging search type creates a clear head of power to support a trial and any future roll-out of x-ray body scanning technology at corrective services facilities.

What was wrong with the existing head of power for non-invasive metal detection et cetera? Why was it inadequate?

Ms Hutchins: I think it was arguable that existing search powers could be used, but it was considered that because of the unique type of image these devices produced—for example, an ion scanning device is the one that kind of touches you but does not produce an image. It was considered that, because it does produce an image and because of the nature of the scan, it was appropriate to clearly authorise that in law.

Mr LISTER: Madam Chair, with your permission and that of the committee, once the public part of the briefing is over I would not mind asking a question regarding drones and so forth which probably would not be appropriate to be answered in a public forum.

CHAIR: Certainly.

Mr LISTER: Would you be happy for us to do that, please?

CHAIR: Yes, we can come back to that at the end.

Mr MARTIN: In relation to prisoners getting onto roofs, could you share with the committee what is the process at the moment when someone gets onto the roof? What is the punishment? What is the deterrent at the moment? You did mention that this would give you the power under regulation to declare other areas out of bounds with the same level of punishment. Can you expand on what areas you were talking about? My concern would be that someone could wander into a courtyard and have two years added on.

Ms Hutchins: I will deal with the first question and then I will go to the second. The new offence has been developed to provide specific deterrence for prisoners gaining access to roofs and, as you have alluded to, other restricted areas that cause a risk to the safety and security of a centre. While other sanctions can be used, they are considered insufficient because they either do not cover the behaviour targeted or do not provide a strong enough deterrent to behaviour. For example, existing section 122 of the Corrective Services Act, which relates to unlawful assembly, riot or mutiny, only applies if there are three or more prisoners involved and it requires additional intent in terms of the rooftop action.

As an alternative to prosecution as a criminal offence, the Corrective Services Act also does have a framework for the matter to be dealt with as a breach of discipline and, if proved, consequences can be a maximum of seven days separate confinement or privileges forfeited. While this may be appropriate in some instances, with the increasing instances of rooftop activity, including the recent Capricornia event, it was considered insufficient in isolation to deter future activity that threatens the correctional environment.

In relation to other restricted areas, generally the accommodation and movement of prisoners within a facility is carefully considered, planned and regulated to ensure the safety and security of the facility and those within it. A prisoner cannot just walk into an area that they are not allowed to be in. As a result, future consideration of other areas to be prescribed by regulation in the offence was considered appropriate. As an example, it could include staff-only zones such as the prison gatehouse, vehicle bay or external roads or buildings within the perimeter fence of a facility. This really addresses the fact that in the last year there have been other major security and safety incidents—that is, prisoners scaling exercise yard fences or prisoners being in areas such as an officers station or at the perimeter fence. If there was consideration in future of prescribing a restricted area in the regulation, it would appropriately consider what behaviours should be captured by the offence versus what behaviours should be captured by the existing breach-of-discipline process.

Mr MARTIN: But there does not have to be intention?

Ms Hutchins: For the offence it has been built in that Corrective Services does need to provide sufficient warning to the prisoner or that they have gained an area that is controlled by a corrective services officer, so I guess in that there would be intent because the prisoner would know that it is against the warning that was provided or that an officer is clearly controlling it and they have managed to circumvent that control.

Mr MARTIN: Thank you.

Ms Hutchins: It is without a reasonable excuse as well, I should add.

Mr MARTIN: The same as the drones?

Ms Hutchins: Yes, that is correct.

CHAIR: Are there any further questions from those on the line?

Mr SULLIVAN: I want to place on the record in the public hearing my membership of the Australian Workers' Union, which covers a range of roles across both youth justice and corrections but does not disqualify me from participating.

Public Briefing—Inquiry into the Corrective Services (Emerging Technologies and Security) and
Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2022

CHAIR: No problem; thank you for that. The human rights consideration within this bill is significant. With regard to the youth justice facilities and the temporary arrangements within the adult system, I ask you to touch on the consideration around the human rights aspect of that—and also in the context of children and adults being in the same place. What are some of those safeguards that will be in place in those temporary situations?

Ms Hutchins: As you have stated, the statement of compatibility to the bill is very significant. A range of rights are engaged. I would like to clarify, though, that there is no intention in the amendments for youth detainees to be detained in an adult corrective services facility.

Mr Drane: That is correct, yes. The emergency provisions contemplate the temporary provision of a facility to use for the detainment of young people. That is not intended to occur within a correctional services facility.

CHAIR: Excellent. Thank you. There being no further questions and no questions taken on notice, I declare this public briefing closed. I thank Hansard and our parliamentary staff for their assistance in today's public briefing.

The committee adjourned at 11.48 am.