

UNCORRECTED

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE

STANDING COMMITTEE ON LAW AND JUSTICE

INQUIRY INTO CRIME PREVENTION THROUGH SOCIAL SUPPORT

At Sydney on Friday 1 October 1999

The Committee met at 10.15 a.m.

PRESENT

The Hon. R. D. Dyer (Chairman)

The Hon. P. J. Breen
The Hon. J. Hatzistergos
The Hon. J. F. Ryan

JOHN HAYWARD MANT: Solicitor, 255 Elizabeth Street, Sydney, affirmed and examined:

CHAIRMAN: In what capacity do you appear before the Committee?

Mr MANT: As a private citizen.

CHAIRMAN: Did you receive a summons issued under my hand in accordance with the provisions of the Parliamentary Evidence Act 1901?

Mr MANT: I did.

CHAIRMAN: Are you conversant with the terms of reference of this inquiry?

Mr MANT: I am.

CHAIRMAN: Could you briefly outline your qualifications and experience as they are relevant to the terms of reference of this inquiry?

Mr MANT: For many years I have been a public servant in both the Commonwealth Government and the South Australian Government. I have held a number of statutory positions, including Acting Commissioner for the Independent Commission Against Corruption. I have consulted widely over many years with a number of government departments and, more lately, local government.

CHAIRMAN: You have made a written submission to the Committee. Do you wish your submission to be included as part of your sworn evidence?

Mr MANT: I do.

CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to briefly elaborate on your submission and make a short opening statement?

Mr MANT: Yes. I will make a statement while using the whiteboard. I want to expand on two concepts. The first includes the three words "input", "output", and "outcome". The input might be teachers, the output might be lessons, and the outcome might be enlightenment. While I was working in Mongolia, a Mongolian said to me, "The outcome of education is not education, but enlightenment". In that Buddhist country, that was a nice description of an outcome. With transport, roads or buses may be the input, and the output would be trips, but the outcome would be accessibility. The problem with State and local government is that, essentially, the organisations are designed around the provision of imports.

When the colonies were founded they were based on eighteenth century models of bureaucracy, and really have not changed. In turn, local government inherited that structure. The model of bureaucracy that they used employed professionals. The earliest organisations in State or colonial government were the Department of Public Works, which had engineers and architects in two divisions, and the Department of Lands, which had surveyors supported by technical officers and clerks. Organisations whose fundamental structure was designed to employ a particular group of specialists could not employ those outside that group. For example, in the surveyors division of the Department of Lands, anyone who was not a surveyor could not be employed. In the engineering division of the traditional public works organisation anyone who was not an engineer could not be employed.

The fundamentals of the State Government are collections of what I call guild departments; that is, their *raison d'être* is the employment of a particular specialist to provide an input. In social services the same thing applies to nurses, doctors and community workers, who perhaps are not professionals although a degree in social work is often a prerequisite for employment in community organisations. Local governments are outposts of State government, and the earliest local government organisations were road boards, engineers and clerks. The State Government issued certificates certifying that a person was competent to be a local government engineer or local government clerk. The State Government ensured that an organisation could have any structure it liked so long as it had separate divisions for engineers and clerks.

In the 1880s when public health became an important issue a new guild was introduced into local government—health and building surveying. Again, the State Government issued certificates certifying people who were competent to be employed in that division. With an organisation that consists of a series of input divisions, no-one can be responsible for a complex outcome. For example, in the case of the main street of a country town, is the

engineer responsible for the buildings, the way that the street functions, the late-night security, how signs are hung, the maintenance of landscaping, or under the new guild, should it be the local government town planner or the clerk? Actually it is all of them; they all have a role. Because they all have a particular task to perform, no one of them will allow any other to be in charge of the outcomes.

I have done many plans for main streets. Everyone comes together, they have a wonderful time, they draw up a complex plan. They then ask, "Who do we give the plan to to make it all happen?" Usually there is no answer, so we form a committee. The guild representatives turn up for a few months and then fade away. In that type of structure no-one can take responsibility for a complex outcome. In that form of organisation everyone is involved in everything but no-one is responsible for anything. That is what place management is all about. With guild structures in State and local government, there are complex places which have complex problems; we think we know the answers, but we are not sure because none of us know enough about the causes of the problems. We need someone to take responsibility to fix the problems in Kings Cross, but to whom do we go in the existing organisations?

In a large development area such as Darling Harbour or the Olympic site, an entirely new organisation is created. Laws which presently apply to the rest of New South Wales do not apply there. We give absolute power to development corporations. But when it comes to Kings Cross and Cabramatta, we cannot do that. At the State and local government level we have attached a place manager to the Premier or the general manager. The place managers in Cabramatta, Fairfield and Moree have been told to find out what the problems are, arrive at a solution and try to fix the problems. And that is what they have done. They are what I call outcome officers rather than input officers. In my paper I comment on how effective they can be. Certainly someone pursuing an outcome full time can be very effective because, basically, they are dealing with input organisations which have a raft of different things to do, and issues to deal with.

They can be very effective, but at the same time there are reasons why the existing organisations do not like outcome managers, such as place managers. For example, in Kings Cross the place manager with South Sydney City council had a run-in with the engineer because she was trying to affect his priorities to fit in with the complex plan of achievements for Kings Cross, whereas his priorities were driven by more general South Sydney issues. He was not going to be told what to do by any social worker, which is what she was. A conflict occurs when one person pursues a set of priorities and the input organisation has a different set and does not want to be told what to do. I have outlined some of the problems of outcome officers in an input-structured organisation.

In Fairfield, they asked, "This is an effective way of managing places that have real problems such as high crime or high social issues, but why should that style of management apply only to places that have problems?" How bad a problem does it have to be before it can be properly managed? During discussions with people from the Premier's Department I am fascinated that people try to work out how bad a place has to be before it is given a place manager. I jokingly say, "How many murders have you had? Only three, not enough. After a few more murders you can have a place manager". On the other hand I might ask, "How big is your drug turnover?" If it is only a minor problem, they will not be given a place manager, but if it gets really bad I tell them to come back and I will give them a place manager. Place managers are seen as dealing with places in crisis rather than a fundamental way in which to manage government. In Fairfield we have said, "Now, let us have outcome managers for all the things that councillors have said they are concerned about; all the outcomes that councillors want to achieve."

We have created an organisation—a council and general manager in a corporate division— which deals with basic accounting and other fundamental tasks, an outcomes division and a services division. In the services division you find the traditional guild organisations—the engineers, the child care centres, the recreation centres and all the normal activities of a council. In the outcomes division you have about 28 staff, most of whom have specific responsibility for an outcome. Those outcomes are a clean green city, a catchment and, importantly, a future for the kids of Fairfield—a very basic outcome about which the council is concerned. What are we going to do about the kids in Fairfield who have such poor life chances? So far as places are concerned, we have cut the council area into four areas and there is a place manager for every area. This is not seen as a way of managing crisis matters; this is seen as a fundamental way of managing government responsibilities. So it is a permanent structure rather than a structure that has been developed to meet a crisis.

In Fairfield we have four place managers: one for the Fairfield area around Fairfield town centre, one for Cabramatta and its surrounding areas, one for the open space system and the rural area and another one for the

residential areas along the new transitway and the employment area, that is, the Wetherill Park employment area. It is working amazingly well. Problems that have never been tackled, and certainly not tackled effectively, are now being grabbed hold of and dealt with in a most effective way. For example, one of the young place managers is working with the Department of Housing and he is encouraging it to make major changes to the way in which a housing estate is managed. At the same time he is working with the owners of a shopping centre to redevelop that centre and to change the way in which it is structured, in particular, the safety aspects, the community connections and the different ethnic groups.

He is trying to get them altogether and interested in the area. He is trying to rearrange bus services so that the unemployed in those areas can get to Wetherill Park instead of spending 1½ hours on a circular transport system to get to their employment. He is organising for a bus around the employment area. He has organised for the tranche of people who work for the dole and who survive the course to have an automatic right to a job somewhere in Wetherill Park. The chamber of commerce will ensure that they get employment. This 30-year-old place manager is tackling the problems in this area. There is crime, there is unemployment, Housing Commission estates have been downgraded and there is a poor centre with lousy transport. He is doing whatever it takes and he is getting whatever inputs are needed to try to address those issues. Never before have we had in the Fairfield council area people who were able to do those things. People have written about these problems but there has never been anyone whose job it was to do anything about them. Some things might have been done but the connections have not been established.

Places are one of the outcomes of State and local government. You have systems like the enlightenment and accessibility, land use and transport. There are other outcomes besides places for which responsibility can be allocated. But, of course, when it comes to crime and communities and the sorts of things that are being talked about in "Pathways to Prevention"—doing something about all the different problems that the families in Fairfield have—place management and case management are extremely important ways of proceeding. I include in my evidence, as an example of that latter point, a summary of a far more detailed set of proposals which has gone to the Federal Government about doing something for the future of people living, working and doing business in Fairfield city. This is using local government and the new outcomes division to manage and to facilitate, through integrated strategies and actions, the future of the kids of a number of families in Fairfield. It is interesting to see the sorts of programs that can be put together when you change the way in which you structure government.

CHAIR: You would like that document to be included in your evidence?

Mr MANT: Yes, I would like it included as part of my evidence.

CHAIR: Arising out of your written submission, you state on the first page under the heading "Consequences of Guild/Silo Organisations:

If a new professional skill is to be employed, a new organisation has to be created capable of employing a new specialisation.

Mr MANT: Yes.

CHAIR: That may have been true historically, as you have been indicating today, with the Department of Public Works in the early days employing only engineers and architects, shall we say. Do you think that that is now possibly a little overstated? For example, the last portfolio I held before the last State election was Public Works and Services. On one side there was the public works operation, the old Public Works Department, still containing largely engineers and architects and, on the other side, there were services which comprised the Property Services Group and the Commercial Services Group of the previous non-Labor Government, and they in turn comprised largely commercial-type people. These days I suppose that department might be described as a conglomerate. Is there anything really wrong with that?

Mr MANT: No, not at all. There is nothing wrong with having guild organisations. Indeed, Public Works is a good example of that. I know that the Minister and the heads of organisations have been moving more towards the outcomes services model so that you have client officers, who are outcome people, going to clients and saying, "Let us solve your problem. Let us work out what your problem is, and then let us solve it, using whatever services we need." That is the duty of an outcome officer. One side of Public Works is organised like that and the other side provides the skilled guild services. I do not mind a proliferation of guild organisations, but it does not work if you do

not have at the core of government people who are responsible for complex outcomes, and in Public Works that is what your client officers do.

CHAIR: I will put another comment to you from your written submission. You state:

It is difficult for professionals from the separate silos to work together.

Let me give you a couple of examples of where structures have been developed; where problems are tackled by representatives of different departments working together without creating a place manager. One example would be the joint investigation teams in the child protection area where the Police Service and the Department of Community Services [DOCS] primarily are obliged to work together, and do work together. Another example might be the current Families First program of the Government where agencies such as education, health and DOCS are working together to identify gaps in services in the hope that they can fill in those gaps. Could you comment on those examples?

Mr MANT: A huge effort is being made by the State Government to get whole-of-government—or joined-up government, as Blair calls it—approaches to problem solving. I am very aware of those types of task forces or joint committees. There are various ways in which they are put together. My view is that they are second-best solutions—better than nothing but second-best. There are gaps, particularly when you are dealing with complex family problems. The point about having an outcomes officer is not that that person delivers anything; indeed, an outcomes officer will be ineffective if he or she has staff. An outcomes officer needs to be an individual. Outcomes officers do not deliver anything but they facilitate and ensure that whatever is required is delivered. Whereas if you have, say, three guild members, if I can use that word, they tend to be able to deliver what they are responsible for in a joined up way. But there may be things that they are not responsible for, and what do they do about that?

CHAIR: You made a comment in your initial presentation to the effect that government agencies tend to consider how bad a place is before a place manager is to be appointed?

Mr MANT: Yes.

CHAIR: Arguably, place managers should be appointed across the board, so to speak. Regarding a local government area, such as Fairfield council, I can readily appreciate how that is viable. I think Fairfield council is divided into four areas. Are you arguing that the whole of New South Wales should be divided in some respect and have place managers, perhaps hundreds of them, all over the place?

Mr MANT: Of course, we are getting into how I would restructure State government.

CHAIR: Yes.

Mr MANT: I would restructure State government by having about eight outcomes departments, which I would form out of staff already employed by the existing 28, or however many departments we have. Those outcomes departments would be responsible for things like: catchments; accessibility, that is, transport and land use; enlightenment; a range of educational and cultural outcomes—these are quite small departments with maybe 100 people in each—and places. You would not have hundreds of place managers because local government is the best place manager, but you need someone who has the capacity to think about all the issues concerning, say, Warringah peninsula and who is able to relate to local government on those issues. That is what we have had at Fairfield and Kings Cross. We have had a State government officer and a local government officer, both of whom are approaching the issues of the place from a whole-of-government perspective. So your question really goes to the restructuring of State government, doing it in a different way.

CHAIR: We might have a much smaller Cabinet.

Mr MANT: That is the problem. State government structures are driven by the number of Cabinet Ministers and the number of heads of departments. Of course, what they have done in other governments like the Victorian, Federal, South Australian and New Zealand governments, is to have committees of Cabinet Ministers. In Victoria there are three Ministers per Ministry. There are eight departments and three Ministers for each

department—one senior Minister and two junior Ministers. The Federal Government did the same thing under Hawke, which meant that you could have a Cabinet and an outer Cabinet and you could run the government with eight people sitting around a table instead of 21, or whatever it is—an unmanageable size to run a government. I do not think the other States or the Federal Government have done it properly. They have stuck the guilds together under a John Patterson, or someone, and a committee of three Ministers. They have not taken the opportunity to create proper outcome organisations and proper service departments in the way that I would recommend and the way in which we have done it in Fairfield.

CHAIR: Could I focus more directly on the matter under inquiry by this Committee. I think I could say that crime prevention is an outcome. Would you see it as being captured in the past by, what I can describe as, the legal and law enforcement guilds? How much resistance to date have place managers experienced from the traditional agencies involved in law enforcement?

Mr MANT: I suppose I would call the outcome “safety”. Crime prevention is a means; the outcome is a safe environment. Because we talk about crime prevention that supports the law side of the inputs, and that is what people say they are about. Yes, it has been driven too much by the lawyers and enforcement. Kings Cross is a classic example. With a group of about 80 people I did a strategic planning session for Kings Cross at the time of the police royal commission, which led to the Kings Cross place managers. One of the issues raised was the amount of petty crime on the street, particularly vandalising cars, smashing car windows, stealing things from car seats, and so on. The general approach from everyone is: We need more coppers on the beat, law enforcement and crime prevention. We should chop off their hands!

When place managers came in and began to understand the place, what was happening and all the different communities at work they found that a large number of petty crimes were being committed by the kids from three families from the Woolloomooloo housing commission estate. This is doing something about the Woolloomooloo housing area and the three families, and finding something for those kids to do other than going up to Kings Cross and smashing car windows. It is crime prevention, but it is not law enforcement, if you follow what I mean. Without the place managers really being there on the spot eight hours a day, six days a week, they probably would not have found that was the problem and there would not necessarily have been anyone to do the many things that had to be done to try to sort it out. But they were able to do all that, and as a result there has been a significant improvement in that sort of crime in Kings Cross. Yes, I think it has been a bit dominated by the lawyers.

CHAIR: The place managers today appear to me to run short-term projects.

Mr MANT: Yes.

CHAIR: Much of the evidence the Committee has received in connection with the reference we have suggests that long-term interventions, beginning in early childhood, would be the most effective means of crime prevention. For example, we have had evidence that the best predictor of future criminal activity is neglect of a child. In your view is a place manager suited to managing long-term interventions?

Mr MANT: Not of that kind, but at Fairfield we have a number of outcomes, of which places are only one. Places where everything finishes up, particularly for local government—the transport system, the retail system, the environment and so on—usually affects a bit of geography. The early intervention staff are really the other side of that coin. It is the case side as against the place side. But because we have outcome people in the council we have three or four staff who are trying to put together programs to take families at risk and do whatever it takes to give them better opportunities, particularly with refugee families. There are a whole myriad of problems for refugee families in Fairfield, and most of the refugee families finish up in Fairfield.

In the same way as the place managers can do whatever it takes to find the right solution to fit the particular place, so too a case person, an outcomes person concerned about families at risk, can do whatever it takes to put a package together for the particular family. They are not limited to a solution that is their particular input. They are able to address all the different things that would make a difference to a family, particularly in Fairfield where they provide a lot of early childhood schooling. They are well placed from the services side to play a major role there, but they want to add to it. Place managers are not an answer to that problem, but outcome managers are an answer. The exhibit to which I referred earlier is an example of the sorts of programs that they are able to put

together because of the new structure.

CHAIR: In your experience does the role of a place manager conflict with that of a local member of Parliament?

Mr MANT: Yes. It does not necessarily conflict with it, but very often it does the job better. We found this at Cabramatta, for example, where the nose of one of the councillors was significantly out of joint as a result of the effectiveness of the place manager. In an input-structured council the only people who can be made responsible for outcomes are the general manager or a councillor. That is why councillors spend so much of their time dealing with complaints and writing letters to council staff trying to get things done. People come to them because there is no-one in the organisation to whom they can go, unless it is a very simple issue like a pothole. But if it is a complex outcome issue there is no-one in the structure to whom they can go, and, at any rate, they do not know where to go. Therefore they go to the local member or the local councillor. In Cabramatta everyone now goes to the place manager because he is on the spot, he is full time, he is in the organisation and therefore probably more effective, and he gets quicker action than the member of Parliament or the local councillor.

CHAIR: I think you have in front of you a copy of the Federal Government's "Pathways to Prevention" report.

Mr MANT: Yes.

CHAIR: Is place management a possible response to the call made in that report for pilot demonstration projects?

Mr MANT: Definitely. Yes, definitely. Some work has been done on the place management experience. An assessment study of it is going on in Fairfield at the moment. Yes, definitely, it is a pilot that should be written up.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: This may be a strange question, given that we are a fair way into this discussion about place managers, but I am a little lost as to where a place manager comes from. Is it something that the local government area establishes or is it a specific program of the State Government, which provides supplementation to a local government should a place manager be required?

Mr MANT: The term is my term. I experimented first with this sort of approach when I was in charge of housing and planning in the South Australian Government. I had a typical planning organisation: a division of planners, a division of technical officers and a division of clerks—administrative officers. We flattened the structure and had area managers, about 15 of them, looking after every area of South Australia. It worked very well. When we did that strategic plan for Kings Cross the issue was: This is a complex place with a complex set of objectives and a complex set of actions. Everyone's view was that we had had lots of these plans, but who was going to do something about it.

We wrote off to the Premier and said, "Why don't you appoint someone in the Premier's Office called a place manager and we will get South Sydney to do the same? Set them up in an office and say, 'Here's the plan. You go away and make sure that all these things happen.'" After some time the Premier agreed to do that. Within one of the divisions within the Premier's department a person was employed for two years to be a place manager. South Sydney City Council also employed someone to be a place manager at the same time and we did much the same sort of thing at Cabramatta. That is where it came from.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: What is your association with Fairfield City Council?

Mr MANT: I have been working with Fairfield City Council for about three years now. I was invited to look at how we could reduce the number of divisions by one. I said I would not do a reorganisation of the council staff until the council spent a couple of weekends with me working out what they wanted to achieve, then we would think about what sort of organisation might be structured to achieve it, which they did, and they had a great time. That was when they wrote down all the outcomes they wanted to achieve, including, right up at the top of the list, a future for the kids of Fairfield.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: I wanted a simple answer. You have been working there as a consultant?

Mr MANT: Yes. I have been working with them and rearranging the staff and writing the strategic plan and generally working with the councillors.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: That is an ongoing arrangement?

Mr MANT: Yes. It is less now that everything is in place, but I am having another strategic planning session with the new council in late November.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: I have a couple of questions about the theoretical structure of what you have presented. I do not disagree with the outcomes focus, but I remember reading something not dissimilar from Gary Sturgess, who said that if you change the boundaries of where public servants orient, you change their focus, and there is little doubt about that. He went on to say that public servants tend to focus on where the boundaries occurred rather than specifically in their field. That seems to be the area in which a lot of public servants tend to work, at the different boundaries of their turf. When you change the administration, do you not simply change where the gaps occur?

Mr MANT: No, you do not. In Fairfield we have four divisions. One is concerned with governance. One is concerned with effectiveness, that is the outcomes. One is concerned with being efficient, that is the services side: "do not bother me with all that because I have a job to do and I am going to get on with it and do it." The last is concerned with fair and proper processes, that is the regulatory division. We have not just cut up the cake in a different way; we have actually baked four separate cakes. Yes, there is a problem with the boundary between outcome people and services people in particular. The services people feel that the outcome people will tell them what to do all the time. That is a real problem with these sorts of organisations. We have done many things to try to overcome that. There are boundaries but they are different boundaries from the sorts of boundaries we get when we try to divide the business of government into 28 different inputs.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: I wondered what impact it would have depending on what you identified as the outcome. For instance, a moment ago we were discussing crime prevention. Some people would head that as justice and some people might head it safety. Does it not have a dramatic impact on the activity that the place managers or the outcome managers will have if they are given different descriptions of their outcome?

Mr MANT: Sure, and they are different. Safety is different from justice, in the same way that place management is different from exercising development control. You exercise development control fairly, properly, in accordance with the rules. The place manager does whatever it takes, wheeling and dealing, making things happen. They are quite different although they contribute in their different ways to the outcome.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: How do you make sure that the place managers or the outcome managers are able to be responsible for the outcome? I can see a situation where someone might say, "It is my job to make sure that the kids of Fairfield have a better future." Then they say, "The biggest input into the kids of Fairfield having a better future is the jobs market. I have done the little bits at the edge that I can do and the council can do to improve that but really the Federal Government is responsible for that." Therefore they are tidily able to abrogate that responsibility and go on to focus on something else. I am a big believer that accountability is an important driver to make people ultimately produce a result. How do you get away from the difficulty that you may well have given someone an outcome that they cannot be held responsible for?

Mr MANT: You picked the classic example. That is why we put the proposed programs to the Federal Government. We have said to it that immigration and employment are fundamentally its problems. This is an area that is suffering very badly from those two Federal policies and we wanted it to work with us to overcome some of the impact. Theoretically and actually you can get performance measures of outcomes, like, say, safety. Is the level of crime dropping? It may be a demographic change, it may be a national economic change or it may be a number of things that place managers have managed to get other people to do, but there are measures that can hold outcome officers responsible—recognising, of course, that the task may be huge and they are having only a marginal impact. That is the nature of the beast. But you do not say we can do it because we will only make marginal improvements and therefore we do not accept responsibility for doing anything.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: I suppose the opposite argument might be that it is that much easier to work out whether the child care facility at Fairfield is operating successfully, because you know whether they have professional staff, you know whether they are opening the hours they are supposed the opening, and you can quickly inspect the place to find out whether it is a safe environment. I suppose you can survey the parents to see whether they are happy with the service. You can understand why people sometimes go more to the guild structure, because it seems to be so much easier to hold accountable.

Mr MANT: It is. Indeed, the councillors who meet more or less as a board of directors in committee over the services division will have those sorts of performance measures for the child care centres—how are they performing—and how the engineering division is performing against its service level agreements with the outcome side. Again, because we have an effectiveness organisation and an efficiency organisation the performance measures are beginning to fall out as being quite different.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: That brings me to the final question I wish to ask you, which is that one of the factors raised by this inquiry has been the lack of evaluation of crime prevention projects in Australia. Do you have any suggestions how this could be improved? Do governments really want evaluations, and how else can central agencies be convinced of the value of funding of crime prevention initiatives?

Mr MANT: I would have to say I do not know enough about the nature of those crime prevention programs to make much of a comment about that. But because we tend to have programs which are input programs dressed up as outcome programs they are very often hard to measure. For example, we could say “yes, we have done really well in crime prevention because we have 35 arrests this month as against 20 last month.” Yes, if it is an input program to improve the arrest rate, you are doing well. However, if it is really an outcomes program to improve safety, that is not a good measure. Again, it is being clear whether this is an outcomes responsibility or an input responsibility. When you are clear about that, then you can get some performance measures that are relevant and can be properly used to assess success.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: Are you familiar with any evaluation of the sorts of programs you have already spoken about, the one at Fairfield, the one at Kings Cross and perhaps—although we have not described it in as much detail—the one at Moree? Are there evaluations that have been done of them? Are you familiar with them and do you think they are fair?

Mr MANT: I am familiar with the one done at Kings Cross. The Premier's Department had a consultant do a report on the Kings Cross one. I thought it was a fair evaluation. I disagreed completely with its conclusions about the nature and future of place management. Effectively I think the consultant felt obliged to rationalise place management assuming that the current structure of state governments was an appropriate structure, instead of saying we are trying to put into a particular structure something that does not really fit. The consequence of that was that the consultant said the place manager should be more of a project manager than a place manager. It was suggested that the guild organisations ought to do a brief, set out what needs to be done, employ someone to go away and do those things and then tick them off and see whether that person was successful. That is not what place management is about. If we had done that we would have ticked off more people walking on the beat to try to stop car windows being broken. That would have been the solution in the brief.

The Hon. P. J. BREEN: Following on from the last question, the survey in the Kings Cross area, are you aware of other areas where surveys have been done as to the effect of place managers?

Mr MANT: No. As I say, I think the same consultant is doing a review of the Cabramatta one, so presumably the same exercise will be done. I think in my submission I made the point that a problem for place managers that an effective place manager is not seeing to be doing much. You are effective because you got the engineer to do something that he may be was not going to do or to do it in a way he would not normally do it. The place manager does not then say, "Look what I have done." What you do is push the engineer up and let him get the credit for it. So, an effective place manager works through other people and influences other people and, therefore, you let them have the credit. One of the problems with place management is, when politicians say to me, "What have they done?" And they have not done all that much themselves. Hopefully they have changed the behaviour of a number of the actors to do things in a different way. They are difficult programs to evaluate therefore in terms of

what they have done. Perhaps not so difficult to evaluate in terms of has crime gone down, and so on, but it is difficult to say how much of that is the place manager's work or would it have happened anyway.

The Hon. P. J. BREEN: So these place managers work through the outcomes office, is that how it works?

Mr MANT: The place managers work through the input officers, the services side, or whoever is available. They work through the community, they work through voluntary organisations, because they do not have staff themselves.

The Hon. P. J. BREEN: I think you said in relation to Fairfield council that there are 28 outcomes officers?

Mr MANT: Yes.

The Hon. P. J. BREEN: And, I think, four place managers?

Mr MANT: Yes.

The Hon. P. J. BREEN: Do I take it that those outcomes officers are responsible to the place managers?

Mr MANT: No. There are 28 staff, of which say six or seven are support staff. There are a number of outcomes, including four places. There is a catchment outcome, there is an open space system outcome, there is a clean green safe city outcome, which has about three staff on that group, there is a future for the kids outcome, which has about four or five staff on it, and there is an accessibility—that is transport and land-use—outcome. So, they are all outcome officers, and place managers are just one of the outcome officers. So, if I am the Cabramatta place manager, what I do in Cabramatta will be influenced by what some of the other outcome officers want to achieve.

The Hon. P. J. BREEN: Finally, the real question, I suppose, for our Committee is the connection between place managers and outcome officers and crime prevention. Are there any figures, statistics, that correlate the work of place managers and the effect it has on crime prevention?

Mr MANT: No, because we only have three experiments in New South Wales—Moree, Cabramatta and Kings Cross. As those are assessed we can see what changes have taken place. The next thing is to see how much of that is the product of the place manager and how much would have happened anyway, and it is difficult to make that connection. There is no doubt that since the State Government and the Fairfield city council appointed place managers in Cabramatta that Cabramatta is a totally different place. I have been going out there, catching a train there, regularly for three years. I never went to Cabramatta, never got out of the train at Cabramatta, certainly never in the evenings, whereas I would have no trouble doing that now. It is a totally different place than it was. If you asked any of the shopkeepers or the people who use the shops they would all agree. It has to be said that it is the product of the intensive effort of those two officers, plus of course the things that come with that. When you only have two or three in a state government area, they do get a disproportionate amount of resources because they are the only ones. So, while there has certainly been quite a bit of money and effort put in—place management has worked.

(The witness withdrew)

(Short adjournment)

JAMES CLELAND MONTAGUE, General Manager, Canterbury City Council, 6 Poinsettia Avenue, North Rocks, sworn and examined:

ANDREW GEORGE SAMMUT, Senior Operations Manager—Community Services, Canterbury City Council, 15 Excelsior Street, Concord, affirmed and examined:

CHAIR: Did you receive a summons issued under my hand in accordance with the provisions of the Parliamentary Evidence Act 1901?

Mr MONTAGUE: Yes, I did.

Mr SAMMUT: Yes, I did.

CHAIR: Are you conversant with the terms of reference for this inquiry?

Mr MONTAGUE: Yes, I am.

Mr SAMMUT: Yes, I am.

CHAIR: Can you briefly outline your qualifications and experience as they are relevant to the terms of reference for this inquiry?

Mr MONTAGUE: I have recent experience in relation to crime prevention measures in my role as General Manager of the Canterbury City Council.

Mr SAMMUT: I have 18 years experience in the community services industry and 14 years of that in local government. Most recently, I have been the support officer to the Community Protection Committee within the Canterbury City Council.

CHAIR: The council has made a written submission. Do you wish the submission to be included as part of your sworn evidence?

Mr MONTAGUE: I had that in mind, yes.

Mr SAMMUT: Yes.

CHAIR: I indicate to both of you that if you consider at any stage during the evidence that, in the public interest, certain evidence or documents you may wish to present should be heard or seen only by the Committee, the Committee would be willing to exceed to that request. I invite either or both of you to make a brief oral statement to the Committee, and then we will embark on the questioning process.

Mr SAMMUT: Mr Chairman and Committee members, thank you very much for the opportunity to be present today to personally present a submission to the inquiry into crime prevention through social support. We feel privileged to be part of your hearings and come here today hopeful of your Committee's endorsement of improved partnerships with local government and the community in developing support programs as a means of crime prevention in local areas. We are representing Canterbury City Council's submission to the inquiry which was formally forwarded to you on 16 November 1998. Our presentation will first touch on our credentials as a partner in crime prevention. We will then focus your attention on key elements of our submission, in particular the need for an effective network of neighbourhood community centres to deliver social support programs to prevent crime in our communities.

Since our original submission was forwarded to the inquiry, our council has pursued our community safety and crime prevention program and has developed its own policy and action plans as part of a comprehensive social plan which I now present to the Committee. Although co-ordinated community safety and crime prevention activities in councils are relatively new, for decades councils have supported local action to address specific crime

concerns of residents. We have improved lighting and landscaping in specific areas in response to resident representations. We have improved public places to eliminate the fear of crime and have regulated their use to deter criminal and antisocial behaviour. We have long advocated the need for adequate law enforcement and justice services for local communities and have for many years promoted social support services in local areas. But much of this early involvement in crime prevention has been ad hoc and reactive.

With increasing emphasis of the New South Wales Police Service on community policing and the restructure of the Police Service to promote local area commands, there has been a growing recognition of the need for planned and coordinated action and effective partnerships to deliver results at a local level. Funding provided to the Attorney General's Department for local community safety plans also reflects this growing interest in coordinating crime prevention through locally managed and targeted programs. Local government is often seen as a critical vehicle for coordination at this level. More and more councils are recognising the need for planned responses to help them define acceptable roles in this emerging area. This definition is limited only by councils' resources and their vision of what is appropriate for each of the stakeholders. From the public's point of view, our research indicates that residents are less concerned about who plays which role in preventing crime. Clearly, the public wants all levels of government to address the incidence and growing fear of crime.

The key issue for us in local government is that we have for many years seen the issue of law and order as one that is outside councils' core activities; at best, law and order was seen as a marginal issue to be referred to the police or State authorities as soon as possible. This is changing. In one study we conducted at the end of 1997, council was merely consulting the community about priorities for its management plan. Given the many other services we provide, we did not expect that the one issue that more residents responded to as both most important and requiring attention for council to address was law and order. It ranked highest among 600 households randomly surveyed. Residents were asked to consider 29 different services and issues addressed by council. Law and order gained the most significant level of support for any service or issue surveyed in the study. It was rated as more important than roads, rates and rubbish. Add to that the open-ended consultation that the council conducted for its Social Profiles and 1997 Youth Summit and most recently our Community Safety Summit. Time and again council was hearing about residents' concerns about law and justice issues and calls for local action.

Whether, as some would argue, this occurred as a result of growing media attention being placed on local crime or the growth of community policing, or whether more people have first-hand experience of crime, or whether the council is just getting better at consulting its residents, our experience is that there is growing concern about crime, law and justice. This issue has been steadily and consistently raised over the last two or three years. Local government is fundamentally about providing for the quality of life for our residents. That is why we provide roads and health services, parks and community centres. Those facilities are provided to enable and encourage people to participate in the community and enjoy the quality of life that they desire. The fear of crime stifles the participation of residents in community life and undermines their wellbeing. It disrupts their effective functioning in the community, damages social harmony and creates tensions and isolation which lead to further crime.

Among major costs to the community is the significant human suffering among the victims, perpetrators and their families. Recent research by the Australian Institute of Criminology found that the fear of crime was high in low income areas and communities lacking neighbourhood cohesion, as well as in those facing constant change. These features echo the community in Canterbury City, which is an area largely made up of low income people in a high density environment which is facing constant social, cultural and economic change. More relevant to our point before this inquiry is that the Australian Institute of Criminology research has highlighted many local solutions to these fears—solutions that are well within the province of local councils.

The response of Canterbury City Council has been to develop our community safety plan as part of our social plan. I would now like to provide the Committee with our Community Safety and Crime Prevention Social Plan extract for your information. This highlights the particular community safety focus of the council and the roles that we have begun to adopt in addressing these issues in a coordinated fashion. This integrated community crime prevention policy and action plan reflects the council's commitment to go beyond the strictly environmental roles that councils are perceived to traditionally play—for example, improving street lighting, regulating developments and managing public places to prevent crime.

It highlights the council's role in social support programs right across issues of concern to our community.

Together with other parts of the social plan, the policy reflects the significant role that the council already plays in supporting the social fabric of a community. This is important to the Committee's terms of reference for the inquiry because we hope it signals to the Committee the range of roles that councils can play in facilitating social support programs in communities and the accepted partnerships that we are pursuing with our communities and police Local Area Commands to prevent crime.

There are more than 170 local government councils in New South Wales and each one defines the scope of its role in the community based on its resources and needs and the opportunities at its disposal. From the State perspective this may be cumbersome and fragmented but each council in New South Wales is managing limited resources in unique circumstances. For this reason, each needs to be conscious of the appropriate partnerships it can form locally to maximise community safety outcomes for its community. The key principle of our policy is the commitment to work in partnership with other stakeholders to prevent crime, to foster social development and to promote community harmony. Our submission focuses on one key element of our role—local facility and service development—and argues that there has been insufficient emphasis on the social infrastructure and network of centres and programs required to address local needs and fundamentally prevent crime.

For the rest of the presentation I would like to focus on the key arguments brought out in the submission to summarise the importance of building a network of community facilities and neighbourhood services that can play a key role in detecting the risk factors in families, co-ordinating government and community responses at the very local level, the neighbourhood level; developing and targeting programs to address specific needs; and preventing the incidence of crime in a non-threatening, non-stigmatising and supportive environment.

Amongst the most significant achievements of our council in promoting community safety since 1976 has been the development of multipurpose community centres. These centres provide neighbourhood information services and develop a range of community programs relevant to local needs. The multipurpose centre model is resource efficient because it targets priority needs in local communities and optimises the use of facilities through shared use of resources. The centres are responsive to their communities and secure resources from many appropriate government and private bodies to meet common objectives in the local area.

Our submission argues that the neighbourhood centres provide the best opportunity for developing social programs relevant to community safety needs in local areas and that a minimum network of facilities should be provided in local areas with adequate funding by the State Government. Most of these services are operated on the community development model—assessing local needs and developing relevant programs through the participation of volunteers and residents. In this way neighbourhood centres offer flexible and responsive crime detection and intervention services and can provide valuable and relevant crime prevention activities within the resources they have available. These activities may include family support, counselling and parent education, child protection, outside-school-hours care, community information and youth diversionary programs appropriate to local needs and circumstances. Operating as positive community resources, these centres also deliver recreational and cultural activities that attract clients in a non-threatening environment, one that respects their right to participate in a way that will not stigmatise and therefore alienate participants.

Our submission assumes that early intervention goes beyond child and youth-related programs but includes services which address the issues early in the cycle of crime, such as child protection and domestic violence programs, perhaps prior to the incidence of crime such as providing child care and community information, and in ways that reduce the fear of crime through things such as aged care projects and cultural and recreational activities. We propose that community development activities operating in community neighbourhood centres can improve the quality of life of all age groups by developing community support structures to create community cohesion, and actively prevent crime by promoting community participation and social harmony.

I will now focus specifically on the terms of reference of the inquiry and the key issues within our submission relating to them. I will deal first with the impact of neighbourhood community centres on criminal participation rates. A key feature of the neighbourhood centres is their flexibility as local community resources to directly target people already involved in criminal behaviour or to prevent the incidence and fear of crime very early in the development cycle. Depending on funding, crime activities directly targeted by neighbourhood centres include domestic violence, drug abuse, juvenile justice, family support, child abuse and personal violence. They also address the needs of specific community safety related groups such as youth at risk, low income and unemployed groups,

people with mental illness and victims of crime.

The effectiveness of these agencies in preventing the recurrence of crime in particular is documented in the annual reviews of service outcomes required by government funding authorities. Objective and comprehensive evaluation research is needed in this area but State government departments have funded these centres for many years to directly prevent crime participation in areas such as child abuse, juvenile justice and youth support, family crisis and domestic violence. Government agencies conduct detailed program funding reviews and continue to fund centres on the basis of their effectiveness in achieving social as well as other crime prevention objectives.

Canterbury city has good examples of funded centres that provide excellent models of what can be achieved in changing offending behaviour. Centres such as the Riverwood Community Centre and the Belmore Youth Resource Centre work with their communities to link individuals and families at risk with programs that can avert further involvement in crime. Our submission refers to three case studies for the centres in support of our position. I would like to table recent documentation from both of the centres which highlights their effectiveness in meeting community safety goals. From a community safety perspective, the benefit of this work is that neighbourhood centres directly deliver programs targeting the most disadvantaged in a community, including families and individuals already involved in crime. They do this while they provide constructive cultural and social activities in a positive community setting to reduce the fear of crime, and at the same time they act as early detection services in a non-threatening and supportive environment.

Another matter addressing the committee's terms of reference is the role of neighbourhood centres in preventing criminal behaviour. In delivering a range of services appropriate to local needs, neighbourhood community centres play a vital role in building support and friendship networks essential to the functioning of a healthy community. Increasingly, this work is being described as investing in the social capital of the community—the processes between people which establish networks, norms, social trust and facilitate co-ordination and co-operation for mutual benefit. There are seven elements to social capital that can be promoted through community development activities and neighbourhood centres. They include participation in the local community, developing feelings of trust and safety, establishing neighbourhood connections, promoting family and friendship connections, promoting tolerance of diversity, encouraging pro-activity in the social context, and valuing life.

There is a clear connection between investment in these activities and a reduction in the fear and incidence of crime. An indication of the extent of the reach of centres into the communities they serve may be gleaned from the census of centres conducted by the Local Community Services Association back in 1996. I will not go through the detail of the findings but it was found that there were six areas particularly relevant to the terms of reference. The services were effective in just one week in reaching out to 26,500 information and referral contacts, 7,000 face-to-face interviews and counselling services, 1,375 occasions of emergency relief and material assistance, 3,410 young people attending youth clubs and youth camps, 390 support groups, including domestic violence and family support, and 130 pre-vocational and employment-related groups.

The third matter I would like to highlight in relation to the terms of reference is the type and level of assistance needed to change offending behaviour. Our submission goes into detail about the level of resources that may be needed to help to turn around the level of funding shortfall of the services. In my view, to date there has been no attempt or commitment by State or Federal governments to establish well-funded, comprehensive networks of centres in any local government area, nor to measure their impact in the achievement of crime reduction objectives. Many local councils have provided or planned facilities for local communities but are reluctant to further develop these centres without the commitment to capital and stable recurrent funding from other levels of government. Services need to be funded for both facilities and adequate levels of staff. Existing services need enhanced funding and many areas do not have any centres in reasonable proximity to local populations.

Having recognised the role of these centres in promoting community safety, it is important to highlight the ad hoc nature of service funding and its impact on the development of services across a local government area. The lack of availability of youth programs across Canterbury, for example, highlights the impact of ad hoc funding without minimum standards of staffing and programs. Canterbury city has three neighbourhood community centres—at Lakemba, Earlwood and Riverwood. Only Riverwood receives specific funding for a neighbourhood youth program. Only one corner of Canterbury city receives funding to develop activities in a local geographic area that can have the type of benefits outlined in the documents you have before you. There are other services for youth in Canterbury. Our centralised youth resource centre focuses on juvenile justice, youth with disabilities, youth with

health problems and Muslim youth, but these services are targeted at particularly disadvantaged young people right across Canterbury city area. It is very difficult for those services to address local needs in communities.

For example, young people cannot get access to centralised services when in low income areas in particular they do not have the pocket money to take a train to get from one end of a local government area to another to attend the services. Because of local need and the absence of neighbourhood youth activities, our council has used our Youth Resource Centre as a basis for youth holiday programs and after-school activities. The extent of its success is indicated in the tabled report. There has been significant growth, 87.3 per cent, in the program client base to 180 people since its establishment only nine months ago. This experiment has highlighted the value and need of this type of activity in local areas. Neighbourhood centres such as those council provides in Earlwood and Lakemba cannot develop these activities for youth because they do not attract the same level of funding and do not receive program funds for youth activities. These areas face particular youth problems in the involvement in crime, unemployment, failure in education, cultural conflict and drug and alcohol abuse.

The Earlwood and Lakemba centres provide venues for older people, counselling, food parcels, community information and family support. They also provide venues for community self-help groups. But in communities with recognised high youth needs they do not have the youth work staff expertise or program funds to deliver activities to prevent crime, involve youth in constructive pursuits or develop their talents. Beyond the gaps they experience in delivering youth activities, many neighbourhood centres are funded with inadequate contributions to the staff resources they need to effectively service the full range of community safety target groups. Designated positions are needed in all centres to perform core roles with community information and social support, youth programs, family and children's support, and activities with healthy older people. Beyond this, specific centralised resources may be required to address high-need areas such as unemployment programs and those addressing the needs of people of non-English speaking backgrounds, which we particularly experience in the Canterbury city area.

This demonstrates the need for minimum standards of funding for all centres to ensure that an adequate range of programs can be delivered to all target groups, but delivered in ways that are appropriate to local needs while harnessing other community and government resources. These resources include voluntary contributions of community members in committees, activity leaders and administrative roles. It means the involvement of local businesses, community service groups and charities. They also include key partnerships that have already been established in many areas with local councils, such as Canterbury, which contribute land, facilities, recurrent maintenance and management costs to these services.

Many councils have shown a willingness to participate in well co-ordinated and appropriately funded initiatives to better serve the interests of their community and community safety. We believe that the State and Federal Governments should join with us and provide the core resources required to sustain the partnerships with local government and local communities.

The final area is the inadequacy of funding for existing services and the need for new services in these areas. There has been no real growth in the level of funding available to neighbourhood centres from the New South Wales Department of Community Services since the 1980s. Although there have been some minor increases as a result of cost-of-living adjustments, they have largely been less than the consumer price index and have not kept pace with significant increases in government and other charges such as superannuation, insurances and workers compensation.

The Council of Social Service of New South Wales, in its pre-budget submission to the Government, estimated that an additional \$5.5 million program funding is required in the community services grants program to meet these increased costs and existing client demand. A further \$1.5 million is also needed to address additional demand currently unmet by these services. In addition, the Local Community Services Association survey estimated that \$19.4 million was required to improve capital facilities for existing services. These funds could be provided over a three-year program but are urgently needed to provide adequate bases for this important work.

Currently, these centres operate with varying levels of resources, depending on the success of local community management and councils to secure funding in a fragmented and unco-ordinated funding environment. A whole-of-government approach is needed to address this issue as many government departments now benefit from these facilities and the work already undertaken to establish community committees to manage local programs. The community safety role for neighbourhood centres could be enhanced by providing venues for government programs,

such as parole and juvenile justice programs, not currently delivered at a local level.

In addition to meeting the capital and recurrent funding needs of existing centres, there are significant gaps in the availability of centres in many areas. Growth funding should be provided to enhance the network of facilities available in local areas, particularly in high-need local government areas. Attempts have been made to develop standards that are being used by local councils and government departments to establish benchmarks for the availability of neighbourhood centres in local communities. These standards generally range from between one centre per 3,500 residents in the population to one centre per 10,000 persons. Currently, there is one centre for every 21,114 persons in New South Wales.

Although it is unrealistic to expect that the preferred standard could be achieved rapidly, there is a need for a commitment to make significant gains in service availability over the next three to five years. To make a significant improvement in the level of new services in both capital and recurrent funding, the Local Community Services Association survey of services estimated that an immediate injection of funds totalling \$20.4 million would be required. This would fund another 25 centres and the equivalent of 400 full-time staff across New South Wales. From the extensive experience of service providers, the extent to which community centres can directly target specific crime issues in their community is dependent on the availability of resources provided. There is a need for more stringent evaluation research on the link between the activities of these services and community safety objectives, but there is ample evidence of the effectiveness of local neighbourhood centres in successfully intervening to support families and prevent the further incidence of crime.

Within the neighbourhood centre model, funding can be tied to target high-need individuals with juvenile justice or family crisis needs. There was some evidence, at the launch of the inquiry seminar, that these programs can best be provided in the context of the local communities in which people live. However, funding that merely targets services which respond to incidence of crime only prevents people already breaking the law from further involvement in crime and at-risk behaviour. In addition to this important area, program funding is needed for primary prevention. This includes funding to address the need in the broader community for access to activities such as information and referral services, parent education, and constructive cultural and recreational pursuits that can support the functioning of ordinary families, address the fear of crime and eliminate the need for crisis support. All of these services fit within the neighbourhood centre model and create an environment which is more welcoming and less threatening to those most in need. Our submission argues that access to facilities and programs is limited in many local areas. In response, there is a need for a whole-of-government and community approach to deliver a more comprehensive network of facilities and programs in the interests of community safety. Councils like Canterbury city stand ready to work in partnership with you to achieve our common goals.

CHAIR: Mr Montague, on the basis of the experience of Canterbury City Council, what lessons have been learnt which in your view might be helpful for other councils wanting to promote crime prevention? What projects do local councils do best? What types of crime prevention projects perhaps do not work well when run by a local council?

Mr MONTAGUE: Our submission focuses on the community centre model and we have been very successful there, particularly with the Riverwood centre. You would have to visit that centre to realise the breadth of services that are provided from it. We believe that councils can do that very well. Recently we have had good experience in working with the local police. I suppose we are fortunate to have a very good local area commander. In recent times through our community protection committee we have been able to forge new relationships with local police to very good effect. I do not know how many councils have established community protection committees but I think our committee, in its short life, has been very effective in achieving some outcomes.

More needs to be done, but it is important—and I think the police recognise this now—for local councils to develop links with the local area command. We have excellent links with our local police and that has been very effective. There is a role for council to get involved with the local police and to assist local police. For example, in the area of community policing, which is different from operational policing, we are looking at providing some support with transport for local police. The council has approached local business people to assist us. In that way we will be able to help our local command with transport so it can be more effective in community policing. Those initiatives are important and are ideally suited to a local council.

CHAIR: I was going to ask you what the role of the police has been. Is it the position that the police interact with council via a locally constituted crime prevention committee? Is that the basic structure?

Mr MONTAGUE: That is the way we have done it. I can think back certainly in my history at Canterbury to when there was virtually no interaction with the local police. I am pleased to say that in recent years with the advent of the committee we have forged much better links. The police regularly attend the meetings of the community protection committee, which I think meets monthly. They provide us with crime statistics and information relating to local crime. One case I can think of concerned the rate of car theft from the local shopping centre, Roselands. As a result of the joint initiatives that the committee pioneered in working with Roselands management and the police, I understand the rate of car theft at Roselands dropped dramatically. That was an issue in that particular centre, and we have had very good results. There is a lot of scope for local councils to work with their local police, perhaps even more so in rural areas than in urban areas.

CHAIR: Can you tell the Committee whether the crime prevention division of the Attorney General's Department has assisted the council's efforts? If so, in what way has such assistance been given? Can any improvement be made to the way the Attorney General's Department, through the crime prevention division, assists the council?

Mr MONTAGUE: I think this relates to the recent incident at Lakemba that led to the formation of a task force. We have certainly received a lot of assistance through that. Funding has been made available for specialised officers to assist. I might let Mr Sammut elaborate on that because he is more familiar with the details.

Mr SAMMUT: The Attorney General's Department has been exceptionally helpful in helping us to develop our community safety program. It has now funded three programs within council. We were one of the first councils in New South Wales to pilot our community safety guides. That involved three young people reaching into the community to promote better usage of public spaces and provide community information to people in the community. That was funded through the community safety division of the Attorney General's Department. Most recently the department has agreed to fund a youth crime prevention officer for the council. That officer was very much seen as needed as a result of the drive-by shooting incident that happened in Lakemba.

Through the Premier's Department and the Attorney General's Department, some better co-ordination has occurred. We are about to appoint someone to that position. The support of those departments has gone beyond simply providing funding. They have provided assistance in developing our strategy and the program. They have produced some excellent materials on the role of local government in community safety and crime prevention, and they have done some very good work in terms of providing us with guidance about the way the community safety plans can be developed.

If there is an area that could be enhanced, I believe it is the level of funding they are able to provide to councils in this area. They provide a limited number of grants to councils to help them develop their community safety plans. Unfortunately we have been unsuccessful in trying to get a grant as yet, but we have received funding for specific projects. It is critical for councils to get access to funding at a basic level to help them develop the sort of plan you have before you so that they can articulate their role in community safety and negotiate with their local community partners an appropriate role in their community.

CHAIR: Can you tell the Committee what the role of non-government organisations has been in crime prevention type projects in your council area?

Mr SAMMUT: The role of non-government organisations is critical to every level of prevention. I prefer to see prevention at three levels: primary, secondary and tertiary. At tertiary level for those who are already involved in crime, we are fortunate to have organisations, such as Barnardo's based in Canterbury, working with young people who have recently been in detention centres. They also work with young people at risk and involved in the juvenile justice system. They provide direct support to young people, particularly those in our non-English speaking background community. They work very closely with the families of those young people to ensure that they are able to fit back into the community and stay out of the cycle of crime as best they can.

So it is fundamental that non-government organisations are involved at the tertiary level because, clearly,

they can provide a much less threatening link to families. They are there to help and they are recognised as providing a valuable role in that way. At the secondary level Canterbury city has many programs that deal with people who are exhibiting risk factors. For example, neighbourhood centres play a critical role in working with young children who may be involved in families at risk, whether there has been a family breakdown or whether there are children who have been abused. The neighbourhood centres give those children alternative opportunities, whether through better child care, direct counselling services, child therapy or family support programs.

Those programs are being provided at a neighbourhood level through non-government organisations. They may receive funding from government but they play a critical role in the personal face-to-face relationship with families that are exhibiting high-risk behaviours.

Even before that, I believe that non-government organisations play a critical role—and the basis of our submission is that—to address the fear of crime, to build social harmony, and to build an opportunity for families to feel as though they can reach out to others, local neighbourhood centres and community agencies are out there providing constructive recreational activities.

The best model is local playgroups, in which mothers with young kids reach out to other mothers who are under stress. Having a playgroup in the community gives mothers the opportunity to talk about their dilemmas and crises. It is critical that they are able to obtain information about counselling services or pickup pamphlets about managing children's behaviour from one facility, a one-stop shop. Many government departments are now adopting the concept of a one-stop shop. For the community and non-government organisations, neighbourhood centres provide that valuable facility for people in need.

CHAIRMAN: Not many councils have the active crime prevention role that Canterbury City Council has. Do you have any idea how other councils might be involved in crime prevention activity? Does prevention have to be driven by the interests of the councillors or the general manager, or is there some other explanation?

Mr MONTAGUE: In the submission that Andy read from we indicated that in our management planning process we conducted random community surveys of 600 or 800 households. Surprisingly, we found that law and order was one of the key issues. At that time the council's officers thought that it was not the council's issue, but a State Government issue. Clearly it is not, because the community believes that the council has a role to play in providing a safe environment within its limited resources. It is early days and I do not know how that role will be defined. Following the surveys this became an issue for council. About 10 or 12 years ago Canterbury had a problem with street prostitution, which led to the formation of a specific committee to deal with that problem. That was the beginning of the community protection committee.

Our surveys reinforced our view that community safety and petty crime, particularly in shopping centres around automatic teller machines, was important to the community, especially the elderly. Most councils could adopt a similar committee, particularly in rural areas, or discrete areas; they should find out what the community wants and, importantly, work with local police to develop strategies to deal with local issues. All councils could learn a lesson from the experience of Canterbury and other councils which have gone down that path.

CHAIRMAN: Council's submission referred to funding of organisations under the Community Services Grants program. I do not want to be unduly defensive, but as Minister for Committee Services, prior to the 1995 State election I promised to enhance the funding of those organisations by \$2.5 million for each year over the succeeding four-year parliamentary term—and that promise was kept. However, you are saying that there is still a need for enhanced funding. I also concede that the additional funding, to which I have referred, went to existing funded organisations only, not to new ones. Could you identify in more detail what you have in mind regarding increased funding?

Mr SAMMUT: The problem for many communities is that in the 1970s and 1980s, when neighbourhood centres were initially funded, a program was put together in many council areas to develop a network of local services. Canterbury developed a local plan that looked at developing centres in an orderly fashion. Halfway through the development of those services the funding dried up. We now have a few areas, particularly Hurlstone Park and Campsie, which have no facilities, no services of this kind whatsoever. We were trying to build a network across the entire local government area [LGA]. In some communities, particularly in the west of Sydney where it is appreciated

that there are recognised high levels of need, when money is allocated it is easy to determine where it ought to go. The problem for established areas such as Canterbury is that while we are trying to build our network and the funding keeps going to the west, our significant needs are ignored.

Areas to the west of Sydney can access area assistance schemes which enable them to provide for some development growth and also section 94 contributions under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, which enables them to get capital funding to build new facilities. The inner-west of Sydney has become the disadvantaged area as far as access to Government funding for services. Although some argue that the transport network makes it easier to access services, those on low incomes, the young and the disadvantaged, have difficulty in reaching the other parts of our LGA to access those centres. There is a need for a commitment to local neighbourhood centres in all LGAs; clearly it needs to be a long-term commitment. No-one is expecting this problem to be addressed overnight, but it requires an ongoing commitment, not a one-off commitment, to ensure that the goal of building a network of services which people can access can be achieved at a realistic level.

Mr MONTAGUE: There is still a degree of scepticism about government commitment to on going funding. Groups often take up the initial seeding grant and run with the program but they ask what guarantee they will have that funding will continue. Generally local government is facing a bleak financial future. Rate pegging has been significant, and therefore councils are struggling to provide new services from the traditional revenue base that they have had for years. There is a feeling that governments of both persuasions may not continue funding. If the centres are established people will not cop them being closed down and the councils will be left to take up the slack. There is a limit to how much slack councils can take up in the current financial climate.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: I am a former resident of Campbelltown, Camden and Canterbury. I had interests in local government in those areas. I wonder about the impact of funding in the outer-western suburbs that is not available to the inner-western suburbs. Has Canterbury council ever seen the value in making a comparison between the number of youth workers in Campbelltown that are publicly funded or privately funded through section 94 contributions? Almost all capital funding is privately provided. It would be helpful for a council such as Canterbury to carry out that research. On the odd occasions I travel through Canterbury I have noticed that its neighbourhood centre is different from that in Campbelltown, which is a big hall with a suite of comfortable offices. However in the Canterbury area the neighbourhood centre is a weatherboard house at Riverwood which would not cut the mustard in Parramatta, Campbelltown or Penrith.

Mr SAMMUT: The centre in Riverwood has been substantially improved.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: In any event, it seemed to be office space rather than a community hall. On the issue of funding one of the critical issues this Committee has to deal with is that whenever ever a study such as this occurs people ask how do we prevent crime? An endless number of people say that we need more money to fund their programs. This Committee is trying to solve the problem of Treasury granting more money from the Community Services Grants program, or other program, and how that money goes to where it is most needed. I have not come to grips with all the documentation you have produced but one was particularly useful and may even explain why funding is not always forthcoming. I do not say that to be negative. I am playing devil's advocate and ask for your response.

The document entitled "Belmore Youth Resource Centre Activities Report March-July 1999" at page 11 sets out the number of participants to activities, one of which was the Aerosol Art Workshop. Some people may think that that was directly related to an irritating form of crime, and an expensive one. That workshop lasted three days, must have been expensive, and resulted in a mural which was eventually hung in a youth centre. I noticed that it attracted 10 participants. It is hard to imagine that a program that attracted 10 participants would have a huge impact on graffiti. How can this Committee be assured that the funding given to programs such as that will ultimately result in a decrease in crime?

Mr SAMMUT: You have identified one program in a series that was held as part of a vacation care service. The only way that you can tell whether services have an impact on crime is to look at the participants, and those participants had been identified, through our Barnardo's Streetwork program, as offenders in that area. One aim of the program was the provision of murals at the youth centre, which it did. However, the State Rail Authority had a project to improve aerosol art around railway stations and there is an aerosol art mural near Belmore railway

line. It is difficult to say that this workshop had a direct result on crime. There are two ways of looking at the problem, firstly, the quantitative outcome, that is the number of people who benefit; and, secondly, the qualitative outcome, whether the people involved in the programs are the primary target group. People involved with the Belmore youth program are largely those most at risk of being involved in further crime. The longer we can keep them out of that loop the more chance we have of keeping them away from crime in the long term.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: Have you found any better mechanisms of reporting? Clearly if I were a Treasury official looking at this, I would say it is complete nonsense. Have you found a reporting mechanism which is more likely to make Treasury say yes?

Mr SAMMUT: The problem with the human services area is that it is difficult to quantify and have thousands of people involved in any program. Part of the problem is the lack of understanding that programs do exist. The purpose of building a network of services is so that people can see them as an ordinary part of the community similar to schools or hospitals. The fact that we have only an ad hoc availability of services contributes to the lack of understanding that the services are there and that they are accessible. In the nine months that we have operated the Belmore centre, although only 10 people have been involved in the one project, 180 have benefited from the program. Many of them referred by Barnardo's Streetwork program, the health program, the juvenile justice program and the homework-help assistance programs.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: A number of your programs in Canterbury are targeted specifically at girls, for example the girls-only ice-skating which attracted 17 participants and a few dance parties and self-defence classes. Is there any particular reason why Canterbury feels the need for girls-only programs?

Mr SAMMUT: Absolutely. There is a large Arabic community in Canterbury which we are attempting to service. Since the development of the youth program at the centre we have been concerned about the lack of involvement of young women in services. The youth workers have attended schools and spoken to parent groups about the barriers against young women participating in services. The parents were quite frank about it. They would not allow their young daughters to go to a centre where there were young men. In order to overcome that problem we had to provide girls-only activities. There were strong concerns in the Arabic and Vietnamese communities about children mixing at the youth centre. We have good, regular contact with parents about those services. That is because they want to know that, when they drop off their daughters there, they are not mixing with boys and they are participating in activities that are well-supervised.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: I refer to the document entitled "Canterbury City Council Community Safety and Crime Prevention Social Plan." On page 42 you refer to a number of trends with regard to recorded crime, and the statistics have been prepared until 1997. I suppose that, when you look at the graphs, they do not appear to be that favourable to you. Has there been some update of those crime statistics which might give you a different outcome?

Mr SAMMUT: Since that document was produced additional data has been released for 1998. Police evidence suggests that we have had a major impact on crime in our community, particularly in relation to car theft. As you said earlier, it has not been complimentary up until this stage, but that is a trend right across New South Wales. However, I am sure you are aware that there has been a drop in crime statistics. Our local area commander sings our praises quite gloriously. The police believe that that co-operation has led to the implementation of a number of programs, in particular, the ones to which Mr Montague alluded, to reduce car theft at shopping centres. The programs at Roselands and the Campsie centre are good examples of that. We have co-ordinated and delivered environmental and social programs to reduce crime in those areas.

Mr MONTAGUE: Let me give a practical example of funding provided to the police. Last week I and the local area commander met with the Commander. The Commander said to us that he was arranging for young people at risk—young people aged between nine and 14 years—to go to Camp Mackay at Currajong. He was actually asking council for money. We asked how much would it cost. These young people are definitely at risk of following criminal behaviour or of exhibiting criminal behaviour. The Commander said that he had 15 or 30 young people lined up for a three-day camp but council did not have the money to send them. I asked him how much it would cost per head and he said that it would cost \$55. That is where we are at. Police are coming to the local council and asking us for money to send 15 young people at risk, aged between nine and 14 years, to Camp Mackay. My first thought was: Why should we not give the police the money if they believe that those programs would help young people?

These are practical solutions to a problem. The police did not have money to do it and they were asking the council for money. For \$2,000 or \$3,000 each year we could send 45 young people to that camp for three days—an experience that they have probably never had, which just may prevent a few of them from turning to crime. I thought to myself what a shame it was that the police had to come to the council begging for money, which effectively is what the local area commander was doing. If there is money to be had, I suggest that a bit more could be directed to the police—not their operational budget but to pool B, as they call it, for community policing and other programs.

Mr SAMMUT: I comment again on the Treasury question that was asked earlier. That is a good example of how, from a local government point of view, we believe that that money would be well spent on a worthwhile program involving 15 young people at risk. Your concern was that it might benefit only 10 or 15 kids and that that might not be a good use of money. This one program that is offered by a local government area will affect the lives of those 15 kids. If we manage to save a few of them, that has to have a long-term benefit on the public purse, and it will keep them out of the criminal justice system and out of prison.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: It is not a bad example but it allows me to focus more on what a Treasury official might say. How do I know whether the 10 people you take away will have any involvement in crime if they never went to this camp? How do we know whether there are people specifically at risk? How do we know whether a camping program will make all the difference? A group of parents with kids who look a bit marginal might want to send them off, at public expense, when that is something that those parents should take care of themselves.

Mr MONTAGUE: These kids have been identified by youth officers in the Police Service as being at risk. There is no question that these children, aged between nine to 14 years, are at risk. The police have said to us that, if they are allowed to go to this camp and have that sort of interaction with other young people, under police supervision, it may help. We are not offering any definite solution to this problem. But for what I consider to be a low cost we could send those young people to that camp for three days. I cited as an example the funding constraints that the police are working under. We are talking about co-operation with local agencies and other groups in our community. The police have to be a major driver in this sort of program; yet they are struggling for funds for basic programs like that. I cannot say whether or not any of those kids will be saved, but they just may be.

The Hon. J. HATZISTERGOS: I make one point. Canterbury council managed on another occasion to get a number of recruits into the police youth club on a more permanent basis. Part of the problem that that program was designed to resolve was poor relationships between young people and the police.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: I have two other areas that I wish to cover. You have had significant difficulties with street prostitution on Canterbury Road. It is obvious to anyone driving down that road late at night. I understand that that has been largely curbed. Associated with that was a syringe difficulty. Has the syringe problem gone with the curbing of the street prostitution?

Mr MONTAGUE: Street prostitution is still an issue. However, it is not as bad as it was. Ten years ago it was a major problem for us and it brought with it the associated issues of condoms and syringes lying all over the place in particular areas. Council went to the extent of engaging staff to do nothing other than clean up after this trade along Canterbury Road. The problem has improved but, on any given night of the week, if you drive along Canterbury Road, you may see one or two girls in that "magical mile" as they call it. The problem is much better than it was but it is still there and we are still removing syringes and condoms from certain sections of Canterbury Road.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: Is that the only part of Canterbury that had what one might call a high level of street trafficking in heroin?

Mr MONTAGUE: There was a section between Beamish Street and Haldon Street, Lakemba—a distance of about three or more kilometres—that was most affected and, in particular, near the Belmore area. The police mounted a successful undercover campaign and I think that was a major contributor to a reduction to the problem. That campaign is ongoing. The police still effect regular surveillance in that area.

Mr SAMMUT: The police did not do it on their own; they worked closely with council when council put

up "No loitering" signs—a controversial program that helped the police efforts. A number of other strategies were undertaken by the community protection committee to ensure that it was working in co-ordination with the police and local community health authorities.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: Some questions have been asked about the legality of the "No loitering" signs. Are they the ones that are the subject of a dispute? Does council have some sort of response to that?

Mr MONTAGUE: One comment was made in the press by a gentleman whose name escapes me now. He said that what the council was doing was ridiculous; that it was illegal; and that we had no right to erect the signs. Interestingly enough, a number of other councils have followed our lead. I cannot give you an answer to the question regarding the legality of the signs. We believe that we have the power, under the Act, to erect those signs, and they have been effective.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: I want to ask you a question about a program called Time Out—a program buried under all these other activities—which appears to be targeted at kids who have difficulty with school attendance. Will you tell us something about that?

Mr SAMMUT: There is a full report on the Time Out program in the community centre's annual report. Basically, the Time Out program takes young people from local primary schools and high schools who are having trouble at school. It focuses mainly on high school kids. People involved in that program work with the schools, pick up the kids from those schools where they are having difficulties, and try to work on areas such as the kids' self-esteem. They embark on specific training programs with those kids and they help and support them in resetting their goals. The aim of the program is to try to get the kids to refocus their efforts at school, but it also gives them an opportunity to obtain direct counselling on their needs. It is a relatively new program at the centre—one that has been modelled on other programs happening in other parts of New South Wales, in particular, Newcastle. There is a program operating in Newcastle and, as I understand it, a similar program is being run at Bankstown, through the Department of Education and Training. All those programs are being run in an attempt to try to keep kids in the school system for as long as possible, by providing them with additional counselling and support services to help them refocus on their educational needs.

The Hon. P. J. BREEN: I am interested in the response to your survey of about 600 people who indicated that law and order was their number one priority. Is it possible that that has come as a result of your success with the street prostitution committee? Perhaps council's activity has led people to believe that council is responsible for law and order.

Mr MONTAGUE: The surveys we have been undertaking are a relatively new phenomenon. We use the Hunter Valley Research Foundation. Those surveys occurred after the major prostitution issue, back in the late 1980s and early 1990s. I do not think it did. I think the community believes—this is certainly what is coming through as a result of these surveys—that council has a role to play in crime prevention. We are not talking about major crime; we are talking about the sorts of crimes that affect people's day-to-day lives—housebreaking, car theft, petty theft, muggings and that sort of thing at shopping centres, and antisocial behaviour, which I guess could be loosely described as a form of crime.

Elderly people said that they did not feel safe in the streets; they did not feel safe at shopping centres; and they did not feel safe using automatic teller machines because groups of young people would loiter around them and they felt intimidated. Those were the things we believed council could help with by working with the local police. Some years ago we went to the extent of raising funds to purchase a police caravan, which was sponsored by the council and others in the community who were interested. The police use that as a staging point at shopping centres. People come up to the van that is staffed by the police. Council has been active for many years in trying to work with the police to improve their presence on the streets and to ensure that they are more visible.

The Hon. P. J. BREEN: Would it be fair to say that there is no surprise in the results of the survey, given the relationship between council and the police?

Mr MONTAGUE: I was surprised because I would have thought that most people still thought about local government as being responsible for traditional services. That all changed in the early 1990s, particularly with the advent of the new Act. I do not have to tell you this, but councils are no longer responsible only for looking after

roads and taking away the garbage. People seem to think, rightly or wrongly, that council, as a legitimate level of government, is responsible for a range of other activities that affect their day-to-day lives. People in Canterbury—in particular elderly people—are telling us that they are afraid to go out in the street. We have a large elderly population in Canterbury and they are concerned about their safety.

The Hon. P. J. BREEN: And they want you to do something about it, not the police?

Mr MONTAGUE: They do, and that is the dilemma that is facing us. We cannot lift their expectations to the point that they believe that council can resolve these issues because we simply do not have the funding to do it. There is an important link between council, the local police and the community in trying to work together. It does not matter whether council is responsible or whether the police are responsible; without the funding it cannot be done. People will tell you that more police are needed on the beat; that they need more cars and everything else. That is what the local area commander is telling me ad nauseam. The police need more money in these high risk areas. The Canterbury area has been identified as a high risk area. People have this expectation that council will do more.

Mr SAMMUT: The sorts of solutions they are suggesting relate to what council's core activities are about: increasing lighting in an area; increasing sight lines around major shopping centres; improving the control of public places; providing youth activities, and getting youth off the street and into recreational programs that they see as council legitimately providing.

The Hon. P. J. BREEN: Do you have any experience of private sector funding?

Mr SAMMUT: We do. The Roselands initiative is probably our best example. As a result of our investigation into the car parking problems there, Roselands supplied the police with funding to provide community safety officers with a bicycle so that they could cycle around the car park. Roselands also provided substantial capital funding for improvements, which were obviously needed, on the street and around the shopping centre, not necessarily just around the perimeter. We also have private sector funding for specific community programs. For example, community groups will approach the leagues club and businesses of that kind for funding for their programs, and that is a contributor towards the operations of the neighbourhood centres or the operations of the police citizens youth clubs.

Mr MONTAGUE: Or, as in the case I mentioned earlier, transport for the local commander for community policing. We are funding half of that one vehicle, and although it is only one vehicle it is a huge help for them. Up until now they did not have a vehicle committed to community policing at all. The local Mazda dealer is donating that vehicle for police use. That is one example we could mention.

The Hon. J. HATZISTERGOS: Do you regard the use of community schools as community centres as an appropriate use of resources as opposed to constructing new facilities?

Mr SAMMUT: Certainly it has a lot of merit, and we currently use our schools for activities like before- and after-school care, and our vacation care programs. It is fair to say that there has been some resistance from the Department of Education and Training about freeing up the facilities entirely simply because the department has care and control over the assets and the facilities. Much depends on what you mean by the use of schools. Are you talking about using existing school classrooms for these activities?

The Hon. J. HATZISTERGOS: We have heard that in Redfern a room is set aside for a community centre.

Mr SAMMUT: That kind of model occurs in a number of areas in Sydney, and schools are being used more and more as community centres for after-hours meetings of community groups, particularly cultural and recreational groups. But using a school as a neighbourhood centre, if you like, has its limitations because of the need to share the space during the time when both are busy. It works fine for after-hours activities, but during the day the department would argue that most of the school resources are committed. Unless you are considering adding additional resources, additional classrooms or things of that kind to a school that has excess capacity, shared use creates some problems. We have the same problem when we are trying to get shared use out of our neighbourhood

centres or our senior citizens centres. Groups require a certain amount of space, and only so much can be shared around.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: That might be a solution in an established area in which school populations are falling. Might that be the case in Canterbury?

Mr SAMMUT: That is certainly a possibility. We could look at how those resources could be better applied back into the community.

The Hon. J. HATZISTERGOS: I referred to Belmore programs, where attendances are low for some activities. Could you outline how you choose the appropriate school holiday activities?

Mr SAMMUT: Our Youth Development Officer has built up very good relations with both the local organisations and the local schools over a long time. She has regular meetings with staff at the local high schools and from those contacts meets with the student representative councils. With the student representatives councils she talks about what activities they would like in the local area. They are built up from regular contact with young people. That is what working with the local community can achieve. The programs you have not mentioned include our anger management workshops, which come directly from the agencies that are working with young people at risk. They can see that one of the core problems of young people, whether they be from Filipino, Polynesian or Arabic backgrounds, is their lack of ability to cope with anger in a difficult situation. They develop other programs that are much more clearly related to the security safety goals we are trying to achieve. Those activities are developed in consultation with those agencies that are working constantly with young people at risk.

The Hon. J. HATZISTERGOS: Do you change these activities according to what you perceive as changing needs and changing demands?

Mr SAMMUT: The advantage of the local neighbourhood and community centre model is that it is changed. Every school holiday period a whole new program is developed from the feedback we get from the young people and the schools to which they relate and other agencies. Every time we run a program it is reviewed. It evaluates what we are doing and ensures that we stay on top of it. That is how we have managed to build up those services over nine months.

Mr MONTAGUE: We think the Riverwood Community Centre is a model that could be followed by other councils and other agencies. Apart from the building costs, which were funded to some extent by the Federal Government, the council has minimal costs associated with maintaining the centre. The centre has funded programs. Apart from minor building maintenance we have no ongoing cost commitment to that centre to speak of. It is an excellent model in that respect. The difficulty for us is that on that scale it is the only centre of its kind in the whole of the city of Canterbury.

We would like to see something of a similar nature established at the other end of the area, in the Campsie area particularly. The mayor has indicated that in the next term of council, which has just started, one of her objectives is to try to establish some type of youth or community centre, with a youth emphasis, in the Campsie region. There is the question of the availability of land, capital costs and ongoing running costs, but we believe that if the land is available and the building could be built, it could be very successfully modelled on the Riverwood Community Centre. The centre at Riverwood is one that could well be a model for other councils to follow.

The Hon. J. F. RYAN: It would be fair to say, for the benefit of the community, that Riverwood is a bit different from the rest of the Canterbury area because it has a high level of Department of Housing tenants as part of its population.

Mr MONTAGUE: That is true. A lot of the people who use the centre come from the housing estate, and I am referring to the immediate housing estate. But we believe that across Canterbury generally there are similar socioeconomic problems—high unemployment, particularly among young people, and generally lower incomes than the State average, which create the same sorts of issues in Belmore and Lakemba that exist in Riverwood.

The Committee adjourned at 12.37p.m.

