

CORRECTIONS

IN ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Record of the *Eighth*
Asian and Pacific Conference of
Correctional Administrators

Manila, Philippines, September 1987

114782

114782

CORRECTIONS

IN ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Record of the *Eighth*
Asian and Pacific Conference of
Correctional Administrators

Kuala Lumpur, September 1987



NCJRS

JAN 3 1988

ACQUISITIONS

Australian Institute of Criminology
October 1987

© Australian Institute of Criminology

Published by the Australian Institute of Criminology,
10-18 Colbee Court, Phillip, ACT.

ISBN 0 642 12271 7
ISSN 1030-4436

114728

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material in micro-
fiche only has been granted by
Australian Institute of
Criminology

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Welcoming Address	2
Opening Address	4
<i>Agenda Item 1:</i> Counter Measures to Overcrowding in Prisons	7
<i>Agenda Item 2:</i> Work Release and Associated Matters.....	14
<i>Agenda Item 3:</i> Effective Links Between Prison Industry and the Private Sector.....	18
<i>Agenda Item 4:</i> Impact on Prison Management of External Monitoring.....	22
<i>Agenda Item 5:</i> Regional Co-operation for the Training of Prison Officers.....	26
Role and Activities of UNAFEI	29
General Business	33
Closing Address.....	36
List of Delegates	38
List of Observers	40
Conference Officials.....	41

INTRODUCTION

This document is the Record of the Eighth Asian and Pacific Conference of Correctional Administrators, held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, between 14 and 19 September 1987.

Delegates from seventeen countries attended the Conference and addressed five agenda items, through prepared papers tabled at the Conference and through oral commentary and discussion on those agenda items at business sessions of the Conference. The commentaries on the agenda items that appear in this Record were agreed by delegates, at the final business session, to accurately reflect the substance of those discussions.

The formally prepared discussion papers from participating countries were distributed to all delegates at the Conference. Copies of those papers are available to correctional authorities from countries not represented at the Conference, from the Australian Institute of Criminology. Some copies of the Record of the Seventh Conference, which was distributed only to correctional administrators in the Asian and Pacific Region, are also available from the Institute.

Office Bearers

At the commencement of the first business session of the Conference, the Honourable Dato Ibrahim bin Haji Mohamed (Malaysia) was unanimously appointed Chairman of the Conference. Professor Richard Harding (Australia) continued as Executive Director of the APCCA.

In 1985, the Conference had been presented with a Fijian warclub as a ceremonial symbol of business by General M.V. Buadromo (Fiji). Presentation of this symbol mace to the Chairman by the delegation from Korea, where the seventh Conference had been held, marked the commencement of the business sessions of the Conference.

WELCOMING ADDRESS

**THE HONOURABLE DATO IBRAHIM BIN HAJI MOHAMED
DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF PRISONS
MALAYSIA**

The Honourable Dato Megat Junid bin Megat Ayub, Honourable Deputy Ministers, Your Excellencies, Honoured Guests, Professor Richard Harding, Distinguished Delegates and Observers, Ladies and Gentlemen,

All delegates and I are extremely grateful to the Honourable Dato Megat Junid bin Megat Ayub, Deputy Minister of Home Affairs, Malaysia, for having spared his precious time to honour us with his kind presence as well as officiate at the opening of the Eighth Asian and Pacific Conference of Correctional Administrators.

It is indeed a great pleasure to have this opportunity to express a few words of welcome to all of you on this auspicious occasion. Kindly permit me to present a brief history of the origin of this Conference. This Conference started way back in 1980 and arose as a result of informal discussions held with correctional administrators in the region by the late Mr William Clifford (then, the Director of the Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra), Mr T.G. Garner (the former Commissioner of Correctional Services, Hong Kong) and myself and this led to the birth of an Asian and Pacific Conference of Correctional Administrators.

At the time, there was a keen awareness at the lack of a voice from the Asian and Pacific region in international forums of criminal justice and, in particular, in the field of corrections. This culminated in the first Conference being convened in Hong Kong in 1980.

Since then, the need for Asian and Pacific Correctional Administrators to meet annually with the view of discussing common problems and matters of mutual interest has not diminished. Over the years, seven conferences have been held namely in Hong Kong, Thailand, Japan, New Zealand, Tonga, Fiji and South Korea.

The present Conference is scheduled to last six days from 14th September 1987 to 19th September 1987 and the program will include discussions on specific issues as well as field trips to observe correctional policy and practice in Malaysia. The agenda comprises the following subjects:

- (a) Counter Measures to Overcrowding in Prisons
- (b) Work Release and Associated Matters
- (c) Effective Links between Prison Industry and Private Sector
- (d) Impact on Prison Management of External Monitoring

(e) Regional Cooperation for the Training of Prison Officers

As with the previous Conferences, it is hoped that, at this gathering, the various correctional services of the Asian and Pacific region will be drawn into closer collaboration. Similarly, it is hoped ways and means will be explored to improve links between the countries participating and, in particular, to explore ways in which each service can learn from the other and perhaps, directly or indirectly, contribute to further advancement of correctional services in other countries of Asia and Pacific.

It is my sincere hope that all of you, distinguished delegates in this Conference, will also take the opportunity to enjoy your stay in Malaysia as well as feel the warmth and hospitality of the Malaysian people.

Before concluding my remarks, once again, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Honourable Dato Megat Junid bin Megat Ayub for gracing this occasion and kindly consenting to officiate at the opening of the Conference, not forgetting too, thanks to all distinguished delegates for their unfailing support.

Thank you.

OPENING ADDRESS

**THE HONOURABLE DATO MEGAT JUNID BIN MEGAT AYUB
DEPUTY MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS
MALAYSIA**

Tuan Pengerusi Majlis, Tuan Pengerusi Jawatankuasa Pengelola, Timbalan-Timbalan Menteri, Dif-Dif Kehormat, Tuan-tuan dan Puan-puan.

Assalamualaikom wbh. dan salam sejahtera.

Terlebih dahulu saya ingin mengucapkan berbanyak terima kasih kepada Pengerusi Jawatankuasa Pengelola Persidangan kerana sudi menjemput saya untuk merasmikan upacara pembukaan Persidangan Kelapan Pentadbir-Pentadbir Penjara Asia Pasifik pada pagi ini. Oleh kerana persidangan ini adalah dihadiri oleh para-para delegasi dan negara-negara asing, maka, izinkanlah saya meneruskan upacara saya dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

On behalf of the Malaysian Government I would like to express my heartfelt welcome to all the distinguished delegates to the present Conference. Malaysia feels highly honoured to have been entrusted by member countries to be host of this important Conference.

In the past, prisons were purely custodial and punitive but today the emphasis is on rehabilitation and treatment of offenders. Correctional administrators are now professionals who possess a thorough knowledge of human behaviour and criminal psychology, bold and courageous to introduce new methods in the field of corrections. You are gathered here today to exchange ideas on how to overcome common problems that may be solved with the help of your expertise and experience.

It is often said that the crime is the shadow of civilization. Indeed it is. It can have serious repercussions on national development and social well-being of the people. Hence, the issue of crime prevention and treatment of offenders should not be taken lightly. As such, I feel that a conference of this nature is indeed very apt.

Crime is one of the major problems besetting the majority of countries in this region. It is thus highly beneficial that all of you who are charged with the responsibility for the tasks of social protection, treatment and rehabilitation of offenders should gather here to exchange ideas and expertise in this area. At the same time, in our attempt to rehabilitate offenders, we should not overlook the fact that prisons should be a deterrence.

This Conference is a continuation of a series of Conferences that have been held in various parts of the Asian and Pacific Region such as in Hong Kong, Thailand, Japan, New Zealand, Tonga, Fiji and South Korea. It is a source of great satisfaction to me

that the Eighth Asian and Pacific Conference of Correctional Administrators is being held in Malaysia.

Undoubtedly, correctional administration deals with an extremely difficult part of the Criminal Justice System. To rehabilitate offenders, to remould their anti-social personalities, to promote resocialisation of offenders — these are no easy tasks. I sincerely hope that all of you will continue to exert untiring efforts devoted to rehabilitation of offenders and better management of penal institutions.

It is heartening to note that the Prison Department of Malaysia has been and will always be open to new concepts of rehabilitation methods closely in line with the recommendations of United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Offenders. Since rehabilitation begins from the first day of a prisoner's admission, Malaysian Prisons have introduced the Prison Community Service Projects where prisoners are employed on various tasks and projects outside the prison walls.

In respect of finance, with a view to reducing government expenditure, Malaysian Prisons have launched joint venture schemes with the private sector to provide all facilities and training for prisoners at the same time generating revenue and showing a substantial savings in government funds.

In Malaysia, we are utilising prison labour to build our own prisons. A good example of this is the new open prison at Marang which can accommodate 1500 inmates. The estimated cost was 32 million dollars. However, through the use of prison labour and with staff supervision the expected total cost will amount to 19 million dollars.

Another example of the proficiency of prison labour is the new Prison Headquarters at Kajang which is built at a cost of 2.8 million dollars. I am sure all the delegates here will have the opportunity to visit this new Headquarters. Likewise, we have embarked on numerous projects throughout the country constructing prisons through utilisation of prison labour. By and large, Malaysia is making every effort to solve its overcrowding problems in prisons, at the same time, rehabilitating them, keeping them gainfully employed on inside and outside projects which is part and parcel of resettlement and saving substantial government funds. Although we encourage prisoners to work on outside projects, nevertheless we take every effort to minimise escapes.

Drug abuse is a serious problem in Malaysia. Convicted drug addicts contribute to overcrowding in Malaysian Prisons. The 5,000 addicts in prisons account for about 30 per cent of the penal population. In my opinion, there is no point in mixing these sick people with criminals in the prisons. Hence, for this reason, drug addicts should be segregated and treated in rehabilitation centres rather than in prisons. This will also ease the overcrowding problem in prisons.

In our war against dadah (drug) abuse, we have spared no effort to continuously review and update the rehabilitation program of convicted dadah (drug) addicts. We have at present three special dadah prisons (that is, at Kajang, Seremban and Jelebu) to cater for this category of offenders who, after classification are sent there for rehabilitation while the others are rehabilitated in other prisons.

The present Conference is designed to provide a forum for senior policy makers and planners in the Asian and Pacific region assuming the highest post in correctional administration in each country to exchange valuable views, pool resources and expertise. I am confident that this Conference will work out appropriate

measures and solutions suitable to the realities of the Asian and Pacific context for the common tasks that confront correctional administrators in the region.

In this way, it is my earnest hope that this Eighth Asian and Pacific Conference of Correctional Administrators in Kuala Lumpur will be able to serve as the major impetus contributing to the further development and improvement of correctional administration in the region and at the same time, fostering closer bonds of collaboration among nations of the Asian and Pacific region.

The fight against crime and the quest for effective treatment of offenders is arduous. There is a lot of work to be done. The responsibility is heavy and the road is long. For this reason, all of you distinguished correctional administrators, should constantly sum up your experiences, improve your performance and strive to promote innovations in your respective field of corrections and correctional administration.

Lastly, I wish our distinguished delegates from abroad a very pleasant stay in Malaysia and a successful conference. Now, it gives me great pleasure to declare this Eighth Asian and Pacific Conference of Correctional Administrators open.

COUNTER MEASURES TO OVERCROWDING IN PRISONS

THE EXTENT OF OVERCROWDING

In general discussion, it emerged that overcrowding was commonplace in prison systems throughout the Region. For example, a delegate from Thailand reported that prison capacity of 60,000 was currently being occupied by approximately 90,000 inmates, whilst a delegate from Australia stated that the most populous State, New South Wales, was operating at 110 per cent of capacity.

However, several delegates reported that in their countries overcrowding was merely a problem rather than, as yet, a crisis. This was the view particularly of the delegates of Singapore and New Zealand with regard to their respective systems.

The delegates from Tonga and the Cook Islands reported that, with regard to their still tiny prison populations, overcrowding was not a problem at all. However, the Conference noted the experience of the Solomon Islands which, in the course of 1987, had changed from an overcrowded system to one operating at 150 per cent of capacity. Clearly, even within the smaller systems, the situation could suddenly deteriorate to problem levels.

A delegate from India pointed out the notion of overcrowding was not merely a numerical or spatial one. Rather, it related to the ability of the prison system to deliver the planned package of services and programs in the light of pressures created by current occupancy rates. In this context, it could be seen that a system which in global terms was not exceeding capacity could be overcrowded in parts. This was in fact, the Indian experience; although total capacity exceeded population by 20,000 (185,000 to 165,000) significant parts of the system were nevertheless overcrowded. This also was the experience of Indonesia.

THE CAUSES OF OVERCROWDING

A preliminary point, which was specifically made by delegates from New Zealand, the Cook Islands, Papua New Guinea, Hong Kong and India and with which no delegates expressed disagreement, was that crime was apparently increasing; with the consequence that the number of contacts between the criminal justice system and wrongdoers was also increasing. That being so, there were always going to be pressures tending to push prison populations upwards.

Delegates in the course of discussion identified at least ten factors tending to contribute particularly to the increase in prison populations. These were:

- (i) growth in the number of remandees;
- (ii) delays in bringing offenders to trial;
- (iii) the impact of drug-related offences and the presence of drug addicts in prison populations;
- (iv) lack of alternatives to imprisonment;
- (v) where alternatives existed, their apparent under-utilisation by sentencers;
- (vi) the use of imprisonment for fine default;
- (vii) the increase in illegal immigration in some countries in the Region;
- (viii) the increase of mentally ill persons in prison populations;
- (ix) the need to segregate an increasing proportion of prisoners; and
- (x) the lack of overall planning of the criminal justice system and, in particular, of the needs of Corrective Service Departments.

(i) Remandees

Delegates identified the growth in the number of remandees as being probably the single most significant factor contributing to the increase in prison populations. In India, for example, 60 per cent of prisoners were remandees; and though the percentage was not as high in any other country, several delegates reported figures of 20 per cent or more. This problem was, in turn, referable to unrealistic or punitive application of laws relating to bail by both police and courts and lack of appropriate guidelines as to how such laws should be applied.

(ii) Delays in trial

Such delays exacerbated the problem caused by excessive use of remand in custody. They were attributable to the pressure upon the criminal justice system brought about by the fact that, in most countries of the Region, increasing workloads had not been matched by a growth in court and judicial services and resources.

(iii) Drug-related offences and drug addiction

A delegate from Malaysia stated that, in his country, approximately 30 per cent of the prison population consisted of drug addicts undergoing rehabilitation programs. These prisoners also accounted for the overcrowding problem. Other delegates referred to the fact that addicts and drug-related offenders had added substantially to the pressure upon their prison numbers.

(iv) Lack of alternatives to imprisonment

The delegate from Malaysia reported that the absence of alternatives certainly contributed to the increase in the prison population. The *Compulsory Attendance Ordinance* 1954 regarding compulsory attendance centres had not been widely used by the courts and as yet nothing had replaced it. A delegate from Papua New Guinea also reported a lack of alternatives; however, probation had just been introduced. A delegate from India reported that sentencing options were also

extremely limited in his country and that, although a Probation Act had been on the books for some time, it had never really taken hold.

(v) Under-utilisation of alternatives to imprisonment

It was widely reported that, even in those jurisdictions where adequate alternatives to imprisonment were available, sentencers appeared reluctant to utilise them adequately. This was due to the interaction between politicians, sensitive to rises in crime rates; the public both fearful and punitive in their attitudes; and sentencers, responding to politicians and the public. A delegate from Papua New Guinea stated that the negativism of the public affected the whole criminal justice process, whilst the delegate from New Zealand stated that Correctional Service Departments seemed, in the present climate of opinion, to have the greatest difficulty in convincing sentencers that non-institutional sentences were punishment at all.

However, several delegates—particularly those from Singapore and Sri Lanka—reported that their non-institutional sentences were operating successfully, not only in terms of their acceptability to the courts but also in terms of outcomes.

(vi) Fine default

Attention was drawn by several delegates to the fact that fines were often set at an unrealistically high level in terms of the capacity of offenders to pay. In a context where the sanction for non-payment was imprisonment, this practice contributed to continuing pressures upon the size of prison populations.

(vii) Illegal immigration

Delegates from Hong Kong and Brunei Darussalam reported that the continuing phenomenon of illegal immigration into their countries placed pressure upon their prison systems. In the case of Hong Kong, the pressure was indirect in as much as detained immigrants were not, technically, prisoners in the normal sense; however, in the case of Brunei Darussalam this phenomenon was a direct contribution to overcrowding.

(viii) Mentally ill prisoners

The delegate from New Zealand pointed out that, in his country, the recent policy of de-institutionalising mental patients from mental hospitals appeared to have had an adverse effect upon the size of the prison population.

(ix) Segregation, classification

The delegate from New Zealand went on to point out that the changing nature of the prison population had meant that an increasing percentage of prisoners had to be held in special conditions away from other categories of prisoners. A delegate from Australia reported, on a related point, that overcrowding was most chronic in his country in relation to maximum security prisoners. Generally it was agreed that the need to classify prisoners into appropriate categories tended to exacerbate pressures on prison accommodation, though a delegate from Hong Kong reported that the arrangements in his country were flexible and workable.

(x) Inadequate planning

A delegate from Papua New Guinea expressed the view that planning of criminal

justice facilities had, in the past, generally been short-sighted. Several other delegates pointed out that the corrections component of criminal justice policy planning had not been sufficiently co-ordinated with other areas or with social policy generally. However, a delegate from Hong Kong paid tribute to those responsible for planning in the fifties and sixties for the foresight they had shown in relation to the prison system and its physical resources in his country.

THE EFFECTS OF OVERCROWDING

It was agreed that, wherever overcrowding occurred, it tended to bring about breakdown or at the very least deterioration in the prison system in various ways. The position of inmates was affected, so too was that of prison officers and, generally, staff/inmate relationships suffered.

With regard to the position of inmates, the delegate from Indonesia stressed that prisoners desire and are entitled to order, cleanliness and security. Threats, conflict, disturbances and program restrictions are produced by serious overcrowding. A delegate from India referred to the difficulty of preventing contamination of remandees, who are mostly first offenders, in circumstances of overcrowding. It was generally agreed that prisoner programs were put under pressure and often had to be reduced as a consequence of overcrowding.

With regard to the effect upon prison officers, it was widely agreed that this was considerable. For example, delegates from Australia, the Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea referred to the increased incidence of assaults upon prison officers. Even when overcrowding did not manifest itself in this way, it was agreed that the stress upon officers was substantial; sick leave rates, for example tended to increase as a consequence.

Generally, the Conference agreed with the view expressed by delegates from Brunei Darussalam and the Solomon Islands that staff/inmate relations suffered wherever and whenever overcrowding existed, and that this in itself tended to undermine the rehabilitative aspects of imprisonment. Strategies such as the highly successful 'live-in housemaster' scheme in Singapore simply could not be attempted once overcrowding went beyond a certain point.

COUNTER MEASURES TO OVERCROWDING

Numerous delegates strongly expressed the view that a holistic approach, involving all parts of the criminal justice system and the body politic, was absolutely essential if overcrowding was to be successfully confronted. Counter measures confined to activities and arrangements within the prison system itself could only be of limited efficacy.

Nevertheless, the point was stressed that short-term responses of the palliative kind could not be postponed. For example, a delegate from Australia referred to the urgent need to improve the industrial conditions and training opportunities for officers in an effort to alleviate stress, and several delegates referred to the urgent need to recruit more staff.

Counter measures which were specifically discussed included the following:

- (i) legal and administrative changes relating to remand and bail;
- (ii) reducing court delays;

- (iii) the creation of a wider range of alternatives to imprisonment and greater utilisation of existing ones by sentencers;
- (iv) the creation and greater utilisation of early release mechanisms;
- (v) more flexible use of classification and transfer of prisoners;
- (vi) the construction of additional prison accommodation;
- (vii) the establishment of special centres for drug addicts; and
- (viii) generally, the creation of a climate of political and public opinion in which the use of imprisonment is not perceived as the primary corrective sanction appropriate for less serious offenders.

Of these, only item (v) can be activated by Correctional Services Departments on their sole initiative.

(i) Remand and bail

A delegate from India referred to the requirement in his country that a remandee who had spent in custody more than a certain percentage of the maximum available sentence for the offence charged was required to be released. This contrasted with the law and experience in most other countries in the Region, where formal limitations of this kind were not present.

Several delegates referred to the ongoing process of consultation with police authorities and court officials with a view of increasing their understanding of the impact of their own decisions upon the prison system. A delegate from Singapore referred to the potential benefit of developing some kind of guidelines pamphlet relating to bail for use by such personnel. However, it was generally thought that statutory change was a more reliable and durable way of improving the situation in this area.

(ii) Court delays

A delegate from Australia reminded the Conference that such matters were beyond the direct impact of corrections administrators. However, several delegates, including those from India, Thailand, New Zealand and Sri Lanka, reported that approaches had been made to governments about this matter and were either under active review or had been positively acted upon. However, the increasingly complex and serious nature of some criminal charges and trials inevitably meant that long delays could not be eliminated altogether.

(iii) Creation and utilisation of alternatives to imprisonment

Delegates of each of the countries which had reported a lack of legally available alternatives all reported that the issue was being re-considered at governmental level.

However, the key problem was that of persuading sentencers to utilise them in appropriate cases. The credibility problem seemed to be acute. In this context, the Director of UNAFEI referred to the work of the 75th Training Course held at Fuchu from 20 April 1987 to 20 June 1987. Pursuant to Resolution 16 of the 7th United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, a draft document relating to minimum standards for the application of non-institutional sanctions had been agreed upon. He considered that this was potentially a

major counter measure to under-utilisation of alternatives to imprisonment. After comments had been received, this draft would be further considered at the 78th International Seminar commencing in February 1989.

The Executive Director informed the Conference that a comparable document had been agreed upon by Australian correctional administrators in May 1987. The International Penal and Penitentiary Foundation would also be holding a colloquium on this topic in October 1987. In this regard, the Asia and Pacific Region seemed to be setting the pace.

The New Zealand delegate referred to moves in his country to set up training programs for judges and to establish a Sentencing Research Council, whilst a delegate from Brunei Darussalam stated that laws relating to sentencing were under active review in his country.

Generally, it was agreed that this problem was a function of the generally hostile public attitudes to offenders being encountered throughout countries of the Region. However, the Conference noted with interest the current success of pre-trial diversion of offenders in the Korean system.

(iv) Early release mechanisms

Several delegates referred to efforts being made to expand the use of early release in their countries. For example, the delegate from Singapore described the extension of work release to long-term prisoners after a successful pilot project relating to short-term prisoners.

A particularly interesting mechanism, not utilised in the more westernised countries of the Region, was that of special remission to mark days of national significance.

For example, in Thailand special release by Royal Pardon was widely utilised, whilst delegates from Sri Lanka and Papua New Guinea reported that remissions were commonplace for selected prisoners to mark their Independence Days. Available evidence did not suggest that the failure rate in such cases was any worse than for any other form of release.

(v) Transfer and classification of prisoners

All countries tried to alleviate their overcrowding problems by optimum use of transfer and classification procedures. However, a delegate from Malaysia pointed out that it was not feasible to transfer remand prisoners away from the area of their pending trial, thus limiting the potential efficacy of this mechanism.

(vi) Additional prison accommodation

A delegate from Brunei Darussalam stressed that it was incumbent upon administrators to utilise and adapt existing space as best they could. In this context, a delegate from Hong Kong referred to the fact that all institutions built in recent years had been designed to accommodate sudden influxes of up to 15 per cent in times of prison population crisis. The Conference welcomed such foresight.

Delegates from Brunei Darussalam, India, Malaysia, New Zealand and the Solomon Islands reported that prison building programs were under way in their countries. This was also the case in Australia. However, no delegate saw such commitments as constituting a solution to overcrowding, but merely as a response.

(vii) **Drug addiction centres**

A delegate from Malaysia reported that his Government had committed itself to a building program with regard to drug addiction centres. Rehabilitation programs would be conducted at such centres, rather than from within prisons. However, a delegate from Hong Kong stated that, in his view, such centres should remain within the control of corrections administrators. Hong Kong experience had been that convicted prisoners who were also drug dependent would benefit from a disciplined as well as a rehabilitative regime.

(viii) **Political and public opinion**

Concern about the punitiveness of political and public opinion overshadowed the whole discussion of this item. Legislators by increasing sentences or being tardy in developing alternatives to imprisonment, police by their bail practices, sentencers by their under-utilisation of alternatives to imprisonment, were all in fact reflecting and reacting to their perceptions through the media of public opinion about crime and punishment.

In this respect, numerous delegates referred to efforts being made to get the public to understand the reality that crime control through punishment alone was subject to the law of diminishing returns.

A delegate from Papua New Guinea described in detail attempts in his country to co-opt police and the judiciary to join in a major public education campaign, by way of public seminars, with regard to this matter. It was possible that the Law and Justice Joint Forum might lead to the establishment of a Standing Commission on Law and Order, one of whose primary functions would be that of public education. The delegate from New Zealand described attempts in his country to develop a bi-partisan criminal justice policy, so that ongoing law and order problems could be systematically and continuously tackled. The Conference agreed that such initiatives as these were crucially important.

CONCLUSION

Prison overcrowding could not be solved by strategies emanating solely from corrections administrators. A holistic approach was required, involving not only all the other criminal justice agencies but also the community as a whole and its political representatives.

WORK RELEASE AND ASSOCIATED MATTERS

THE PREVALENCE OF WORK RELEASE PROGRAMS

The provision of work release programs for prisoners is not uniform throughout the Region. Some countries (Australia, the Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Singapore and Sri Lanka) have formal established work release programs. Some others (Hong Kong and Japan) were currently in the process of formalising legislative procedures for such schemes. Indonesia, Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands were impressed with work release programs and were intending to try and introduce them, while Brunei Darussalam, the Cook Islands and Thailand all have programs that allow some prisoners to work outside the prison. New Zealand which had had a work release program for many years, was in the throes of re-assessing the policies underlying it and reorganising the program itself.

An Indian delegate pointed out that in his country convicted prisoners comprised the minority of the prison population and they were occupied on essential services within the prison. The Tongan delegate indicate that the family was still a very strong social institution in his country, and prisoners on release returned straight home to their families. These two countries therefore had no work release programs.

THE RATIONALE FOR WORK RELEASE PROGRAMS

The advantages of work release programs were well summarised by the delegate from Papua New Guinea who stated their value lay in their benefits to the prisoner, the community and the economy.

Benefits to the prisoners arise from the potential assistance a work release program provides through a supervised re-integration into the work force, according to an Australian delegate. This re-emphasises a Japanese delegate's general observation that any work done during a prison sentence is a part of the prisoner's re-socialisation. The Indonesian delegate made a similar point indicating the prisoners' work should take into account their talents and gifts and should emphasise treatment not profit.

Re-settlement into the community is plainly enhanced for prisoners if they have developed improved work skills and have found a job at which to work. A Malaysian delegate indicated that these two features flowed directly from a work release pro-

gram. A Singaporean delegate indicated that preparation for release was the principal purpose of such a program although a side benefit was a reduction in prison crowding. Another side benefit mentioned by the Sri Lankan delegate was that a program gets prisoners away from the unhealthy atmosphere of a prison.

As pointed out by a Malaysian delegate, benefits to the community include the contribution to his or her family which a prisoner on a work release program can make. That in turn may save some social service payments to the family. However, a further benefit to the community, according to an Australian delegate, is the value of work done for the community by minimum security prisoners, engaged in work on community property outside the prison.

That, of course, also contributes benefits to the economy. A particularly dramatic example of this was provided by the Malaysian Deputy Minister for Home Affairs in his opening address to the Conference when he indicated the great savings made in using prisoner labour in building a new prison.

FEATURES OF WORK RELEASE PROGRAMS

A critical element of any work release program is the selection of eligible prisoners. Delegates from two countries made particular reference to this. The Sri Lankan delegate indicated that a comprehensive and careful social investigation report was prepared for work release applicants in his country. A delegate from Singapore described the selection process in that country; it involved a three person committee appointed by the appropriate Minister and comprising two Justices of the Peace and a businessman. That committee was supplemented and advised by professional staff from the Prisons Department, although the Director had to agree with the committee's recommendation and make the final decision.

While most of the operational work release programs in the Region involve prisoners working in some private enterprise business and returning to the prison after work each day, there were some variations on this theme. Groups of prisoners engaged in outside work on public buildings, parks and so forth were described by delegates from Australia and Thailand. In the latter country, prisoners earn one day's remission for each day worked on such community projects and can also reap some financial reward from that participation.

Attitudes towards the money earned by work release prisoners varied within the region. A Malaysian delegate indicated that 70 per cent of the wages earned by their prisoners were retained by them, and that practice meant that accusations of exploitation of prisoners were forestalled. (The remaining 30 per cent was split equally into contributions to the prisoners' welfare fund and government revenue.) The Sri Lankan delegate indicated that prisoners there are allowed to keep all their wages but have to pay for their transport to their jobs and for their food. They are allowed to send half their wages back to their families.

The Cook Islands delegate reported that prisoners can be 'hired out' to appropriate persons to work for them on Saturdays and public holidays. The money earned by prisoners engaged in this work release type program are kept by the prisoners but they are required to bank some proportion of it as determined by the Prisons Department. While it appears that prisoners involved in this program perform basically unskilled jobs, two countries have moved towards pre-training for work release prisoners. A delegate from Singapore reported a two month course leading to a cer-

tificate had been introduced for those prisoners going on work release in the building industry, whilst a Korean delegate indicated that prisoners there had to satisfactorily complete a one year vocational training course to become eligible for work release.

An intended innovation, described by an Australian delegate, comprises an extended form of work release program in which prisoners are required to find themselves outside accommodation while on that program. Such prisoners will thus live outside the prison, but they will be required to report back to the prison authorities during the week. In fact, fourteen hours of personal development and community work will be required from prisoners each week, probably comprising three hours on each of two week nights and eight hours at the weekend. This program has been devised to provide a more gradual transition from prison to the community with greater supervision than currently provided to those on parole.

PROBLEMS WITH WORK RELEASE PROGRAMS

The major problem with work release programs, mentioned by a number of delegates, concerned the community's attitude or reactions towards such programs. A delegate from Brunei Darussalam summarised the situation by saying that local conditions had to be considered before trying to implement a work release program, and those conditions included consideration of the view of unions.

Delegates from Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands drew attention to the negative community views towards corrections within their countries, and suggested these would need to be changed for work release programs to be accepted. A Malaysian delegate agreed with this proposition by saying public support was 'vital', and suggested that the public be informed about the realities of the effect of imprisonment on people, especially in the context of overcrowding.

An Australian delegate saw much merit in explaining to sentencers in particular the rationale and importance of work release programs. Then when the media highlighted the occasional failure of a prisoner on work release, hopefully sentencers would become allies against the predictable backlash. Fear of that backlash causes correctional administrators to restrict the use of work release programs to no-risk prisoners, according to that Australian delegate, notwithstanding the value of such programs to long term prisoners who have greater need for assistance to resettle in the community.

Not all communities in the Region are negatively disposed to prisons, or work release programs in particular. The Sri Lankan delegate reported that local community service groups in his country had been very supportive and indeed active in finding work release jobs for prisoners.

It was pointed out by the delegates from the Cook Islands and New Zealand that high levels of unemployment in the community make work release programs more difficult to implement. The New Zealand delegate commented further on the unemployment issue by indicating that there were now increasing numbers of prisoners who had never worked and who would certainly need some training in work skills before they could be considered for anything like a work release program.

A Solomon Island delegate indicated some concern about the supervision of prisoners on work release, but a Malaysian delegate indicated that in their work release scheme which started in 1981, supervision of both employer and worker

had been maintained. What were greater problems were the possibility of work releasees smuggling contraband into the prison on return from work, or engaging in prohibited behaviour while away from the prison. The former of these can be countered in most part by searching prisoners on return, the latter requires firm action. A Singapore delegate reported that all work releasees there were subject to a urine test, to detect drug use, on return to the prison. The Cook Islands delegate reported smelling the breath of prisoners returning from Saturday work, to check for alcohol use.

CONCLUSION

Overall delegates were positively disposed to the notion of work release programs. The New Zealand delegate probably put it most strongly when he said such programs were an 'essential part' of a prison's package of programs. A delegate from Singapore gave the conference positive feedback about work release when he indicated that employers seemed to favour work release prisoners because they were generally more hardworking and disciplined than other workers.

However, as the Sri Lankan delegate pointed out, it was difficult to expand work release programs, as there were only a fixed number of possible jobs available within any area. In addition, under some circumstances it could happen that there were not enough prisoners wishing to enter work release. An Indian delegate stated that there was such reluctance by many Indian prisoners, who believed that outside work would be simply too demanding.

The generally positive view of delegates might be strengthened if more research on the effectiveness of work release programs were undertaken, a matter raised by a Malaysian delegate. Such research would appear most useful and would enable the value of such programs to be presented to the community more cogently.

EFFECTIVE LINKS BETWEEN PRISON INDUSTRY AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR

PRESENT EXTENT OF LINKS WITH THE PRIVATE SECTOR

In the course of general discussion, it emerged that there were four main categories within the Region. These were:

- (i) Systems where there were major interactions, notably joint ventures;
- (ii) Systems where there were major interactions, short of joint ventures;
- (iii) Systems where there were relatively minor but tangible interactions; and
- (iv) Systems where there were virtually no interactions at all.

(i) Joint ventures

The primary example within the Region of joint venture arrangements was Singapore. A delegate described his system in detail to the Conference. He pointed out that the body responsible for running this aspect of prison industry, S.C.O.R.E., was an independent statutory authority, though the Director of Prisons was in fact also the executive head of S.C.O.R.E.

At the present time, 15 private sector companies operated 30 factories within Singapore prisons; some 2000 prisoners were employed in these factories. Using true cost-accounting methods, a surplus of some S\$2,500,000 annually had been achieved in each of the last five years. A normal production rate had enabled such profits to be achieved. Workers were paid two-thirds of the applicable rate for outsiders, and were insured for workers compensation and related purposes just like outside workers.

S.C.O.R.E. was also responsible for managing traditional prison industries, such as laundering, bread-baking and printing; the main customers were the prison system itself and other parts of the public sector such as hospitals and the Army.

Altogether, some 85 per cent of employable prisoners were thus engaged in productive work. In his view, this was an integral part of the rehabilitation program of the Singapore prison system.

Malaysia was also involved in joint ventures. At present, there were 27 firms working in conjunction with prisons utilising prison labour. For the most part, these related to traditional labour-intensive craft industries. The arrangements were reasonably successful.

(ii) Major interactions short of joint ventures

Delegates from Hong Kong, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Thailand and the Solomon Islands all described existing or planned major interactions with the private sector.

Some—for example, Korea and Hong Kong—involved manufacturing products on contract for the private sector pursuant to orders or other contractual arrangements, such as that of preferred sub-contractor for contracts placed with the private sector by other parts of the public sector.

Others (for example, Japan through the structure of C.A.P.I.C.) involved value-added work in relation to raw materials supplied by the private sector. In the case of Indonesia, the variety of arrangements included a pilot project with regard to such matters as a dried-flower business and a rattan-factory which could evolve in the future into joint venture arrangements. The range and variety of local arrangements in all these countries was extensive, indicating the need to respond creatively to local penal, economic and industrial conditions.

In the case of Thailand, the main basis of private sector interaction was through a major direct sales effort to consumers. In 1986, the equivalent of M\$37,000,000 had been raised in this way, principally with regard to craft industry products. All countries in this category relied to a substantial extent on direct selling, in contrast to Singapore which was sensitive to the need not to cut across the efforts of private sector business.

The position of the Solomon Islands, by contrast, was that competition should be offered to the private sector. The private sector economy was in some respects not a truly competitive one, as shown by excessive charges for such matters as outboard-motor repairs and the manufacture of fishing nets. In that country, it was considered that overall benefit to the economy would be achieved by direct competition through cheap prison labour.

(iii) Minor but tangible interactions

Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea and the Cook Islands fell into this category. In Australia and New Zealand, low skill levels of inmates plus trade union complications had held back the ability of prison industries to produce goods of a quality and type acceptable to consumers or the private sector; however, some direct sales did occur. The main effort, however, went in to meeting the requirements of the public sector. In Papua New Guinea, agriculture and small-scale enterprises were the focus of prison industries; available equipment for potentially more lucrative markets was out-of-date, and capital funds were not available to re-equip. The delegate from the Cook Islands reported that, as the prison system was so small, there were no direct private sector links; however, there was a viable ukelele-manufacturing craft industry which led to direct sales to the consumer and thus brought some finance into the prison system and to the prisoners themselves.

(iv) No private sector interactions

Delegates from Brunei Darussalam, India, Sri Lanka and Tonga reported that, to all intents and purposes, there were no links at all in their countries. In Sri Lanka, the time was ripe for change as the nation moved away from public ownership of enterprises as a central political tenet; in India, there was still a concern, perhaps partially misplaced, that such interactions could be thought to be exploiting the prisoner; in

Brunei Darussalam the principal objective was still to attain an acceptable level of self-sufficiency by use of prison labour; and in Tonga this also was seen as a primary aim in addition to that of occupying prisoners and improving their work skills.

PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH PRIVATE SECTOR LINKS AND PRISON INDUSTRIES GENERALLY

Several themes were identified which cut across the particular existing arrangements but which affected their growth and development. These included:

- (i) the question of capital investment and the disposition of profits;
- (ii) the question of prisoner work skills;
- (iii) the need for community support for prison industrial and sales activities;
- (iv) the need to service prisons themselves; and
- (v) the need to ensure that prison work continued to meet the penological objectives of rehabilitation and re-integration of prisoners.

(i) Capital investment and profits

Several delegates pointed out that arrangements existing in their countries whereby profits were ploughed back into the general public revenue produced a substantial disincentive and source of frustration. In a competitive world, funds must be made available for capital investment. Delegates welcomed the arrangement in Malaysia, whereby a trust fund had been set up to enable profits to be used for staff and prisoner welfare, and in Singapore, whereby profits could be used for prisoner rehabilitation programs. It was agreed that, whether capital funds came from profits or from the public revenue, no sustained progress could be made in this area without proper investment.

(ii) Prisoner work skills

Reference has already been made to some of the deficiencies and some of the constructive responses to this problem in Agenda Item 2. A related point, made by a delegate from Malaysia, was that the security needs of prisons—such as regular musters, movement of people and vehicles into and out of prisons, and the fact that internal prison transfer or disciplinary arrangements may lead to changes of personnel on the production line—may exacerbate this problem.

(iii) Community support

Whilst trade union hostility was a problem in some countries, it was generally considered that this was not insuperable. Indeed, in some countries it simply was not a problem. The more compelling need was positively to enlist community and business support. For example, a delegate from Papua New Guinea emphasised the desirability of close and continuing contact with Chambers of Commerce, a point widely recognised and endorsed by delegates. Generally, the points made in relation to Agenda Item 1 as to the need to get the community to understand the dilemmas and aims of the prison system were re-emphasised.

(iv) Servicing prisons

All delegates mentioned the primary need to utilise prisoner labour so as to ensure that the immediate and short-term needs of prisons themselves were met. Only when this objective had been obtained—which was still not the case in several countries of the Region—could there be spare capacity for work with or cutting across the private sector.

(v) Rehabilitation and re-integration

Whatever form prison industry took, it must never be forgotten that its primary objective was to contribute to the overarching penological objective of correcting, rehabilitating and facilitating the re-integration of prisoners. All delegates agreed upon this. These aims were not necessarily inconsistent with that of developing prison industrial links with the private sector; on the contrary, they were capable of being complementary to each other. Nevertheless, they should constantly be kept in mind.

CONCLUSION

Development of prison industries, and the growth of links with the private sector, were in the course of rapid evolution in countries of the Region. The models so far adopted reflected local conditions, opportunities and constraints. The matter was of such importance that it should be kept under regular review.

IMPACT ON PRISON MANAGEMENT OF EXTERNAL MONITORING

There were considerable differences with respect to the extent of external monitoring of correctional administrators throughout the region. On the one hand, delegates from Brunei Darussalam, Japan and the Republic of Korea indicated that no special external monitoring bodies had been established in their countries. On the other hand, countries with a British heritage, as well as Indonesia and Thailand, indicated various degrees of accountability evidenced through external oversight.

That accountability ranged from slight to fairly rigorous. In the Solomon Islands that oversight was described by its delegate as having little impact on actual prison management. At the other extreme an Australian delegate instanced a long list of agencies and bodies that all made certain demands of correctional administrators.

The introduction of such agencies would appear to have come from a concern that prisons should not be seen as 'mysterious' (as the Indian delegate put it) by the public at large. The best way to de-mystify prisons is debatable; however, it is, as the New Zealand delegate emphasised, a 'very complex' matter. In the event, the following seven types of oversight were identified during the discussion.

- (i) Parliamentary based;
- (ii) Government bodies;
- (iii) Special investigatory bodies, particularly the Ombudsman;
- (iv) Judicial officers;
- (v) Prison visitors;
- (vi) Outside bodies; and
- (vii) The media.

(i) Parliamentary based

The most frequent form of parliamentary oversight occurs through the statutory requirement to produce an annual report to the parliament. As the Sri Lankan delegate pointed out, that allows members of parliament to discuss the actual situation in the prison system.

Other forms of parliamentary oversight that were mentioned in the discussion included Cabinet (and its committees), Caucus Committees, Ministerial Committees

or Task Forces, and Royal Commissions or Inquiries. A Hong Kong delegate introduced the conference to OMELCO (the Office of Members of Executive and Legislative Councils) a body whose members have the right to any government documents, the right of access to senior government officers and the right to challenge a department's action.

While not specifically intended to monitor prisons, OMELCO is a very high-powered redress body which has investigated 88 complaints within the Hong Kong prison system during the period 1980-85.

(ii) Government bodies

Delegates identified a number of other Government bodies that effectively exercise some oversight over correctional administrators. Chief among these was the Treasury and/or the Auditor General, who, with the advent of program budgeting, examine whether stated objectives are actually being achieved. A Malaysian delegate indicated that a close relationship with the Treasury was an excellent idea as it made sure that body fully understood the reality of contemporary corrections.

Other agencies include the Health Department (which could monitor health services and hygiene), the Public Service Board (or similar body for checking staff numbers and practices), the Human Rights Commission (or similar that could investigate complaints about the breach of human rights), Equal Opportunity Commissions (or similar that could investigate alleged instances of discrimination), and Occupational Health and Safety bodies (that could investigate alleged hazardous or unreasonable working conditions).

The delegate from India pointed out that in his country prison systems were dependent upon other government departments for some services. However, when those departments failed to provide those necessary services, it was the prison administrators who were invariably criticised. That unfairness was compounded by the fact that there could be so many government agencies which could impact upon the Indian prison systems that their exact number might not even be known.

(iii) Special investigatory bodies, including the Ombudsman

A number of delegates reported the existence of an Ombudsman or similar within their countries. That government officer generally has immediate access to any prison, and prisoners have the ability to write direct to him or her outlining complaints about administration. An Australian delegate, while reporting that correctional matters provided most complaints to the Ombudsman, did indicate that only one matter out of approximately 400 reported to the Ombudsman had been found to be sustained.

(iv) Judicial Officers

Many delegates indicated that visiting justices or magistrates, who attended the prison to hear charges against prisoners, were still playing a second role of inspecting the prison. Typical of that situation was that described by a Singaporean delegate where judicial officers are empowered to visit prison on their own initiative and make reports of such visits, to be forwarded to the Minister.

The Sri Lankan delegate indicated how in his country all judges were empowered to visit any prison at any time, inspect it and speak to any prisoners. That obviously

allowed for quite open judicial access and oversight. A Malaysian delegate indicated that massive savings of resources had been achieved through dealing with cases 'for mention' inside the prison rather than taking prisoners to an outside court for this formality. The introduction of these 'prison courts' therefore allowed some degree of judicial observation.

An Indian delegate described the experience in his country whereby the interest of the judiciary in prison practices had actually led to a situation which had quite seriously affected correctional administration. What had occurred was that judges had subjected many existing prison procedures to rigorous legal examination and concluded for instance that a prison governor could not, in punishment cases, proceed in a summary fashion to impose punishment in many cases without prior approval of a court. That sort of monitoring is plainly quite counterproductive to running a prison.

(v) **Prison visitors**

A number of delegates indicated that they had introduced prison visitors to provide external oversight of their prisons. Generally speaking, those official visitors are upstanding citizens appointed by, and responsible to, the Minister. Delegates from Australia and India pointed out that it was made quite clear to appointees that their role did not involve 'interfering' with the day to day running of the prison, and they generally had, for instance, to give reasonable notice of their intention to visit a certain prison.

(vi) **Outside bodies**

A number of existing organisations in the community were mentioned during discussion as providing further opportunities for 'outsiders' to monitor activities within the correctional area.

Official bodies such as a Parole Board or the Malaysian Institution Discharge Board involved persons who are able to observe at least some of the workings of the corrections system. Prisoners' Aid bodies, Civil Rehabilitation Committees and related bodies were similarly placed. An Australian delegate suggested that persons involved in such groups helped correctional administrators retain their perspective by reacting to developments.

The New Zealand delegate identified victims' rights groups as being likely to have more impact upon correctional administrators in the future, and reminded the Conference that prison officers' unions also had considerable impact upon practice. The Indonesian delegate reported that, pursuant to an agreement between the Government of the Republic of Indonesia and the International Commission on Red Cross in Geneva, prisons in his country were visited every three months by the International Red Cross, whose main concern was health but who obviously also filled a monitoring role.

Delegates from Australia and New Zealand identified politically active groups as a not inconsiderable monitoring agency. In Australia, prisoners' action groups were active but their disruptive activities distracted from any positive impact they might be able to make.

While not strictly a group, members of the public at large can play monitoring roles. A delegate from Thailand emphasised this point indicating how those who can be encouraged to work as volunteers in the correctional area do also monitor activities. A Malaysian delegate indicated that voluntary organisations that provide

counsellors for inmates were welcome, and delegates from Tonga and Singapore reminded the conference that chaplains or other religious functionaries were also aware of correctional activities. Embassy staff checking the welfare of their imprisoned nationals played a not dissimilar role, as pointed out by a delegate from Singapore.

(vii) **The media**

While a delegate from Brunei Darussalam indicated that they had generally received a 'good press', other delegates who commented on the role of the media as a monitor of correctional practice were quite negative towards existing media conduct. A Papua New Guinea delegate said that he thought the media was 'hungry for negative stories' and the New Zealand delegate suggested some media people could be described as 'blatantly dishonest'.

Delegates from Hong Kong and Australia suggested that correctional administrators should deliberately provide more assistance to the media in order to ensure accurate reporting; full briefings at times of major incidents were important. The New Zealand delegate however indicated that his attempts to run educational seminars for the media to improve their coverage of correctional matters had been poorly attended.

The delegate from the Cook Islands also recounted a bad overseas press story which inaccurately portrayed his prison. However, on reflection he realised that the media article criticised the harshness of the Cook Island prison, whereas local criticism was that it was too soft. That anecdote emphasised the fact that the impact on the community of any media report can never be taken for granted. And that in turn emphasises the importance of correctional administrators making sure that the media are always accurately informed of the facts relating to any situation.

One practical disadvantage of being the subject of outside monitoring bodies of one sort or another is the necessity for correctional departments to provide response to various allegations. The preparation of such reports can, as an Australian delegate pointed out, be a real strain on resources. Indeed, unless extra staff and resources are provided, then existing programs may have to be wound down; indeed, as an Indian delegate pointed out, security might be diluted by the necessity to allocate staff to non-productive activities of this kind.

Yet there are definite advantages to be gained from external monitoring. The New Zealand delegate indicated how so many complaints were being raised with the Ombudsman that it forced his Department to examine its own methods of dealing with prisoner grievances. After boosting the number of prison inspectors within the Department, it was found that complaints against the Department were reduced by over ninety per cent.

Further than that, if an outside monitoring body identifies known areas of deficient operations, that fact can be used to press for further funds to redress the deficiency. Indeed, outside monitoring should not lead to identification of problems unknown to correctional administrators, and the monitoring process would be used by administrators to achieve change. For ultimately, as an Indian delegate put it, improvement is best from within rather than without.

Agenda Item 5

REGIONAL CO-OPERATION FOR THE TRAINING OF PRISON OFFICERS

EXISTING ARRANGEMENTS

In the course of general discussion, it emerged that there is already a substantial amount of regional co-operation and mutual assistance in the training of prison officers. This includes:

- (i) Sri Lanka sending some middle-ranking officers to Hong Kong;
- (ii) Brunei Darussalam sending base-grade officers to Malaysia and also to Hong Kong, Singapore and Thailand from time to time;
- (iii) Korea sending senior officers to the Fuchu Training Centre in Japan; and
- (iv) The Cook Islands sending base-grade officers to New Zealand.

In addition, the Conference noted with appreciation that, throughout its 25 years history, UNAFEI had offered advanced training courses to appropriate correctional officers throughout the whole of the Region.

However, despite the volume of activity, it was clear that efforts were somewhat fragmented and unplanned. Moreover, a delegate from Singapore pointed out that the facilities available within the Region were not always utilised. For example, eight scholarships a year were available for training and study by officers from the Region in the Singapore system, yet in 1986 only one of these had been taken up, by Thailand. Nevertheless, it was widely commented that insufficient attention by way of regional co-operation had been given to the need for training middle-ranking officers.

TRAINING NEEDS

Four needs were identified in the course of discussion. These were:

- (i) greater resources for training of base-grade officers;
- (ii) improved training opportunities for middle-ranking officers;
- (iii) exchange of information and creation of training courses with regard to specialist matters of mutual concern, such as how to deal with hostage-taking; and
- (iv) continued and expanded opportunities for training of senior officers and management personnel.

(i) **Base-grade officer training**

A delegate from India emphasised how crucial this was at a time of changing values and a certain amount of role confusion within the prison system. Delegates from Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands described the enormous strain upon their own systems brought about by inadequate training of base-grade staff. The delegate from the Solomon Islands considered that a regionally-supported emergency response, by way of crash courses, was warranted. On the other hand, the delegate from Tonga, whilst agreeing that resources and opportunities were inadequate to needs in his country, considered that a positive response lay in training a middle-ranking officer overseas (in Australia) and then bringing him back to develop local training courses within Tonga. However, Prisons had to compete with other Departments for such training scholarships and so far seemed to have had a rather low priority.

It was pointed out by a delegate from Hong Kong that language could be a problem if base-grade officers were sent to overseas countries for training; for example, the bulk of such courses in his country were conducted in Cantonese. Generally, it was considered that such training should ideally be conducted in the country where the service would occur, so that local needs and conditions could adequately be taken into account. Nevertheless, real value could be gained from training in other countries, as exemplified by the experience of Brunei Darussalam and New Zealand.

(ii) **Middle-ranking officer training**

As previously mentioned, it was in this area that the training hiatus was most marked. Such officers were the leaders of the future; yet training opportunities were greater *after* they had attained senior levels, rather than to equip them for such positions. There was wide agreement that this problem merited particular further attention on a continuing basis.

(iii) **Specialist training**

The delegate from Indonesia referred to the success with which Malaysia had recently handled two hostage-taking incidents. This seemed to indicate the sort of specialist area where countries in the Region could benefit from the experience, by way of information exchange and training courses, of other countries.

The Chairman referred to the Malaysian experience. He believed two clear lessons emerged; first, the need to keep cool, and second the absolute necessity for a clear line of demarcation between the role of prisons administrators and that of the police. Such situations must be directed and controlled by prison authorities.

The Executive Director commented that recent Australian experience in the State of Victoria completely supported these lessons. In his view, administrators generally had more to learn from other corrections administrators in the Region than from police authorities in their own countries. This was a prime example of an area where regional co-operation in training would immediately be beneficial. In this regard, a delegate from Hong Kong referred to the availability of a developed hostage-negotiation training course in his country.

(iv) **Training of senior personnel**

This area was the best catered for. The role of UNAFEI was strongly established and appreciated. Other 'one-off' opportunities, such as under the U.N. Development

Program, also were being utilised. Numerically, such programs imposed less of a manpower and financial strain upon organisations, and were thus more manageable.

SUGGESTED RESPONSES

The delegate from New Zealand stated that a primary need was for a comprehensive inventory of training opportunities and programs within the Region, so that available opportunities and resources could be fully utilised. This view was widely accepted. The Director of UNAFEI stated that his Institute would be happy to act as a clearing-house to establish such an inventory or directory, which could then be distributed to all countries within the Region. This naturally tied in with the UNAFEI Regional Survey of key indicators in criminal justice administration.

The Director of UNAFEI went on to state that the need for training of middle-level officers was now fully recognised, and that he was re-examining UNAFEI priorities in the light of this. In any event, he emphasised the commitment of UNAFEI to continuing to give particular support to the correctional component of the criminal justice system.

Speaking on behalf of Australian correctional administrators generally, a delegate from Australia stated that places could be made available to personnel throughout the Region at training courses, of all levels, run at the various State Staff Training Colleges in that country. Such a scheme could be co-ordinated through the administrative support of the Australian Institute of Criminology. It was necessary to identify clearly the needs of the exporting countries so as to ensure that particular courses were relevant in any given case to such needs.

Finally, discussion occurred as to the need for the establishment of an additional regional training institute to meet the problems identified in discussion. There was no clear agreement upon this matter, but delegates considered it would be appropriate to examine this proposal more fully.

ROLE AND ACTIVITIES OF UNAFEI

In light of the Silver Anniversary of the United Nations Asia and Far East Institute for the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders (UNAFEI), the Chairman invited Dr Hideo Utsuro, the Director of that Institute, to formally address the Conference.

Dr Utsuro circulated to all delegates a formal paper, entitled, 'A Quarter Century Contribution of UNAFEI to the Development of Correctional Administration in Asia and the Pacific Region'. That paper outlined features of some of UNAFEI's seventy-five training courses which had educated some 1,718 criminal justice personnel over the preceding twenty-five years. In particular, Dr Utsuro pointed out that forty-six (or sixty per cent) of all those training courses dealt with correctional administration or related matters. The Director's paper then included the following:

Most recently, a total of twenty-four participants representing twelve countries were joined together in the 75th International Training Course in 1987, in order to study the theme, 'Non-Institutional Treatment of Offenders: Its Role and Improvement for More Effective Programmes'. After a searching examination from various viewpoints, the participants eventually made the 'Draft of the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-Institutional Treatment of Offenders'. This is, as far as we know, the very first attempt to search for a body of standards and principles of non-institutional measures of corrections, which should be universally approved and accepted.

The present draft is a body of guiding principles, mainly focused upon; namely,

- (a) available forms of non-institutional treatment measures,
- (b) role of non-institutional treatment measures,
- (c) measures to implement non-institutional treatment programs in a more effective way, and
- (d) practical use of volunteers in non-institutional treatment measures.

Although it is no more than an early draft as of now, it will be modified and further refined on the basis of the suggestions and constructive criticism made by experts and practitioners in the region. Also, it will be thoroughly and intensively examined in the forthcoming 78th International Seminar in February to March 1988, where, it is expected, top-ranking administrators and policy-makers of corrections in Asia and the Pacific region will join together. In this connection, I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to call for the whole-hearted co-operation extended by the members of the Asian and Pacific Conference of Correctional Administrators.

The examples mentioned above are some of the major activities of UNAFEI to contribute to the improvement of correctional administration in Asia and the Pacific region. It is thus apparent, I believe, that UNAFEI has contributed a great deal to the development of correctional policies in the region.

Next I will very briefly touch upon some of the future perspectives of UNAFEI's activity. Since its foundation, UNAFEI has been dealing with the issues concerning correctional administration as one of the major items in its training courses, seminars, research activities and information services. Issues concerning correctional administration are given the first priority in the UNAFEI activities. This policy is definitely shown by the fact that, since 1970, the three-month international training course in the spring-to-summer period has been regularly organised to study the treatment of offenders and its related issues. This policy shall not be changed in the future. This is the first point to be mentioned with regard to the UNAFEI's policy in the future.

Second, it shall not be changed that UNAFEI will carry out the three-month international training course for the middle-ranking managers together with the one-month international seminar for the top-ranking policy-makers, who have difficulties to one degree or another in leaving their important positions for long periods, in its training program annually.

Third, we are in a position of recognising that we should organise the 'general' training course to cover the overall aspect of correctional administration and the related issues on one side and the 'special' training course and seminar to deal with more specific and urgent issues in depth on the other. In this regard, I would like to solicit the comments and suggestions of the distinguished delegates attending the Eighth Asian and Pacific Conference of Correctional Administrators, which coincides with the UNAFEI's 25th Anniversary.

Fourth, UNAFEI will continue to conduct the overseas joint seminar once every year together with the governments in Asia and the Pacific region.

Now, some of the most immediate future activities of UNAFEI will be briefly touched upon. With regard to the international seminar, for instance, the forthcoming 78th International Seminar, which is scheduled to be held from 8 February to 12 March 1988, will have its main theme entitled 'Footprints, Contemporary Achievements and Future Perspectives in Policies for Correction and Rehabilitation of Offenders'.

In all countries, not only in Asia and the Pacific region, but also in all other regions of the world, great efforts have been made in the development of policies and measures which both provide an efficient response to offending and also humanely address the rehabilitation of offenders. Observing the path of these developments in various countries, it is evident that long strides and great achievements have been attained in the past decades. At the same time, however, developments at present move at rather a dull pace, and perhaps have even lost their way in the mist, in terms of the general trend over countries. It is thus crucially necessary to renew our efforts to retrace our earlier footprints and examine the results achieved to date. On the basis of the above-mentioned understanding, the 78th International Seminar will be conducted in order to firmly establish the future directions of policies as well as to clearly identify the measures to facilitate further developments in the field of corrections and rehabilitation of offenders.

With regard to the overseas joint seminar, we plan to conduct the Sri Lanka-UNAFEI Joint Seminar on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders in Colombo, Sri Lanka, in December 1987.

With regard to its research activities, UNAFEI will seek for the feasibility of a co-operative research project on correctional administration in Asia and the Pacific region. More specifically, in 1988, UNAFEI plans to conduct 'A survey on the actual situation and recommendable measures for improvement in the treatment of offenders' jointly with several countries in the region. The purpose of the survey will be to describe the existing modalities of corrections as well as to identify the most intricate and intractable problems

in the field of contemporary corrections in the region and seek for the solution that shall be implemented immediately by the correctional administrators in the region.

With regard to its information services, UNAFEI will further strengthen its capacity as a regional centre of information collection and dissemination in the field of criminal justice. For example, UNAFEI is now conducting a regional survey concerning some of the key indicators and basic facts in criminal justice administration. Information obtained by the survey will be fed back to countries in the region.

The above-mentioned are some of the projects which UNAFEI is now going to carry out. Through these activities, UNAFEI will be continuously contributing to the further development of correctional administration in Asia and the Pacific region. In conclusion, I shall express my commitment that UNAFEI will make every possible effort to serve and fulfill its mandate as the United Nation's sole regional institute for the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders in Asia and the Pacific region.

Also, I shall express my deepest gratitude to Dato Ibrahim bin Haji Mohamed for his thoughtful arrangement in providing me with this opportunity, while soliciting the imaginative views and opinions of the distinguished delegates with regard to the future directions and activities of UNAFEI. I would eagerly like to bring your invaluable suggestions and comments back to the 76th International Seminar which is now being held at UNAFEI. Your views and opinions will certainly be utilised fruitfully in the Seminar, in which we are evaluating the UNAFEI Work Programs up to date as well as searching for the future development of UNAFEI activities.

Discussion

Following Dr Utsuro's presentation and invitation to comment upon UNAFEI's activities, some delegates made general observations raising the following issues:

- (i) the restriction of the numbers of participants in training courses coming from the Asia and Pacific region
- (ii) the possibility of reducing the duration of training courses from three months, to allow more personnel to be trained
- (iii) the introduction of more courses aimed at training middle management correctional personnel.

Dr Utsuro thanked the Conference for raising these matters and indicated that he would take them back to UNAFEI for further consideration.

Resolution

The Conference then unanimously adopted the following resolution on the occasion of the Silver Anniversary of UNAFEI:

The Eighth Asian and Pacific Conference of Correctional Administrators, on the 16th September 1987, at Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia,

1. Extends the most respectful congratulations to UNAFEI and its staff for its Silver Anniversary;
2. Concludes with appreciation that UNAFEI has been contributing a great deal to the improvement of correctional administration in the region for the last 25 years;
3. Recommends that UNAFEI shall further search for the expansion in scale and the improvement in quality of its training, research and information services in order to meet the ever-increasing needs in the region;

4. Recommends also that UNAFEI shall, in its training and research activities, deal with the momentous and serious issues in the field of correctional administration; *inter alia*,
 - (a) training of correctional personnel, not only at senior levels but also of middle-ranking officers;
 - (b) collection, collation and dissemination of key indicators in criminal justice administration relating to countries in the Region;
 - (c) the identification, through research and conference activities, of new issues and trends in criminal justice administration and crime control; and
 - (d) generally, the raising of public and political consciousness throughout the Region as to the problems and dilemmas of crime control.

GENERAL BUSINESS

At the final business session of the Conference, Mr Kerepia (Papua New Guinea) raised two matters for discussion.

The first related to the lack of training facilities for prison staff within the Region, notwithstanding the work of UNAFEI. During a lengthy discussion, it was suggested that a number of agencies should be asked to assist establish a Training Institute within the Region. These agencies included the United Nations, the Commonwealth Secretariat, ASEAN, the Australian Development Assistance Bureau, and the Australian Institute of Criminology.

It was generally agreed that such a Training Institute would have a different function from UNAFEI and would take some time to come into existence. Mr Hill (Australia) indicated that in the immediate future, he was sure that all Australian correctional administrators would be ready to welcome officers from other countries to participate in existing correctional officer training courses in Australia.

That generous offer was agreed to provide some immediate assistance, but a Papua New Guinea delegate moved the following motion, which was seconded by the delegate from Kiribati, and subsequently passed by the Conference.

It was therefore resolved that:

in light of the discussions, the Conference ask the Executive Director to explore with all relevant agencies the possibility of setting up an appropriate Training Institute for correctional officers within the Region.

The second issue raised by Mr Kerepia (Papua New Guinea) was the possibility of South Pacific delegates having their own regular meetings, as did their Police Commissioners. The Chairman summarised the feeling of delegates when he said that that was an initiative that South Pacific administrators could take up themselves, APCCA being happy to hear of any progress they might make.

The Executive Director then drew delegates' attention to another matter — the notion of Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners in the Region. He reminded delegates that, at the request of the 7th Conference, he had distributed an analysis of comments expressed on this topic that had been expressed at that Conference.

The analysis indicated no strong support for Regional Standard Minimum Rules and, accordingly, he recommended that no further attempt be made at this time to

create such a set of Rules. The Chairman and some other delegates expressed their agreement with that proposition, and the Conference then endorsed it.

Inspections

During the Conference delegates inspected the following facilities of the Malaysian Prison Department:

- (i) Malaysian Prison Headquarters and Kajang Prison Complex
- (ii) Tempat Tahanan Perlindungan Kemunting (The Kemunting Rehabilitation Centre)
- (iii) Penang Prison
- (iv) Pusat Pemulihan Akhlak, Pulau Jerejak (The Correctional Centre on Jerejak Island)
- (v) Pusat Pemulihan Akhlak, Batu Gajah (The Correctional Centre at Batu Gajah)

At all of these establishments, delegates were greeted with great warmth and treated to cultural displays and generous hospitality. All delegates benefited greatly from the opportunity of seeing Malaysian prisons and discussing correctional matters with staff.

Hospitality

During the course of the Conference, delegates received the following most generous hospitality:

- (i) A formal dinner hosted by the Honourable Dato Megat Junid bin Megat Ayub.
- (ii) Formal dinners hosted by Senior Malaysian Prison Officers in both Kuala Lumpur and Penang.
- (iii) A formal dinner hosted by The Honourable Dato Ibrahim bin Haji Mohamed.
- (iv) A formal luncheon hosted by Director Hideo Utsuro of UNAFEL.
- (v) A prison trade and industry exhibition, and cultural show at Stadium Negara, Kuala Lumpur.

Next Conference

Mr David Grant (Australia), on behalf of all correctional administrators in Australia, invited delegates to attend the Ninth Asian and Pacific Conference of Correctional Administrators to be held in Sydney in September 1988.

Some discussion of the possible location for the 1989 Conference concluded with an Indian delegate agreeing to consider the feasibility of hosting the Conference in his country.

Agenda Items 1988

The Conference considered delegates' suggestions for agenda items in 1988. One suggested topic, 'Home Detention and Electronic Monitoring', was finally decided to be best dealt with through a formal presentation by the 1988 host nation, Australia. The Australian delegation agreed to prepare such a presentation.

It was then decided that four further agenda topics would be discussed at the 1988 Conference. As the number of suggested topics exceeded four, delegates voted for those agenda topics they wished to discuss. This led to identification of the following four topics:

1. Trends and Patterns of Penal Populations: Size, Composition, Types and Characteristics.
2. Inter-Agency Co-operation Within the Criminal Justice System, namely between corrections and other agencies.
3. Safeguarding Human Rights Within the Penal System.
4. The Media: Its Power and Influence Upon Corrections Systems.

Vote of Thanks

Major General Hudiori (Indonesia) moved an eloquent vote of thanks to the Conference Chairman, The Honourable Dato Ibrahim bin Haji Mohamed, for his firm, considerate and good natured leadership during the Conference. He also complimented and thanked all the Conference officials for their excellent work, and thanked all those staff (and their families) who had made inspections of facilities such interesting and delightful occasions.

Delegates unanimously endorsed these votes of thanks without hesitation and with considerable enthusiasm.

CLOSING ADDRESS

THE HONOURABLE TAN SRI DATUK AZIZAN BIN ZAINAL ABIDIN
SECRETARY-GENERAL
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS
MALAYSIA

The Honourable Dato Ibrahim, Professor Harding, Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen

I feel greatly honoured to have been invited to officiate at the closing of this Eighth Asian and Pacific Conference of Correctional Administrators.

I would like first of all to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished delegates for taking time from their busy schedules to attend this conference and for their invaluable contribution to the success of this Conference.

We at the Home Ministry have been following your deliberations with great interest. I have no doubt that there are many ideas and proposals made at this Conference which would assist us in solving some of the problems we have been grappling with here in Malaysia.

From the topics which you have chosen for discussion at this Conference and from the reports I have been receiving on your deliberations, I notice that most countries represented here share several problems in common. As such, your views and recommendations are most timely and relevant and we are looking forward to receiving the detailed report of this meeting.

Basically, the problems faced by the Malaysian Prison Department and the Home Ministry, which is responsible for the policy of the Department, emanate from two separate but inter-related sets of environments which call for urgent and appropriate responses from both the Department and the Ministry.

These are firstly the financial constraints within which we have to function and the other the changes in society which necessitate adjustment and modification of our operations. These factors do not apply to only the Prison Department and Home Ministry but impinge on every agency of Government.

One of the realities of life which we all have to put up with is the fact that every Government faces numerous demands on it for funds and that the demands from its various agencies have been on the increase year after year. Unfortunately, Governments simply do not have enough money to meet fully the escalating demands. No agency can hope under the circumstances to get as much funding as it would like. The Prison Department is no exception. Faced with this constraint the Department and the Ministry have to make the most of the funds made available to them. We have therefore to be always looking for better and cheaper ways of doing what needs to be done.

There are several areas of operation which if suitably modified and adapted could yield considerable savings in cost. The Malaysian Prison Department for example, has in the past several years, achieved significant savings by utilising prisoners in the construction of buildings required by the Department and the Ministry. This has benefited us in two ways. It has enabled us to keep down the cost of construction of some of our buildings while at the same time it serves as an important instrument for rehabilitation. Considering the benefits derived we intend to refine and expand the scheme to deal with the building requirements of the Prisons Department. We will, however, not operate the scheme outside the Department in order not to compete with the private sector.

We are now looking into other areas where we can set about cutting costs without sacrificing standards. As you are aware, the cost of any operation is determined by numerous factors. The materials used in the construction of our buildings do exert considerable bearing on the total cost of the buildings. They also affect the cost of operation, maintenance, lighting and ventilation. Layout and the structure of the buildings have an impact on the requirement for surveillance. Modernisation of equipment could result in lower costs. These are but a few examples of areas which could be studied both together in general and by each country to meet its specific needs. Conferences such as this serve as vehicles for consultation among practitioners in the countries of the region. Besides having consultations among ourselves, we should also open the door to others with the necessary expertise and draw them into working together with us for the benefit of the correctional system — the prison service, and the country.

Ladies and Gentlemen, the other challenge facing the Prison Department in this country has its origin in the changes that are taking place in society. Those of you who have been to this country before, say, some ten years ago will not fail to notice the physical changes which this country has undergone, particularly the development in urban centres. These changes are not confined to buildings, amenities and infrastructure but are also evident in the behaviour and attitude of the people. What you saw on the 16th at Stadium Negara was an example of these changes. The result of all these changes is that today Dato Ibrahim is handling in his guest houses quite a different kind of crowd from those of twenty years ago.

The mix of the inmates in terms of educational and socio-economic background are quite different today. If the prison were to fulfil its objective as a correctional institution it has to adjust its approach to cater for these changing conditions. To discharge its functions properly the prison department will have to use expertise in diverse disciplines. I believe this has long been recognised and in many countries there has been continual adjustment to accommodate this requirement for specialised knowledge. We ourselves have embarked on a similar exercise. There are several approaches and modalities. I am certain that the experience of countries in the region could be utilised to assist one another in evolving the right modality and refining their approach.

Finally Ladies and Gentlemen I would like once again to thank you for your attendance, support and contribution.

During the course of this Conference, thanks to Dato Ibrahim, you have come to know a little more of Malaysia and the Malaysian. I hope this contact has evoked in you a better understanding of this country and a liking for it and its people.

May I wish the overseas delegates a pleasant and safe journey home.

Thank you.

LIST OF DELEGATES

AUSTRALIA

Mr Dennis Challenger, Assistant Director,
Australian Institute of Criminology

Mr David Grant, Deputy Chairman, New
South Wales Corrective Services Commis-
sion

Professor Richard W. Harding, Law School,
University of Western Australia

Mr Ian C. Hill, Executive Director, Western
Australian Department of Corrective Ser-
vices

BRUNEI DARUSSALAM

Mr Christopher Chin Nyuk Foon, Assistant
Director (Prisons), Prisons Department

Mr Mohamad b. Haji Awang Damit, Chief
Officer, Prisons Department

COOK ISLANDS

Mr Joseph Herman, Permanent Head, De-
partment of Corrective Services

HONG KONG

Mr Fung Kwan Yuet, Superintendent of
Correctional Services, Correctional Services
Department

Mr Francis Wong Hon Chung, Assistant
Commissioner (Operational), Correctional
Services Department

INDIA

Mr Bikranjit Singh Sandhu, Inspector
General of Prisons, State Government of
Punjab

Mr A.K. Sharma, Director (Prisons & C.D),
Ministry of Home Affairs

INDONESIA

Major General Hudioro, Director-General
of Corrections, Department of Justice

JAPAN

Mr Yoshio Mizushima, Director of Industry
Division, Correction Bureau, Ministry of
Justice

Professor Fumio Saito, Faculty Member,
UNAFEI

Mr Hideo Utsuro, Director, UNAFEI

REPUBLIC OF KIRIBATI

Mr Iotua Tebukei, Assistant Commissioner,
Police

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Mr Kang, Dong-Woon, Assistant Super-
visor, Ministry of Justice

Mr Kim, Dong-Chul, Director-General, Cor-
rectional Bureau, Ministry of Justice

Mr Park, Sang-Jung, Director, The 2nd
Security Division, Ministry of Justice

MALAYSIA

The Honourable Dato Ibrahim bin Haji
Mohamed, Director-General, Prison De-
partment

Mr V.F. Rqzario, Deputy Director-General,
Prison Department

Mr Mohamed Nadzri bin Kushairy, Assistant Director-General, Prison Department
Mr Jamaluddin bin Haji Abdul Hamid, Assistant Director-General, Selangor Central Prison

Mr Nor Shahid bin Mohamed Nor, Director, Security Division, Prison Department

Mr Donald Wee May Kuen, Director, Malaysian Prison College

NEW ZEALAND

Mr Mel P. Smith, Deputy Secretary for Justice, Department of Justice

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Mr J. Priya Delgoda, Assistant Commissioner, Correctional Services

Mr Pious B. Kerepia, Commissioner, Correctional Service

Mr Richard C. Sikani, Executive Officer, Correctional Service

SINGAPORE

Mr Quek Shi Lei, Director of Prisons

Mr Tee Tua Ba, Deputy Commissioner of Police/ Director Special Duties (Prison)

SOLOMON ISLANDS

Mr William J. Guinan, Prison Adviser, Ministry of Police and Justice

Mr Solomon Manata, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Police and Justice

SRI LANKA

Mr H.G. Dharmadasa, Deputy Commissioner of Prisons

THAILAND

Mr Nathee Chitsawang, Chief, Research and Planning Sub-Division, Department of Correction

Mr Prasert Mekmanee, Director, Penology Division, Department of Correction

Mr Siri Srisawasdi, Deputy Director-General, Department of Correction

Mr Hisashi Hasegawa, Regional Advisor on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Social Development Division Economic and Social Commission for Asia and Pacific

TONGA

Mr Soane M.T. Tone, Superintendent of Prisons, Ministry of Police and Prisons

LIST OF OBSERVERS

MALAYSIA

Mr Abdul Aziz bin Haji Idris
Mr Abdul Jalil bin Che Din
Mr Abdullah bin Abu Bakar
Mr Ahmad bin Lihat
Mr Haji Abdul Rahman bin Haji
Mohamed Ali
Mr Chong Fook Choy
Ms Hamidah bte Haji Haron
Mr Hussain bin Beladar
Mr Ismail bin Johari
Mr Kamaruddin bin Muhamad
Mr Mohamed bin Abdul Rahman
Mr Mohamed Feroz bin Abdullah
Mr Mohamed Jaffar bin Yaacob
Mr Mohamed Noh bin Tan Sri Murad
Mr Mustafa bin Osman

Mr Nazlan bin Abdullah
Mr Haji Nik Ariffin bin Haji Nik Omar
Mr Othman bin Mustaffa
Mr Othman Andu
Mr Peter Rogers
Mr Raghbir Singh
YM. Raja Ghazali bin Raja Ngah Ali
Mr Razali bin Haji Mohamed
Mr Samsudin bin Tan Sri Murad
Mr Haji Shamsuddin bin Haji Jaafar
Mr Supian bin Amat
Mr V. Velayutham
Mr Wan Zulkiffeli bin Wan Hassan
Mr Yusof bin Mohamed Noor
Mr Zai Abdul Latif bin Ibrahim
Mr Zainal Abidin bin Haji Abdul Ghani
Mr Zainal Abidin bin Mohamed Noor

CONFERENCE OFFICIALS

Prisons Department

The Honourable Dato Ibrahim bin Haji
Mohamed

Mr V.F. Rozario

Haji Nik Ariffin bin Haji Nik Omar

Mr Mohamed Nadzri bin Kushairy

Haji Abdul Rahman bin Haji Mohamed
Ali

Mr Jamaluddin bin Haji Abdul Hamid

Mr Nor Shahid bin Mohamed Nor

Haji Shamsuddin bin Haji Jaafar

Mr Chong Fook Choy

Mr Donald Wee

Mr Samsudin bin Tan Sri Murad

Mr Abdul Jalil bin Che Din

Mr Peter Rogers

Mrs Hamidah binti Haji Haron

Mr Mustafa bin Osman

Mr Zai Latiff bin Ibrahim

Mr Abdul Latif bin Hussain

Mr Mohamed Noh bin Tan Sri Murad

Mr Raghbir Singh

Mr Abu Bakar bin Juah

Mr Thang Ah Yong

Ministry of Home Affairs

Mr Aseh bin haji Che Mat

International Conventions Secretariat

Prime Minister's Department

Mr David Ong Chan Hor

Mr R. Krishnasamy

Mr C.T. Chong

Miss Pauzan binti Abdul Majid

Mr Kamaruddin Othman

Mr S.V. Lingam

Mr Ong Han Hoe