

From: THE PRIVATE SECRETARY



HOME OFFICE  
QUEEN ANNE'S GATE  
LONDON SW1H 9AT

16 July 1984

010.  
Dear David,

n.b pm  
sub  
16/7

MANAGING THE LONG-TERM PRISON SYSTEM: THE REPORT OF THE CONTROL REVIEW COMMITTEE

Last September the Home Secretary asked a group of officials and prison governors - the Control Review Committee - to carry out an urgent review of our arrangements for monitoring control in the prison system. The Committee have now completed ... their work and I enclose for your information an advance copy of their report ... which is being published at 11 am tomorrow, Tuesday 17 July. I also enclose a copy of the statement that the Home Secretary will be making at that time broadly accepting the Committee's conclusions.

I am copying this letter and the enclosures to Janet Lewis-Jones (Lord President's Office), John Graham (Scottish Office), Graham Sandiford (NIO), David Peretz (Treasury) and Richard Hatfield (Cabinet Office).

Yours ever

H H TAYLOR

David Barclay, Esq



STATEMENT BY THE HOME SECRETARY ON THE PUBLICATION OF THE CONTROL  
REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

One of the most fundamental problems that any prison system has to solve is how to contain its most dangerous and difficult prisoners. For nearly 20 years the solution in this country has been to disperse these men among the population of a number of prisons protected by very secure perimeters. These prisons - the 'dispersal' prisons - have indeed an almost perfect record in preventing escapes. But their record of riots and disturbances - some nine major incidents since 1969 - shows that we have not yet got the system right.

I, therefore, asked the Prison Department in September last year to consider, as a matter of urgency, what might be done. This work has been carried out by a group of Prison Department administrators and experienced prison governors - the Control Review Committee - under the chairmanship of the Director of Operational Policy, and their report (Managing the long-term prison system) is being published today. This is an important document. And I broadly accept the Committee's conclusions. It is clear to me that the prison system should make a far more direct connection between the way a prisoner behaves and the privileges he enjoys. Disincentives to disruptive behaviour, and incentives to behaving well should be built into the way the system works.

How can this be done?

The Committee conclude, and I agree that:

First, instead of long-term prisoners entering the relatively privileged training prisons straight away as at present, they should first spend



a period of sentence planning at a local prison. Such a period of assessment would serve immediately to discourage any assumption that such a prisoner had a right to the more privileged regime and would indeed be used to establish from the outset a clear understanding on the part of each prisoner of the importance which management would attach to the relationship between behaviour and privileges throughout his or her sentence.

Second, it should be possible to remove prisoners who are subsequently actively disruptive from the normal long-term system - something which it is not possible to do for more than short periods at present. They should be returned for a further period of assessment and then could be placed in one of the special units which the Committee proposes should be developed.

Third, the system of privileges in the lower security prisons - to which many long-term prisoners eventually progress - should be reviewed with the object of ensuring that incentives to good behaviour persist throughout a prisoner's sentence.

Overall, it is essential that the system for long-term prisoners should be seen as a whole. A system of graduated control is required in which greater emphasis is put on central planning which has at its disposal all the resources of the adult prison system. The present dispersal system inhibits consistency of planning and flexibility in the use of resources.

### Special Units

The proposal for new, special units is clearly crucial to this new concept of control. Indeed, the need for such provision is urgent. But it is also important to emphasise that prisoners are disruptive for a wide range of reasons. That means that different kinds of units are needed to meet



differing requirements. The calculatedly subversive prisoner and the violently mentally disturbed prisoner pose, for example, very different problems. There is no single panacea. There will be no going back to the discredited 'Control Units', with their attempt at programmed conditions, which the Prison Department experimented with 10 years ago.

But there is a clear need for special units where really determined trouble-makers will be deprived of the opportunity to disrupt the normal functioning of the system; where the regime will be sparse and highly regulated; and whose existence should have a welcome deterrent effect . And we also need units which have an overtly supportive orientation; and others where the emphasis is simply on the containment of prisoners who have shown that they will not respond to any incentives.

#### The way forward

The Committee's report is wide-ranging. It rightly draws attention, for instance, to the importance of prison design for the way in which prisons function. I am anxious that we should benefit from international experience about this and in the light of the Committee's report have instructed an immediate study of recent US developments and experience. A team of officials will visit the USA later this year. No doubt there are failings as well as successes in the American approach. But if there are lessons to be learnt we should ensure that they are taken on board for the long-term.

Again, looking ahead, once a new framework of control is established there may also, as the Committee suggests, be scope for developing more individualised



programmes for prisoners which, if properly managed, would make greater demands on them than some present regimes and would develop in them a greater sense of personal responsibility.

The immediate need, however, is to get the new system of graduated control advocated by the Committee off the ground. To that end specific plans are being drawn up to take ahead the proposals I have described. I have already given instructions for the early re-establishment of the special unit which used to exist in C Wing, Parkhurst to which disruptive, mentally disturbed prisoners can be sent. But I am also anxious to ensure that outside experts should be invited to participate in developing the proposals for the establishment and monitoring of the proposed new special units. I will be making a further announcement on how we intend to give effect to this. I am determined that our prison system should be better structured to improve the control of difficult and dangerous prisoners, to assist effective management of the establishment to which they are sent, and to ensure a constructive approach to the sentences served by prisoners. The Control Review Committee's report has provided us with a positive agenda for action. Its proposals will be vigorously pursued.





# Home Office

## NEWS RELEASE

50 Queen Anne's Gate London SW1H 9AT  
Telephone 01-213 3030/4050/5050  
(Night line 01-213 3000)

*Handwritten:*  
JMB  
14/7

Night Line: 213-3000

July 17, 1984

NOT FOR PUBLICATION, BROADCAST OR USE ON CLUB TAPES BEFORE 1100 HOURS, TUESDAY, JULY 17, 1984. THIS DOCUMENT IS ISSUED IN ADVANCE ON THE STRICT UNDERSTANDING THAT NO APPROACH BE MADE TO ANY ORGANISATION OR PERSON ABOUT ITS CONTENTS BEFORE THE TIME OF PUBLICATION.

HOME SECRETARY WELCOMES PRISONS CONTROL REPORT  
"NEED FOR MORE DIRECT CONNECTION BETWEEN THE WAY  
A PRISONER BEHAVES AND THE PRIVILEGES HE ENJOYS"

The Home Secretary, the Rt. Hon. Leon Brittan QC. MP, today welcomed publication of the Control Review Committee report on the control of difficult and dangerous prisoners. The report proposes major changes in the present dispersal system in order to achieve a system of graduated control. He said:

"One of the most fundamental problems that any prison system has to solve is how to contain its most dangerous and difficult prisoners. For nearly 20 years the solution in this country has been to disperse these men among the population of a number of prisons protected by very secure perimeters. These prisons - the 'dispersal' prisons - have indeed an almost perfect record in preventing escapes. But their record of riots and disturbances - some nine major incidents since 1969 - shows that we have not yet got the system right."

The report is the outcome of the work of a group of Prison Department administrators and experienced governors who were asked last year by the Home Secretary to look into this problem.

The Home Secretary has broadly accepted the Committee's conclusions.

Commenting on them today Mr. Brittan said:

"It is clear to me that the prison system should make a far more direct



connection between the way a prisoner behaves and the privileges he enjoys. Disincentives to disruptive behaviour, and incentives to behaving well should be built into the way the system works.

How can this be done?

The Committee conclude, and I agree that:

First, instead of long-term prisoners entering the relatively privileged training prisons straight away as at present, they should first spend a period of sentence planning at a local prison. Such a period of assessment would serve immediately to discourage any assumption that such a prisoner has a right to the more privileged regime and would indeed be used to establish from the outset a clear understanding on the part of each prisoner of the importance which management would attach to the relationship between behaviour and privileges throughout his or her sentence.

Second, it should be possible to remove prisoners who are subsequently actively disruptive from the normal long-term system - something which it is not possible to do for more than short periods at present. They should be returned for a further period of assessment and then could be placed in one of the special units which the Committee proposes should be developed.

Third, the system of privileges in the lower security prisons, to which many long-term prisoners eventually progress - should be reviewed with the object of ensuring that incentives to good behaviour persist throughout a prisoner's sentence.

Overall, it is essential that the system for long-term prisoners should be seen as a whole. A system of graduated control is required in which greater emphasis is put on central planning which has at its disposal all the resources of the adult prison system. The present dispersal system inhibits consistency of planning and flexibility in the use of resources.

Special Units

The proposal for new, special units is clearly crucial to this new concept of control. Indeed, the need for such provision is urgent. But it is also important to emphasise that prisoners are disruptive for a wide range of reasons. That means that different kinds of units are needed to meet differing requirements. The calculatedly subversive prisoner and the violently mentally disturbed prisoner pose, for example, very different problems. There is no single panacea. There will be no going back to the discredited 'Control Units', with their attempt at programmed conditions, which the Prison Department experimented with 10 years ago.



But there is a clear need for special units where really determined trouble-makers will be deprived of the opportunity to disrupt the normal functioning of the system; where the regime will be sparse and highly regulated; and whose existence should have a welcome deterrent effect. And we also need units which have an overtly supportive orientation; and others where the emphasis is simply on the containment of prisoners who have shown that they will not respond to any incentives.

#### The way forward

The Committee's report is wide-ranging. It rightly draws attention, for instance to the importance of prison design for the way in which prisons function. I am anxious that we should benefit from international experience about this and in the light of the Committee's report have instructed an immediate study of recent US developments and experience. A team of officials will visit the USA later this year. No doubt there are failings as well as successes in the American approach. But if there are lessons to be learnt we should ensure that they are taken on board for the long-term.

Again, looking ahead, once a new framework of control is established there may also, as the Committee suggests, be scope for developing more individualised programmes for prisoners which, if properly managed, would make greater demands on them than some present regimes and would develop in them a greater sense of personal responsibility.

The immediate need, however, is to get the new system of graduated control advocated by the Committee off the ground. To that end specific plans are being drawn up to take ahead the proposals I have described. I have already given instructions for the early re-establishment of the special unit which used to exist in C Wing, Parkhurst to which disruptive, mentally disturbed prisoners can be sent. But I am also anxious to ensure that outside experts should be invited to participate in developing the proposals for the establishment and monitoring of the proposed new special units. I will be making a further announcement on how we intend to give effect to this. I am determined that our prison system should be better structured to improve the control of difficult and dangerous prisoners, to assist effective management of the establishment to which they are sent, and to ensure a constructive approach to the sentences served by prisoners. The Control Review Committee's report has provided us with a positive agenda for action. Its proposals will be vigorously pursued."



NOTES TO EDITORS

The Home Secretary asked the Control Review Committee,  
"To review the maintenance of control in the prison system,  
including the implications for physical security with particular reference  
to the dispersal system, and to make recommendations."

Under the chairmanship of Mr. Tony Langdon, Director of Operational  
Policy, Prison Department, the committee's membership was -

Mr. A.M.E. de Frising - Governor I, Office of the Deputy Director  
General.

Mr. I. Dunbar - Governor I, Governor HM Prison, Wormwood Scrubs.

Mr. M. Goddard - Principal, P3 Division, Prison Department.

Mr. J.E. Hayzelden - Assistant Secretary, P5 Division, Prison Department.

Mr. A.J. Pearson - Governor I, Governor HM Prison, Brixton.

Mr. J.F. Ferriss - Governor I, Governor HM Prison, Hull.

Mr. F.H. Shapland - Director of Psychological Services, Prison Department.

Mr. Q.J. Thomas - Assistant Secretary, P3 Division.

Mr. L.J.F. Wheeler CBE - Regional Director, South West Region.

The idea of dispersing the relatively small number of highest security  
(Category A) prisoners among the population of a number of prisons protected  
by very secure perimeters was adopted by the Government in 1968. Currently  
there are 8 dispersal prisons: Albany, Frankland, Gartree, Hull,  
Long Lartin, Parkhurst, Wakefield and Wormwood Scrubs.

The number of prisoners formally in Category 'A' is approximately 275.  
They are all sentenced and all serving more than 5 years, and are held in  
dispersal prisons. There are also about 100 prisoners (including remand  
prisoners) provisionally in Category 'A' held generally in local prisons.