

Division 66: Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services, \$3 310 000 —

Mr J.M. Francis, Chairman.

Mr D.T. Redman, Minister for Corrective Services.

Professor N.A. Morgan, Inspector of Custodial Services.

Mr A.J. Harvey, Deputy Inspector of Custodial Services.

Ms C. Buckland, Chief of Staff, Office of the Minister for Corrective Services.

Mr J. Partridge, Principal Policy Adviser, Office of the Minister for Corrective Services.

[Witnesses introduced.]

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Cockburn.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: Given the Inspector for Custodial Services has been very patiently waiting all morning I thought I would pay due courtesy and give him some time in the chamber. I note that the inspector's office has been spared any efficiency dividend. Is that the case?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Yes; it is. All the departments and organisations that came under a certain scale were not required to meet an efficiency dividend target.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: I note also there has been a minor increase in the inspector's appropriation. I presume that is simply for very small things. The minister can explain exactly what the increase is. I put this to the minister last year and put it to him again this year. Why has the inspector's appropriation not been increased so he can broaden his role and carry out all his duties under the act, particularly providing reports to the minister of a broader nature rather than on the inspection of prisons?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: From what I am advised, in 2010–11 an increase of \$600 000 was given to the inspector. Some was clawed back because of timing. The member will remember that I introduced some legislation last year and that has increased the scope of services to the inspector around show-cause notices and the level of scope he has. The authority areas are the same but the level of scope he has to drill down into people and services and a range of things has been accounted for with an increase of \$600 000 to the budget. Those increases are CPI changes over the budget forward estimates.

Mr F.M. LOGAN: The minister indicated that some of that \$600 000 had been clawed back. Why was that?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Because, at that point, the legislation was not in place to give the enhanced services to the inspector, yet the decision had been made to appropriate that before the legislation was able to go through the house. As the member will appreciate, it takes time to pass legislation. We did that with the member's support, I might add. We had someone's support over there!

Mr F.M. LOGAN: We obviously supported that. The act itself allows the inspector to go slightly broader than the inspector's role currently allows; obviously, that is inquiring into the health and welfare of prisoners and the manner in which they are incarcerated. Why could not the inspector's role—it is allowable under the act—also go to producing reports or making comments or giving any view on the continued breaches of internal security that occur in our prisons? By that I mean the access prisoners have to the prison roofs of Acacia, Casuarina and Hakea. Last year—in one year—there were 11 breaches of internal security. For the life of me, I do not understand why the Inspector of Custodial Services cannot produce a report into the internal breaches and why those prisoners were on a roof.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Thank you, member. The member will be aware that in the amendment to the Inspector of Custodial Services Act that was passed in November last year there were two areas of change. One gives the inspector the capacity to issue a show-cause notice, which is a very direct power to seek a change. That was one of the outcomes of the Ward matter. The second was to undertake specific audits. Those audits can be of individual prisoners or cohorts of prisoners. It is a minimum number of 40 individual prisoners a year as they progress through the Corrective Services system. It could be Aboriginal women in remote communities; it could be Indonesian people smugglers as a group. I might add that the inspector has undertaken and is currently undertaking an audit of a specific cohort of prisoners on roofs, with the specific intent of reporting back to government and, I guess, Parliament, what is happening there and whether there is a need for changes. No doubt we will make recommendations in accordance with that for, I might add, both adults and juveniles. I think we can see that that is a very clear example of exactly the changes this legislation has provided. It is an issue that no doubt the member has brought to the chamber on different occasions and that the inspector has highlighted under his own steam as something we now need to look at and he is now choosing to audit that as such.

The appropriation was recommended.

Meeting suspended from 1.00 to 2.00 pm