



***JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON
THE CORRUPTION AND CRIME
COMMISSION***

**EXAMINATION OF THE 2004-2005
ANNUAL REPORT OF THE
PARLIAMENTARY INSPECTOR OF THE
CORRUPTION AND CRIME COMMISSION**

**Report No. 6
in the 37th Parliament**

2006

Published by the Legislative Assembly, Parliament of Western Australia, Perth, April, 2006.

Printed by the Government Printer, State Law Publisher, Western Australia.



Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission

Examination of the 2004-2005 Annual Report of the Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission

ISBN: 1 920830 66 9

(Series: Western Australia. Parliament. Legislative Assembly. Committees.
Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission. Report 6)

328.365

Copies available from: State Law Publisher
10 William Street
PERTH WA 6000

Telephone: (08) 9321 7688
Facsimile: (08) 9321 7536
Email: sales@dpc.wa.gov.au
Copies available on-line: www.parliament.wa.gov.au



***JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON
THE CORRUPTION AND CRIME
COMMISSION***

**EXAMINATION OF THE 2004-2005
ANNUAL REPORT OF THE
PARLIAMENTARY INSPECTOR OF THE
CORRUPTION AND CRIME COMMISSION**

Report No. 6

Presented by:
Mr John Hyde, MLA and Hon. Ray Halligan, MLC
Laid on the Table of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council
on 6 April 2006

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chairman	Mr John Hyde, MLA Member for Perth
Deputy Chairman	Hon Ray Halligan, MLC Member for North Metropolitan
Members	Ms Judy Hughes, MLA Member for Kingsley Hon Margaret Rowe, MLC Member for Agricultural

COMMITTEE STAFF

Principal Research Officer	Ms Andrea McCallum, BA, B Juris, LL B, LL M
-----------------------------------	---

COMMITTEE ADDRESS

Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission
Legislative Assembly
Parliament House
Harvest Terrace
PERTH WA 6000

Tel: (08) 9222 7467
Fax: (08) 9222 7804
Email: jscccc@parliament.wa.gov.au
Website: www.parliament.wa.gov.au

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COMMITTEE MEMBERS.....	i
COMMITTEE STAFF.....	i
COMMITTEE ADDRESS	i
COMMITTEE'S FUNCTIONS AND POWERS.....	v
CHAIRMAN'S FOREWORD.....	vii
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS.....	ix
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 STATUTORY FUNCTIONS OF THE PARLIAMENTARY INSPECTOR.....	1
1.2 ROLE OF THE PARLIAMENTARY INSPECTOR.....	2
1.3 INVESTIGATION OF COMPLAINTS ABOUT THE CORRUPTION AND CRIME COMMISSION	2
1.4 ANALYSIS OF THE AUDIT AND OTHER FUNCTIONS OF THE PARLIAMENTARY INSPECTOR.....	3
1.5 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	3
1.6 OPERATION OF THE CORRUPTION AND CRIME COMMISSION.....	3
1.7 GENERAL COMMENTS	4
1.8 PUBLIC HEARING WITH THE PARLIAMENTARY INSPECTOR	4
APPENDIX ONE.....	7
WITNESSES TO PUBLIC HEARINGS	7
APPENDIX TWO.....	9
TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE.....	9
PARLIAMENTARY INSPECTOR OF THE CORRUPTION AND CRIME COMMISSION	9
19 OCTOBER 2005.....	9

COMMITTEE'S FUNCTIONS AND POWERS

On 31 May 2005 the Legislative Council concurred with a resolution of the Legislative Assembly to establish the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission.

The Joint Standing Committee's functions and powers are defined in the Legislative Assembly's Standing Orders 289-293 and other Assembly Standing Orders relating to standing and select committees, as far as they can be applied. Certain standing orders of the Legislative Council also apply.

It is the function of the Joint Standing Committee to -

- monitor and report to Parliament on the exercise of the functions of the Corruption and Crime Commission and the Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission;
- inquire into, and report to Parliament on the means by which corruption prevention practices may be enhanced within the public sector; and
- carry out any other functions conferred on the Committee under the *Corruption and Crime Commission Act 2003*.

The Committee consists of four members, two from the Legislative Assembly and two from the Legislative Council.

CHAIRMAN'S FOREWORD

The Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission tabled his Annual Report 2004-2005 in the Parliament on 19 October 2005. The Committee held a public hearing with the Parliamentary Inspector in relation to his Annual Report on the same day. The transcript of the hearing is attached as Appendix 2 of this report.

This is the second annual report of the Parliamentary Inspector, and is more comprehensive than the first annual report, which covered a period of six months from January 2004 to 30 June 2004. The Annual Report 2004-2005 demonstrates that the Parliamentary Inspector's workload has increased from the previous reporting period.

The Parliamentary Inspector fulfils a vital role in the oversight of the CCC. As the CCC is independent of the Executive, and has powers beyond that of the Police in some cases, the Western Australian public requires a high degree of accountability on the part of the CCC. Under the *Corruption and Crime Commission Act, 2003*, the Parliamentary Inspector is responsible for the auditing and monitoring of the operations of the CCC and reporting to this parliamentary oversight committee. The Parliamentary Inspector may make recommendations and table reports to the Committee with respect to the CCC.

The Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission ensures a further level of scrutiny of the CCC by monitoring and reporting to Parliament on the exercise of the functions of both the CCC and the Parliamentary Inspector. Unlike the Parliamentary Inspector, however, the Committee does not have the statutory power to access operational information from the CCC.

Given the Parliamentary Inspector's extensive statutory auditing, monitoring and reporting functions, it is essential that he liaise closely and regularly with the Committee. During the reporting period, the Committee met with the Parliamentary Inspector on a number of occasions, but anticipates that as the workload of the CCC and the Parliamentary Inspector increases, so too will the frequency of meetings with and reports to the Committee.

The inaugural Parliamentary Inspector, Malcolm McCusker QC, brings a great deal of knowledge and experience to the position. The Committee enjoys a positive working relationship with Mr McCusker.



MR JOHN HYDE, MLA
CHAIRMAN

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

Act	<i>Corruption and Crime Commission Act, 2003</i>
CCC	Corruption and Crime Commission of Western Australia
Committee	Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission
Parliamentary Inspector	Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission of Western Australia

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Statutory Functions of the Parliamentary Inspector

Under section 195 of the Act, the Parliamentary Inspector has the following functions -

- to audit the operation of the Act;
- to audit the operations of the CCC for the purpose of monitoring compliance with the laws of the State;
- to deal with matters of misconduct on the part of the CCC, officers of the CCC and officers of the Parliamentary Inspector;
- to audit any operation carried out pursuant to the powers conferred or made available by the Act;
- to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the CCC's procedures;
- to make recommendations to the CCC, independent agencies and appropriate authorities;
- to report and make recommendations to either House of Parliament and the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission; and
- to perform any other function given to the Parliamentary Inspector under the Act or other legislation.

Section 195 also provides that the functions of the Parliamentary Inspector may be performed -

- on the Parliamentary Inspector's own initiative;
- at the request of the Minister;
- in response to a matter reported to the Parliamentary Inspector; or
- in response to a reference by either House of Parliament, the Joint Standing Committee on the Corruption and Crime Commission, or the CCC.

In order to carry out these functions, the Parliamentary Inspector has extensive powers pursuant to section 196 of the Act. The Parliamentary Inspector is entitled to full access to the records of the CCC, including operational information. However, in exercising his powers, the Parliamentary Inspector is not to interfere with, obstruct, hinder or delay any lawful operation of the CCC (section 198).

1.2 Role of the Parliamentary Inspector

The Parliamentary Inspector clarifies in his Annual Report that the Parliamentary Inspector does not perform an appellate role, reviewing the findings of the CCC. As pointed out by the Parliamentary Inspector, in determining whether a complaint was properly assessed by the CCC, it may at times be necessary to review the subject matter of the complaint, but not for the purpose of revisiting the original findings of the CCC.

At the public hearing with the Parliamentary Inspector on 19 October 2005, Mr McCusker elaborated on this issue:

In some cases it takes a great amount of time to deal with the complainant because although the primary task of the Inspector is to determine whether the Commission is performing its job correctly, which means looking at each allegation that it has not done so, nevertheless it is often necessary for that purpose to delve into the entire subject matter of the complaint. One complaint ... is a kind of bouncing ball. Each time I would say that the matter is concluded, the complainant would come back to me with something further.¹

The Committee agrees that it is necessary to dispel this misconception about the role of the Parliamentary Inspector. Part of the problem is the lack of adequate information on the role and functions of the Parliamentary Inspector in either printed brochure or internet sites. The Committee considers the best way to address the current deficiency is for the CCC's website to dedicate a separate section to the Office of the Parliamentary Inspector. Although the website makes brief reference to the Parliamentary Inspector, it is not easily accessible and contains limited information.

The Annual Report actually refers to a brochure having been produced explaining the role of the Parliamentary Inspector and how to make complaints. However, it appears that this was mistakenly included in the Report and there is no brochure as yet. The Parliamentary Inspector may review the need for developing a brochure in due course if misinformation about his role and functions continues.

1.3 Investigation of Complaints about the Corruption and Crime Commission

During the reporting period, the Parliamentary Inspector received 30 referrals, of which 14 were complaints referred by the CCC. He states in the Annual Report that they were all either complaints that the CCC had failed to investigate a matter to the satisfaction of the complainant, or had rejected a complaint that the complainant considered ought not to have been rejected.

In future annual reports, the Committee would find it helpful if the Parliamentary Inspector provided more information of a statistical nature as to the type of investigations conducted. Relevant information would include the ratio of allegations involving officers of the CCC

¹ Malcolm McCusker, Transcript of Evidence, 19 October 2005, p.2.

compared to complaints about the CCC, and a breakdown of the nature and source of the complaints about the CCC.

1.4 Analysis of the Audit and other Functions of the Parliamentary Inspector

In Chapter 2 of the Annual Report, the Parliamentary Inspector sets out a short statement in relation to the main audit functions under the Act. In future annual reports, the Committee recommends that the Parliamentary Inspector elaborates upon these matters and set out how he reached his conclusions. For example, it would be useful to clarify the basis upon which the Parliamentary Inspector determined that during the reporting period the CCC complied with the laws of the State and that there are systems in place to ensure compliance.

The Committee recommends that the Parliamentary Inspector and any future Acting Parliamentary Inspectors receive training on the CCC's developing case management system and other aspects of its unique IT environment in order to be able to access operational records of the CCC.

Although the audit functions set out in the Act should not only be addressed in the annual reports of the Parliamentary Inspector, it would be appropriate for a brief summary to be included at the completion of each reporting period. Future annual reports should therefore include a brief assessment as to the effectiveness and appropriateness of the CCC's procedures, and address the issue of recommendations to the CCC, Committee and others as set out in section 195.

1.5 Performance Indicators

The Parliamentary Inspector's suggested performance indicators are useful, and can be refined over time. It may also be useful to include the length of time taken to finalise investigations. Naturally, the length of time taken to finalise investigations is not necessarily a qualitative measure, as each investigation differs depending on such factors as complexity and volume of material. Another possible performance indicator would be the number of complaints about the Parliamentary Inspector's findings.

1.6 Operation of the Corruption and Crime Commission

Chapter Seven of the Annual Report deals with the Parliamentary Inspector's overall views as to the operation of the CCC. Whilst his comments are helpful, the Committee recommends that in future annual reports the Parliamentary Inspector elaborate on the effectiveness and efficiency of the CCC, including specific issues such as:

- its prevention and education function;
- its timeliness in investigating allegations of misconduct;
- whether authorities have been correctly obtained;

- whether the CCC’s registers are up to date;
- whether matters under investigation are appropriately being investigated by the CCC or should be investigated by another agency;
- its use of public versus private hearings; and
- its relationship with stakeholders.

1.7 General Comments

Other topics the Committee recommends being included in the Parliamentary Inspector’s annual reports include:

- a. Frequency of meetings between the Parliamentary Inspector and the Commissioner and Executive Director of the CCC;
- b. Reporting to the Committee and to Parliament - the number and nature of reports to the Committee and to Parliament throughout the reporting period; and
- c. Conflicts of interest.

In response to a question by the Committee at the public hearing on 19 October 2005, Mr McCusker said that an Acting Parliamentary Inspector would only be required if he was away and there was an urgent need for a Parliamentary Inspector, or when he had a conflict of interest. He gave evidence that no conflicts had arisen to date.² The Committee considers that conflicts of interest are inevitable over time, however, given that Perth is a relatively small city and that Mr McCusker is also a private barrister. Therefore, the Committee recommends that future annual reports specifically address the issue of conflicts of interest on the part of the Parliamentary Inspector and any Acting Parliamentary Inspectors.

1.8 Public Hearing with the Parliamentary Inspector

The Committee held public hearings with the CCC and the Parliamentary Inspector on 19 October 2005 in relation to their respective annual reports. The Parliamentary Inspector also gave evidence about the performance of the CCC during the reporting period.

Mr McCusker gave evidence that most of his time to date has been occupied with investigating complaints about the CCC. However, he said that in the 2005-2006 reporting year, he would take a more proactive role in terms of addressing the other auditing and monitoring functions of the Parliamentary Inspector. Mr McCusker spoke about the possibility of engaging somebody to

² Malcolm McCusker, Transcript of Evidence, 19 October 2005, p.6.

assist him perform the more administrative tasks associated with the Parliamentary Inspector's functions.

Similarly, in the 2004-2005 budget estimates statements, the Parliamentary Inspector referred to conducting a formal review of the CCC's operations in 2005-2006, and to establishing an audit system of the CCC.

The Committee encourages the Parliamentary Inspector's intentions to address these broader performance issues regarding the CCC, and would be pleased to discuss these matters in more detail with Mr McCusker at the next regular public hearing.

APPENDIX ONE

WITNESSES TO PUBLIC HEARINGS

Date	Name	Position	Organisation
19 October 2005	Mr Malcolm McCusker	Parliamentary Inspector	Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission

APPENDIX TWO

TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE

PARLIAMENTARY INSPECTOR OF THE CORRUPTION AND CRIME COMMISSION

19 OCTOBER 2005

**JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE
CORRUPTION AND CRIME COMMISSION**

SESSION TWO

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE TAKEN
AT PERTH
WEDNESDAY, 19 OCTOBER 2005**

Members

**Mr John Hyde (Chairman)
Hon Ray Halligan (Deputy Chairman)
Ms Margaret Quirk
Hon Margaret Rowe**

Hearing commenced at 11.20 am

McCUSKER, MR MALCOLM JAMES
Parliamentary Inspector of the Corruption and Crime Commission,
45 St Georges Tce,
Perth 6000, examined:

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the parliamentary inspector for giving the committee the courtesy of tabling his report with the committee before it is tabled at 12 noon in the Parliament.

Mr McCusker: In that regard, it has come to my attention that the copy that was sent to the committee was not the final copy. I will have to get the final copy. There was a problem with the production of it within the department that was dealing with it. It sent the committee a copy that was not the full version. Also, because of staffing reasons there was a problem with the Auditor General producing his report; therefore, that will not be included in the report that is tabled. As a result, I am not sure whether we will be in a position to table the final report at 12.00 noon today.

The CHAIRMAN: That is fine. Are you happy with the committee being able to address the issues to which you have alluded?

Mr McCusker: Certainly. The final report contains more material. I note that it just does not contain some material.

The CHAIRMAN: Excellent. Would you like to make an opening statement? This is your first full calendar year in the role.

Mr McCusker: Yes. As the committee will appreciate, this is the first full calendar year in which I am reporting the period up to 30 June 2005, which means that events after that date are not strictly relevant to the report. I have found during that period that a degree of change has taken place within the commission. One of the significant changes is that the commission moved to its present headquarters in May this year and a settling in period followed. The new premises of the commission are far more satisfactory than the previous premises from every viewpoint.

In my dealings with the commission, from the commissioner level down, I have had nothing but the utmost cooperation from it. Whenever a complaint has been made against the commission or an officer of the commission - I hasten to say that that has happened only rarely - the complaints have been immediately referred to me by the commissioner himself and have been accompanied by all the relevant material with an invitation to question any officer of the commission on the subject matter of the complaints. With one exception, the nature of the complaints referred to me have been either that the commission has not fully investigated a complaint or has not accepted that the complaint comes within the jurisdiction of the commission. In some cases it takes a great amount of time to deal with the complainant because although the primary task of the inspector is to determine whether the commission is performing its job correctly, which means looking at each allegation that it has not done so, nevertheless it is often necessary for that purpose to delve into the entire subject matter of the complaint. One complaint of which the committee is aware - I sent some information to the committee about this just yesterday - is a kind of bouncing ball. Each time I would say that the matter had been concluded, the complainant would come back to me with something further. As a result, it is impossible to say - I notice there has been a request in accordance with standard public service procedure - to try to estimate the average length of time it takes to deal with a referral. It is impossible to do that because some matters take a long time and

others take just a couple of hours. However, as I said at the outset of my opening statement, I have received nothing but cooperation from the commission and I am satisfied - as I have said in my report - that the commission is performing its functions properly.

The CHAIRMAN: This committee is very determined to ensure the closure of matters of serial complainants. Your appointment, through legislation of the Parliament and through the work of the committee, has been established to provide closure for those types of cases. Each time there is a change of government, which involves new members of Parliament and a bureaucratic reshuffle, the same complaint from a dedicated complainant is referred to the Ombudsman, the Commissioner for Public Sector Standards and the Leader of the Opposition when a new Leader of the Opposition is appointed. The committee must praise you, parliamentary inspector, regarding a complainant whose complaint has no substance and who has attempted to seek help from the Queen, Gough Whitlam, Bob Hawke, Kofi Annan, probably U Thant in his time. For the first time the head of a public body has told him that the case is finished and that if he continues with it, he will become a serial complainant and that there are ways of dealing with serial complainants.

Mr McCusker: Yes. That is true. There must be closure on these matters. Some complainants have a very genuine grievance, but it cannot be addressed by the Corruption and Crime Commission. The grievance may stem from a court action in which the complainant has failed and which has nothing to do with the commission. As I mentioned in the report, the public must be educated more about the true functions of the commission and the role of the parliamentary inspector. As I said in the report also, I want to make it clear that I am not an appellate court for the Corruption and Crime Commission. If somebody is not satisfied with the commission's handling of a matter or complaint, on occasion people come to me thinking that they can appeal to me on the decision. To some extent I must deal with that because I must determine whether the commission has handled the matter correctly. On no occasion so far that I have had a referral direct from the commission or from a complainant have I come to the conclusion that the commission has not dealt with it in terms of procedures in a proper manner.

[11.30 am]

The CHAIRMAN: I want to address the issue. We just went into a closed hearing. We thank you and the commissioner for both agreeing to appear on the same day. Clearly, the committee uses you and your position as our conduit into what operational matters we should be entitled to know in a broad sense. The clear question we asked the commissioner is related to the time of you making your report to the committee in August, that there were no existing complaints regarding Ms Rayner or matters that had not been brought to you or the committee at that point in time.

Mr McCusker: I was here, of course, when I heard the commissioner deal with that issue. What he said was perfectly correct. After the publicity that arose from the issue concerning Ms Rayner, there was a further matter that was raised that goes back a long way. It was pre the CCC's time. It was raised in relation to something to do with the ACC, of which she was previously an acting commissioner. Because of the statutory structure of the Corruption and Crime Commission - we have legal advice on the subject, too - it meant that this was something that had to be dealt with by the commission, which in turn, of course, because it was an allegation against a former acting commissioner, was referred to me. That had nothing to do with Ms Rayner's position as the Acting Commissioner of the Corruption and Crime Commission. The only matter that I am aware of was, as the commissioner said, in relation to one operation that the acting commissioner was dealing with - that was called Operation Rustle - where there was some difference of opinion between her and some of the investigators of the commission. But that was merely a difference of opinion and it was not something that could possibly be said to be the subject of a complaint against her as such. It was a difference of viewpoint really.

The CHAIRMAN: Do other members have a question at this point or would they like me to keep going?

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I have a general question; it is not in the other context.

I have a couple of matters, inspector. Firstly, in the course of the previous year in undertaking your task, are there any themes arising or any systemic issues that you have some concerns about?

Mr McCusker: No. I do not think that there are any systemic problems within the commission whatsoever. In terms of operational matters there was some slight problem in getting responses from the police, as I understand it from the commission, but that is as far as it went. I was made privy to the problem there. But that was resolved; I saw the steps that were taken to resolve that particular matter.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: My other question that I just quickly wanted to ask was that you note in your report that there might be a need for more, if you like, proactive work in the sense of looking at specific administrative procedures and so forth.

Mr McCusker: Yes.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: Would it be true to say that you have been pretty fully occupied with reacting to particular allegations?

Mr McCusker: I have so far. But what I have in mind doing, probably early in the new year - I will talk to the committee further about this - is possibly to engage a person, maybe on a part-time basis, to conduct some of that kind of investigation because the reaction to referrals is taking a lot of time. There is always a danger that you are going to, as it were, redo what someone else is doing. It is not the function of the inspector to look over the shoulder of the commissioner all the time and check. It is impossible. It is a very large organisation for one person on a part-time basis. The important thing is for the inspector to ensure that proper procedures are in place and that those procedures appear to be carried out correctly.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you satisfied at this point in time with the Police Service's response time to the CCC?

Mr McCusker: It has improved quite a lot since the issue was taken up by the commissioner at the highest level.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it acceptable now? Is it best practice?

Mr McCusker: Right at this moment I am not able to answer that. I think it probably would be but I would need to talk to the commissioner and get some further information.

The CHAIRMAN: The commissioner has not raised any issues with current or outstanding issues that the Police Service is eight months, 10 months or whatever overdue?

Mr McCusker: The commissioner did discuss with me some months ago that problem but he also showed me the steps that were taken to resolve it and responses from the Commissioner of Police. I think the matter has been resolved. Part of the problem with the WA Police Service appears to have been that an officer who would have been handling a matter had been shifted to another place. So you get the difficulty of finding who should now respond.

The CHAIRMAN: Hopefully he found Dumbleyung.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: Inspector, you have already made mention of the fact that some of the excess workload that you have may well be due to the lack of knowledge in the community as to the workings of the CCC and the parliamentary inspector. In your 2003-04 annual report, you refer to preparing a brochure about the role of the parliamentary inspector.

Mr McCusker: Yes.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: Has this been done?

Mr McCusker: The role of the parliamentary inspector is referred to in the Corruption and Crime Commission's booklet that they have produced. It is very clear there. Anyone who goes to the Corruption and Crime Commission is immediately informed by looking at the brochure that the parliamentary inspector is available if they are not satisfied with the Corruption and Crime Commission's handling of a matter.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: Again, in the annual report, you stated that you would adopt a proactive role in conducting periodic inquiries to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the CCC's procedures. What have you done in that regard?

Mr McCusker: I have to a limited extent in that I have attended upon the commissioner from time to time. As I said earlier, I intend to engage, if I can, some person who is perhaps more familiar with administration and can more adequately deal with the administrative side of things and, in that way, become more proactive than at present.

The CHAIRMAN: At page 11, referring to the operation of the commission, you assert that 2 410 complaints or allegations of misconduct were reported, of which 582 were from individuals and 1 828 from public sector agencies. I presume that the 1 828 is from CEOs under their statutory requirement.

Mr McCusker: That is so, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any analysis of the 1 828 in terms of any of them being vexatious?

Mr McCusker: I do not know of any analysis that has been undertaken by the commission. I have certainly not undertaken that. I have little doubt that there would be a small percentage - I hope a small percentage - which could be said to be vexatious because that is always the way.

The CHAIRMAN: All right. Unfortunately, because the Assembly will meet promptly at 12.00 we will have to finish dead on seven minutes to 12.00.

Ms M.M. QUIRK: I do not have any other questions. I would like to thank the inspector - certainly for the short time I have been on the committee - for assisting us in our work. I think the role he plays is very valuable. We are certainly grateful for the level of assistance we have had from him.

Mr McCusker: Thank you.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: I would like to echo those remarks as well but also ask a question, if I may.

Mr McCusker: Certainly.

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: Do you have any recommendations you would like to make to the committee regarding the CCC?

Mr McCusker: The CCC as such?

Hon RAY HALLIGAN: Yes, its operations.

Mr McCusker: No, I do not want to sound complacent but I am very happy with the organisation of the CCC. The commissioner is not here so I can say that he is an excellent head who, I have observed, keeps fully in touch with what is happening and does keep me informed, which is very important. There is no element of keeping things close to the chest there; they are very forthright. Of course, he has an excellent CEO. I notice in the report - and in my final annual report I have referred to it - that the commission does suggest some amendments to the act, one in particular being the definition of "misconduct". I agree with that. The definition of "misconduct" as it stands in the act is very difficult for someone who has a statutory responsibility of making a notification to

the commission to understand apart from the question of whether a person's conduct has been fraudulent or dishonest, which is fairly easily recognisable. The definition then goes on to say what might constitute an offence under various legislation. At that point, I think some persons' eyes might start to glaze and they might say, "How do I know whether that constitutes an offence?" I think a clearer definition would be helpful, if it is possible.

[11.41 am]

Ms M.M. QUIRK: You are going to make a liar of me now because I am going to ask you another question because of that. Do you think the education function of the Corruption and Crime Commission would be easier if that issue were clarified?

Mr McCusker: Yes, I do.

The CHAIRMAN: One of the issues in the CCC report is in terms of giving case studies of particular cases which illustrates, one hopes, in real terms to public servants correct conduct as distinct from misconduct. In global terms, you are saying, and we are saying it, that the CCC is motoring along well. We need to be able to summarise in an empirical way why. Having been in the building and having been in the old Anti-Corruption Commission environment, clearly we know that there is an entirely different morale and different process. We know that it is functioning well. What empirical evidence can you provide to the committee to back up -

Mr McCusker: One empirical observation I make is the very small number of referrals that are made to me comprising complaints about the CCC. It is very small indeed, which is good, and, of those, so far, I have not found any cause ultimately for complaint against the CCC's operations or procedures as such. They are really directed to a complaint that the CCC does not consider that a matter falls within its jurisdiction and the person aggrieved thinks that it should fall within its jurisdiction, or the CCC has come to a conclusion with which the complainant does not agree. However, that is no reflection on the CCC as such. The small number of complaints received directly from the public or referred to me by the CCC itself is very indicative of the situation.

The CHAIRMAN: In comparison with Western Australia, the number in Queensland is huge; that is the one empirical figure we have. The number here is minor. I have a final question. Obviously, we know you have access to anything in the CCC. Does the CCC have a monthly meeting, an operational meeting or something that you are invited to drop in on or that you regularly get involved with?

Mr McCusker: It has a weekly meeting. I have open access to that meeting at any time. I have attended a weekly meeting to see just what goes on. A lot of it is entirely operational. I have been provided with reports of the weekly meetings, which are pretty massive, and the agenda and so forth. What impresses me about it is that the operational people are there, where it is relevant, and the commissioner, of course, is kept apprised of everything that is going on.

The CHAIRMAN: We are in the process of looking at an acting parliamentary inspector. In terms of the budget, will his or her salary costs come out of your budget, or will that be separate from government?

Mr McCusker: I am not sure about that. An acting parliamentary inspector would, of course, be required only either when I am away and there is an urgent need for a parliamentary inspector or when I have a conflict. So far, the conflict has not arisen, but it may. So, it is important that someone is available. My understanding is that the acting parliamentary inspector would be called upon only on an ad hoc basis, but it would need to be someone, whether man or woman, who is reasonably close to the Perth metropolitan area.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions, members? I declare this meeting and hearing finished. Thank you very much, inspector.

Hearing concluded at 11.46 am
