

Submission No.	599
Date Received	

The Secretary of the Committee  
Inquiry into Immigration Detention in Australia  
House of Representatives  
PO Box 6021  
Parliament House  
Canberra, ACT, 2600

13 October 2008

RECEIVED  
15 OCT 2008

BY: MIB

### **Inquiry into Immigration Detention in Australia**

Thank you for the opportunity to make this supplementary submission in response to specific points raised during public hearings.

**Case management** – from my experience in WA tax office, case managers fully managed cases. They were expected to clear them by target date and had to have a very good reason for not doing so. I've also worked in social work settings where case managers' role included liaising and co-ordinating with other professionals. The case manager in both these scenarios was expected to drive it forward and progress chase.

My sense is that case managers in DIAC – and this is a new way of working for them – act merely as a contact person. They don't seem to be proactive or initiate contact with the applicant; and don't delve or drive the case to conclusion. When the applicant contacts, by the end of the conversation, he or she is as much in the dark as they were before speaking to the case manager.

**Community-based detention options** - DIAC is seeking to work co-operatively with NGOs and other groups. These groups must be paid appropriately and at commercial rates. For too long, poorly-funded organizations with heavy reliance on volunteers have undertaken the bulk of the support of detainees or ex-detainees, and BVE holders. Their resources are strained beyond belief.

**Prison as a preferable option to detention** – The reasons for this include;

- Opportunity to attend workshops
- Structured day in prison whereas in detention, little structure and not enough to do so detainees sleep a lot, wasting away the day.
- Detainees can ask a guard for something and be told 'I'll find out for you', then may wait some time for the answer to a simple question; in prison, the systems are better defined, the person gets a yes or a no.

***Security checks*** - Dennis Richardson, then Director-General of ASIO, reported that DIAC requested ASIO to make 3,704 security assessments in 2000/01 and 1,574 in 2001/2 in relation to unauthorised arrivals. Of these, there were no adverse assessments ie none were found to pose a direct or indirect threat to Australia's security<sup>1</sup>.

In 2005 two unauthorized arrivals detained on Nauru received adverse assessments from ASIO. Mr Faisal's case was later reviewed by ASIO and the adverse assessment was dropped. Mr Sagar was resettled in Sweden. Due to the secrecy that surrounds these assessments, the grounds for the Mr Sagar's adverse assessment are not known to him or his lawyers although legal avenues are being pursued to try and find out.

Regards

Sue Hoffman  
BA (Hons); M. Lead (Social Justice)

---

<sup>1</sup> Source: Report of Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, Human Rights Subcommittee, August 22 2002, pages 36-37.  
<http://parlinfoweb.aph.gov.au/piweb/Repository/Commjnt/Commjnt/Linked/1895-2.PDF>