



SCOTTISH HOME AND HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Report of
Her Majesty's Chief
Inspector of Prisons
for Scotland
1984

*Presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for Scotland
by Command of Her Majesty
October 1985*

EDINBURGH
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
£2.50 net

Cmd 9636

PREVIOUS REPORTS

1981—Cmd. 8619

1982—Cmd. 9035

1983—Cmd. 9401

ISBN 0 10 196360 2

H.M. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF PRISONS FOR SCOTLAND

ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1984

Foreword by the Secretary of State for Scotland

In his fourth annual report, H.M. Chief Inspector of Prisons for Scotland makes three formal recommendations. In the first of these (Chapter 1.09) he calls for revision of The Prison (Scotland) Rules, 1952 to meet present day needs. Whilst this is recognised as being important and desirable it would make an extremely heavy demand on staff resources and it cannot therefore be undertaken immediately. The second recommendation (Chapter 2.04) calls for an examination of the need for censorship in those establishments where payphones have been installed. The recommendation is accepted and the issue will be examined most carefully as soon as possible.

Steps are being taken towards a general improvement of conditions for remand inmates (Chapter 4.07) but the overcrowding problems will remain until Phase II of Shotts Prison is available for occupation. Current plans, however, include the spending of £2.25m on Longriggend Remand Unit in the next three years to improve the conditions and facilities for both staff and inmates.

As H.M. Chief Inspector indicates this is his last Annual Report and I would wish to take this opportunity to acknowledge the considerable contributions he has made, through his reports, to the more efficient functioning of the Scottish Prison Service.

GEORGE YOUNGER

Report of
Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons
1984

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Foreword	iii
 <i>Chapter One</i>	
Inspectorate Staff	2
Programme of Inspections	2
Reports	3
 <i>Chapter Two</i>	
General	4
 <i>Chapter Three</i>	
Effects of Section 45 of The Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 1980	6
 <i>Chapter Four</i>	
Remands	8
 <i>Chapter Five</i>	
Recommendations	10

Report of
Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons
for Scotland
1984

St Andrew's House
Edinburgh
EH1 3DE

31 May 1985

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE GEORGE YOUNGER, T.D., M.P.
Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Scotland

I submit this my fourth and last Annual Report. I feel it appropriate to include in this letter a number of personal observations.

My objective, within my terms of reference, has been to establish the independence of the Inspectorate and to report on establishments inspected in a manner which would not only be critical where necessary but commendatory and supportive. Any success achieved in the attainment of this objective has only been possible because of the quality of professional input by my staff. I wish therefore to take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude to all of them. My thanks are also due to those who have given support and encouragement during the past 4½ years, to the Secretary of the Scottish Home and Health Department, to the Director of the Scottish Prison Service and his colleagues who have always been available to discuss matters with openness and courtesy, to Governors and staff of establishments and not least to the many inmates who have spoken to me openly and constructively.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your obedient Servant



D. A. P. BARRY, C.B.E.
Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons for Scotland.

CHAPTER ONE

Inspectorate Staff

1.01 The Chief Inspector's staff in 1984 was as follows:

J. Drummond	Governor Class I H.M. Deputy Chief Inspector of Prisons
J. S. Bertram	Governor Class III Inspector of Prisons
J. Pearce	Governor Class III Inspector of Prisons
J. B. Lyall	Senior Executive Officer
A. G. Templeman	Senior Executive Officer
Miss L. M. Moffat	Personal Secretary

1.02 Mr Bertram was appointed Governor of H.M. Young Offenders Institution, Castle Huntly, taking post there on 1st December 1984, and was on that day succeeded by Mr Pearce formerly Deputy Governor of H.M. Prison, Peterhead. Mr Bertram entered the Prison Service as a prison officer in 1948. His long and varied experience enabled him to make a valuable contribution to the work of the Inspectorate.

1.03 Mr Lyall was succeeded by Mr Templeman on 24th September 1984.

Programme of Inspections

1.04 The programme approved by the Secretary of State was for inspections of the following establishments all of which were inspected having been inspected for the first time in 1981.

H.M. Prison Edinburgh
H.M. Prison Aberdeen
H.M. Prison Inverness
H.M. Prison Peterhead
H.M. Prison Dungavel
H.M. Remand Institution Longriggend

1.05 It was agreed that the Inspectorate should be professionally assisted in its inspection of social work units in penal establishments during the 1984-86 round of inspections. The Inspectorate was particularly pleased that Professor Phyllida Parsloe was able to accept the invitation to undertake this work. Professor Parsloe holds the Chair of Applied Social Studies at the University of Bristol having previously been Professor of Social Work at Aberdeen University and a member of the Parole Board for Scotland.

1.06 It was not possible for the social work inspections to be fully synchronised with our own programme for 1984 and it became apparent that it would be more appropriate for us to present a special report on social work units in

Scottish penal establishments during the course of 1985, this to be based on the examination of those social work units in penal establishments examined during 1984 and the early part of 1985.

1.07 Visits were made to all other establishments during the year.

1.08 At the invitation of the Director a special visit was made to H.M. Prison Peterhead shortly after the serious incident there on 9th January 1984. The Director was anxious that we should see at first hand the damage done to "A" Hall—in which a programme of complete refurbishing had very recently been completed—and to observe the conditions under which certain inmates were being contained. We gave consideration to the matter of humanity in the context of Recommendation No. R(82)17 "Custody and Treatment of Dangerous Prisoners" adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on 24th September 1982 and the Explanatory Memorandum on this approved by the European Committee on Crime Problems (ISBN 92-871-0247-3) and found the action taken to be within these guidelines.

1.09 Following our inspection of Peterhead later in the year we asked the Director to examine the authority under which the privileges and regime of certain inmates are restricted and so advise us. We await reply. This has implications not only for Peterhead and we *recommend* that The Prison (Scotland) Rules, 1952, should be updated to meet present day needs in this and other respects.

Reports

1.10 Reports on the following were forwarded to the Secretary of State:

H.M. Special Unit, Barlinnie
 H.M. Young Offenders Institution, Friarton
 H.M. Borstal Institutions, Castle Huntly
 Noranside
 Polmont
 H.M. Young Offenders Institution and Detention Centre,
 Glenochil
 H.M. Prison and Young Offenders Institution, Dumfries

Reports published in 1984 were in respect of:

H.M. Prison, Shotts
 H.M. Prison, Barlinnie
 H.M. Borstal Institution, Castle Huntly
 H.M. Prison and Young Offenders Institution, Dumfries
 H.M. Borstal Institution, Noranside

CHAPTER TWO

General

2.01 The Chief Inspector met with H.M. Chief Inspector of Prisons for England and Wales on a number of occasions, one of these, at his invitation, was during his inspection of H.M. Prison Frankland, near Durham. The Chief Inspector also made a visit to H.M. Prison Wakefield. Both these establishments had, because of their security arrangements, some relevance to our inspection of Peterhead.

2.02 The Deputy Chief Inspector attended, as an observer, a meeting of the Parole Board for Scotland.

2.03 The Inspectorate received reports of a number of the working parties set up under the recommendations of the Committee of Inquiry into the United Kingdom Prison Service (the May Committee) and was particularly pleased to note the recommendations of the working groups dealing with "Staff Roles" and "Objectives and Regimes". The Inspectorate will watch the outcome with interest.

2.04 Following the reporting of the working groups the Director issued a circular to Governors inviting them to submit, should they consider it appropriate, applications for general authority to instal pay-phones for the use of certain categories of inmates. This development is much welcomed by the Inspectorate but we *recommend* that where such facilities are installed the continuing necessity for censorship of mail should be examined.

2.05 It is our belief that remand inmates probably have a greater need than others of access to telephones. We fully understand the considerable difficulties in the way of this but we suggest that it would be both reasonable and appropriate for such a facility to be provided for outgoing calls to defence lawyers and possibly home area social workers. We understand that in some countries such facilities are provided without payment, there being a resultant saving in the cost of legal aid. We believe the provision of such a facility would be welcomed not only by inmates and by their agents but also, because of the likely reduction in tension, by Governors and staff.

2.06 During 1984 we have been paying particular regard to staff training within each establishment inspected and in respect of some, have been obliged to draw attention to the less than satisfactory programme of local staff training. In some establishments meetings of the local Staff Training Committee had not taken place at the required frequency and staff training officers were in some cases unable to perform their duties properly because of lack of time and opportunity. If training is to be effective the staff training officer must be given an appropriate status within his establishment and must have reasonable expectation that the programme can be implemented and staff be made available to undergo training.

2.07 During 1984 the Inspectorate has paid regard in its re-inspections of those establishments first examined in 1981 to the recommendations made in

that year. Progress has been made in the implementation of these recommendations. It is now seen to be appropriate to reduce the number of recommendations to the Secretary of State as, from experience, we have found that the Director and senior members of his staff act on matters raised with them at our post-inspection meetings. The same is true of Governors of individual establishments who are quick to act on matters where local initiative is appropriate.

2.08 There are a number of areas which have not been the subject of detailed examination because the Inspectorate lacks the professional resource properly to undertake such work. In particular we would mention the medical services, educational services, the structural condition of buildings and the industrial activity in penal establishments. It had been our intention to initiate an examination of industrial activity in 1985 and authority was sought to employ outside consultants for that purpose. It was found, however, that the necessary financial resource would not have been available before the financial year 1985-86 and the Chief Inspector felt therefore that, as the examination and reporting could not be completed during his own tenure of office, the matter would have to be left over for consideration by his successor.

2.09 In 1984 much understandable public concern was expressed about deaths of youths in the Glenochil complex. The Sheriff Principal of Tayside, Central and Fife in his determination following the Fatal Accident Inquiry in May 1984 into the death of an inmate in the Detention Centre there on 16th February 1984 (the previous deaths were all in the Young Offenders Institution) recommended that a small working group be set up to review the precautions adopted at Glenochil Young Offenders Institution and Detention Centre to deal with inmates who might present suicide risks. (This working group was set up by the Secretary of State and the Chief Inspector and Deputy Chief Inspector met with it in 1985.)

2.10 The problem of drugs in penal establishments has also received public attention. This is, of course, an extension of the problem which exists in the country as a whole. Whilst there are many ways in which drugs can be introduced, one route is inevitably through visits. Relaxed visiting arrangements provide opportunity for exploitation by those unscrupulous, misguided or irresponsible enough to wish to do so. Staff at all levels wish to normalise visiting arrangements as far as possible and are aware that vigilance must be continuous and effective. It must be a matter of much concern that relatives and friends are prepared to attempt to smuggle drugs to those they are visiting thereby putting at risk, not only the health of those they visit, but the conditions under which visits take place. The only way in which the passage of drugs at visits would be eliminated would be by having visits conducted in closed cubicles to a greater extent than is now done, which would be a retrograde step.

CHAPTER THREE

Effects of Section 45 of the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 1980

3.01 Implementation of the above on 15th November 1983 resulted in Borstal Training no longer being a sentence available to courts and some change in the Detention Centre sentence. Borstal Institutions became Young Offender Institutions and one Young Offenders Institution became an additional Detention Centre. It became apparent quite early in 1984 that there would be significant effects on the size of the population of Young Offenders Institutions and Detention Centres. The table which follows shows the population of all the Young Offenders Institutions (YOIs) and Detention Centres at the end of 1983 and 1984, together with the average, highest and lowest recorded populations and capacity of each establishment in 1984:

Under 21 Population Changes Resulting from Section 45 of the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 1980, Implemented 15th November 1983

	<i>Accommodation 1984</i>	<i>Total At Lock-up 31.12.83</i>	<i>Total At Lock-Up 31.12.84</i>	<i>Daily Average 1984</i>	<i>Daily Highest 1984</i>	<i>Daily Lowest 1984</i>
<i>Young Offender Institutions</i>						
<i>Males</i>						
Castle Huntly	114	109	77	88	117	61
Dumfries	120*	98	—*	86	101	68
Glenochil	496	255	266	212	271	175
Noranside	116†	105	67	82	112	60
Polmont	410	371	222	295	390	221
	1256	938	632	763		
	120*					
	1136					
<i>Females</i>						
Cornton Vale	41‡	22	12	21	28	11
<i>Detention Centres</i>						
<i>Males</i>						
Friarton	75	77	71	61	79	46
Glenochil	182	116	175	156	202	107
	257	193	246	217	281	153

Those borstal inmates completing sentences are included in YOI numbers. Last female borstal inmate was released on 6.8.84 and at 31.12.84 there were 11 male borstal inmates remaining.

* Transfer of YO from Dumfries to Glenochil effected 19-28.11.84 and accommodation made available for adults.

† Reduced to 74 from 30.10.84 to permit building upgrading.

‡ A former borstal section of 55 rooms became an adult section from 7.8.84.

3.02 We observed a significant underuse of accommodation develop in Glenochil YOI particularly and, arising from that, Dumfries YO inmates were transferred there in late 1984 so making Dumfries available from November to accommodate sentenced adult males under the National Classification system, thereby providing a measure of relief in respect of prison overcrowding.

3.03 Consequent to the change of use of Dumfries the YOI Visiting Committee, appointed by the Secretary of State, demitted office after faithfully serving the establishment since 1965. This Committee had succeeded one, also appointed by the Secretary of State, first established there in 1951 for the Borstal Institution.

3.04 The open YOIs at Castle Huntly and Noranside have also experienced some difficulty in keeping populations at a level at which the resources are efficiently utilised. The Governors of both establishments, with the co-operation of staff, and the support of Visiting Committees, accept as many as can be found from the general YO population for their establishments.

3.05 Some difficulties were experienced in application of the Detention Centre regime to those inmates who had undergone previous Detention Centre sentences. We understood that consideration was being given at the end of 1984 to appropriate legislative action to remedy this.

CHAPTER FOUR

Remands

4.01 In 1981 the Secretary of State requested that we examine the facilities available to those held on remand in custody and we reported on this in the 1981 Annual Report. During our re-inspections in 1984 we again paid particular attention to the remand facilities in the establishments inspected. There has been a steady increase in the remand population in Scotland and the average in 1984 was 942 compared with 746 in 1981.

4.02 We feel it necessary to re-state that the conditions for remand inmates should compare favourably with those afforded to sentenced inmates. In 1981 the quality of life provided for nearly all remands fell very far short of this basic requirement, the exceptions being Cornton Vale, Inverness and the female section of Aberdeen.

4.03 In 1984, we were glad to observe the considerable improvements which had been made in the male remand hall at Aberdeen Prison.

4.04 In Edinburgh Prison a new dining and recreation facility was provided in 1984. Unfortunately the number of remands in custody there increased substantially in 1984, from 116 at the time of our inspection in April to 174 at the end of the year. The new facilities were consequently overstretched and overcrowding became an even greater problem than formerly in accommodation which suffered from inmate vandalism and overdue redecoration and refurbishing.

4.05 The roots of much of this problem lie in the past. During the post war years, and particularly in the 1960s, the population of penal establishments increased rapidly and substantially and the pressure for new accommodation became acute. Much of the resource which became available was directed to the accommodation and facility for those inmates undergoing sentences and in particular the long-term inmate. Consequently the needs of remand inmates, the number of which increased at, proportionally, a greater rate than sentenced inmates, were somewhat neglected. Efforts to improve matters have been against the considerable difficulty which the ever increasing number creates.

4.06 The table which follows illustrates the extent of the problem in connection with the rise in remand population.

4.07 The Inspectorate is not required to pay regard to resource but is constrained to say that it is unrealistic to expect an improvement in a situation, which generally can only be described as unacceptable, without injection of considerable resource and not simply by reducing expenditure elsewhere. Nowhere is this more apparent than at Longriggend Remand Institution, still technically an annex of Barlinnie Prison. Though we found much improvement there in 1984 in comparison with 1981, Longriggend shares many of the shortcomings of those institutions which have been created from acquired premises for use as penal establishments. We consequently *recommend* that improvement in the conditions and facilities for remand inmates should be given the necessary resource as a matter of priority.

Average Daily Population in Penal Establishments

<i>Year</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Remand</i>	<i>Remand as % of total</i>
1950	1781	133	7
1951	1851	140	8
1952	2089	151	7
1953	2152	155	7
1954	2169	148	7
1955	2176	150	7
1956	2268	168	7
1957	2435	200	8
1958	2672	249	9
1959	2866	277	10
1960	2821	288	10
1961	2997	314	10
1962	3238	389	12
1963	3504	393	11
1964	3250	339	10
1965	3381	359	11
1966	3858	422	11
1967	4238	462	11
1968	4541	534	12
1969	4834	567	12
1970	5003	628	13
1971	5338	701	13
1972	5220	644	12
1973	4810	597	12
1974	4689	645	14
1975	4951	740	15
1976	4884	746	15
1977	4871	706	14
1978	5062	728	14
1979	4585	691	15
1980	4860	705	15
1981	4518	746	17
1982	4891	844	17
1983	5052	863	17
1984	4753	942	20

CHAPTER FIVE

Recommendations

5.01 We recommend that The Prison (Scotland) Rules, 1952, be updated to meet present day needs. (1.09)

5.02 We recommend that where pay-phones have been installed the need to continue censorship of inmates' mail should be examined. (2.04)

5.03 We recommend that improvement in the conditions and facilities for remand inmates should be given the necessary resource as a matter of priority. (4.07)