

**LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE**

**EXAMINATION OF ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES 2000 – 2001**

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
VOLUME 1**

**ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO**

**Additional Information Relating to the  
Examination of Expenditure 2000 – 2001**

**September 2001**



## CONTENTS

---

<b>Attorney-General's Portfolio</b>	
<b>Examination of Additional Estimates 2000 – 2001</b>	
<i>Clarification of responses given during hearing</i>	
Relating to Senate Legal & Constitutional Committee, Proof Hansard, Monday 19 February 2001, page 117	1
<i>Correction to Response from hearing on 22 November 2000</i>	
Question on Notice 46 (relating to the salaries of AAT, SSAT, MRT & RRT members)	3
<i>Tabled Documents from Estimates Hearing on 19 February 2001</i>	
Office of the Privacy Commissioner – new private sector legislation	6
- helping business to develop privacy solutions	8
Australian Customs Service - Briefing Document on the Submission from the Chief Executive Officer of Tradegate to Members of the Senate Estimates Committee dated 6 February 2001	13
Australian Customs Service – Customs Connect Facility (CCF) The Concept	24
Australian Customs Service – CCF: User access and possible Channels	25
Australian Customs Service – connect.com.au: Current Trade & Transport Community Network	26
Australian Federal Police – Actual Staffing Numbers	27
Attorney-General's Department - Joint Statement by the Prime Minister & Premiers of NSW and Victoria in relation to corporations legislation, 21 December 2000	28
Attorney-General's Department – Fact Sheet on Children's Privacy, 22 December 2000	29
Attorney-General's Department – Community Legal Centres in SA: A Fabric for the Future, Implementation Advisory Group, May 1998	30
Attorney-General's Department – Advertisement in AFR for Executive Members for the Administrative Review Tribunal, 17 November 2000	32

Attorney-General's Department – Advertisement for President & CEO for Administrative Review Tribunal	33
Attorney-General's Department – Advertisement for Senior Members & Members, AFR, 15/12/00	34
Government Response on the Senate Legal & Constitutional References Committee Report on Privacy and the Private Sector, 14 February 2001	35
'Bureaucrats caught on the hop over Skase case', 19 February (Article relating to the Senate Legal & Constitutional Committee, Proof Hansard, Monday 19 February 2001, p.6 and p.67)	36
<i>Answers to Questions on Notice</i>	
Attorney General's Portfolio	
Staffing levels	39
Vacant office space	68
Outstanding appointments	97
Family Court of Australia	100
Attorney General's Department	
Numbers of staff employed by each Family Court registry & sub-registry	101
Family Court of Australia	102
Office of Film & Literature Classification	112
CRIMTRAC	119
Attorney-General's Department	
Anti-discrimination laws	121
Family Court of Australia	122
Attorney-General's Department	
Dates of estimate responses	153
Corporations law	166
Office of the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions	167
Family Court of Australia	169
Attorney General's Department	
Trade Practices Act	174
<i>MOU between Federal Court &amp; the Federal Magistrates Service</i>	175
<i>MOU between Family Court &amp; the Federal Magistrates Service</i>	202

Australian Customs Service	247
<i>PricewaterHouseCoopers: Cost Benefit Analysis of Cargo Management Re-engineering – Progress Report, September 1999</i>	251
<i>PriceWaterHouseCoopers: Cost Benefit Analysis of Cargo Management Re-Engineering, October 1999</i>	273
Australian Federal Police	301
Australian Security Intelligence Organisation	322
Attorney General’s Department	
Commonwealth Protective Security Manual	323
Adelaide Law Courts Building	325
Office of Parliamentary Counsel	326
Attorney General’s Department	
Human Rights Branch	333
Recommendations of the ALRC report on the FOI Act	335
The ACT and the Electronic Transactions Bill	339
Office of Film and Literature Classification	340
Attorney General’s Department	
Amending the Copyright Act 1968	341
Request for report prepared by the Law Foundation of NSW	344
Costs related to the Administrative Review Tribunal	345
Positions at the Administrative Appeals Tribunal	346
Costs of National Call Centre	349
Law by Telecommunications Project	350
Family Law Pathways Advisory Group	352
Funding to southern, western, central and northern regions	354
Review document on SA Community Legal Centres	356
Funding to Women’s Legal Service SA	357
Community legal centres and Commonwealth funding	439
Juvenile diversion scheme	452
Monitoring of analog systems	453
Attorney-General’s Portfolio – Dates Received Answers to Questions on Notice	453 -1

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

Paid full-time equivalent (FTE) staffing levels for the Department (excluding the Insolvency Trustee Service Australia and the Australian Protective Service) for the last 3 years are as follows:

- 30 June 1998 568
- 30 June 1999 578
- 30 June 2000 579#.

As at 28 February 2001, the Department employed 544 FTE staff. The staff changes were made in the context of the Department's overall budgetary position but were not all directly related to budgetary constraints.

The reduction in the number of FTE staff between July 2000 and February 2001 includes:

- 8 staff going on leave without pay
- 9 staff transferred to CrimTrac after it became an Executive Agency on 1 July 2000
- 2 staff transferred to the Insolvency Trustee Service Australia after it became an Executive Agency on 1 July 2000
- 10 pay processing staff transferred to the Australian Protective Service as part of an internal restructure.

#Note: This figure differs from the 30 June 2000 figure in Appendix 5 to the Department's Annual Report 1999-2000 due to an incorrect method of extracting staff figures from the Department's computer system at that date.

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS TRIBUNAL  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

No positions were lost as a result of this year's (2000-01) Budget decisions.

Staffing levels over the last three years were as follows:

1999-2000:	151.02
1998-99:	160.6
1997-98:	162.6

The figures include both members and staff of the Tribunal.

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN BUREAU OF CRIMINAL INTELLIGENCE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

No positions were lost as a result of this year's (2000-01) Budget decisions.

Staffing levels over the last three years were as follows:

At 30 June 2000 the ABCI had a total authorised staff of 65 comprising 21 women, 40 men and 4 vacancies. Authorised staff includes outposted police liaison officers located in Western Australia, Victoria, Queensland and South Australia.

At 30 June 1999 the ABCI had a total staff of 66 comprising 23 women and 43 men. This includes outposted police liaison officers located in New South Wales, Western Australian, Victoria, Queensland and South Australia.

As at 30 June 1998 the ABCI had a total of 59 comprising 24 women and 35 men. Outposted liaison officers located in New South Wales, Western Australian, Victoria, Queensland and South Australia.

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.



SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALASIAN CENTRE FOR POLICING RESEARCH  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

No positions were lost as a result of this year's (2000-01) Budget decisions.

Staffing levels over the last three years were as follows:

1999-2000:	15
1998-99:	15
1997-98:	15

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN CUSTOMS SERVICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

There were no positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions.

Staffing levels for the past three years are as follows:

Financial Year	Staffing Level (Based on Headcount)
1997/98	4360
1998/99	4043
1999/00	4165

Source: Annual Reports.

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

In the 2000-01 Budget there were no specific Government measures to reduce positions in the AFP.

AFP staffing levels over the last three years were as follows:

Year	Staff Nos
1997 / 98	2630
1998 / 99	2791
1999 / 2000	2890

Source: Respective AFP Annual Reports

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

AGS commenced fully separate business operations on 1 September 1999 following its establishment as a statutory authority and government business enterprise. AGS staffing levels do not depend on the level of the budget but rather on the volume of business it has. AGS full time equivalent staffing at the end of the last three financial years was as follows:

1999-2000	610
1998-99	590
1997-98	682

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY AND  
CRIMINOLOGY RESEARCH COUNCIL  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

No positions were lost as a result of this year's (2000-01) Budget decisions.

Staffing levels over the last three years were as follows:

1999-2000:	42
1998-99:	45
1997-98:	34

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

**SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF POLICE MANAGEMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

No positions were lost as a result of this year's (2000-01) Budget decisions.

Staffing levels over the last three years were as follows:

1999-2000:	26
1998-99:	26
1997-98:	27

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

**SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN LAW REFORM COMMISSION  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

No positions were lost as a result of this year's (2000-01) Budget decisions.

Staffing levels (including Commissioners) over the last three years were as follows:

1999-2000:	26
1998-99:	25
1997-98:	27

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE ORGANISATION  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

ASIO lost no positions as a result of the 2000-01 Budget decisions. In fact, ASIO received additional funding in the context of the 2000 Olympics, the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting and for capability improvement.

The staff figures for the last three years are set out below.

	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
Average staffing level for each financial year	488	513	538
Full time equivalent at the end of the financial year	480	525	565
Number of staff at the end of each financial year	536	566	605

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.



SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRAC  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

No positions were lost as a result of this year's (2000-01) Budget decisions.

Staffing levels over the last three years were as follows:

1999-2000:	67
1998-99:	45
1997-98:	43

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
COPYRIGHT TRIBUNAL  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

No positions were lost as a result of this year's (2000-01) Budget decisions.

Staffing levels over the last three years were as follows:

1999-2000:	Nil
1998-99:	Nil
1997-98:	Nil

The Copyright Tribunal employs no staff as its support is provided by the Federal Court of Australia.

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
CRIMTRAC  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

As the CrimTrac Agency was established on 1 July 2000, no positions were lost as a result of this year's (2000-01) Budget decisions.

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
DEFENCE FORCE DISCIPLINE APPEAL TRIBUNAL  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

No positions were lost as a result of this year's (2000-01) Budget decisions.

Staffing levels over the last three years were as follows:

1999-2000:	Nil
1998-99:	Nil
1997-98:	Nil

The tribunal employs no staff with its support being provided entirely by the Federal Court of Australia.

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
OFFICE OF THE COMMONWEALTH DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTION  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

No positions were lost as a result of this year's (2000-01) Budget decisions.

Staffing levels over the last three years were as follows:

1999-2000:	403
1998-99:	410
1997-98:	413

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The positions lost this year due directly to Budget decisions have been SES Band 2 Registrars and their assistant staff as a result of the establishment of the Federal Magistrates Service. The Registrars were employed from April/May 1999.

The numbers of Registrars and assistants at the following dates are:

	Registrars	Assistants
30 June 1999	18	18
30 June 2000	21	21
28 February 2001	10	10

The Family Court is funded for four SES Band 2 Registrars and four assistants after 30 June 2001 and two Registrars and two assistants after 30 June 2002 although arrangements with the FMS are expected to result in the Court retaining funding for seven Registrars and seven assistants from 1 July 2001 until 30 June 2002.

Reduced appropriations generally have also had an impact on numbers of other staff as reflected in the answer to Question on Notice No. 5.

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

**SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FEDERAL COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

No positions were lost as a result of this year's (2000-01) Budget decisions.

Staffing levels (equivalent full time) over the last three years were as follows:

1999-2000:	314.31
1998-99:	308
1997-98:	274.46

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

**SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FEDERAL MAGISTRATES SERVICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

No positions were lost as a result of this year's (2000-01) Budget decisions.

Staffing levels over the last three years were as follows:

1999-2000 (as at 30/6/2000):	13
1998-99:	Nil
1997-98:	Nil

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.



**SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FEDERAL POLICE DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

No positions were lost as a result of this year's (2000-01) Budget decisions.

The Tribunal is administered by staff of the Federal Court of Australia on a part time basis as business arises. The Tribunal has no "staff" employed and this has also been the position for the last 3 years.

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

No positions were lost as a result of this year's (2000-01) Budget decisions.

Staffing levels over the last three years were as follows:

1999-2000:	76.6
1998-99:	86.0
1997-98:	87.3

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

No positions were lost as a direct result of this year's budget decisions.

Staffing levels:

February 2001:	97
99/00:	129
98/99:	116

Note that the Office of the Privacy Commissioner was established as a separate agency on 1 July 2000. Prior to that the Privacy Commissioner and his staff formed part of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission and this is reflected in the staffing levels for 99/00 and 98/99.

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
INSOLVENCY AND TRUSTEE SERVICE AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

No positions are expected to be lost in the Insolvency and Trustee Service Australia (ITSA) as a result of this year's Budget decisions. The operative staffing level at 30 June 2001 is estimated to be 236. This compares with the following operative staffing levels over the last 3 years:

272 as at 30 June 1998

242 as at 30 June 1999

238 as at 30 June 2000

The estimated reduction in staff by 30 June 2001 is a result of planned productivity efficiencies to fund agreed pay increases under the ITSA Certified Agreement 2000-2002.

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The National Crime Authority did not lose any positions as a result of last year's Budget decisions.

The staffing of the NCA as at 31 December was 407 (including 150 secondees from other law enforcement agencies, 134 of whom were seconded police officers).

Staffing over the past 3 years was as follows:

30 June 2000	450
30 June 1999	410
30 June 1998	376

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
NATIONAL NATIVE TITLE TRIBUNAL  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

No staff reductions have been made as a result of Government Budget decisions. The staffing profile which follows reflects the fluctuating workload of the NNTT over the period in question with increases in the financial years 98/99 and 00/to date. [POH stands for Public Office Holders].

	Perm	POH	Temp	Total	Full time	Part time	POH
As at 30/6/98	202	14	19	235			
As at 30/6/99	177	13	54	244	211	20	13
As at 30/6/00	170	17	45	232	200	15	17
As at 28/2/01	202	18	28	248	202	28	18

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
OFFICE OF THE PRIVACY COMMISSIONER  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

No positions were lost as a direct result of this year's budget decisions.

Staffing levels:

February 2001: 35

Note that the Office of the Privacy Commissioner was established as a separate agency on 1 July 2000. Prior to that the Privacy Commissioner and his staff formed part of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission.

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
OFFICE OF FILM AND LITERATURE CLASSIFICATION  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The Office of Film and Literature Classification (OFLC) has lost no positions as a result of this year's budget decisions. Staffing levels over the last three years were as follows:

1999-2000:	52
1998-99:	40
1997-98:	39

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.



**SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
OFFICE OF PARLIAMENTARY COUNSEL  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Staffing levels:

Can you provide an update of any positions lost as a result of this year's Budget decisions and compare that with staffing levels over the last 3 years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

No positions were lost as a result of this year's (2000-01) Budget decisions.

Staffing levels over the last three years were as follows:

1999-2000:	48
1998-99:	48
1997-98:	48

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- a. Yes, the Australian Protective Service leases property that has been left vacant by a sublet organisation that did not fulfil its tenancy contract, August 2000.
- b. Level 15, 323 Castlereagh Street SYDNEY NSW 2000
- c. Approximately 112m<sup>2</sup>; \$235.00m<sup>2</sup>; until 1 March 2001. Attempts were made to sublet but proved unsuccessful mainly due to the rental term starting at 6 months and obviously reducing down to one month.

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

**SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS TRIBUNAL  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- a. No
- b. Not applicable
- c. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN BUREAU OF CRIMINAL INTELLIGENCE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- d. No
- e. Not applicable
- f. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALASIAN CENTRE FOR POLICING RESEARCH  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- g. No
- h. Not applicable
- i. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN CUSTOMS SERVICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

A list of properties leased by Customs with vacant lettable space is attached at Table One.

**TABLE ONE: PROPERTIES WITH VACANT SPACE LEASED BY  
CUSTOMS**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Vacant Lettable Space</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Lease Expiration</b>	
2-12 Macquarie Street Parramatta NSW	500 square metres	\$315 per square metre per annum	28 February 2002	Jones Lang LaSalle a of terminating the cor
340 Adelaide Street Brisbane QLD	902 square metres	\$296.70 per square metre per annum	30 June 2001	Jones Lang LaSalle a of terminating the cor
2 Henry Street Fremantle WA	315 square metres	\$222.50 per square metre per annum	28 February 2002	Jones Lang LaSalle a of terminating the cor

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- a. The AFP leases one property with vacant space.
- b. The building is located at 170 Little Mallop Street, Geelong Victoria.
- c. The vacant lettable space is 167.8 m<sup>2</sup> and the cost is \$95.00 per square metre. The contract term is for three years commencing on 1 January 2000. The space has been vacant since 12 August 2000. On 31 July 2000 Haydens were appointed to sub-let the space on behalf of the AFP. To date there has not been any interest in the space.

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT SOLICITOR  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- j. As a GBE, AGS manages its office space holdings carefully with a view to having appropriate office space matched to its business needs and, in order to reduce costs, little or no unprofitably utilised space. Consequently, AGS does not have significant levels of vacant space.
- k. Not applicable
- l. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.



SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY  
AND  
CRIMINOLOGY RESEARCH COUNCIL  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- m. No
- n. Not applicable
- o. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF POLICE MANAGEMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- p. No
- q. Not applicable
- r. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

**SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN LAW REFORM COMMISSION  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- s. No
- t. Not applicable
- u. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

**SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE ORGANISATION  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- v. Yes
- w. Sydney
- x. The Sydney office post-Olympic accommodation requirements are being assessed and discussions have been initiated with the owners of the building about a possible reduction in space to meet ASIO's future needs. The existing lease expires in September 2003.

The cost of the Sydney office is \$303.92 per square metre per annum.

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRAC  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- y. No
- z. Not applicable
- aa. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
COPYRIGHT TRIBUNAL  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- bb. No
- cc. Not applicable
- dd. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
CRIMTRAC  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- ee. The Agency does not own or lease property with vacant space.
- ff. Nil
- gg. Nil

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

**SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
DEFENCE FORCE DISCIPLINE APPEAL TRIBUNAL  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- hh. No
- ii. Not applicable
- jj. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.



**SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTION  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- kk. The Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions does not own or lease property with vacant space.
- ll. Not applicable
- mm. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

- a) Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b) If so, what is the location of the building?
- c) What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square; the contract term; have there been any attempt to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

a. The Family Court does not own or lease any property with vacant space.

b&c. Not applicable.

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

**SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FEDERAL COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- nn. The Federal Court of Australia does not own or lease property with vacant space.
- oo. Not applicable
- pp. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FEDERAL MAGISTRATES SERVICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- qq. No
- rr. Not applicable
- ss. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

**SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FEDERAL POLICE DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- tt. No
- uu. Not applicable
- vv. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- ww. No
- xx. Not applicable
- yy. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- zz. The Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission does not own or lease property with vacant office space.
- aaa. Not applicable
- bbb. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
INSOLVENCY AND TRUSTEE SERVICE AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- a. Yes
- b. Two locations:
  - Level 19, Grenfell Centre, 25 Grenfell Street, Adelaide, SA
  - Level 14, Samuel Griffith Place, 340 Adelaide Street Brisbane, QLD
- c. Grenfell Centre

453.5 square metres; \$295 m<sup>2</sup>; lease expires 30 April 2001; previously sub-leased but sub-tenancy expired 31 May 2000; attempts were made to renegotiate with the building owner but were unsuccessful.

Samuel Griffith Place

400 square metres; \$280 m<sup>2</sup>; lease expires 30 June 2003; attempts have been made to sub-lease this space.

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.



**SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- ccc. Yes
- ddd. Sydney and Melbourne
- eee. The National Crime Authority has offices in Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Adelaide and Perth. There is no vacant space in the Brisbane, Adelaide or Perth offices. In the Sydney and Melbourne offices, staff accommodation arrangements are being reviewed ("stacking exercises") to establish if the current staff and facilities can be accommodated in less space and if there is any potential to sublet any vacant space which may become available.

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
NATIONAL NATIVE TITLE TRIBUNAL  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- fff. The NNTT does not lease any property with vacant space.
- ggg. Not applicable
- hhh. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
OFFICE OF FEDERAL PRIVACY COMMISSION  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- iii. The Office of the Privacy Commissioner does not own or lease property with vacant office space.
- jjj. Not applicable
- kkk. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
OFFICE OF FILM AND LITERATURE CLASSIFICATION  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

lll. The OFLC does not own or lease any property with vacant space.

mmm. Not applicable

nnn. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

**SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
OFFICE OF PARLIAMENTARY COUNSEL  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Vacant Office Space:

- a. Does the Department or any agency own or lease property with vacant space?
- b. If so, what is the location of the building?
- c. What is the vacant lettable space and the cost per square metre of that space; the contract term; have there been any attempts to sub-let, make alternative arrangements or re-negotiate?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- ooo. No
- ppp. Not applicable
- qqq. Not applicable

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

\* This question was directed at the Department and agencies within the Attorney-General's Portfolio. Separate responses to the question have been provided by the Department and the agencies, and are distinguished by the 'part number' reference.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Appointments:

- a. What statutory appointments within the Department and each of the agencies are currently outstanding?
- b. When did these appointments become vacant?
- c. Are there any vacant positions that will not be filled?
- d. What is the timetable for the filling of those positions?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

Family Court of Australia

- a. The Government is considering 2 appointments to the Family Court of Australia.
- b. The two proposed appointments are a consequence of the retirement in July 2000 of the Hon Justice Peter Moss and the retirement in February 2001 of the Hon Justice Warwick Rourke.
- c. No
- d. The timetable is a matter for Government

It should be noted that there is no judge of the Family Court of Australia currently designated as Deputy Chief Justice. The designation of Deputy Chief Justice has not been used since the retirement of Deputy Chief Justice Bartlett in 1998. This has not affected the number of judges as a judge was appointed to take the place of Deputy Chief Justice Bartlett on the bench of the Family Court of Western Australia (with a dual appointment to the Family Court of Australia). The Government does not intend to use that designation.

Federal Magistrates Service

- a. Of the 16 initial appointments to the Federal Magistrates Service the Government announced were to be made, 15 (including that of the Chief Federal Magistrate) have been made. The last of these appointments, that of a federal magistrate in Melbourne, is under consideration by the Attorney-General.

The Government has also decided to appoint a federal magistrate based in either Darwin or Adelaide, who will hear cases regularly in both locations as

well as on circuit to regional areas. Expressions of interest in this appointment were invited in a press advertisement on 13 January 2001 and applications closed on 16 February 2001.

- b. They are new appointments
- c. No
- d. The timetable is a matter for Government

Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission

- a. Of the five statutory Commissioner appointments, three are filled on a substantive basis and two (Race Discrimination Commissioner and Disability Discrimination Commissioner) are filled on a long-term acting basis.
- b. None of the appointments are vacant.
- c. The Government proposes to continue the acting arrangements pending the passage of legislation restructuring the Commission.
- d. Refer to (c) above.

Classification Review Board

- a. Section 73 of the *Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) Act 1995* (the Act) provides that the Classification Review Board is to consist of a Convenor, and a Deputy Convenor and at least 3, but not more than 8, other members. These are part time appointments. The Review Board currently has a Convenor, a Deputy Convenor and three other members, two of whom have been appointed to act on a short-term basis. This level of membership fulfils the minimum requirement under the Act.
- b. Refer to a. above.
- c. Further appointments to the Review Board are expected to be made shortly.
- d. The timetable is a matter for Government.

Privacy Advisory Committee

- a. One position on the Privacy Advisory Committee.
- b. The statutory appointment became vacant on 31 December 1997.
- c. It is intended that the position be filled.
- d. The timetable is a matter for Government



### Tribunals

Where tribunals do not have minimum membership numbers, the number of members is a matter for the Government of the day. Therefore these tribunals do not have vacancies of statutory positions except where President or Registrar positions are vacant. There are no such vacancies in tribunals at present.

### Office of Parliamentary Counsel

- a. One of the two positions of Second Parliamentary Counsel.
- b. This position became vacant on 10 February 2001.
- c. No.
- d. The timetable is a matter for Government

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

What were the operating hours for each Family Court registry and sub-registry as at 1 July 1999, 1 July 2000 and today's date?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

Registries normally operate within the 7.30am to 6pm bandwidth. Hours during which different services are available vary according to client needs.

An after hours emergency service is maintained by the Court for clients needing immediate attention outside of normal working hours.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

**How many staff were employed by each Family Court registry and sub-registry on 1 July 1999, 1 July 2000 and today's date – and on what basis (full-time or part-time)?**

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

Registry	FTE (excludes Judges)					
	01/07/1999		01/07/2000		19/02/2001	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time
Adelaide Registry	65	3	66	1	64	2
Brisbane Registry	113	7	96	1	78	2
Canberra Registry	24	8	26	3	18	2
Dandenong Registry	41	11	40	4	36	1
Darwin Registry	17	2	15		13	0
Hobart Registry	22	7	21	4	16	1
Melbourne Registry	109	39	112	11	98	6
Newcastle Registry	31	10	35	5	25	3
Parramatta Registry	76	16	75	8	55	4
Sydney Registry	94	7	100	9	75	3
Townsville Registry	24	2	18	1	18	1
Sub-Registry Albury	5	2	4		3	0
Sub-Registry Alice Springs	3		1	2	1	2
Sub-Registry Cairns	8	1	4		4	
Sub-Registry Coffs Harbour	3	2	3	1		
Sub-Registry Dubbo	4		3		3	
Sub-Registry Gold Coast	6					
Sub-Registry Launceston	4	7	2	3	0	3
Sub-Registry Lismore	3	2	3	1	3	
Sub-Registry Rockhampton	2		1	2		1
Sub-Registry Wollongong	3	1	3		2	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>657</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>512</b>	<b>32</b>

**NB. These are FTE figures and do not necessarily coincide with staff number figures based upon the number of people employed.**

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

If there has been a closure or reduction in hours of any Family Court registry or sub-registry, to which other registries are people directed when the registry or sub-registry is not operational?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The Court is committed to matching its resources to the needs of its clients in the most effective and efficient way possible. Changes to the resourcing of any registry or sub-registry have occurred after carefully considering the needs of the local community and how those needs can best be met.

**Rockhampton**

During non-circuit weeks Rockhampton clients are directed to Townsville via the 1800 number on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. The office is staffed by a counsellor on Tuesdays and Thursdays during these weeks. Links are being developed with community organisations in Rockhampton to provide a more comprehensive mediation service.

**Gold Coast**

Service delivery in the Gold Coast region has been changed in partnership with non government organisations in the region. From 1 July 2000 mediation services operated by community based organisations have been provided from multiple sites in the Gold Coast allowing better flexibility of access for clients in the region. Deputy Registrar conciliation services have continued in the region at Southport Magistrate's Court from April 2000 on a bi-monthly basis.

**Coffs Harbour**

Since the restructure of service delivery in the Coffs Harbour area which took effect on 30 September 2000, Coffs Harbour operates as a circuit location. Generally, for information or filing purposes, clients are now directed to the Newcastle registry and Lismore sub-registry as appropriate.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

As at 1 July 1999, 1 July 2000 and today's date, was there a judge or registrar permanently located in each registry? If there has been a change, what is the nature of the new arrangements for judicial or registrar attendance? How often does this occur?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

Registry	01/07/1999	01/07/2000	19/02/2001	Comments
Adelaide	5 Judges 1 Judicial Registrar 3 Registrars	5 Judges 1 Judicial Registrar 2 Registrars	5 Judges 1 Judicial Registrar 2 Registrars	Federal Magistrate appointed and number of Registrars reduced. An additional Federal Magistrate position has been advertised to service both Darwin and Adelaide.
Brisbane	8 Judges 1 Judicial Registrar 4 Registrars	7 Judges 1 Judicial Registrar 4 Registrars	8 Judges 1 Judicial Registrar 3 Registrars	Judge retired on 30/06/2000 and was replaced July 2000. Federal Magistrates appointed and number of Registrars reduced
Canberra	2 Judges 1 Registrar	2 Judges	2 Judges	Federal Magistrate appointed and Registrar position terminated
Dandenong	1 Judge 1 Judicial Registrar 1 Registrar	1 Judge 1 Judicial Registrar 1 Registrar	1 Judicial Registrar	Judge transferred to Melbourne and defended hearings now heard in Melbourne. All other services maintained by registry staff supported by circuits of Judicial Officers as needed.
Darwin	1 Registrar	1 Registrar	Nil	Circuits conducted by both FCoA and FMS. A Federal Magistrate position has been advertised to service both Darwin and Adelaide.

Hobart	1 Judge 1 Registrar	1 Judge 1 Registrar	1 Judge	Federal Magistrate appointed and Registrar position terminated
Melbourne	11 Judges 1 Judicial Registrar 4 Registrars	11 Judges 1 Judicial Registrar 4 Registrars	12 Judges 1 Judicial Registrar 3 Registrars	Judge transferred from Dandenong. Federal Magistrates appointed and number of Registrars reduced
Newcastle	1 Judge 1 Registrar	1 Judge	1 Judge	Federal Magistrate appointed and Registrar position terminated.
Parramatta	6 Judges 1 Judicial Registrar 2 Registrars	6 Judges 1 Judicial Registrar	5 Judges 1 Judicial Registrar	Judge retired – replacement not yet named Federal Magistrates appointed and number of Registrars reduced
Sydney	11 Judges 2 Judicial Registrar 2 Registrars	11 Judges 2 Judicial Registrar 2 Registrars	10 Judges 2 Judicial Registrar 2 Registrars	Judge retired - replacement not yet named
Townsville	1 Judge 1 Registrar	1 Judge	1 Judge	Federal Magistrate appointed and Registrar position terminated.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

What arrangements exist for each registry and sub-registry for access to the Federal Magistrates Service?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

Registry	Comments
Adelaide	Full filing services. A Federal Magistrate is located at the Registry
Albury*	Filing services via Melbourne
Alice Springs*	Filing services via Darwin
Brisbane	Full filing services. Two Federal Magistrates are located at the Registry
Cairns*	Full filing services.
Canberra	Full filing services. A Federal Magistrate is located at the Registry
Dandenong	Full filing services for FMS circuits conducted from Melbourne
Darwin	Full filing services for FMS circuits plus FMS divorce and directions lists monthly via video.
Dubbo*	Filing services via Parramatta
Launceston*	Filing services via Hobart. A Federal Magistrate is located at Launceston and all matters filed in Hobart by Northern Tasmanian clients will be heard by the FMS in Launceston or on circuit to the North West coast.
Lismore*	Filing service via Newcastle or Brisbane
Hobart	Full filing services for Tasmania. The Federal Magistrate based at Launceston will visit Hobart on a regular basis.
Melbourne	Full filing services. Two Federal Magistrates and the Chief Magistrate are located at the Registry.
Newcastle	Full filing services. A Federal Magistrate is located at the Registry
Parramatta	Full filing services. Two Federal Magistrates are located at the Registry
Rockhampton*	Filing services via Townsville
Sydney	Divorce filing services. Applications are dealt with by FCoA Registrars or Deputy Registrars under delegation from the Chief Magistrate.
Townsville	Full filing services. A Federal Magistrate is located at the Registry
Wollongong*	Filing services via Sydney.

\* denotes sub - registry

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

As of 1 July 1999, 1 July 2000 and today's date, what were the resources for counselling in each registry, sub-registry, judicial circuit location and counselling circuits and outreach – how many counselling staff, at what level, were they full time or part time, how many days a week did they provide counselling services in this location?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The resources used for counselling are described in the two following tables.

Table A sets out the resources for counselling in each registry and sub-registry, showing how many counselling staff and at what level. The number of full time and part time staff tends to fluctuate and so Table A shows the full time equivalent (FTE) figure for each registry and sub-registry.

Table B sets out the resources for counselling in each circuit location, showing the number of counsellor days allocated to each circuit location per year. The table provides further details such as the type of circuit, the number of circuits to each location per annum, the number of days per circuit and the number of counsellors per circuit. The level of counselling staff performing circuit work is predominantly Executive Officer Level 1.

In terms of type of circuit, *Counselling* circuits are attended only by Counsellors whereas Counsellors accompany judicial officers on *Judicial* circuits. The counselling resources committed to both types of circuit at any given location is invariably the same and Table B does not otherwise distinguish between the resources deployed at each type of circuit.

In order to describe counselling resources deployed on circuit as at 1 July 1999, 1 July 2000 and today's date, it is necessary for Table B to show the Family Court's counselling circuit program for 1998/99, 1999/2000 and 2000/01 respectively. As indicated by Table B, the programs for 1998/99 and 1999/2000 were more or less identical; a major review of all circuit programs occurred late in 1999/2000 with changes to take effect in the following year. The 2000/01 circuit program may be subject to further change especially as the coordination of circuits between the Family Court and the Federal Magistrates Service is still under review.



**Table A**

	<b>01/07/1999</b>	<b>01/07/2000</b>	<b>19/2/2001</b>
<b>Registry</b>	FTE	FTE	FTE
<b>Adelaide Registry (Total)</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>11.8</b>	<b>9.9</b>
EXE2 (SOGA)	1		1
EXE2 (SOGB)	2	2	1
EXE1 (SOGC)	7.6	9.8	7.9
<b>Brisbane Registry (Total)</b>	<b>15.9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9.21</b>
EXE2 (SOGA)	2	1	1
EXE2 (SOGB)			1
EXE1 (SOGC)	13.9	9	7.21
<b>Canberra Registry (Total)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.81</b>
EXE2 (SOGA)	1		
EXE2 (SOGB)			
EXE1 (SOGC)	4	2.8	2.81
<b>Dandenong Registry (Total)</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>
EXE2 (SOGA)	1	1	
EXE2 (SOGB)			1
EXE1 (SOGC)	7	7	5
<b>Darwin Registry (Total)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
EXE2 (SOGA)	1	1	1
EXE2 (SOGB)			
EXE1 (SOGC)	2		
<b>Hobart Registry (Total)</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>2</b>
EXE2 (SOGA)	1	1	1
EXE2 (SOGB)			
EXE1 (SOGC)	2.8	2.2	1
<b>Melbourne Registry (Total)</b>	<b>23.2</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>17.35</b>
EXE2 (SOGA)	1		1
EXE2 (SOGB)	2	3	2
EXE1 (SOGC)	20.2	19	14.35
<b>Newcastle Registry (Total)</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>5</b>
EXE2 (SOGA)	1		0.8
EXE2 (SOGB)			
EXE1 (SOGC)	5.6	7.2	4.2
<b>Parramatta Registry (Total)</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>13.01</b>
EXE2 (SOGA)	1	1	1
EXE2 (SOGB)	1	1	1
EXE1 (SOGC)	11.8	11.4	11.01
<b>Sydney Registry (Total)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14.8</b>	<b>9.7</b>
EXE2 (SOGA)	1	1	1
EXE2 (SOGB)	1	1	1
EXE1 (SOGC)	13	12.8	7.7
<b>Townsville Registry (Total)</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
EXE2 (SOGA)	1	1	1
EXE2 (SOGB)			
EXE1 (SOGC)	3	2	2

	01/07/1999	01/07/2000	19/2/2001
Registry	FTE	FTE	FTE
<b>Sub-Registry Albury (Total)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
EXE2 (SOGA)			
EXE2 (SOGB)	1	1	1
EXE1 (SOGC)	2	2	1
<b>Sub-Registry Alice Springs (Total)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.6</b>
EXE1 (SOGC)	1	0.6	0.6
<b>Sub-Registry Cairns (Total)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
EXE2 (SOGB)	1		
EXE1 (SOGC)	2	2	1
<b>Sub-Registry Coffs Harbour (Total)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
EXE2 (SOGA)			
EXE2 (SOGB)	1	1	
EXE1 (SOGC)	1	1	
<b>Sub-Registry Dubbo (Total)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
EXE2 (SOGA)			
EXE2 (SOGB)	1	1	1
EXE1 (SOGC)	1	1	1
<b>Sub-Registry Launceston (Total)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>2</b>
EXE2 (SOGA)			
EXE2 (SOGB)	1	1	0.6
EXE1 (SOGC)	2	1	1.4
<b>Sub-Registry Lismore (Total)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
EXE2 (SOGA)	1	1	1
EXE2 (SOGB)			
EXE1 (SOGC)	1	1	1
<b>Sub-Registry Rockhampton (Total)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.4</b>
EXE2 (SOGA)			
EXE2 (SOGB)			
EXE1 (SOGC)	0		0.4
<b>Sub-Registry Wollongong (Total)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
EXE2 (SOGA)			
EXE2 (SOGB)			
EXE1 (SOGC)	2	2	1 <sup>#1</sup>
<b>Total</b>	<b>126.9</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>89.98</b>

#1 Recruitment is underway to recruit a counsellor for Wollongong

Please also note that Alice Springs, Darwin and Cairns also share between them 6 positions for Aboriginal Family Consultants. Of the 6 actual occupants, 4 are accredited by the Court as Mediators.

**Table B**

CIRCUITS	Counsellor Resources deployed on circuit from Registries and Sub-Registries as at 1/7/1999 (1998/99) and 1/7/2000 (1999/2000)				Counsellor Resources deployed on circuit from Registries and Sub-Registries as at 19/2/2001 (2000/01)				
	Type of circuit	Days/ circuit	Circuits p.a.	No. of Counsellors per circuit	Total counselling staff days p.a.	Days/ circuit	Circuits p.a.	No. of Counsellors per circuit	Total counselling staff days p.a.
<b>New South Wales</b>									
Nowra	Counselling	1	48	1	48	1	48	1	48 <sup>#2</sup>
Orange	Counselling	2	12	1	36	0	0	0	0
		1	12	1					
Parkes	Counselling	1	12	1	12	0	0	0	0
Bourke	Counselling	1.5	3	1	4.5	0	0	0	0
Lightening Ridge	Counselling	1.5	3	1	4.5	0	0	0	0
Tamworth	Judicial and Counselling	5	8	1	40	5	6	1	30
Taree	Counselling	5	7	1	35	5	5	1	25
Muswellbrook	Counselling	2	6	1	12	0	0	0	0
Coffs Harbour (Note Coffs harbour Registry to circuit location)	Judicial and Counselling	Resident Counsellor	Resident Counsellor			Alternate 2/3 days each month	12	2	60
Tenterfield/Glen Innes/Inverell	Counselling	5	10	1	50	0	0	0	0
<b>Queensland</b>									
Gold Coast	Counselling	4	48	1	192	2	48	1	96 <sup>#3</sup>
Ayr/Bowen, Emerald, Mt isa	Counselling	2	12	1	24	0	0	0	0
MacKay	Judicial and Counselling	5	12	1	60	5	8	1	40
Rockhampton	Judicial and Counselling	2	48	1	96	2	48	1	96

#2. It is planned to cease the Nowra circuit by approximately the end of March 2001.

#3. For the Gold Coast, 2 staff circuit 3 locations 4 days per fortnight. The FCoA operates out of CBA premises.

	Counsellor Resources deployed on circuit from Registries and Sub-Registries as at 1/7/1999 (1998/99) and 1/7/2000 (1999/2000)				Counsellor Resources deployed on circuit from Registries and Sub-Registries as at 19/2/2001 (2000/01)				
<b>Northern Territory</b>									
Katherine	Counselling	4	8	1	32	3	7	1	21
Tennant Creek	Counselling	3	7	1	21	3	7	1	21
Pitjilands		4	8	1	32	4	8	1	32
<b>Victoria</b>									
Ballarat ##	Judicial and Counselling	2	16	2	64	2	4	2	16 ##
Bendigo ##	Judicial and Counselling	2	15	2	60	2	3	1	6 ##
Geelong ##	Judicial and Counselling	1	50	1	50	1	9	1	9 ##
Mildura ##	Judicial and Counselling	5	5	2	50	0	0	0	0 ##
Warrnambool ##	Judicial and Counselling	3	5	2	30	3	1	2	6 ##
Griffith	Counselling	1	12	1	12	0	0	0	0
Shepparton	Counselling	3	12	1	36	2.6	3	1	7.8
Wagga Wagga	Counselling	1	26	1	26	1.5	2	1	3
Wangaratta	Counselling	1	26	1	26	1.6	3	1	4.8
Bairnsdale	Judicial and Counselling from 2001	1	12	1	12	1	12	1	12
Sale	Counselling	2	12	2	48	2	12	1	24
Traralgon ##	Counselling only from 2001	2	12	2	48	3	10	1	30 ##

NB ## Circuit program for these locations may be subject to change during 2000/01 as the coordination of circuits between the Family Court and Federal Magistrates Service is under review.

	Counsellor Resources deployed on circuit from Registries and Sub-Registries as at 1/7/1999 (1998/99) and 1/7/2000 (1999/2000)				Counsellor Resources deployed on circuit from Registries and Sub-Registries as at 19/2/2001 (2000/01)			
<b>South Australia</b>								
Berri	2	5	1	10	5	3	1	15
Broken Hill	5	6	1	30	5	6	1	30
Mt. Gambier	5	7	1	35	5	6	1	30
Port Augusta	1	8	1	8	2	6	1	12
Port Pirie	2	8	1	16	2	6	1	12
Whyalla	2	8	1	16	2	6	1	12
<b>A.C.T.</b>								
Batermans Bay	1	12	2	24	1	12	1	12
Bega	1	12	2	24	1	12	1	12
<b>Tasmania</b>								
	No circuits							

**Outreach Services providing Counselling Services**

	Number of Days Per Week	
	At 1/7/1999	At 19/2/2001
<b>NSW</b>		
Gosford	4	2
<b>Tasmania</b>		
Devenport	2	2

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
OFFICE OF FILM AND LITERATURE CLASSIFICATION  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Harradine tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Please provide the Committee with the working [papers] of the Classification Board in respect to the film “Hannibal”.

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator’s question is as follows:**

The classification report produced by the Classification Board in respect of the film ‘Hannibal’ is attached.

The Classification Board does not publicly release information about the way in which individual members of the Board vote on specific matters. Accordingly, it would not be appropriate for the working papers and votes of individual classifiers to be provided.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
CRIMTRAC  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Harradine asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

- (a) Does the CRIMTRAC database only include persons who have been found guilty of committing a criminal offence?
- (b) What categories of offenders are included in the CRIMTRAC database?
- (c) Are firearm owners in Australia included in the CRIMTRAC database?
- (d) If citizens who have no criminal record are included, what safeguards are there in place to protect their privacy?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- (a) The CrimTrac Agency provides a mechanism for police to gain access to current information on persons, objects and events of interest on a national basis through the maintenance of several databases; not through operation of a single database. In the longer term access is likely to be via an integrated viewing or browsing system.

Persons, objects and events of interest to police are varied and include details of registered firearms, missing persons and details of motor vehicles, as well as information on persons who have been found guilty of committing a criminal offence. Rapid access to such information is essential for police to serve the community in an effective manner.

- (b) Through the National Names Index police can obtain criminal history information from other jurisdictions. The categories of offenders for which these records are kept are governed by the respective jurisdictional legislation which specifies when and under what circumstances personal details are recorded. By way of examples, such records would normally include persons convicted of criminal activity or who have outstanding warrants.
- (c) All Australian Governments agreed in November 1996, as part of a series of national firearms reforms, to the establishment of a national firearms licensing and registration system (NFLRS). The NFLRS provides police with direct access to details of license holders and registered firearms currently available from individual State and Territory firearm registries. CrimTrac will facilitate quicker and more accurate access to NFLRS for police.

The NFLRS is not a criminal database. Individual records on the NFLRS simply note possession of a firearms license and details of any registered firearm. Inclusion of a person on the NFLRS is not, nor ever has been, an

indicator of criminality. On the contrary, an applicant for a firearms license must meet strict criminal history requirements before being granted a license and being recorded on the NFLRS. There is no record on the NFLRS of whether a person has committed an offence. The NFLRS is a record keeping system; one that helps to protect the public from unauthorised access to firearms while helping to protect the integrity and reputation of genuine law abiding firearms license holders. This approach will not change under CrimTrac.

- (d) Because the CrimTrac Agency is a Commonwealth Agency it is bound by the *Commonwealth Privacy Act 1988* and therefore must comply with 11 Information Privacy Principles, which prescribe safeguards for handling personal information.

Since July 1 2000, the CrimTrac Agency has taken responsibility for the systems that were formerly run by the National Exchange of Police Information (NEPI). It is also developing new systems (a National Automated Fingerprint Identification System, a National Criminal Investigation DNA Database, and the integrated viewing or browsing system mentioned earlier). The CrimTrac Agency has been keeping the Privacy Commissioner informed of developments as they occur and is consulting with staff from the Privacy Commissioner's Office in the development of new applications.



SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Harradine asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Did the late-term abortion of the baby in Victoria last year on the grounds of suspected dwarfism violate anti-discrimination laws?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The Department is aware of this matter through media reports. Those reports concentrated mainly on issues of medical ethics.

The Department has not considered whether the abortion was in breach of discrimination laws. The Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission and, where necessary, the courts have the role of determining whether or not a breach of Commonwealth discrimination laws has occurred in particular cases. The Commonwealth's anti-discrimination laws contain mechanisms whereby the parties involved may seek a legal ruling as to whether the action taken in a matter amounts to discrimination under those laws. The Commission also has wide ranging functions of inquiring into and reporting on matters relating to human rights. In addition, State and Territories have mechanisms under their respective anti-discrimination legislation.

These are the appropriate mechanisms for determining and dealing with allegations of discrimination.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Mason asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001:**

- a) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify in each year all overseas trips taken by the Chief Justice and paid for wholly or in part, directly or indirectly, out of Court funds and the amount paid on his behalf. If accompanied by any person in respect of such trips, specify the identity of that person and whether that person's expenses were paid in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, out of Court funds and the amount paid on that person's behalf;
- b) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify for each year the amount of Travel Allowance claimed by and paid to the Chief Justice;
- c) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify for each year the total amount in respect of airfares within Australia incurred by the Chief Justice and paid wholly or in part out of Court funds;
- d) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify the total amount expended in each year out of Court funds on furnishings, fittings, objects d'art, cutlery, crockery and the like for the use of the Chief Justice;
- e) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify total motor vehicle expenses incurred by or on behalf of the Chief Justice and paid for wholly or in part directly or indirectly out of Court funds;
- f) In respect of the information sought in (a) - (e) above, specify where in the books and the financial statements of the Court that the information is recorded.

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- a) Note that "allowances" can include conference registration fees which sometimes include an accommodation component.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>
1995/96	New Zealand - NZ Law Society Family Law Conference and NZ Judges' conference	\$728	\$1,668
1995/96	USA - Association of Family and Conciliation Courts (AFCC) conference	Nil - costs met privately	Nil - fares paid by AFCC
1995/96	New Zealand - Triennial NZ and Chief Justices' conference Accompanied by spouse	\$1,609	\$2,037 \$1,347
1995/96	UK, USA Spain - UNICEF Conference, AFCC/World Congress Meetings	\$1,970	Nil - fares paid by privately and frequent flyer points used
1996/97	USA/UK/The Hague/Thailand - 2 <sup>nd</sup> World	Nil - costs	\$7,836

	Congress on Family Law and meetings in USA with UNICEF/meetings with President of the Family Law Division of the High Court and officers of the Lord Chancellor's Department/meetings with the Family Court of Thailand and UNICEF.  Accompanied by spouse	met privately	Other fares met privately  \$7,836
1997/98	USA - to preside over the AFCC Executive Committee meeting and to attend the Board meeting of the National Council of Family and Juvenile Judges and other meetings.	Nil	\$8,491
1997/98	USA/UK/The Hague - AFCC 35 <sup>th</sup> Annual Conference,Hague conference on Private International Law and meetings senior members of the UK judiciary in London. Accompanied by spouse	Nil	\$8,619  \$8,619
1998/99	South Africa - International conference on Reconciling Violent Relationships; meetings with Minister for Justice, University of Capetown	\$4,105	\$8,248
1998/99	Hong Kong & Canada - meetings with Hong Kong Chief Judge of the Appeal Court and other judges on various issues including an examination of methods of court administration and information technology systems - executive committee meeting of AFCC. Accompanied by spouse	\$768 Costs in Canada met privately	\$9,537  \$9,537
1999/00	Papua & New Guinea - to present a paper at the First PNG National Legal Convention	Nil - costs met by hosts	Nil - cost met by frequent flyer points
1999/00	New Zealand - Conference of Australian and NZ Family Law Judges	\$391	\$611
1999/00	East Timor - visit at the invitation of Mr Jose Ramos Horta, vice president of CNRT to examine ways in which Australian courts and particularly the Family Court could offer assistance to the newly established Court in East Timor	Nil - accommodation provided by East Timor	Nil - travel by military aircraft
1999/00	China - invitation by HREOC as part of an overseas aid program sponsored by AUSAID in support of the Australian/Chinese Human Rights Dialogue	Nil - costs met by HREOC	Nil - costs met by HREOC

b) and c)

The Family Court is a national court with Registries in all capital cities except Perth and premises in other significant population areas throughout Australia except Western Australia. The Court incurs significant costs in providing services to rural and regional Australia, which includes travel by the Chief Justice to such locations.

In respect of domestic travel -

<b>Year</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>
1995/96	\$19,910.00	\$33,382.05
1996/97	\$21,885.00	\$35,835.05
1997/98	\$17,565.00	\$26,035.35
1998/99	\$24,700.00	\$30,643.91
1999/00	\$28,648.50	\$32,744.40

**d) Purchases**

24 April 1999	Kitchenware (pots, pans, trays etc)	\$410.65
22 June 1999	Glassware for Conference Room use (48 glasses)	\$258.80
17 February 2001	Glassware, coffee plungers and tea towels For Conference Room use.	\$200.71

Additionally, the Chief Justice has purchased at his own personal expense a number of pieces of furniture and objects d'art which are in general use within his Chambers and conference room areas. The Court's ability to make use of these items, at no cost to the public purse, effectively represents a considerable saving in expenditure.

e) The Chief Justice is entitled to use Comcar for official purposes. In 1997/98, it was decided to lease a vehicle from DASFLEET in lieu of the Comcar arrangement in Melbourne.

e) The Chief Justice is entitled to use Comcar for travel between his home and the Court premises, and also for airport transfers when travelling. In 1997/98, it was decided to lease a vehicle from DASFLEET in lieu of the Comcar arrangement to and from Court premises.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Comcar</b>	<b>Other</b>
1995/96	\$40,315.50	\$2,548.91
1996/97	\$43,620.35	\$2,706.56
1997/98	\$22,504.05	\$6,128.36
1998/99	\$7,659.15	\$13,025.65
1999/00	\$8,153.98	\$16,360.05

f) The information is recorded electronically in the Family Court's financial management information system (FINEST) and in paper records such as the Overseas Travel Register, registers of Movement Requisitions, invoices and other accounts documents. The information is reflected in financial information reported in annual Financial Statements audited by the Australian National Audit Office and published in Family Court Annual Reports.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Mason asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001:**

- a) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify in each year all overseas trips taken by the former Deputy Chief Justice Alan Barblett and paid for wholly or in part, directly or indirectly, out of Court funds and the amount paid on his behalf. If accompanied by any person in respect of such trips, specify the identity of that person and whether that person's expenses were paid in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, out of Court funds and the amount paid on that person's behalf;
- b) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify for each year the amount of Travel Allowance claimed by and paid to the former Deputy Chief Justice;
- c) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify for each year the total amount in respect of airfares within Australia incurred by the former Deputy Chief Justice and paid wholly or in part out of Court funds;
- d) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify the total amount expended in each year out of Court funds on furnishings, fittings, objects d'art, cutlery, crockery and the like for the use of the former Deputy Chief Justice;
- e) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify total motor vehicle expenses incurred by or on behalf of the former Deputy Chief Justice and paid for wholly or in part directly or indirectly out of Court funds;
- f) In respect of the decision to offer a retainer payable out of Court funds to the former Deputy Chief Justice following the termination of his judicial commission,
  - a. Specify who made the decision to offer that retainer
  - b. Specify the amount paid to the former Deputy Chief Justice as at 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000 pursuant to the said retainer, including fees, Travel Allowance, any amount paid to cover airfares and motor vehicle expenses, and any other financial benefits received pursuant to the said retainer.
- g) In respect of the information sought in (a) - (e) above, specify where in the books and the financial statements of the Court that the information is recorded.

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- a) Note that "allowances" can include conference registration fees which sometimes include an accommodation component.

Year	Reason	Allowances	Fares
1995/96	China - Lawasia Biennial Conference Accompanied by spouse	\$7,082.91	\$6,306.00 \$1,254.00
1996/97	USA/Canada/UK - Australian Bar Association Conference and Commonwealth Law	\$10,249.98	\$8,882.00

	Conference/meeting with President of the Family Division of the High Court. Accompanied by spouse		\$8,882.00
1996/97	New Zealand - Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration conference Accompanied by spouse	\$2,381.90	\$3,296.00 \$3,296.00
1996/97	USA - Association of Family and Conciliation Courts 2 <sup>nd</sup> World Congress Accompanied by spouse	\$8,569.00	Precise amount unable to be determined from available records

b) and c) In respect of domestic travel -

Year	Allowances	Fares
1995/96	\$16,180.00	\$33,657
1996/97	\$18,995.00	\$8,134
1997/98	\$17,679.00	\$32,233.10
1998/99	\$12,910.00	\$24,148.20
1999/00	\$13,260.00	\$27,773.22

d) The former Deputy Chief Justice Alan Barblett was also a Judge of the Family Court of Western Australia. Expenses incurred by way of chambers expenses for the purposes of his duties as a Judge of the Family Court of Western Australia are not available to the Family Court of Australia.

e)

Year	Comcar	Other
1995/96	\$8,639.15	*
1996/97	\$7300,50	*
1997/98	\$5,689.805	*
1998/99	\$3,883.10	*
1999/00	\$6,206.25	*

\* The former Deputy Chief Justice Alan Barblett was also a Judge of the Family Court of Western Australia. Expenses incurred by way of self drive motor vehicles for the purposes of his duties as a Judge of the Family Court of Western Australia are not available to the Family Court of Australia.

f) The former Deputy Chief Justice is not paid a retainer but has accepted a contract to provide consultancy services in matters of practice and procedure at a daily rate plus expenses at standards normally applying to a Judge. To date, he has also been engaged in the following specific activities: selection process to engage SES Band 2 Registrars, selection process to engage Deputy Registrars, and selection of the new CEO

a.	Chief Executive		
b.		1998/99	1999/2000
	Fees	\$13,875	\$71,600
	Fares	\$15,890	\$27,773
	T/A	\$8,710	\$13,260
	Comcar	\$2,730	\$6,206
	Phone/fax	\$3,213	\$2,549

g) The information is recorded electronically in the Family Court's financial management information system (FINEST) and in paper records such as the Overseas Travel Register, registers of Movement Requisitions, invoices and other accounts documents. The information is reflected in financial information reported in annual Financial Statements audited by the Australian National Audit Office and published in Family Court Annual Reports.

The former Deputy Chief Justice Alan Barblett was also a Judge of the Family Court of Western Australia. Accordingly, expenses incurred by way of motor vehicles, chambers expenses, fares and travelling allowance for the purposes of his duties as a Judge of the Family Court of Western Australia are not available to the Family Court of Australia and are not included in the above figures.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Mason asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001:**

- a) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify in each year all overseas trips taken by Justice Buckley and paid for wholly or in part, directly or indirectly, out of Court funds and the amount paid on his behalf. If accompanied by any person in respect of such trips, specify the identity of that person and whether that person's expenses were paid in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, out of Court funds and the amount paid on that person's behalf;
- b) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify for each year the amount of Travel Allowance claimed by and paid to Justice Buckley;
- c) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify for each year the total amount in respect of airfares within Australia incurred by the Justice Buckley and paid wholly or in part out of Court funds;
- d) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify the total amount expended in each year out of Court funds on furnishings, fittings, objects d'art, cutlery, crockery and the like for the use of the Justice Buckley;
- e) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify total motor vehicle expenses incurred by or on behalf of the Justice Buckley and paid for wholly or in part directly or indirectly out of Court funds;
- f) In respect of the information sought in (a) - (e) above, specify where in the books and the financial statements of the Court that the information is recorded.

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- a) Note that "allowances" can include conference registration fees which sometimes include an accommodation component.

Year	Reason	Allowances	Fares
1995/96	Singapore - planning for 1997 Australian Institute of Judicial Administration (AIJA) conference	\$2,052	Nil – costs met by AIJA
1996/97	New Zealand - AIJA Annual General Meeting. Accompanied by spouse	\$1,996	\$2,168 \$2,168
1997/98	Singapore & Hong Kong - to examine the use of technology in courts	\$3,758	\$3,733
1998/99	Fiji - Law Reform Commission meeting	\$687	Nil – use of frequent flyer points
1998/99	China - AIJA conference Accompanied by spouse	\$2,913	\$4,677 \$4,677
1998/99	New Zealand - planning for joint Australian and NZ Family Law judges conference	\$558	\$1,787



1998/99	Canada, UK - Judicial Education study tour Accompanied by spouse	\$24,992	\$6,949  \$6,949
1999/00	East Timor - meetings with judges of Dili District Court	Nil - costs met by hosts	Nil - travel by military aircraft
1999/00	Canada & St.Lucia - facilitator at Judicial Education conferences	Nil - costs met by host	\$5,400 to upgrade to Business class - Economy fare met by host
1999/00	New Zealand – joint conference of NZ and Australian Family Law judges Accompanied by spouse	\$1,786	\$611  \$611

b) and c)

The Family Court is a national court with Registries in all capital cities except Perth and with premises in other significant population areas throughout Australia except Western Australia. The Court incurs significant costs in providing services to rural and regional Australia, which includes travel by Justice Buckley to such locations.

In respect of domestic travel –

Year	Allowances	Fares
1995/96	\$9,020.00	\$4,295.50
1996/97	\$10,995.00	\$16,665.70
1997/98	\$17,235.00	\$34,806.00
1998/99	\$18,875.00	\$29,012.47
1999/00	\$17,920.00	\$36,506.59

d) There is no record of any expenditure on the items contained in this question.

e) Justice Buckley is entitled to use Comcar for official purposes. In 1997/98, the Judge elected to use a self drive vehicle in lieu of the Comcar arrangements in Brisbane.

Year	Comcar	Other
1995/96	\$5,722.05	Nil
1996/97	\$16,266.25	Nil
1997/98	\$14,480.95	\$3,694.27
1998/99	\$9,688.65	\$10,945.06
1999/00	\$10,351.81	\$12,098.82

f) The information is recorded electronically in the Family Court's financial management information system (FINEST) and in paper records such as the Overseas Travel Register, registers of Movement Requisitions, invoices and other accounts documents. The information is reflected in financial information reported in annual Financial Statements audited by the Australian National Audit Office and published in Family Court Annual Reports.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Mason asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001:**

The 1999/2000 annual report of the Court includes a specific reference to the "personal staff" of the Chief Justice (see p.11, 16),

- a) As at 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify each person included in that description by name and designation and the gross annual salary paid to each;
- b) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify in each year all overseas trips taken by each person and paid for wholly or in part, directly or indirectly, out of Court funds and the amount so paid;
- c) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify for each year the amount of Travel Allowance claimed by and paid to any such person;
- d) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify for each year the total amount in respect of airfares within Australia incurred by any such person and paid wholly or in part out of Court funds;
- e) In respect of the information sought in (a) - (e) above, specify where in the books and the financial statements of the Court that the information is recorded.
- f) In respect of the designated driver to the Chief Justice:
  - a. State the terms of his employment and whether those terms are in writing,
  - b. State whether a record is kept of all journeys made by him in that capacity, including persons carried,
  - c. State whether while driving in that capacity he drives persons from time to time other than and in absence of the Chief Justice.

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- a) The Government believes that the remuneration ranges of public servants in the Australian Public Service should be public knowledge but that the precise remuneration paid to individuals should remain confidential. Accordingly, the designation and salary of positions on the Chief Justice's personal staff are as follows:

Senior Legal Adviser	Senior Executive Band 1	\$86,694	salary
Senior Legal Associate	Executive Level 2	\$77,705	salary
Chief of Staff	Executive Level 2	\$75,769	salary
Executive Assistant	Executive Level 1	\$56,070	salary
Driver	APS 2	\$30,015	salary

b)

Note that "allowances" can include conference registration fees which sometimes include an accommodation component.

Senior Legal Adviser

<b>Year</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>
1995/96	UK - to attend consultations on English divorce law reform - all costs met by British Telecom	Nil	Nil
1996/97			
1997/98	South Africa - Family Law Conference	\$938	Nil - fare paid by attendee
1997/98	New Zealand - Family Law Council meeting	\$822	Nil - fare met by frequent flyer points
1997/98	USA - 35 <sup>th</sup> Association of Family and Conciliation Courts Annual Conference	\$2,821	\$6,116
1998/99	New Zealand - planning for joint Judges conference	\$664	\$1,851
1998/99	South Africa - International conference on Reconciling Violent Relationships	\$1,777	\$2,262
1999/00	New Zealand - meeting with joint conference organisers	\$638	Frequent flyer points
1999/00	New Zealand - conference of NZ and Australian Family Court judges	\$392	\$611
1999/00	USA - 37 <sup>th</sup> Annual Association of Family and Conciliation Courts Conference	\$2,848	Nil - fare paid by attendee
1999/00	Canada - presentation of paper on behalf of Chief Justice at International Family Law Conference	\$2,311	\$7,350

Senior Legal Associate

<b>Year</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>
1995/96			
1996/97	USA - 2 <sup>nd</sup> World Congress on Family Law	\$4,042	Nil - attendee paid own fares
1997/98			
1998/99	New Zealand - Youth Justice in Focus conference	\$1,313	Nil - attendee paid own fares
1999/00			

c) and d)

The Family Court is a national court with Registries in all capital cities except Perth and with premises in other significant population areas throughout Australia except Western Australia. The Court incurs significant costs in providing services to rural and regional Australia, which includes travel by personal staff accompanying the Chief Justice to such locations.

In respect of domestic travel –

#### Senior Legal Adviser

<b>Year</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>
1995/96	\$5,100	\$6,811
1996/97	\$8,142	\$14,282
1997/98	\$9,341	\$9,772
1998/99	\$12,461	\$12,030
1999/00	\$12,100	\$14,887

#### Senior Legal Associate

<b>Year</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>
1995/96	\$7,170	\$3,738
1996/97	\$5,473	\$10,187
1997/98	\$8,110	\$14,000
1998/99	\$8,805	\$14,137
1999/00	\$13,640	\$13,502

#### Chief of Staff

<b>Year</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>
1995/96		
1996/97		
1997/98		
1998/99	\$172	\$3,456
1999/00	\$158	\$848

#### Executive Assistant

<b>Year</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>
1995/96	\$638	N/A
1996/97	\$1,249	\$1,201
1997/98	\$2,109	\$1,513
1998/99	\$8,486	\$5,163
1999/00	\$13,543	\$7,305

#### Driver

<b>Year</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>
1995/96		
1996/97		
1997/98	\$476	\$0
1998/99	\$570	\$0
1999/00	\$333	\$427

- e) The information is recorded electronically in the Family Court's financial management information system (FINEST) and in paper records such as the Overseas Travel Register, registers of Movement Requisitions, invoices and other accounts documents. The information is reflected in financial information reported in annual Financial Statements audited by the Australian National Audit Office and published in Family Court Annual Reports.
  
- f)
  - a. The terms of employment are set out in writing in an Australian Workplace Agreement.
  
  - b. No
  
  - c. Yes

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Mason asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001:**

Regarding visitors from overseas:

- a) During the five year period preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, identify each person from overseas who came to Australia or who attended any function in Australia organised by the Court whose expenses in so doing were paid in whole or in part out of Court funds and in each case state the amount of expenses so paid;
- b) During the same period identify any member of the Court who attended any overseas conference or other function at the invitation of any person identified in (a) above or the institution to which such person belonged and whose expenses were met from funds provided by any such person or any such institution in whole or in part specifying in each case the amount of expenses so met.

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

a)

<b>1995</b>	<b>Total Cost to FCoA</b>
The Rt Hon Sir Stephen Brown, UK	\$1,444
Mr Justice Daniel Fatiaki, Fiji	\$2,112
Ms Florence Fenton, Fiji	\$1,498
Madam Justice Catherine Fraser, Canada	\$1,084
Hon Judge Pat Mahony, NZ	\$1,084
Mr Isileki Mataitoga, Fiji	\$430
Dr Gabrielle Maxwell, NZ	\$2,196
Sir John Muria, Solomon Islands	\$4,285
His Hon Judge John Strettel, NZ	\$1,084
His Hon Judge Alex Twaddle, NZ	\$1084
Mr Justice George Walsh, Canada	\$1,355
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$17,656</b>
<b>Less monies from Attorney General's Department</b>	<b>\$8,325</b>
<b>TOTAL COST TO FCOA FOR OVERSEAS GUESTS</b>	<b>\$9,331</b>
<b>1996</b>	
His Hon Judge Brian Callaghan, NZ	\$44
District Judge Ms Laura Chin Yi, Singapore	\$44
The Hon Judge Ramon Pethig, NZ	\$44
The Rt Hon Sir Peter Singer, UK	\$44
The Hon Sir Timoci Tuivaga, Fiji	\$2,117
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,293</b>
<b>Less monies from Attorney-General's Department for Sir Timoci</b>	<b>\$2,073</b>
<b>TOTAL COST TO FCOA FOR OVERSEAS GUESTS</b>	<b>\$220</b>

## 1997

Judge Tan Boon, Singapore	\$55
Mr Ian Burns, UK	\$835
Judge Don Inglis, NZ	\$55
Justice Mukhtar Ahmad Jenejo, Pakistan	\$55
His Honour Pat Mahony, Chief Judge, NZ	\$55
The Hon Judge Toru Matsuda, Japan	\$55
Judge Paul Whitehead, NZ	\$55
Judge Tagaloa Puni, Western Samoa	\$2,100
The Hon Justice Michael Scott, Fiji	\$835
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$4,100</b>
<b>Less monies from Attorney-General's Department</b>	<b>\$2,825</b>
<b>TOTAL COST OF GUESTS TO FCOA</b>	<b>\$1,275</b>

## 1998

The Hon Justice Rosalie Abella, Canada	\$6,589
Ms Fenton, Fiji	\$2,185
Judge Stephen Herrell, USA	\$1,290
Ms Jalal, Fiji	\$2,185
Justice Paul Lam Shang Leen, Mauritius	\$2,190
The Hon Justice Joni Madraiwiwi, Fiji	\$3,319
Ms Alice Tai, Hong Kong	\$5,137
Judge Arline Rotman, USA	\$1,590
Mr Eroni Sauvakacolo, Fiji	\$390
The Hon Ratu Tavai, Fiji	\$1,590
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$26,465</b>
<b>Less monies from Attorney General's Department</b>	<b>\$1,777</b>
<b>TOTAL COST OF GUESTS TO FCOA</b>	<b>\$24,688</b>

## 2000

His Hon Judge Pat Mahony, NZ	\$290
<b>TOTAL COST OF GUEST TO FCOA</b>	<b>\$290</b>

**N.B. In 1995 Attorney General's Department granted to the Family Court of Australia \$15,000 to enable representatives from Pacific Region countries to attend Family Court conferences.**

**b)** There would have been instances where Judges or staff of the Court travelled overseas at the invitation of people or organisations referred to in Part (a). However, a reliable search of these instances for the purposes of answering this question would require a manual check of paper records for the entire period in question and would constitute an unreasonable diversion of resources. In any event, Court records would not show the amounts paid by other organisations regarding the invitations that they themselves extended.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Mason asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001:**

As to the senior management of the administrative staff attached to the Court

- a) Identify as at 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000 by name each person falling within the class of senior management and specify in each case the gross salary payable per annum;
- b) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify in each year all overseas trips taken by any such member of senior management and paid for wholly or in part, directly or indirectly, out of Court funds and the amount so paid on his behalf. If accompanied by any person in respect of such trips, specify the identity of that person and whether that person's expenses were paid in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, out of Court funds and the amount paid on that person's behalf;
- c) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify for each year the amount of Travel Allowance claimed by and paid to any such member of senior management;
- d) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify for each year the total amount in respect of airfares within Australia incurred by any such member of senior management and paid wholly or in part out of Court funds;
- e) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify the total amount expended in each year out of Court funds on furnishings, fittings, objects d'art, cutlery, crockery and the like for the use of any such member of senior management;
- f) During each of the five years preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000, specify total motor vehicle expenses incurred by any such member of senior management and paid for wholly or in part directly or indirectly out of Court funds;
- g) In respect of the information sought in (a) - (e) above, specify where in the books and the financial statements of the Court that the information is recorded.

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- a) The Government believes that the remuneration ranges of public servants in the Australian Public Service should be public knowledge but that the precise remuneration paid to individuals should remain confidential. Accordingly, the designation and salary range of positions identified as senior management are as follows:

Chief Executive Officer Statutory appointment	\$135,000 salary
General Manager Corporate Services Senior Executive Band 2	\$106,855 salary



General Manager Client Services Senior Executive Band 2	\$106,855 salary
Principal Registrar Senior Executive Band 2	\$106,855 salary
Chief Finance Officer Senior Executive Band 1	\$86,694 salary
Chief Information Officer Senior Executive Band 1	\$82,120 salary
General Adviser Dispute Resolution Senior Executive Band 1	\$86,694 salary
Southern Area Manager Senior Executive Band 1	\$86,694 salary
Northern Area Manager Senior Executive Band 1	\$86,694 salary

b)

Note that "allowances" can include conference registration fees which sometimes include an accommodation component.

Chief Executive Officer

<b>Year</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>
1995/96	New Zealand - Family Law conference	\$942	\$363
1996/97	New Zealand - Australian Institute of Judicial Administration (AIJA) conference	\$1,498	\$1,480
1997/98	South Africa - Family Law conference Accompanied by spouse	\$3,004	\$4,669 \$4,669
1997/98	New Zealand - discussions with NZ Family Court and Justice Department regarding accrual budgeting	\$1,415	\$1,345
1998/99	South Africa & Canada - Violent Relationships conference and conference of Association of Family and Conciliation Courts (AFCC) Accompanied by spouse	\$8,748	\$6,929 \$6,929
1999/00	East Timor - Meetings with East Timor government and judges of Dili District Court	Nil - costs met by host	Travel by military aircraft. Vehicle hire \$984
1999/00	New Zealand - conference of NZ and Australian Family Law judges	\$319	\$548

### General Manager Client Services

<b>Year</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>
1995/96			
1996/97			
1997/98	USA - World Court Technology conference	\$2,533	\$6,429
1997/98	Singapore & Hong Kong - examine use of technology in court operations	\$3,393	\$3,733
1998/99			
1999/00			

### Principal Registrar

<b>Year</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>
1995/96			
1996/97	USA - 2 <sup>nd</sup> World Congress	\$3,148	Nil - fares paid by attendee
1997/98	USA - AFCC 35 <sup>th</sup> Annual Conference	\$3,870	\$2,303
1998/99			
1999/00	New Zealand - Conference of NZ and Australian Family Law Judges	\$237	\$611

### Chief Finance Officer

<b>Year</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>
1995/96	USA & Canada - conference on Courthouse Design, meeting with officials at National Center for State Courts	\$3,701	Nil - costs met by frequent flyer points
1996/97	USA - development program sponsored by PSMPC	\$2,083	\$6,064
1997/98	New Zealand - accrual budgeting meetings with NZ Family Court and Justice Department	\$1,202	\$1,599
1998/99	USA & Canada - conference on Courthouse Design, meetings with officials of Ontario Department of Justice and Family Court.	\$8,252	\$4,076
1999/00			

### Chief Information Officer

<b>Year</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>
1995/96			
1996/97			
1997/98			
1998/99			
1999/00	USA - Court Technology Conference	\$4,838	\$7,685

### General Adviser Dispute Resolution

<b>Year</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>
1995/96	USA - conference of Association of Family and Conciliation Courts (AFCC)	\$2,895	Nil - paid by attendee
1995/96	USA - AFCC conference	\$2,859	\$5,421

1995/96	Singapore - provide consultancy to Singapore Subordinate Courts in establishing a counselling service	Nil - expenses met by host	Nil - expenses meet by host
1995/96	USA - AFCC conference	\$2,030	Nil - paid by attendee
1995/96	Singapore - provide consultancy to Singapore Subordinate Courts in establishing a counselling service	Nil - expenses met by host	Nil - expenses meet by host
1996/97	USA - AFCC conference	\$2,271	Nil - paid by attendee
1996/97	Singapore - provide consultancy to Singapore Subordinate Courts in establishing a counselling service	Nil - expenses met by host	Nil - expenses meet by host
1996/97	USA - 2 <sup>nd</sup> World Congress	\$3,542	Nil - fares paid by attendee
1997/98	Singapore - provide consultancy to Singapore Subordinate Courts in establishing a counselling service	Nil - expenses met by host	Nil - expenses meet by host
1997/98	Singapore - provide consultancy to Singapore Subordinate Courts in establishing a counselling service	Nil - expenses met by host	Nil - expenses meet by host
1997/98	UK & Holland - International Mediation conference	Nil - paid by attendee	Nil - paid by attendee
1997/98	USA - 35 <sup>th</sup> AFCC Annual Conference	\$2,662	Nil - fares paid by attendee
1998/99	Fiji - Family Law Expert Group Workshop	\$389	Nil - fares paid by host
1998/99	USA - AFCC conference and Executive Board meeting	\$1,381	Nil - fares paid by attendee
1998/99	Singapore - conduct training at Singapore Subordinate Courts	\$1,271	Nil - fares paid by host
1998/99	Canada - AFCC 36 <sup>th</sup> Annual Conference	\$2,523	\$6,266
1999/00	USA - AFCC Executive Meeting	\$653	\$Nil - fares paid by attendee
1999/00	USA - AFCC Executive Meeting	\$1,994	Nil - fares paid by attendee

#### Northern Area Manager

<b>Year</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>
1995/96			
1996/97			
1997/98	USA - AFCC 35 <sup>th</sup> Annual Conference	\$2,384	Nil - fares paid by attendee
1998/99			
1999/00			

c) and d) and f)

The Family Court is a national court with Registries in all capital cities except Perth and with premises in other significant population areas throughout Australia except Western Australia. The Court incurs significant costs in providing services to rural and regional Australia, which includes travel by senior management.

Information on motor vehicle expenses can be provided with respect to self-drive vehicles (which form part of the remuneration of the employees concerned), but not with respect to taxis and Comcar expenses without scrutinising individual paper records which may not be searchable by name of traveller and which would be an unreasonable diversion of resources.

In respect of domestic travel, information on fares is unavailable in early years because payments were coded in bulk to an airline account rather than linked to individual movement requisitions under then prevailing arrangements with airlines. Information by traveller could only be obtained by the very labour intensive course of scrutinising the paper record, ie examine every movement requisition for those which relate to the officers concerned.

#### Chief Executive Officer

<b>Year</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>	<b>EVS Vehicle Costs</b>
1995/96	\$35,033	N/A	\$8,554
1996/97	\$35,835	N/A	\$12,935
1997/98	\$38,940	\$30,239	\$15,040
1998/99	\$21,299	\$22,584	\$13,062
1999/00	\$20,460	\$24,041	\$15,138

#### General Manager Corporate Services

<b>Year</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>	<b>EVS Vehicle Costs</b>
1995/96			
1996/97			
1997/98	\$3,819	\$9,973	\$2,312
1998/99	\$11,917	\$23,164	\$13,147
1999/00	\$9,868	\$26,127	\$14,949

General Manager Client Services

<b>Year</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>	<b>EVS Vehicle Costs</b>
1995/96	\$7,077	N/A	\$9,032
1996/97	\$7,983	N/A	\$14,131
1997/98	\$15,212	\$39,032	\$14,925
1998/99	\$16,434	\$25,799	\$16,975
1999/00	\$15,632	\$24,070	\$16,120

Principal Registrar

<b>Year</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>	<b>EVS Vehicle Costs</b>
1995/96	\$22,148	N/A	\$10,344
1996/97	\$8,081	N/A	\$8,672
1997/98	\$7,231	\$15,307	\$11,682
1998/99	\$6,666	\$15,366	\$9,782
1999/00	\$22,044	\$30,451	\$12,328

Chief Finance Officer

<b>Year</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>	<b>EVS Vehicle Costs</b>
1995/96	\$4,709	N/A	\$10,109
1996/97	\$2,632	N/A	\$11,061
1997/98	\$4,597	\$11,485	\$11,193
1998/99	\$8,873	\$21,629	\$10,683
1999/00	\$16,872	\$11,334	\$15,974

Chief Information Officer

<b>Year</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>	<b>EVS Vehicle Costs</b>
1995/96			
1996/97			
1997/98	\$1,435	\$7,802	\$453
1998/99	\$2,481	\$17,843	\$321
1999/00	\$7,612	\$24,758	\$12,641

General Adviser Dispute Resolution

<b>Year</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>	<b>EVS Vehicle Costs</b>
1995/96	\$5,147	N/A	\$7,401
1996/97	\$6,325	N/A	\$7,707
1997/98	\$4,869	\$19,575	\$7,189
1998/99	\$1,943	\$5,869	\$11,426
1999/00	\$14,040	\$14,398	\$10,358

Southern Area Manager

<b>Year</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>	<b>EVS Vehicle Costs</b>
1995/96			
1996/97			
1997/98	\$0	\$628	
1998/99	\$5,770	\$25,937	\$10,118
1999/00	\$5,055	\$26,143	\$13,423

Northern Area Manager

<b>Year</b>	<b>Allowances</b>	<b>Fares</b>	<b>EVS Vehicle Costs</b>
1995/96	\$4,432	N/A	
1996/97	\$4,390	N/A	
1997/98	\$1,550	\$3,392	
1998/99	\$7,756	\$26,040	\$4,956
1999/00	\$8,700	\$30,153	\$8,080

e) Apart from the costs associated with the consolidation of the then Office of the Chief Executive into leased premises in Canberra in 1998, there have been no material purchases of furnishings etc for the use of the senior management of the Court. The relevant costs associated with the abovementioned consolidation were met by the lessor under incentive arrangements.

g) The information is recorded electronically in the Family Court's financial management information system (FINEST) and in paper records such as the Overseas Travel Register, registers of Movement Requisitions, invoices and other accounts documents. The information is reflected in financial information reported in annual Financial Statements audited by the Australian National Audit Office and published in Family Court Annual Reports.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Mason asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001:**

With respect to consultants engaged on behalf of the Court during the five year period preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000,

- a) list such consultants by name for each year and the amounts paid in respect of each consultancy;
- b) identify the person or persons who made the decision in each case to engage such consultants;
- c) in respect of each of the consultancies which were subject of a tender process specify where the matter was advertised;
- d) specify each consultancy which was not advertised and state precisely the reasons for failing to advertise;
- e) state where in the financial records and accounts of the Court the existence of these consultancies and the amounts so paid are recorded.

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- a), b), & d) The Family Court maintains a detailed database in order to manage its contracts and consultancies and to satisfy Annual Report reporting requirements. The database has been maintained since 1998/99 but not for earlier years when reporting requirements were less stringent. Accordingly, information to answer this Question for the years 1995/96 to 1997/98 has been reconstructed from the Court's financial management information system (FINEST) for consultancies exceeding \$2,000 (then mandatory reporting threshold) and, although a substantial amount of information is available, not all the detail is available. A search of paper records for the remaining small amount of information otherwise unavailable would be an unreasonable diversion of resources.
- c) This information is not recorded electronically in the Court's financial management information system or contracts database. It would require a search of every individual paper file, which would be an extremely labour intensive task.
- e) The information is recorded electronically in the Family Court's financial management information system (FINEST), in the Court's contracts & consultancies data base and in paper records such as invoices and other accounts documents. The information is reflected in financial information reported in annual Financial Statements audited by the Australian National Audit Office and published in Family Court Annual Reports.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Mason asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

During the two year period preceding 30<sup>th</sup> June 2000 with respect to written judgments at first instance delivered by members of the Court,

- a) was any such written judgment drafted in whole or in part by someone other than the judge/judicial registrar in question, such person being a member of the Chief Justice's personal staff;
- b) if so specify
  - a. the identity of the judges/judicial registrars in question;
  - b. the identity of the persons who drafted the judgments;
  - c. the judgments in question.

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

All other federal courts (with the current exception of the FMS), provide at least two personal staff for each judge (including, for superior courts, a legally qualified associate). The FMS are currently recruiting for Deputy Associate positions - a process which when completed will provide two personal staff for each Federal Magistrate.

In contrast, the Family Court of Australia, as an economy measure, provides a secretary only (without legal qualifications) to judges in the Trial Division. The Family Court provides a small number of Legal Associates to support the Appeal Division judges only, including the Chief Justice.

Part of the duties of the Chief Justice's Senior Legal Associate (and the other legal associates in the Court) is to assist judges with the preparation of judgements. However, it is inappropriate to discuss the precise role that the legal associates play in the preparation of such judgments as their role obviously varies from case to case and is, in any event, a matter for the individual judge whom they are assisting.



SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Mason asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

During each of the five years preceding 30th June 2000, using either Court records or the records maintained by Auscript, set out for all of the judges of the Court those periods when each judge was on leave, and specify the number of days on which each judge was listed to sit and did sit either at first instance or on the Full Court and the number of days when each judge was not so listed and did not sit.

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

It is not considered appropriate to provide information as to the identity of individual judges in relation to sitting days or leave, as this would adversely affect the integrity of the Court.

Information pertaining to the financial year 1999/2000 was provided in the answer to Senator Mason's Question on Notice No. 22 of May 2000.

Information pertaining to the financial years prior to 1999/2000 cannot be provided for reasons explained in the answer to Question on Notice No. 22 of May 2000 and further explained in the answer to Question on Notice No. 87 of November 2000.

Auscript have advised the Family Court of Australia that a reliable search for the purposes of answering this question would require a manual check of paper records for the entire period in question and would constitute an unreasonable diversion of resources. Even in the event that a search was feasible the information would, in any case, be incomplete as not all hearings are recorded by Auscript.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Mason asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

In regards to the workloads of the Court's registries and sub-registries around Australia:

- a) are the staff levels at each location adequate to deal with the existing workloads;
- b) if some locations experience workload greater than the registry's or sub-registry's resources are able to effectively cope with, what sort of assistance is provided to those locations by the Court in order to remedy that situation.

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- a. While the Court has had to reduce staffing levels in response to changes in Appropriations, the Court believes that staffing levels at each location are generally adequate to deal with existing workloads.
- b. The Family Court is among the leaders in courts anywhere in introducing a comprehensive resource deployment model. The Court's "Resource Planning Model", developed with the assistance of KPMG, allows the Court to deploy available staffing and associated administrative resources to meet projected workloads in Registries. The Resource Planning Model is re-calibrated annually, which may see some resources reallocated between Registries to reflect any changing workloads, but only within funding limits set by Appropriations.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Can you provide the Committee with a table of when responses were provided to the Attorney or to the Minister for Justice and Customs and when they were provided back to the Committee?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The table attached indicates the responsible Minister for each question (taken on notice at the Supplementary Estimates Hearings of 22 November 2000); the date responses were provided to the Attorney-General or the Minister for Justice and Customs; and the date the responses were provided to the Committee.

The table does not indicate those instances where the Ministers' offices sent responses back to the Department for amendment, and when those revised responses were returned to the Ministers' office for approval.

QoN	Summary of Question	Min	Date To Minister	Date To Committee
1	What were the operating hours for each Family Court registry and sub-registry as at 1 July 1999, 1 July 2000 and today's date?	A-G	19/12/00	24/01/01
2	How many staff were employed by each Family Court registry and sub-registry on 1 July 1999, 1 July 2000 and today's date - and on what basis (full time or part time)?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
3	If there has been a closure or reduction in hours of any Family Court registry or sub-registry, to which other registries are people directed when the registry or sub-registry is not operational?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
4	As at 1 July 1999, 1 July 2000 and today's date, was there a judge or registrar permanently located in each registry? If there has been a change, what is the nature of the new arrangements for judicial or registrar attendance? How often does this occur?	A-G	19/12/00	31/01/01
5	What arrangements exist for each registry and sub-registry for access to the Federal Magistrates Service?	A-G	19/12/00	31/01/01
6	In respect to each registry and sub-registry, what other changes had been made (other than with respect to registry opening hours and cuts to counselling services), in order to cut costs?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
7	As of 1 July 1999, 1 July 2000 and today's date, what were the resources for counselling in each registry, sub-registry, judicial circuit location and counselling circuits and outreach - how many counselling staff, at what level, were they full time or part time, how many days a week did they provide counselling services in this location?	A-G	19/12/00	31/01/01
8	To which local organisations does the Family Court now refer applicants in Family Court matters?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
9	Since 1995/96 in Newcastle Registry has the time frame from application to hearing for children's hearings of a day or more increased to 18 months?	A-G	19/12/00	24/01/01
10	Are the comparable figures for Sydney and Parramatta about 12 months?	A-G	19/12/00	24/01/01
11	How many Judge sitting weeks has the Court provided at Newcastle in each year from 1995/1996 to 1999/2000, and how many are to be provided in the current year?	A-G	19/12/00	24/01/01
12	How many applications for children's orders were filed in Newcastle Registry in each of the years from 1995/96 to 1999/2000?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
13	Is the Court concerned that practitioners from the Central Coast, Newcastle and the northern half of NSW have been filing children's applications in Sydney and Parramatta rather than Newcastle, because of the delays in Newcastle?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
14	Has a decline in application numbers adversely affected the allocation of resources to Newcastle?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
15	How many Court Counsellors were employed at Newcastle Registry in 1995/96 and how many are there now?	A-G	19/12/00	31/01/01
16	Was the counselling staff at Newcastle reduced by two full time positions in the current financial year?	A-G	19/12/00	31/01/01
17	Is the counselling staff at Newcastle sufficient to provide welfare reports as	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01

	currently being ordered by the Family Court at Newcastle and the Federal Magistrate at Newcastle?			
18	Would the counselling staff at Newcastle and the Newcastle Registry funding be able to provide the welfare reports needed by the Family Court if within the next 12 months additional Judge sitting time is provided at Newcastle so the elapsed time from filing to hearing in children's matters is reduced to less than 12 months?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
19	Would the counselling staff at Newcastle be adequate to also provide reports for the Federal Magistrate at the current rate?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
20	If the Federal Magistrates Court provides an additional 2 days per week of Federal Magistrate sittings at Newcastle how would the Court supply the welfare reports ordered at Newcastle by the Family Court and the Federal Magistrates Court?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
21	What steps has the Court taken since 1 January 1999 to reduce the delay in the hearing of children's matters at Newcastle?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
22	Does the Court have any commitment or plan to ensure that delays for hearings by a Judge at Newcastle are comparable with figures for Sydney and Parramatta? If so, what are they?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
23	Community Link Australia (\$1,211,858 + agreed expenses). a) Could you please describe the nature of the work? b) Who or what is Community Link Australia? c) What was the cost of the agreed expenses? d) Please provide a breakdown of the agreed expenses.	A-G	18/12/00	22/01/01
24	Creswell, Chris (\$81,139). Could you please describe the nature of the work?	A-G	13/12/00	22/01/01
25	Law Foundation of NSW (\$97,310). a) Could you please describe the nature of the work? b) Could you provide the Committee with the report on Phase One? c) What is the timetable for completion of this project?	A-G	18/12/00	22/01/01
26	What is the name of the legal entity to which contracts were entered into or payment was made in respect of each of the following consultancies: a) Berrico, b) Community Link Australia, c) People & Strategy, d) People First International, e) Rushworthy Consulting, f) Timmins Consultancy and Training.	A-G	15/12/00	22/01/01
27	Can we get a copy of the Level of Client Satisfaction Survey and the findings? The outline in the annual report is understandably brief, would like to see the detail.	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00
28	Why was the decision made to survey key clients?	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00
29	Why was the decision made to get a consultant to conduct the Level of Client Satisfaction Survey?	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00
30	Who were the "key clients" who were interviewed for the Level of Client Satisfaction Survey?	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00
31	There were 221 individual clients interviewed for the Level of Client Satisfaction Survey. a) How were these people identified? b) How were they approached? c) Were there many people approached who declined to participate? d) What were their reasons?	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00
32	There was about a third of respondents to the Level of Client Satisfaction Survey, so about 70 key clients expected the AFP to add greater value and improve service delivery. What were the specific complaints of these clients? Why did these complaints arise?	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00

33	The initiatives to rectify these complaints - where is the money coming from to implement them?	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00
34	The report talks about ensuring that clients have realistic expectations of the AFP - does this mean that the AFP just does not have the resources to address all client needs?	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00
35	Will the follow up survey be undertaken by a consultant?	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00
36	If yes, is it always followed? Is it prescribed by the Act?	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00
37	If yes, what is the situation with these officers now that there is no AFPAS?	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00
38	Given that the new service (Administrative Review Tribunal) is now hoped to commence on 1 July 2001 rather than 1 February 2001, have changes to the budget figures been prepared? What are the new figures? When will revised budget allocations be issued?	A-G	13/12/00	22/01/01
39	What will be the expected savings from the establishment of the ART, after the revision has been taken into account, for the year commencing 1 July 2001, and the three subsequent outyears?	A-G	13/12/00	22/01/01
40	Has the Attorney-General commissioned any consultants to examine, whether exclusively or among other things, the costing for the ART proposal?	A-G	13/12/00	22/01/01
41	Who was or is responsible for preparing this report on the ART or reviewing the costings? [i.e. which firm or company?]	A-G	13/12/00	22/01/01
42	Over what period were these consultancy services provided? Is the consultancy complete, or ongoing? What was the cost of the consultancy?	A-G	13/12/00	22/01/01
43	What was the outcome/recommendations of the report?	A-G	13/12/00	22/01/01
44	Is it true that the savings claimed in this year's budget were not supported by the work undertaken by the consultant engaged for the purpose of more accurately costing the ART? When will the new figures be made public?	A-G	13/12/00	22/01/01
45	What was the budget estimate for total remuneration costs for each of the following positions: President of the ART, Executive Members, Senior Members, Members?	A-G	13/12/00	22/01/01
46	How does this compare to existing salaries earned by presidential members, senior members, members, etc of the AAT, SSAT, MRT and RRT?	A-G	13/12/00	22/01/01
47	Has any revision been made to the estimated salaries on which the ART proposal was initially costed?	A-G	13/12/00	22/01/01
48	What is the government's estimate for the savings that arise solely due to the abolition of second tier review from the SSAT? On what basis were these costings produced?	A-G	13/12/00	22/01/01
49	What percentage of cases from the SSAT were assumed would be appealed on the limited range of grounds for second tier review? [e.g. was it assumed that only 1% of SSAT matters would go to a second tier review? 10%? How many?]	A-G	13/12/00	22/01/01
50	How many times has the Family Law Pathways Advisory Group met? On which dates?	A-G	18/12/00	22/01/01
51	Will the Family Law Pathways Advisory Group report by December 2000 as originally anticipated?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
52	What are the total costs associated with the establishment, meetings and deliberations of the Advisory Group - not counting secretariat support provided by the department?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01

53	Has the new funding model for family law legal aid assignments been implemented in all States and Territories?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
54	How does the new funding model for family law legal aid assignments encourage the use of alternative means of resolving disputes?	A-G	19/12/00	24/01/01
55	How is the expensive cases criminal fund administered? Who may apply under the fund? Legal Aid Commissions or accused persons themselves?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
56	Over what period will the amount of \$9 million be available? [i.e. what was the start time and what is the end time for allocations from the fund?]	A-G	18/12/00	22/01/01
57	How much has already been distributed from the expensive cases criminal fund? For how many criminal cases?	A-G	18/12/00	22/01/01
58	What are the criteria which are applied in determining whether someone qualifies for assistance from the fund? Are the criteria published or available online? Where? If not, can the Committee be provided with a copy?	A-G	18/12/00	22/01/01
59	On which dates have SCAG meetings been scheduled between now and 30 June 2001?	A-G	18/12/00	22/01/01
60	What was the total cost of the Scoping Study prepared by Cutler & Company Pty Ltd dated February 2000?	A-G	19/12/00	24/01/01
61	What was the total cost of the consultant's report prepared by Cutler & Company Pty Ltd dated February 2000?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
62	What other expenditures have been made from the funding announced for the two services which have been combined as the Law By Telecommunications Initiative?	A-G	19/12/00	24/01/01
63	What were the 15 schemes under which the Department provided financial assistance? How much was provided under each scheme, and (without identifying particular applicants), how much was provided in 1999-2000 to each applicant?	A-G	18/12/00	22/01/01
64	Review of community legal centres: Which reviews are complete? Can you provide the Committee with the reports and recommendations prepared as a result of completed reviews?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
65	Review of community legal centres: Which reviews are currently underway?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
66	Review of community legal centres: Could you please briefly describe the methodology of the review?	A-G	18/12/00	22/01/01
67	Review of community legal centres: When is it proposed to commence reviews of other states?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
68	Review of community legal centres: What was the outcome of the South Australian review?	A-G	19/12/00	24/01/01
69	Review of community legal centres: How have Community Legal Centres in South Australia responded to the results of the review?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
70	Review of community legal centres: Does the review for South Australia require CLC's to amalgamate in order to retain Commonwealth funding?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01
71	Review of community legal centres: What will happen to those centres which do not, or unable to, amalgamate with other centres?	A-G	19/12/00	24/01/01
72	Review of community legal centres: What timeframes and deadlines have been placed on South Australian CLC's with respect to outcomes of the review? When does their existing Commonwealth funding run out?	A-G	19/12/00	24/01/01
73	Could you please provide an annual breakdown of the number of questions received in	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01

	each financial year since 1993-1994, the number answered within 30 days of receipt, the number not so answered within 30 days of receipt and the number which remained unanswered but which were still within the 30 day period for response.			
74	How many indigenous justice projects have been funded through the NCP over the last two years? Can we have details of what these projects were, who ran them, funding amount and period for each project.	MJC	21/12/00	22/12/00
75	Apart from funding projects, what other work does the NCP do regarding indigenous justice?	MJC	21/12/00	22/12/00
76	What is the relationship between the NCP and the diversionary programs for juveniles in the NT?	A-G	13/12/00	22/01/01
77	Is the NCP responsible for the management of the \$5 million per annum under the Howard/Bourke deal?	A-G	13/12/00	22/01/01
78	Does the NCP continue to fund indigenous crime prevention projects now that there is the Howard/Bourke deal? If not, why not?	MJC	13/12/00	18/12/00
79	Provide a breakdown for the financial years 1995-96, 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-2000 of: research projects, pilot projects, prevention activities, communication activities and crime prevention training that have been or are being funded under the NCP initiative together with the amount of Commonwealth funding provided.	MJC	20/12/00	19/01/01
80	Are there funding guidelines for each of the category of projects funded under the NCP, and are there evaluation measures or procedures which are in place? Are these documents available?	MJC	13/12/00	18/01/01
81	Within the NCP, is there a separate program following from the 'Pathways to Prevention' report?	MJC	13/12/00	18/01/01
82	If there is not a 'Pathways to Prevention' program, is there an identifiable program of funding for the \$8 million for early intervention work which is commonly associated with 'Pathways to Prevention'? What guidelines are there for funding under this \$8 million? What programs have been funded so far, what are the amounts? What evaluation procedures are in place?	MJC	13/12/00	2/1/01
83	Is an evaluation of the NCP being undertaken or is there one planned, if so when will the results be available?	MJC	13/12/00	18/12/00
84	What is the Commonwealth's involvement with the National Anti-Crime Strategy? What is the funding involvement?	MJC	19/12/00	19/01/01
85	Apart from funding projects, what other activities are undertaken by the NCP? What are the mechanisms for cooperation/information sharing between the NCP and State Governments? What meetings and/or conferences has the NCP been involved in?	MJC	15/12/00	18/01/01
86	At the hearing on 29 May 2000, I asked: "a) How many managerial staff within the CEO's office will go? b) Will there be any reductions in travel? c) I understand that some savings were achieved by the Court in relation to its new group airline booking arrangements. What was the extent of these savings for the Family Court for 2000-2001? d) How are those savings to be applied?" In answer to this question it is stated that the court intends to reduce its expenditure on travel by 40% between this year and next. a. Will this adversely affect the	A-G	18/12/00	22/01/01



	performance of the Court's duties? b. If yes, then why is it being done? c. If no, why wasn't this measure adopted previously?			
87	At the hearing on 29 May 2000, I asked: "a) I was wondering if I could have some figures of the numbers of days each member (judge) of the Family Court sat and heard cases in the calendar year 1999 b) Secondly, who was on leave in the calendar year 1999?" a. Why are the details of judicial workload prior to July 1999 (in the words of the answer to Question on Notice 22) "unreliable or misleading"? b. If the management information system for the purposes of determining how many days in a calendar year a judge sat and heard cases was "unreliable and misleading", why did it take until July 1999 to reform the management information system? c. How were the output of judges and performance against standards assessed prior to July 1999? If it did not involve in any way measuring sitting days, what was measured and why?	A-G	18/12/00	22/01/01
88	At the hearing on 29 May 2000, I asked: "a) Can I have an indication of the number of outstanding judgements in both the general division of the court and also the appeal division of the court? b) It would be helpful if those outstanding judgements could be broken up into those that are less than three months old, those between three and six months and then those that are more than six months old. c) With those judgements that are older than six months, could you give an indication as to which judges are responsible for those judgements?" The Court's Case Management Guidelines provide that in relation to reserved judgements: "Except in unusual circumstances, reserved judgements will be delivered no later than three months from the date upon which they are reserved" (15.11) a. As of 16 June 2000, there were 109 general division judgements outstanding for more than 3 months but less than 6 months. In addition there are 14 general division judgements outstanding for more than 6 months. That makes a total of 41 judgements (out of a total of 109 - nearly 40%) outstanding for more than 3 months. In this context what sort of "appropriate actions" (from answer QoN 23 (c)) are being taken by the Chief Justice to "maintain timeliness in the delivery of judgements"? b. Having regard to the number of outstanding judgements in past years has there been any improvement recently? c. Why are the number of appeal division judgements outstanding for less than 3 months not available?	A-G	18/12/00	22/01/01
89	At the hearing on 29 May 2000, I requested more detail about system used to monitor outstanding judgements. Given the significant number of outstanding judgements, is the Family Court satisfied that their system of monitoring outstanding judgements is working? What plans, if any, are there for reform of the system?	A-G	18/12/00	22/01/01
90	Again, why aren't statistics available until July 1999 to answer questions relating to sitting days of the judges of the Family Court? What is the particular "purpose" different from that of the Question on Notice" that the information on sitting and non-sitting days has been collected for in the past such that no answer can be given to QoN 25?	A-G	18/12/00	22/01/01
91	In relation to the Court's project that allows for the electronic filing, lodgement, service and handling of documents: Can the Court clarify the cost of developing it, the projected savings and indicate what the Court has already	A-G	5/1/01	24/01/01

	Looking into by way of integration of videoconferencing and the Internet?			
92	What dates has the Audit Committee (page 18 of Annual Report) met since 1 July 2000?	A-G	20/12/00	22/01/01
93	On what occasions did the Secretary of the Department attend the Audit Committee as an observer?	A-G	20/12/00	22/01/01
94	Are minutes of the Audit Committee meetings available and can they be provided to the Committee?	A-G	20/12/00	22/01/01
95	In relation to the review of audit reports involving matters of concern to senior management of the department. What are those matters of concern? Can the Department also provide what advice the Audit Committee provided in regard to each of the matters of concern?	A-G	20/12/00	22/01/01
96	In relation to the establishment and maintenance of appropriate ethical standards: Can the Committee be provided with the formal procedures for determining the breaches of the code of conduct?	A-G	18/12/00	22/01/01
97	Can the Committee be provided with the procedures established for dealing with whistleblower reports as required by the Public Service regulation 2.4?	A-G	13/12/00	22/01/01
98	Can the Committee be provided with further details of the nature of the whistleblower report since 1 July 2000?	A-G	13/12/00	22/01/01
99	Can the Department provide the Committee with a detailed departmental structure which identifies the reporting relationship for each employee in the department? (ie. The number, level and employment status of employees contributing to each of the output groups and subgroups - for example, details of the employees contributing to each output group 1.1.1, 1.1.2 and so on).	A-G	13/12/00	22/01/01
100	Can the Department provide the Committee with a list of the consultancies for which the actual cost exceeded the initial quote by, say, five per cent?	A-G	14/12/00	22/01/01
101	How many consultancies were there with a value of less than \$10,000, including the name of the consultant, the contract price, the purpose, the selection process and the justification of proceedings by way of consultancy? Do you have a total cost of what you have under \$10,000?	A-G	14/12/00	22/01/01
102	Can the Committee be provided with a copy of The Story of Sydney Airport?	MJC	15/12/00	20/12/00
103	In relation to The Story of Sydney Airport publication: Who was the legal entity with which the contract was entered into or the payment was made to? When was it published and what was the distribution of it?	MJC	15/12/00	20/12/00
104	In relation to discretionary grants: What were the criteria for including grant recipients in the annual report? Is there a requirement there now? Why does the annual report not include the full information of all grant recipients?	A-G	15/12/00	22/01/01
105	In relation to financial statements: What are the legal matters in which the department is involved? Is it possible to provide an estimate of those outcomes? Are there any upper limits placed or to be placed on the liabilities that may arise?	A-G	19/12/00	24/01/01
106	Where in the annual report provides the costing for the move from Macintosh to PC? Is it part of your normal ongoing operating expense or your budget? What consultancies have been utilised to smooth the transition from the Macintosh to the	A-G	13/12/00	31/01/01

	PC platform? With your database or your records management system, what costings have been put in place? I guess some of the material would be stored in a Macintosh format so you will need it, by and large, to be translated to a PC format so it can be accessed again. Is that being looked at and what is the cost of that translation? Has any information been lost in the translation?				
107	In relation to the maintenance of the PC platform: Is that in the budget, and under what name? What consultancy is it and what is the total cost of the consultancy? Is there a monitoring process to ensure that it has been finalised? Is there a sign-off date?	A-G	13/12/00		31/01/01
108	In relation to the appointment of the President and the CEO of the ART: Could you advise the Committee when those appointments are made?	A-G	19/12/00		22/01/01
109	In regard to the retirement and replacement of judges, could you inform the Committee which judges have retired and in which locations prior to 1 July 2000?	A-G	19/12/00		24/01/01
110	In relation to the number of counsellors: Can the Court provide the Committee with detail of where the reductions have taken place?	A-G	19/12/00		24/01/01
111	In relation to accreditation under the act, can the Court confirm that this accreditation is done by the Department of Family and Community Services? Can the Court also find out if there is any specific and special training for dealing with Family Court matters, rather than a general counselling service? Can the Court provide any information on any unique requirements within the Family Court for dealing with the trauma of separation of couples, and then of course when children come into it.	A-G	20/12/00		24/01/01
112	In relation to the perceived reduction in services: What is the actual waiting time, firstly, for families seeking mediation and, also, for those seeking pre-trial counselling? Can you isolate those that are non-capital city based?	A-G	19/12/00		22/01/01
113	In the Court's report, you say that the recommendations contained in the Australian Law Reform Commission's report Managing Justice were of little value. Can you tell the Committee which recommendations were of little value? How you are dealing or not dealing with them as the case may be? How is it that your Court says that they do not need to deal with them?	A-G	19/12/00		22/01/01
114	Is the Department aware of those recommendations and that the Family Court has said that they are of little value?				
	Has the Department from a higher view had a look at the recommendations and had a look at whether or not the answer that the Family Court has given in relation to those recommendations - that they are of little value - is an accurate reflection? Have those comments been passed on to the Australian Law Reform Commission? Should there be any follow-up in relation to that?	A-G	13/12/00		24/01/01
115	In relation to strategic management consultancies: Can the Court provide the Committee with all documents regarding what has come from the expenditure of \$505,000?	A-G	20/12/00		24/01/01
116	In relation to client surveys: Can you inform the Committee of your final decision: whether you intend to maintain a two-year client survey or move to another system?	A-G	19/12/00		22/01/01
117	Can the Committee be provided with a copy of the submission made by HREOC on the	A-G	15/12/00		24/01/01

	Workplace Relations Amendment Bill 2000.			
118	How was the fee that is charged for the Privacy Commissioner to speak at business functions arrived at?	A-G	15/12/00	24/01/01
119	Can HREOC provide the Committee with a breakdown of what amounts were solely attributed to presentations?	A-G	15/12/00	24/01/01
120	Can HREOC provide the Committee with detail of the list of functions that the Privacy Commissioner has spoken at since 1 July 1999 and the fee that was charged on each occasion?	A-G	15/12/00	24/01/01
121	In relation to the Privacy Advisory Committee, how often and when does it meet?	A-G	15/12/00	24/01/01
122	In relation to the Privacy Advisory Committee, can you give some detail of who the current members are and how many vacancies there are on it?	A-G	19/12/00	24/01/01
123	Can you provide the Committee with a budget for the Privacy Connections Network?	A-G	15/12/00	24/01/01
124	In relation to the Privacy Connections Network, can the Committee be provided with copies of the final report when it is available?	A-G	15/12/00	24/01/01
125	Can you confirm when the Office of the DPP was first contacted on the Reith telecard matter?	A-G	20/12/00	22/01/01
126	Do you know on which date a brief was provided by the Australian Federal Police for formal consideration by your office on this matter?	A-G	20/12/00	22/01/01
127	Can you confirm how the Attorney was briefed. What was the manner of the briefing? Was it in writing? Was it in person? If there was a personal briefing, who else was present at the briefing?	A-G	20/12/00	22/01/01
128	Was there any discussion between the Office of the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions and the Attorney-General, his office or his department prior to the release of the media statement? If there was, who was that discussion with?	A-G	20/12/00	22/01/01
129	In relation to referrals: A number of briefs have been forwarded to you from DIMA and DETYA in relation to international education providers. Can you confirm the dates on which briefs have been forwarded to you? How many remain outstanding in terms of a response from the DPP, and of those that are outstanding, how long before we are likely to see a decision from the DPP concerning those briefs?	A-G	21/12/00	22/01/01
130	Can the FMS provide the Committee with a budget for the financial year?	A-G	19/12/00	24/01/01
131	Does the FMS know how many cases have been filed and resolved to date?	A-G	19/12/00	24/01/01
132	In relation to TRS: What does this promotion involve? Is it something that happens every month or every week? When you say people go out and talk to other people, what sort of program is it? Is it a point presentation or is it a documentary? How does it work?	MJC	18/12/00	18/01/01
133	Can you provide the Committee with any documentation relating to the information having been provided to the Office of Government Information Technology?	MJC	18/12/00	18/01/01
134	Can you clarify whether the customs broker transactions and key changes to applications part of the original contract?	MJC	18/12/00	20/12/00 (Revised 18/01/01)
135	Can the Committee be provided with a full assessment of whether or not EDS have met their originally contracted levels of industry development, with detail of any variations of that commitment?	MJC	18/12/00	18/01/01

136	Can the Committee be provided with any documentation that you have either prepared for your own benefit or, indeed, prepared for the purpose of supplying it to any other agency, but with particular interest in OASITTO, the Department of Finance and Administration or the minister's office?	MJC	18/12/00	20/12/00 (Revised 18/01/01)
137	Do you have a current assessment as to what proportion of your IT work is contracted to IT providers other than EDS? Could you also provide a list of any consultants you have engaged with respect to information technology - not necessarily in conjunction with EDS, but any advice in the form of consultancies?	MJC	18/12/00	18/01/01
138	Can you provide the Committee with full details of your proposals with respect to cargo management re-engineering and also, very specifically, the business model, the business case, behind that endeavour?	MJC	18/12/00	20/12/00 (Revised 18/01/01)
139	In relation to budget measures for officers in East Timor: Can you provide a breakdown of how those sums are allocated? Have you raised a specific budget to deal with that? Would a range of articles constitute that expenditure?	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00
140	In relation to travel allowance for officers in East Timor: Does that revolve around your view of what determination No. 3 means, or is it a view that you have taken that they are getting the MSA and therefore are not entitled to travel allowance, irrespective of what your regulations might otherwise say?	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00
141	Have the AFPA advised you of their view of clause 22 of determination No. 3 in written form? Are you aware of their view of the determination or the interpretation to be applied to it?	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00
142	In relation to tax treatment of AFP Officers: Can the Minister advise the Committee when the issue of tax-free treatment for AFP officers is resolved?	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00
143	Can you provide the Committee with a breakdown of the funding allocated to the programs under the NIDS strategy?	MJC	19/12/00	18/01/01
144	In relation to client surveys: Can you provide a list of the departments that were surveyed? Was there anyone approached by you who may have declined? Who made the decision to use a private consultancy firm? Was that an in-house decision, and was this matter then put out to tender?	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00
145	Were there any specific complaints identified as part of that area they had targeted? If so, could you make those available and provide some background information as to why those complaints arose and whether there will be remedial action put in place to correct those? How are you going to pay for it given the state of your budget? Can you provide a percentage breakdown and list in hierarchical order.	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00
146	Can you provide the Committee with a breakdown of the level of funding between the AIPM, the ABCI and the ACPR?	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00
147	Could you provide a breakdown of the number of AFP personnel who are on secondment to those organisations or are permanently placed there? Additionally, could you provide a breakdown of their staff - whether they are officers, for example - and the number of staff in each of those three bodies? Can you also provide a breakdown of their salary or remuneration in terms of whether they are in the SES officers	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00

	band or in the officer stream.				
148	How many references, if any, have there been in the last 12 months from government to the AFP about examining leaks? Are there standing AFP officers that investigate these, or is a task force drawn together to investigate them?	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00	
149	In relation to the search warrant on Dr Dorling's home: In the course of that information being provided, would the magistrate have been informed that the AFP had sought access to electronic records of the office of the shadow minister for foreign affairs, Dr Dorling's employer, which were held in the parliamentary information system?	MJC	19/12/00	20/12/00	
150	How many federal agents are authorised officers - authorised to certify that information is required from carriers or carriage service providers - under the provisions of section 282 of the Telecommunications Act?	MJC	19/12/00	18/01/01	
151	Can the AFP confirm how many commissioned officers are in the AFP?	MJC	19/12/00	18/01/01	
152	How often in the past year have AFP officers certified under section 282 of the Telecommunications Act that the disclosure of information or documents by carriers or carriage service providers were reasonably necessary for the enforcement of the criminal law? Can the AFP also compare this with previous years, bearing in mind that the Act was amended in 1997?	MJC	19/12/00	18/01/01	
153	Does the AFP have the ability within the act to enter into any inter-agency or inter-departmental agreement, memorandum of understanding, guidelines or other arrangement which govern the disclosure and/or use of information obtained by law enforcement or other agencies under section 282 of the act? Can the Department consider this question in relation to other law enforcement agencies that might not be connected with the AFP? Can the Committee be provided with a sample copy of those arrangements?	MJC	19/12/00	18/01/01	
154	In relation to the Expensive Commonwealth Criminal Cases Fund: What has been distributed so far?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01	
155	Can the Department provide a copy of the guidelines that govern the decisions?	A-G	19/12/00	22/01/01	
156	How has the Building Safer Communities money been allocated for 2000-01?	MJC	19/12/00	19/01/01	
157	Can the Department provide details of the number of people employed under the NCP program and at what APS level they are (at a relatively recent date), how the NCP program is structured and some detail of what the priority areas are - that is, those priorities areas that are identified on the NCP program website?	MJC	15/12/00	18/01/01	
158	In relation to the booklets about preventing burglaries: What were the production and distribution costs of the pamphlet and can you provide the Committee with information about how the project could be evaluated? What are the performance measures? If it is successful, is it the intention to expand it throughout the rest of the community?	MJC	13/12/00	21/12/00	
159	To provide the Committee with letters and to see the scope of the offers the Department made and the way the Department tried to construct offers which would be affordable by the APS but, at the same time, produce a significant increase in remuneration for members.	MJC	15/12/00	20/12/00	
160	In relation to a question on notice that Senator West put to Minister Vanstone on	MJC	15/12/00	20/12/00	

	<p>16 August 2000. It was question No. 2751. Senator West was asking about the closure of the analog network around Australia from 1 January 2000 and asked the Minister to advise if the APS was responsible directly or indirectly for alarm systems that were dependent upon access to the analog network at 31 December 1999. She went into details of how many sites. The minister informed the Committee that the APS had 13 alarm security systems on the analog network at 31 December 1999 and that they were going to be progressively upgraded. They were located in the ACT, NSW, Victoria and SA. The Minister then went into the detail of when the upgrade was going to take place, starting on 24 March 2000 and progressing through to the last one on 11 September 2000. What were the arrangements for those premises, if indeed there were premises, where these security alarm systems were operating? What were the arrangements in place between the closure of the analog system and the upgrade that was going to happen, for example, firstly on 24 March 2000?</p>		
161	<p>What is the current attrition rate for the response team at Sydney Airport?</p>	MJC	20/12/00
162	<p>What is the basis of the financial risk or contingent liability calculations for both stolen generation costs and native title? How many claims are they based on, where are they and when are they due to proceed in the courts?</p>	A-G	24/01/01
163	<p>There is \$14 million allocated under native title (payments to or for the states) in the 2000-01 budget. Which states have received payments, how much have they received, and what is the basis for these costing?</p>	A-G	24/01/01
164	<p>What are the costs to the Commonwealth of State's acquiring native title rights, and for the establishment of bodies to deal with native title? How are these costs worked out? Can you tell me what the proportional cost between the Commonwealth and the States for compensation due to the acquiring of these native title rights will be?</p>	A-G	24/01/01





SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001**

In relation to Corporations Law:

Can you provide the Committee with some costing as to how you intend to implement it should the other states come on board?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The arrangements under the proposed Commonwealth, State and Territory legislation will for practical purposes restore the regulatory environment which existed before the High Court's decisions in *Re Wakim; ex parte McNally* (1999) 198 CLR 511 and *The Queen v Hughes* (2000) 74 ALJR 802. The Commonwealth legislation does not involve substantive policy changes and therefore does not have any significant financial impact.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
OFFICE OF THE COMMONWEALTH DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

In respect of the Mal Brough investigation, was advice sought from the DPP at any stage? If yes could you please supply information as to when the advice was sought, when it was provided, who prepared the advice and to whom it went.

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

A lawyer in the DPP Brisbane Office had two telephone conversations with AFP officers on 1 February 2001. It was at an early stage of the investigation. The DPP lawyer gave some preliminary oral advice about potential offences that the AFP said were being considered and also advised that the DPP would look at any brief referred. No brief of evidence was referred and the DPP gave no further advice.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
OFFICE OF THE COMMONWEALTH DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

In relation to the media statement (concerning the DPP's consideration of the so-called Reith telecard affair) what time of the day was that issued?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The media statement was faxed to the Parliament Press Gallery Media Release Distribution Service at 4:32 pm on Thursday 12 October 2000.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

In relation to unrepresented litigants:

Can the Family Court provide a copy of the overview of the report?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

As indicated to the committee at the hearing, the Family Court will provide a copy of the overview of the report.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

When the Family Court finalises the tracking feedback, can the Family Court make that available to the Committee?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

As indicated to the committee at the hearing, the Family Court will provide details of the tracking feedback when it is finalised.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

In relation to the recommendations of *Managing Justice*:

If this information becomes available:

- a) Can the Committee be provided with information on those recommendations that you have in train and the matters that you are responding to?
- b) Can the Committee be provided with information regarding the Court's meeting with CJCC next week on the recommendations?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

See page 31 L&C Senate Estimates 19 February 2001

a & b. Yes, when available.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Cooney asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

How many circuits are now operating in Victoria?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The FCoA currently operates the following Circuits in Victoria:

Albury (NSW), Bairnsdale, Ballarat, Bendigo, Geelong, Mildura, Sale, Shepparton, Traralgon, Wangaratta, Warrnambool.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
FAMILY COURT OF AUSTRALIA  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Cooney asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Can the Court measure how the length of a trial might be increased or, alternatively, decreased – or it may stay the same – depending on whether the litigants are represented?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

At the present moment there is insufficient data to draw any reliable conclusions. The Court will monitor comparative filing to finished times as part of the evaluation of the Self Represented Litigants Project.



SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

In relation to the Trade Practices Act:

What is the breakup in the Federal Court between part IV and part V?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The number of Part V matters filed in the Federal Court from 28 June 2000 to 21 February 2001 that could have been filed in the Federal Magistrates Service was 107. A further 92 matters were filed in the Federal Court under Part IV. These could not have been filed in the Federal Magistrates Service.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Can the Committee be provided with a copy of the MOU between the Federal Court and the Federal Magistrates Service when it is signed?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The MOU has not yet been signed. A copy will be provided to the Committee when it becomes available.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

If a document, similar to that between the Federal Court and the Federal Magistrates Service, between the Federal Magistrates Service and the Family Court becomes available, can the Committee obtain a copy?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The document will be provided to the Committee when it becomes available.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN CUSTOMS SERVICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Lundy asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Provide the Committee with specific dates as to when the decision [to move away from Tradegate being the industry hub and the only gateway into Customs] was made.

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

As early as 16 March 1999 industry had been informed that Customs envisaged the development of an open electronic (e-business) gateway.

That point has been reiterated on numerous occasions.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN CUSTOMS SERVICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Lundy asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Can you provide detail of that relationship [with Mr Humphry] and the time frame in which it occurred and any documentation arising out of that process?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

In 1998 Customs decided to form an Industry Reference Group (IRG) to ensure the Government elements of CMR properly reflected the needs of industry.

Mr Richard Humphry was asked to chair this working group with membership drawn from senior ranks of the importing, exporting and international trade service industries.

The IRG met on five occasions under the chairmanship of Mr Humphry:

- 16 March 1999
- 1 June 1999
- 7 September 1999
- 23 November 1999; and
- 4 April 2000.

At the first meeting it was agreed the functions of the IRG were to:

- provide strategic input to the CMR project and facilitate the involvement of relevant industry experts in the work of the project team
- identify opportunities for greater efficiencies in cargo management through innovative and cooperative effort by all parties involved; and
- provide a consultation and coordination mechanism to work towards achieving these efficiencies.

The CMR Business Model was released in March 2000 and at this time CMR development moved from a conceptual phase to a more technical phase. Accordingly, at the fifth meeting it was agreed that the IRG would not meet again unless particular issues were identified that required discussion at a high level representative forum as other existing fora were better placed to address the technical issues.

The meetings were hosted by Mr Humphry in Sydney.

Customs reimbursed Mr Humphry and other participants of the IRG for costs incurred for accommodation, meals and travel as requested.

The only documentation arising from the process were documents circulated before meetings, official records of the meeting and the Price Waterhouse Cost Benefit Analysis (refer QoN 37).

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN CUSTOMS SERVICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Lundy asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Can Customs provide the Pricewaterhouse documentation to the Committee?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

Yes. A copy is attached.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN CUSTOMS SERVICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Lundy asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Can Customs clarify whether the marginal impact on SMEs is a positive or negative impact, even if you have to go back to Pricewaterhouse Coopers?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

It is considered that the marginal impact on SMEs is positive. It should also be noted that the relevant comment in the Price Waterhouse Coopers report refers to a quote from service providers themselves rather than an observation of the consultant.



SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN CUSTOMS SERVICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Lundy asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Can Customs provide the Committee with the evaluation document for the EDS contract?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

Customs will provide the evaluation document requested. Because it contains material relating to each tenderer for the Customs IT outsourcing contract (EDS, IBM and Andersen Consulting), it will be necessary to delete from the document details which may create the risk of commercial damage to the Commonwealth or other parties which might follow from its public release.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN CUSTOMS SERVICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Lundy asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Can Customs provide a copy of the contract with EDS and all its variations?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

Customs will provide a copy of its contract with EDS. It will, however, need to delete from it material such as personal information, pricing details and other elements, the release of which may create a potential for commercial damage to the Commonwealth or to other parties.

Customs is negotiating with EDS the extent of the material to be deleted.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN CUSTOMS SERVICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

As a consequence of the tender being successful, would that mean that there would be consequential downsizing or redundancies in that area, or would the technical people that you referred to be shifted to other operational areas?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

See response provided by the Chief Executive Officer of Customs, Mr Lionel Woodward on page 61 of the Transcript.

Responses to Questions on Notice 42 –48, relating to the Australian Federal Police had not been received at the time of tabling this Additional Information Volume. Once received, these responses will be tabled separately.

**SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Senator Bolkus asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Can the AFP provide any documents that might be available to officers doing the course or any notes that may be pertinent to this question [of parliamentary privilege]?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

All investigators attached to the AFP's Head Office Investigations team are given an introductory package, which includes material on parliamentary privilege. The material is contained in a guideline and a checklist pertaining to the execution of search warrants and Members of Parliament. These extracts are attached.

At the Additional Estimates hearing on 19 February 2001, Deputy Commissioner Keelty stated that federal agents attached to Head Office Investigations are instructed in parliamentary privilege by Mr Harry Evans of the Senate. In clarification, whilst such training was arranged with Mr Evans for 12 December 2000, it was postponed. Arrangements are currently being made to reschedule the training course.

## **EXTRACTS FROM THE EXECUTION OF SEARCH WARRANTS RELATING TO MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (A CHECK LIST)**

1.5 Section 15 of the Parliamentary Privileges Act 1987 states that Police may exercise their ordinary powers within the Parliamentary precincts and the Team Leader should also have a good general knowledge of the workings of the Australian Parliament.<sup>2</sup>

2.2 AFP members should make themselves familiar with issues that may amount to an offence against Parliament or things that may render an item not seizable by virtue of statutory parliamentary privilege. These are mentioned in the 'Guidelines for execution of search warrants by the AFP on the Electorate offices of Members of Parliament'<sup>5</sup> (hereinafter referred to as 'the guidelines') and should be raised in the affidavit as having been given due consideration. The document attached at Annex 'A' includes guidelines on:

- Issues of obstructing a Member of Parliament in the execution of their duty
- Parliamentary Privilege
- Claims of Privilege by the Member of Parliament
- Dealing with Confidential material

2.3 AFP Legal Counsel provided an opinion in February 1997 in respect to possible offences against the Parliamentary Privileges Act 1987. This Act imposes sanctions for offences against the House such as Contempt of Parliament. A summary of this opinion is attached at Annex 'B'.

2.4 The Deputy Director, DPP Perth has given an opinion relative to 'Search and seizure on the Electorate Office of a Member of Parliament – Parliamentary Privilege.' dated August 1995. The substance of this opinion should be considered in the course of obtaining and executing a search warrant relating to Members of Parliament. A summary of this opinion discussing Parliamentary Precincts and Parliamentary Privilege is attached at Annex 'C'.

**2.5 Members should also be aware of the provisions of Section 13 of the Parliamentary Privileges Act 1987, which prohibits the unauthorised disclosure of certain evidence. This disclosure relates to such things as:**

- A document prepared for the *purpose* of submission and submitted to a House or Committee which has been directed by a House or committee to be treated as evidence taken in camera.
- The same relates to a document containing a record of oral evidence under the same circumstances.

---

<sup>2</sup> Odgers Australian Senate Practice, 7<sup>th</sup> Edit 1995, edited by H Evans Clerk of the Senate and House of Representatives Practice 1997, edited by L Barlin Clerk of the House of Representatives, is a recommended reference

<sup>5</sup> As of July 1997 the 'guidelines' are in DRAFT FORM ONLY and are yet to be formally adopted. However, the procedures set out in the guidelines should be adhered to in the meantime.

**5.4 The following paragraph has been included in approved affidavits relative to a possible claim of privilege, namely:**

‘If in the course of the execution of the search warrant the member or any person in authority on his behalf claims Parliamentary Privilege I hereby undertaken to adopt the following procedure:

- A. To inquire as to why privilege is claimed
- B. Regardless of the answer supply the member with a copy of the document(s)
- C. Seal the documents in containers in the presence of the member or interested party
- D. Deliver the containers, intact, to a person mutually agreed between me and the member or interested party) such as the Clerk of the Court at.....or a person of like office<sup>7</sup>
- E. Allow the documents to be so held by the independent party until such times as the Speaker of the House or President of the Senate determines what action is to be taken.

**5.7 The following text has been included in an affidavit regarding the search of premises outside business hours, namely:**

‘The reasons I request to search the business premises outside normal business hours are as follows:

- A. To insure the Members electorate office duties are not unduly hindered.
- B. To ensure minimal exposure (particularly to media attention) in the execution of the warrant; and
- C. The proposed entry time of around (insert relevant time) will allow the member ready access to the Speaker of the House/President of the Senate, his or her solicitors or any other party he or she wishes to consult in relation to the search.

6.1.....

- **It has been long established practice that the Presiding Officer has always been consulted in respect to matters within his or her jurisdiction. This includes intended investigations, arrests or the execution of process, including Section 3E warrants within the precincts of Parliament House. Checks should be conducted to insure the subject premises has not been declared by regulations as being part of Parliamentary precincts for the purpose of the Act. The ‘Parliamentary precincts’ is defined by section 4 of the Parliamentary Precincts Act 1988.**

---

<sup>7</sup> Tentative arrangements for the same should be made prior to the execution of the warrant without disclosing the individual subject of the warrant (although this may well be the issuing Judicial Officer in which case disclosure of the name will not be an issue).

9.1 Where possible and providing the integrity of the investigation is not compromised efforts should be made to execute the warrant when the Member is in attendance at the subject premises or can readily be called to attend without hindering Parliamentary duties.....

**9.3 Execution at the close of the business day is less likely to interfere with the Member's Parliamentary duties and hence reduce the likelihood of contempt of Parliament being raised as an issue.**

**11.2 The Member should be given the opportunity to identify documents of a private nature relating to himself or constituents. The warrant holder will make a decision whether those documents are relevant to the investigation.**

11.3 Members should be particularly alert to sensitive documentation such as that relating to Cabinet or a Parliamentary Committee. To this end it should be established at an early stage if any such documents are held by the Member and the relevance of them to the inquiry. In practice the Team Leader (at least) should have an appropriate security clearance (Top Secret is desirable).

11.5 The Member should be asked to identify any documentation which is seized but is required by him to continue the performance of his Parliamentary functions e.g.; Electorate office diaries, personal diaries etc: Steps should be taken to accommodate the Members needs through photocopying as soon as possible.



## **EXTRACTS FROM GUIDELINES FOR EXECUTION OF SEARCH WARRANTS BY THE AFP ON THE ELECTORATE OFFICES OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT**

Preliminary

**4. When a search warrant is executed upon the electorate office of a Member of Parliament one or more of the following issues could arise:-**

- a) the execution of the search warrant might amount to an offence against a House, for example because its effect is to obstruct performance of the member's duties as a member;
- b) the disclosure of something seized in reliance on the warrant, or exposed to the police in the course of search, might amount of an offence against a House;
- c) a thing otherwise seizable under the warrant might not be seizable because it is not admissible by a court in that it attracts statutory parliamentary privilege – a related issue being the possibility of a statutory offence of unauthorised disclosure; or
- d) the execution of the search warrant might involve seizure or exposure to the police in the course of search, or subsequent disclosure, of confidential material that does not attract parliamentary privilege and without entailing an offence against a House or any other offence.

**6. It should be noted that material of the kind referred to in s16(3) of the Parliamentary Privileges Act 1987 is not liable to seizure under warrant. If it is possible that material sought may be within the category, the AFP should consult the relevant Presiding Officer or the chair of the relevant committee.**

### **Claim of privilege**

**8. In paragraphs 9(a) to 9(g) 'claim of privilege' means a claim that proposed action in purported reliance on a search warrant should not take place because it would be a breach of privilege, either because it would amount to an offence against a House or because the warrant does not authorise seizure of a thing that attracts privilege.**

**9. The purpose of paragraphs 9(a) to 9(g) is to suspend police action until there has been some consideration by or on behalf of Parliament of the claim. While in due course a court might also need to rule on the matter, that aspect can be left to later proceedings, or if necessary to a person affected seeking injunctive relief.**

- a) if the member (or a person acting on his/her behalf) identifies anything to be seized where a claim of privilege is likely to be raised the following procedure should be followed:-

- b) the member (or representative), if raising a likely claim, should be asked to indicate the basis for the claim;
- c) the item should be secured to the satisfaction of the executing officer and the member (or representative). The member should have reasonable opportunity to take copies of any document or other record secured in this way. A schedule of the items so secured should be prepared and agreed by the parties;
- d) the things so secured should be delivered into the safekeeping of a third party as agreed between the parties (eg. warrant issuing officer or Clerk of Court) pending the resolution of the claim of privilege;
- e) the claim of privilege should be referred by the member for, or otherwise brought to, the attention of the Presiding Officer of the relevant House for the purpose of obtaining an indication either:-
  - i. that there is no apparent basis for a privilege claim (in which event the item should be released to the AFP); or
  - ii. that the matter should be further considered by the relevant House.
- f) this does not prevent the member or any other person from pursuing the claim of privilege in any other way. However, the intention is to provide only a reasonable opportunity for the claim to be pursued and to allow release of the item to the AFP if the claim is not pursued; and
- g) the AFP will notify the Attorney-General [in his/her capacity as First Law Officer and Minister responsible for the AFP] in any case where the execution of a search warrant on the electorate office of a member is likely to be the subject of a claim of privilege.

11. In relation to paragraphs 9(a) to 9(c), it is assumed that a claim of privilege should not be made merely to delay or frustrate access for bona fide criminal justice purposes to material when, while confidential in the sense described above, could not properly be the subject of a claim of privilege. However, in such cases a claim of public interest immunity might arise.

- a) even if no claim of privilege is raised, the executing officer should take all reasonable steps to conduct the search and obtain seizable material without unnecessarily examining or removing third-party confidential material that might be in the electorate office;
- b) if, in respect of any material proposed to be seized, the member indicates that public interest immunity will be claimed, the AFP, unless it needs urgent access to the material, should treat that material as under paragraphs 9(a) to 9(d) to enable a reasonable opportunity for the claim to be resolved; and

- c) if the AFP needs access to the material urgently for the purposes of an investigation, it should ensure that the material is not disclosed more widely than necessary for those purposes.

**13. Where any document/record or thing is seized by police pursuant to the warrant the executing officer should inform the member that the AFP will, to the extent possible, provide or facilitate access by the member to any document/record or thing seized under the warrant which is necessary for the performance of the member's duties as a member.**

#### **Parliament House**

**14. If a search under warrant is proposed in relation to the offices of a member in Parliament House these guidelines should be treated as applicable and:-**

- a) it should be determined at a senior level within the AFP (General Manager) that the need for the search warrant is clear, and that it relates to a sufficiently serious matter; and
- b) the usual practice should be followed of prior consultation with the Presiding Officers before conducting enquiries or executing any process in the parliamentary precincts.

## ANNEX 'B'

### CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

The contempt provisions relating to the commonwealth Parliament were substantially revised in 1987 with the introduction of the *Parliamentary Privileges Act 1987* ('the Act'). Relevant to this issue are the provisions which enable a House of the Federal Parliament to impose sanctions on a person for 'an offence against the House'. Offences against the House include contempt by virtue of subsection 3(3) of the Act. The penalties for such an offence are set out at subsections 7(1) and 7(5) of the Act, being imprisonment not exceeding six months or a fine up to \$5,000 for a natural person or \$25,000 in the case of a corporation.

Conduct which might amount to an offence is defined at section 4 of the Act as follows:

#### 4. Essential element of offences

Conduct (including use of words) does not constitute an offence against a House unless it amounts, or is intended or likely to amount, to an improper interference with the free exercise by a House or committee of its authority or functions or with the free performance by a member of the member's duties as a member.

To constitute a 'contempt' the conduct must amount or be intended or likely to amount to an improper interference with the authority or functions of the House or the member's duties as a member. By including the term 'improper', the Act contemplates that not all interference with the free exercise of the Members duties is prohibited.

The Office of General Counsel has previously advised that a search warrant executed in respect of a criminal offence is unlikely to amount to an improper interference with the member's duties as a member, at least where the member is a suspect having regard to the fact that the member is not immune from arrest for a criminal offence.

Accordingly, where police are acting lawfully, in good faith, and with due regard to the sensitivities involved the investigations are unlikely to amount to an offence. If circumstances are such that any there is any doubt, investigators should seek advice at the earliest opportunity.

## ANNEX 'C'

### SUMMARY OF OPINION BY ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT IN RESPECT TO PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE – SEPTEMBER 1995

In this instance a Member of Parliament had complained that the execution of a search warrant was a breach of parliamentary privilege. The matter was referred to the Privileges Committee of the House of Representatives.

The following relevant issues arose from the opinion of the Office of General Counsel, Attorney-General's Department:

The Electorate Office of a member is not part of the parliamentary precincts.

A Crimes Act 1914 search warrant can be executed on the Electorate office of a Member of Parliament (this would apply equally to the Member's residence etc.)

The fundamental principle is that action in respect of a member will not constitute a breach of privilege or contempt of Parliament unless it is action that 'amounts or is intended or likely to amount, to an improper interference with the free exercise by a House or Committee of its authority of functions or with the free performance by a member of the member's duties as a member (See Parliamentary Privileges Act, S.4).

It is well recognised that 'where a member of parliament is accused of a criminal offence, it has never been suggested that his status as a member places him in any different position as regards the law of arrest or trial from that of an ordinary citizen'<sup>1</sup>

A search warrant 'might be a breach of privilege if the effect of the execution of the warrant was to constitute an improper interference with the member's duties as a member. If the search was in respect of a criminal offence (at least if the member is the suspect) having regard to the fact the member is not immune from criminal prosecution it is unlikely to be deemed improper interference.

Temporary inconvenience suffered by the member's constituents, if that were proved, would not amount to an improper interference.

Exposure of confidential or sensitive material (NOT protected by the Parliamentary Privileges Act) during the course of a search warrant is not different to the possession of similar material by other persons.

---

<sup>1</sup> see Enid Campbell Parliamentary Privilege in Australia, p.60

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Ludwig (Hansard p 82) asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Can the AFP provide a breakdown over those three years of what the money was allocated to in meeting the programs that were highlighted or suggested by the Ayers Report, if that is what you used as the benchmark or as the way you were going to allocate the money or, alternatively, how you allocated the \$117 million over the three years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The below table provides the allocation of funds to each of the projects within the Reform Program over the years 1998-99 to 2000-01.

<b>REFORM PROGRAM SUMMARY OF PROJECT COSTS AND FUNDING</b>				
DESCRIPTION	COST			TOTAL
	1998-99 \$m	1999-00 \$m	2000-01 \$m	
<b>A</b> Recruitment - Increase staff to 2800	9.822	13.420	12.734	<b>35.976</b>
<b>B</b> AFPAS - Payment of AFPAS entitlements on termination	-	5.265	9.892	<b>15.157</b>
<b>C</b> Learning & Development Strategy	4.564	3.107	2.186	<b>9.857</b>
<b>D</b> Reprofiting & Restructuring of Workforce	9.731	12.828	9.466	<b>32.025</b>
<b>E</b> Equipment Upgrade - One-off purchases	5.008	5.956	1.545	<b>12.509</b>
<b>F</b> Upgrade of Forensic Facilities	1.000	3.891	-	<b>4.891</b>
<b>G</b> Upgrade of Firing Range	0.655	-	-	<b>0.655</b>
<b>H</b> Liquidity Payments to Regions	4.796	-	-	<b>4.796</b>
<b>I</b> Additional Mobility Costs	0.220	0.460	0.460	<b>1.140</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>35.796</b>	<b>44.927</b>	<b>36.283</b>	<b>117.006</b>

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Ludwig (Hansard p 82) asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Were the reforms under the Ayers Review, under the \$117 million, implemented by way of one-off expenditure? Were the moneys designed to be expended during that period and then the program was 'successful and completed' or were some programs left unfinished? If there are any programs that remain unfunded or will cease to be funded from 30 June, can you give me a breakdown of which ones they are? (ie. What ones have you addressed, how much money you gave expended and how you intend to deal on an ongoing basis with those ones that are ongoing.)

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The Reform Program was a three-year program of reforms within the AFP, with all projects expected to be completed or implemented by the end of the three-year program. That funding will lapse on 30 June 2001.

The Government agreed, as part of the original decision to establish the Reform Program, that a further stage of the AFP Reform Program should be considered in the 2001-02 Budget context in light of the outcome achieved from Stage 1 and changes in the criminal environment since 1998. Renewal of those elements of the Reform Program determined to be ongoing is currently under consideration in the 2001-02 Budget context.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Can the AFP provide information as to the number of fraud investigations, which have been referred to the AFP and how many of those the AFP has accepted since 1995?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

FRAUD <sup>1</sup> REFERRALS ACCEPTED AND REJECTED				
Financial Year	Referrals received	Accepted <sup>2</sup>	Rejected <sup>3</sup>	Evaluation <sup>4</sup>
99/00	312 <sup>5</sup>	267	45	0
98/99	308 <sup>6</sup>	252	55	1
97/98	360 <sup>7</sup>	269	90	1
96/97	539 <sup>8</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A
95/96	701 <sup>9</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: Executive Information System (EIS) as at 1 February 2001 unless otherwise stated.

Notes:

N/A = Not available

<sup>1</sup> Those cases with an incident type of fraud.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes all cases with a status of rejected and evaluation. The number is derived, i.e. Referrals received - (Rejected + Evaluation) = Accepted.

<sup>3</sup> Includes cases with a status of Rejected.

<sup>4</sup> Includes cases with a status of Evaluation.

<sup>5</sup> AFP Annual Report 1999-2000, p. 69. This figure updates that provided to the Senate Estimates hearing on 19 February 2001.

<sup>6</sup> AFP Annual Report 1998-1999, p. 93. This figure updates that provided to the Senate Estimates hearing on 19 February 2001.

<sup>7</sup> AFP Annual Report 1998-1999, p. 93.

<sup>8</sup> AFP Annual Report 1996-1997, p. 89.

<sup>9</sup> AFP Annual Report 1996-1997, p. 89.



**SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Provide figures that break down expenditure that has been earmarked or put up for both the Weston Creek facility and the Barton Police College in relation to refurbishments or upgrading of laboratories or IT?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

Between 1993/94 and 1995/96 the AFP undertook refurbishment of the Barton Police College. The total spent on the project was \$11,439,199 which included \$10,959,267 construction costs and \$479,932 for loose furniture and fittings.

In 1999/00 and 2000/01 the AFP spent \$4,895,000 on construction of the new Forensic laboratories and refurbishment of existing Forensic facilities. Of this \$3,767,131 was for construction costs and \$1,127,869 was for the fitout and fixtures.

Currently in 2000/01 a refurbishment of office and workshop accommodation is under way at the Weston Creek facility. Fit-out works to be completed in May 2001 are expected to cost \$1,408,258. In addition the AFP is constructing a technical training facility at Weston that will cost \$88,215.

The Australian Federal Police has not incurred expenditure on upgrading information technology at the Weston Creek or the Barton complex since the desktop roll-out some eighteen months ago. Systems maintenance has occurred at a similar rate to the rest of the AFP. It should be noted that, as with other properties the AFP rent, the IT infrastructure is entirely portable.

Both the Barton and Weston facilities are under long-term lease to the AFP.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Can the AFP provide a snapshot of where they are going - looking at the administrative and operational investigative staff, with location where it is possible, and their experience and grade levels, (ie the number allocated to ACT policing and the number of staff allocated to protective services, and the number of sworn and unsworn staff in each functional stream together with an indicative number of staff allocated to strike teams)?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

At the end of December, 2000 the AFP employed 2871 staff. Of this number 759 were employed in the ACT Community Policing, 124 were employed in Protection, 520 were employed in enabling service including Forensic services, technical support and corporate services, and the remaining 1468 were employed in our operational areas. Table 1 indicates the breakdown of those numbers.

**Table 1**

<b>AFP Staffing Numbers by Personnel Area as at end of 2000</b>				
Business Area		PA		Total
		Sworn	Unsworn	
<b>ACT</b>	ACT Policing	647	112	<b>759</b>
	<b>ACT sub-Total</b>	<b>647</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>759</b>
<b>Enabling</b>	Commissioner / Media	6	11	<b>17</b>
	Forensic	33	50	<b>83</b>
	Finance & People	64	106	<b>170</b>
	IT	2	62	<b>64</b>
	Learning & Dev	63	26	<b>89</b>
	Policy & Commercial	29	68	<b>97</b>
	<b>Enabling sub-Total</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>520</b>
	<b>Operational</b>	Deputy Commissioner	1	
Eastern		267	79	<b>346</b>
International & Federal		342	155	<b>497</b>
Northern		149	46	<b>195</b>
Protection Services		113	11	<b>124</b>
Southern		265	47	<b>312</b>
Western		91	26	<b>117</b>
<b>Operational sub-Total</b>		<b>1228</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>1592</b>

<b>Total</b>	<b>2072</b>	<b>799</b>	<b>2871</b>
--------------	-------------	------------	-------------

Table 2 indicates staff by location and years of experience.

*Table 2*

<b>AFP Staff by Operational / Enabling Area and Years of Experience – end December 2000</b>								
<b>Experience</b>	<b>ACT</b>	<b>Eastern</b>	<b>Northern</b>	<b>Southern</b>	<b>Western</b>	<b>I&amp;FO</b>	<b>Protection</b>	<b>Enabling</b>
0yrs-5yrs	355	185	70	104	59	101	18	186
6yrs-10yrs	70	53	29	50	11	97	23	88
11yrs-15yrs	119	53	44	54	20	115	33	109
16yrs-20yrs	88	31	27	42	10	85	21	85
21yrs-25yrs	68	15	21	45	14	61	15	29
26yrs+	59	9	4	17	3	39	14	23
<b>Total</b>	<b>759</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>520</b>

Table 3 indicates staff by location and salary grading.

*Table 3*

<b>AFP Staff by Functional Area and Salary Grade – End December 2000</b>								
<b>Salary Grading</b>	<b>ACT</b>	<b>Eastern</b>	<b>Northern</b>	<b>Southern</b>	<b>Western</b>	<b>I&amp;FO</b>	<b>Protection</b>	<b>Enabling</b>
Grade 1								7
Grade 2				1				2
Grade 3	1	1						1
Grade 4	1	8		1	1	1	1	1
Grade 5	29	20	11	22	9	4		27
Grade 6	168	54	31	45	19	10		2
Grade 7	99	66	17	27	17	25	9	32
Grade 8	16	8	3	4	3	26	4	23
Grade 9	51	31	9	34	6	39	5	88
Grade 10	267	76	66	118	36	154	64	70
Grade 11	6	18	11	2	3	27	8	16
Grade 12	57	37	19	31	9	89	14	116
Grade 13	38	11	15	13	8	39	10	34
Grade 14	8	5	2	3	1	28		19
Grade 15	5		2	5	2	5	1	21
Grade 16	4	3	7	1		24	4	36
Grade 17	3	5		2		5	3	4
Grade 18			1		1	1		3
Grade 19	1				1	2		5
Grade 20		2	1	2	1	2		5
Grade 21	1							3
Grade 22	1	1						3
none	3			1		17	1	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>759</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>520</b>

Table 4 indicates staff by functional stream and location.

**Table 4**  
**AFP Staffing Numbers by Outcomes and Principal Function Streams as at end of 2000**  
 (Source: EIS Pay 14)

PFS	ACT	Sub-Total	Enabling						Sub- Total	Operational							Sub- Total	Total	
			COMM	FORS	F&PM	IT	L&D	P&C		COMM	EAST	I&FO	NORTH	PROT	S-Adel	SOUTH			WEST
ACT	627	627			1				1			4						4	632
Admin	44	44	1	1	8	2	7	13	32		9	26	10	6	1	9	7	68	144
Assets	3	3						7	7		3		2		1			6	16
Business							1		1										1
Executive	5	5	3		5	2	2	6	18	1	6	9	9	1		3	3	32	55
Finance	4	4			19	1	3	1	24		7	3	6		1	4	4	25	53
Forensic				82				3	85										85
H & S	3	3			13				13		1	1						2	18
HR	6	6			52	1	68	4	125		9	7	4			10	5	35	166
In Op-Pool	2	2			6		1		7		3	2			1	13		19	28
Int Sec			3		64	1	3		71			2	1			1		4	75
Intell	1	1									26	41	33	29	8	15	25	177	178
Investig	8	8					1		1		183	30	93	1	24	166	54	551	560
Is Terr												28						28	28
IT/Eng	17	17				54	1	7	62		11	46				4	1	62	141
Knowledge	11	11	8		1	1	1	25	36		20	12	3			9	2	46	93
Legal	7	7						12	12		1	1						2	21
Liaison												31				5	2	38	38
P & P	13	13	2			2	1	18	23		25	56	15	3	4	9	7	119	155
Protect Res Agents												2		84				86	86
Surveill	8	8			1			1	2		32	35	11		5	15	5	103	113
UN											1	107	1			1		110	110
<b>Total</b>	<b>759</b>	<b>759</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>497</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>1592</b>	<b>2871</b>

In relation to the numbers of staff allocated to strike teams I can confirm that under the National Illicit Drug Strategy there are 133 full time staff directly involved.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
 AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Can the AFP provide information on the number of resignations, retirements, redundancies or terminations (ie the percentage turnover of your staff, part time, casual and full-time. What areas has the attrition mostly come from, whether it be from administrative or from operational areas?)

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The AFP's separation rate is based on the loss of all staff, including full time, part time and casual. The separation rate for the 2000 calendar year was 16.50 % (478). Table 1 indicates the separation rate for sworn and unsworn staff.

**Table 1**

AFP SEPARATION NUMBERS AND RATES - 2000														
PA	Employment Group	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
Sworn	Casual							1						1
	Perm FT	26	19	21	14	13	18	51	18	11	10	6	12	219
	Perm PT	1	1	1	1	1		2		2			1	10
	<b>Total Sworn</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>230</b>
Unsworn	Perm FT	14	11	17	8	9	9	10	2	12	14	12	5	123
	Perm PT		1			1		1		2	1			6
	Temp FT	10	10	8	4	11	9	5	23	12	5	5	4	106
	Temp PT		1	2	1		1	3	1	1	1	2		12
<b>Total Unsworn</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>248</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>478</b>	
Quarterly Figures		Qtr 1			Qtr 2			Qtr 3			Qtr 4		Total	
Sworn	Separation nos.	69			47			85			29		230	
	Quarterly av	2030.5			2022.5			2011			2049		2028.25	
	<b>Sworn Rate</b>	<b>3.40%</b>			<b>2.32%</b>			<b>4.23%</b>			<b>1.42%</b>		<b>11.36%</b>	
Unsworn	Separation nos.	74			53			72			49		248	
	Quarterly av	852.5			882			898.5			840		868.25	
	<b>Unsworn Rate</b>	<b>8.68%</b>			<b>6.01%</b>			<b>8.01%</b>			<b>5.83%</b>		<b>28.54%</b>	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>Separation nos.</b>	<b>143</b>			<b>100</b>			<b>157</b>			<b>78</b>		<b>478</b>	
	<b>Quarterly av</b>	<b>2883</b>			<b>2904.5</b>			<b>2909.5</b>			<b>2889</b>		<b>2896.5</b>	
	<b>Total rate</b>	<b>4.96%</b>			<b>3.44%</b>			<b>5.40%</b>			<b>2.70%</b>		<b>16.50%</b>	

Table 2 indicates the operational areas and reasons for the loss of staff over the past three calendar years.

**Table 2**

<b>AFP Reasons for Cessation 1998-2000 (Source EIS)</b>										
<b>Business Area</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Deceased</b>	<b>Dismissal</b>	<b>Early Term</b>	<b>Invalidity</b>	<b>Redundancy</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Resignation</b>	<b>Retirement</b>	<b>Total</b>
ACT Policing	1998			1	2	13	2	13	8	<b>39</b>
	1999			1			3	24	12	<b>40</b>
	2000	1		2		10	14	65	14	<b>106</b>
<b>ACT sub-Total</b>		<b>1</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>185</b>
Enabling	1998					12	1	38	5	<b>56</b>
	1999		1	2	2	5	15	53	11	<b>89</b>
	2000	1		1		29	7	74	16	<b>128</b>
<b>Enabling sub-Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>273</b>
Operational	1998			3	1	43	1	47	18	<b>113</b>
	1999	1	1	4	1	2	6	70	21	<b>106</b>
	2000		2	8	7	26	22	155	24	<b>244</b>
<b>Operational sub- Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>463</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>539</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>921</b>

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

In relation to the recruitment program that has been operating, how many recruits have come in the last two years? How many in the recruitment were new recruits or from ACT Policing? How many came in through an advertisement?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

469 police recruits were trained by the AFP over the last two years of which 214 new recruits were deployed to the ACT.

The AFP advertises for new recruits by way of information posted on the website, and an advertisement placed in every major Australian paper prior to testing and interviews being conducted. Application forms are obtained by new recruits via the AFP website.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
 AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE  
 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

In the limited time that the agreement has been in place, is it possible to show some figures to indicate how effective the system has been to date (ie in terms of the people who have progressed)?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The Certified Agreement facilitates the AFP's flexible, teams based employment framework, and the delivery of people skills in response to operational needs through a range of progressions mechanisms:

The principal mechanisms are:

- a) advancement (promotion) between grades to a vacant role at a higher grade level via advertisement in the Australian Federal Police Gazette and a merit based selection process; and
- b) by in-situ progression based on the achievement of higher order competencies and the delivery of a higher level work value within an employee's current role where the organisation is satisfied as to the long term effectiveness of the higher order role.

Advancements which have occurred as a result of merit selection and in-situ advancement are nominated accordingly in the attached table.

In addition to the two main modes of advancement provided for in the agreement, a significant number of advancements occurred in relation to team members in Federal Operations and Community Operations (including some hundreds of Federal Agents in Federal Operations and Constables in Community Operations) to rectify some classification anomalies. The anomalies were identified through the application of the AFP's role evaluation system known as Job Size. The advancements which have occurred through this process are also referred to in the attached table.

Progression Mechanism	Number
Merit advancement	983
In-situ advancement	133
Classification anomaly advancement	913
<b>Total</b>	<b>2029</b>



SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
AUSTRALIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE ORGANISATION  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001:**

In terms of the overall staff profile, can you give us some figures on the proportion of staff who may have tertiary qualifications and how that has changed over the last five or so years?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is:**

Currently 49% of ASIO's staff have tertiary qualifications. Of these nearly half hold a post graduate qualification. Of those staff who do not hold a degree more than 35% have some type of formal post secondary qualification.

In 1991, the last occasion for which comparable figures are available, approximately 30% of ASIO's staff held tertiary qualifications.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Can the Committee be provided with the relevant sections of the *Commonwealth Protective Security Manual*?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

A copy of the *Commonwealth Protective Security Manual* is attached. The relevant section of the *Commonwealth Protective Security Manual* which requires the referral of all major national security incidents to ASIO is at paragraph 6.8 of Part G. It states:

“Agencies must ensure that all major national security incidents that affect them are reported to ASIO.”

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Can the Department provide an update on the Adelaide Law Courts Building, and whether we are still going ahead with that and what stage are we up to? (ie When contracts will be let and when building might commence.)

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The Department of Finance and Administration, who have responsibility for the project, advise that on 8 February the House of Representatives referred the proposal to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works (PWC). It is expected that the PWC hearing will be held in Adelaide on 27 April 2001. Subject to the approval of the Committee, it is proposed to seek expressions of interest with a view to proceeding to select tender in late 2001. Construction is expected to commence in January- February 2002, when the cleared site is scheduled to be transferred to the Commonwealth by the South Australian Government. Completion of the building is expected in mid to late 2003.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
OFFICE OF FILM AND LITERATURE CLASSIFICATION  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Bolkus asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

What is the status of the review of the classification of Robert Mapplethorpe's book *Pictures*?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The Classification Review Board met on Friday 2 March 2001 to consider an application from the South Australia Police for review of the Classification Board's decision to grant Robert Mapplethorpe's book *Pictures* an "Unrestricted" Classification. The Review Board decided to classify the book "Category 1 - restricted". A copy of the Review Board's statement of reasons is attached.

ATTACHMENT A

Date & Place of Arrival	Name of Crew	Offence - 232A	Offence - 233(1)(a)	Adults	Juveniles	No. of Pax	Prosecution & Sentence	Court/Location
21/07/1999 Ashmore Reef	NGGADAS, Samuel		X	1		7	Complete 16/08/00 - 6 mths imprisonment	Pt Hed Mag 16/08/99
21/07/1999 Ashmore Reef	SULEIMAN		X	1		7	Complete 16/08/00 - 6 mths imprisonment	Pt Hed Mag 16/08/99
21/07/1999 Ashmore Reef	TUKA, Welem		X	1		7	Complete 16/08/00 - 6 mths imprisonment	Pt Hed Mag 16/08/99
21/07/1999 Ashmore Reef	LAY, Maltus		X	1		7	Complete 16/08/00 - 6 mths imprisonment	Pt Hed Mag 16/08/99
11/08/1999 Ashmore Reef	MUSTAFA, Boy		X	1		15	Complete at 29/08/99. 12 mths imprisonment.	Broome Mag 29/08/99
11/08/1999 Ashmore Reef	BACO, Kasmat		X	1		15	Complete at 29/08/99. 12 mths imprisonment.	Broome Mag 29/08/99
11/08/1999 Ashmore Reef	LATIF, King		X	1		15	Complete at 29/08/99. 12 mths imprisonment.	Broome Mag 29/08/99
11/08/1999 Ashmore Reef	MATINOS, Rokyi		X	1		15	Complete at 29/08/99. 15 mths imprisonment.	Broome Mag 29/08/99
11/08/1999 Ashmore Reef	LAHAYA, Commodo		X	1		15	Complete at 29/08/99. 12 mths imprisonment.	Broome Mag 29/08/99
13/08/1999 Christmas Island	ALI, Rusdin Bin		X	1		140	Complete at 01/02/00. 4 yr 6 mth imprisonment to serve 2y6m. 2 yr \$1000-.	Pt Hed District Ct
13/08/1999 Christmas Island	DARMONDO, Bin Dambo		X	1		140	Complete at 01/02/00. 3 yr imprisonment to serve 1y8m. 18 mths \$750-.	Pt Hed District Ct

Date & Place of Arrival	Name of Crew	Offence - 232A	Offence - 233(1)(a)	Adults	Juveniles	No. of Pax	Prosecution & Sentence	Court/Location
23/08/1999 Ashmore Reef	MUCHLIS		X	1		8	Complete 29/11/99. 2 yrs imprisonment, to serve 12mths.	Pt Hed District Ct
23/08/1999 Ashmore Reef	SUHARTANG		X		1	8	Complete 06/09/99. self surety \$100	Pt Hed Childs Ct
23/08/1999 Ashmore Reef	HASAN BASRI		X		1	8	Complete 06/09/99. self surety \$100	Pt Hed Childs Ct
14/09/1999 Bonaparte Archi	SUKRISMAN SUTIMAN	X		1		14	Sentenced 25/02/00. 3 yrs imprison to serve 18 mths. To be released 13/03/01	Peth Dist Ct
14/09/1999 Bonaparte Archi	RUDDIN, Hami (HAMID Abdul)	X		1		14	Sentenced 03/05/00. 3 yrs to serve 18 mths.	Perth Dist Ct
18/10/1999 Cape Leveque	ALAM, Andi Samsu	X		1		24	Sentenced 11/04/00 - 2 yrs impris to commence 18/10/99 release after 1 yr. Recog \$2000- to be good behav.	Broome Dist Ct
18/10/1999 Cape Leveque	ALWI, Mohamad	X		1		24	Sentenced 11/04/00 - 2 yrs impris to commence 18/10/99 release after 1 yr. Recog \$2000- to be good behav.	Broome Dist Ct
2/10/1999 Kimberely Coast	KUSAN (KUSNANTO)	X		1		21	Sentence 25/02/00 3 yrs imprison to serve 18 mths.	Perth Dist Ct
2/10/1999 Kimberely Coast	SALEH, Mohamad	X		1		21	Sentenced 28/04/00. 3 yr 6 mth, to serve 21 mths.	Broome Dist Ct
24/10/1999 Kimberely Cst	RASID, Jamil		X		1	25	12 mths imprisonment backdated to 25/10/99.	Perth Childs Ct
24/10/1999 Kimberely Cst	SAM, Anjjs		X		1	25	12 mths imprisonment backdated to 25/10/99.	Perth Childs Ct
22/10/1999 Ashmore Reef	KADIR, Usman		X	1		3	Complete 23/11/99. 2 yrs imprisonment.	Broome Mag
22/10/1999 Ashmore Reef	UR Erasmus		X	1		3	Complete 23/11/99. 20 mths imprisonment. No RRO.	Broome Mag
22/10/1999 Ashmore Reef	UMBU, Afit		X	1		3	Complete 23/11/99. 20 mths imprisonment. No RRO.	Broome Mag

Date & Place of Arrival	Name of Crew	Offence - 232A	Offence - 233(1)(a)	Adults	Juveniles	No. of Pax	Prosecution & Sentence	Court/Location
22/10/1999 Ashmore Reef	LADUMA, Hanafi	X		1		140	Sentenced 11/04/00 - 5 1/2 yrs impris (non-parole 2 yrs & 9 mths) to commence 22/10/99.	Broome Dist Ct
22/10/1999 Ashmore Reef	LADUMA, Dede	X		1		140	Sentenced 11/04/00 - 4 yrs impris (non-parole 2 yrs) to commence 22/10/99.	Broome Dist Ct
22/10/1999 Ashmore Reef	KLAU, Anton Karos	X		1		140	Sentenced 11/04/00 - 4 yrs impris (non-parole 2 yrs) to commence 22/10/99.	Broome Dist Ct
22/10/1999 Ashmore Reef	OLANG, Jumadi	X		1		140	Sentenced 11/04/00 - 4 yrs impris (non-parole 2 yrs) to commence 22/10/99.	Broome Dist Ct
22/10/1999 Ashmore Reef	KASIM, Salim	X		1		140	Sentenced 11/04/00 - 4 yrs impris (non-parole 2 yrs) to commence 22/10/99.	Broome Dist Ct
22/10/1999 Ashmore Reef	LURY, Mathius	X		1		140	Sentenced 11/04/00 - 4 yrs impris (non-parole 2 yrs) to commence 22/10/99.	Broome Dist Ct
7/11/1999 Ashmore Reef	WAHAB, Ridwan	X		1		82	Sentenced 11/04/00 - 5 yrs impris (non-parole 2 1/2 yrs) from 07/11/99.	Broome Dist Ct
7/11/1999 Ashmore Reef	ILU, Samsudin	X		1		82	Sentenced 11/04/00 - 4 yrs impris (non-parole 2 yrs) from 7/11/99.	Broome Dist Ct
7/11/1999 Ashmore Reef	AMIR, Samsul	X			1	82	On remand- awaiting court appearance on 06/06/2000. Sentenced 11/07/00	Broome Dist Ct/ Perth Child's Crf
7/11/1999 Ashmore Reef	AMAR, Alan	X			1	82	On remand- awaiting court appearance on 06/06/2000. Sentenced 11/07/00.	Broome Dist Ct/ Perth Child's Crf
7/11/1999 Ashmore Reef	UDIN, Syafrudin Bin	X		1		82	Sentenced 11/04/00 - 4 yrs impris (non-parole 2 yrs) from 7/11/99.	Broome Dist Ct
5/11/1999 Ashmore Reef	WETANGKI, Jusuf	X		1		75	Sentenced 11/04/00 - 4 yrs impris non-parole 2 yrs from 7/11/99.	Broome Dist Ct

Date & Place of Arrival	Name of Crew	Offence - 232A	Offence - 233(1)(a)	Adults	Juveniles	No. of Pax	Prosecution & Sentence	Court/Location
5/11/1999 Ashmore Reef	YUSEF, Mohammad	X		1		75	Sentenced 11/04/00 - 3 yrs impris non-parole 1 1/2 yrs from 7/1/99.	Broome Dist Ct
08/11/99 NW Kimberely Cst	HARIS Edi	X		1		25	Sentenced 11/04/00. 2 yrs to serve 12 mths.Released 07/11/00	Broome Dist Ct
08/11/99 NW Kimberely Cst	WIJAYA, Heri	X		1		25	Sentenced 11/04/00. 2 yrs to serve 12 mths.Released 07/11/00	Broome Dist Ct
8/11/1999 Christmas Island	JULU, Anwar Bin	X		1		156	<b>sentenced 17/05/00 to 4 yrs, minimum of 2 yrs.</b>	Perth Dist Ct
8/11/1999 Christmas Island	SUKANDI	X		1		156	<b>sentenced 17/05/00 to 4 yrs, minimum of 2 yrs.</b>	Perth Dist Ct
8/11/1999 Christmas Island	BASITE, Rustam Bin	X		1		156	Sentenced 16/08/00. 3 yrs to serve 18 mths.	Perth Dist Ct
27/11/99 Christmas Island	LAMAHA, Jarjuddin	X		1		180	Sentenced on 06/06/00. <b>5 1/2 yrs, to serve 2 yrs, 9 mths. Starting point 7 1/2 yrs with 2 yrs off for cooperation. Sought leave to appeal against sentence on 13/11/00. Supreme Court WA refused.</b>	Perth Dist Ct
27/11/99 Christmas Island	ABDULLAH, Jumah		X	1		180	Sentenced 21/07/00. 3 yr 4 mths, to serve 20 mths.	Perth Dist Ct
27/11/99 Christmas Island	MAKMUR, Rosli		X	1		180	Sentenced 21/07/00. 3 yr 4 mths, to serve 20 mths.	Perth Dist Ct
21/12/99 Powerful Island	GOMANG, Akmal		X	1		4	Sentenced - 03/04/00 - 2 yrs imprison to serve 1.	South Hedland District Court
21/12/99 Powerful Island	TALLO, Aii		X	1		4	Sentenced - 03/04/00 - 2 yrs imprison to serve 1.	South Hedland District Court



Date & Place of Arrival	Name of Crew	Offence - 232A	Offence - 233(1)(a)	Adults	Juveniles	No. of Pax	Prosecution & Sentence	Court/Location
21/12/99 Powerful Island	ABANG, Umar		X	1		4	Sentenced - 03/04/00 - 2 yrs imprison to serve 1.	South Hedland District Court
20/12/99 Christmas Island	ILYAS ABDULLAH	X		1		228	Sentenced 31/05/00. 5 yr, non- parole 2 yr, 6 mths.	Perth Dist Ct
20/12/99 Christmas Island	RAHMAT AL RAHMAN	X		1		228	Sentenced 31/05/00. 6 yr, non- parole 3 yrs.	Perth Dist Ct
20/12/99 Christmas Island	MUHAMMAD ALWI	X		1		228	Sentenced 31/05/00. 6 yr, non- parole 3 yrs.	Perth Dist Ct
01/02/00 Christmas Island	CITA, Wira	X		1		281	Sentenced 19/05/00. 7 yrs, <b>3&amp;1/2 yrs non-parole.. Sought leave to appeal again</b> <b>sentence on 13/11/00.</b> <b>Supreme Court WA refused.</b>	Perth District Ct
01/02/00 Christmas Island	SALAMA, Lorens	X		1		281	S100 Statement 09/03/00. Status Conf - 19/12/00. Trial 04/04/01.	Perth Dist Ct
16/02/00 Christmas Island	DARWAN (KASIN, Darwan) KASIM		X	1		22	S100 Statement - 09/03/00. Status Conf - 19/01/01	Perth Dist Ct
16/02/00 Christmas Island	HALILI SUNGGUH, La-ode		X	1		22	Sentenced 12/05/00. 3 yrs to serve 18 mths.	Perth Dist Ct
16/02/00 Christmas Island	BAYUNI (KAMARUNDIN, Bayuni)		X	1		22	Sentenced 12/05/00. 3 yrs to serve 18 mths.	Perth Dist Ct
21/03/2000 NW Kimberley Coast	AMAN, Sania	X			1	34	Sentenced 08/11/00. 18 mths deten, release after 9 mths.	Broome Children's Ct
21/03/2000 NW Kimberley Coast	UDIN, Astar	X			1	34	Sentenced 08/11/00. 18 mths deten, release after 9 mths.	Broome Children's Ct
19/06/00 Ashmore Islands	NURU MALENG	X		1		112	Sentenced 03/10/00. 3 yrs 6 mths, non-parole 21 mths.	Broome Dist Ct

Date & Place of Arrival	Name of Crew	Offence - 232A	Offence - 233(1)(a)	Adults	Juveniles	No. of Pax	Prosecution & Sentence	Court/Location
19/06/00 Ashmore Islands	Mahmud RIDWAN	X			1	112	Sentenced 17/10/00. 18 mths, supervised release after 9 mths.	Broome Dist Ct - Perth Child's Crt
19/06/00 Ashmore Islands	Anton RAJ (RAJI)	X		1		112	Sentenced 03/10/00. 3 yrs 3 mths, non-parole 18 mths.	Broome Dist Ct
19/06/00 Ashmore Islands	Fijai ABDUL RAHMAN	X		1		112	Sentenced 03/10/00. 3 yrs 3 mths, non-parole 18 mths.	Broome Dist Ct
27/06/00 Christmas Island	DULLALAH IKSAN, Ibrahim		X	1		3	Sentenced 07/11/00. 4 yr, non-parole 2 yrs.	Broome Dist Ct
27/06/00 Christmas Island	KEREN, Suyanto (Girin)		X	1		3	Sentenced 07/11/00. 2 yrs, to serve 12 mths. \$5000.	Broome Dist Ct
27/06/00 Christmas Island	SALIM, Zaenal Abidin SALAM		X	1		3	Sentenced 07/11/00. 2 yrs, to serve 12 mths. \$5000.	Broome Dist Ct
27/06/00 Christmas Island	CEWAN, Sukirman		X	1		3	Sentenced 07/11/00. 2 yrs, to serve 12 mths. \$5000.	Broome Dist Ct
10/07/00 Ashmore Reef	BAHARUDIN, Hassan	X		1		30	Transferred from Pt Hedland to Broome 28/07/00. Sentence 05/12/00 3 yrs to serve 18 mths.	Broome Dist Ct/ Broome Mag Crt
10/07/00 Ashmore Reef	EHMAN (MAKKA TOU)	X		1		30	Transferred from Pt Hedland to Broome 28/07/00. Sentence 05/12/00 3 yrs to serve 18 mths.	Broome Dist Ct
10/07/00 Ashmore Reef	BUDAIN, Umar	X		1		30	Hearing 05/02/2001.	Broome Dist Ct/ Broome Mag Crt
11/07/00 Ashmore Reef	TOBI, Lette	X		1		36	Sentenced 07/11/00. 4 yrs, non-parole 2 yrs.	Broome Dist Ct
11/07/00 Ashmore Reef	BOY, Bulan	X		1		36	Sentenced 07/11/00. 4 yrs, non-parole 2 yrs.	Broome Dist Ct
17/08/00 Ashmore Reef	NASON GIRI	X		1		74	Sentenced 08/11/00.3 yrs 6 mths, non-parole 20 mths.	Broome Dist Ct

Date & Place of Arrival	Name of Crew	Offence - 232A	Offence - 233(1)(a)	Adults	Juveniles	No. of Pax	Prosecution & Sentence	Court/Location
17/08/00 Ashmore Reef	IFAN	X			1	74	Sentenced 13/11/00 8 months young offenders detention.	Perth Children's Ct
17/08/00 Ashmore Reef	RUDIN (UDIN, Bin Mohamad Ali)	X			1	74	Sentenced 13/11/00 8 Mths young offenders detention.	Perth Children's Ct
04/09/00 Ashmore Reef	Dahwali UD-DIN	X		1		77	Sentenced 07/11/00. 4 yrs, non-parole 2 yrs.	Broome Dist Ct
04/09/00 Ashmore Reef	JUMA Rudin	X		1		77	Sentenced 07/11/00. 3 yrs, to serve 18 mths \$5000.	Broome Dist Ct
04/09/00 Ashmore Reef	LEY, Leroy	X		1		77	Sentenced 07/11/00. 3 yrs to serve 18 mths \$5000.	Broome Dist Ct
04/09/00 Ashmore Reef	Mustafa, RIDWAN		X		1	77	Sentenced 31/10/00. 12 mths, supervised release after 6 mths.	Perth Children's Ct
04/09/00 Ashmore Reef	Abu Bakar JAMAL	X		1		77	Sentenced 07/11/00. 3 yrs, to serve 18 mths \$5000.	Broome Dist Ct
25/10/00 Ashmore Islands	Joni Agles	X				32	Sentenced 12/02/01. 3Y to serve 18M \$5000.	Broome Dist Crt
25/10/00 Ashmore Islands	PARENCESES	X			1	32	Sentenced 12/02/01. 9M to serve 4M2W.	Perth Children's Crt
25/10/00 Ashmore Islands	MUHAMMAD	X			1	32	Sentenced 12/02/01. 9M to serve 4M2W.	Perth Children's Crt
25/10/00 Ashmore Islands	Ujang Inus	X		1		32	Sentenced 12/01/01. 2Y3M, to serve 1Y1M2W \$3000.	Broome Dist Crt
28/10/00 Ashmore Islands	Jon Fanggi	X		1		116	Sentenced 12/02/01. 4Y6M , to serve 2Y3M \$5000.	Broome Dist Crt
28/10/00 Ashmore Islands	Saleh Baco	X		1		116	Sentenced 12/02/01. 4Y6M , to serve 2Y3M \$5000.	Broome Dist Crt
28/10/00 Ashmore Islands	Bahrudin Wahyu	X		1		116	Sentenced 12/01/01. 3Y9M, to serve 1Y9M \$4000.	Broome Dist Crt

Date & Place of Arrival	Name of Crew	Offence - 232A	Offence - 233(1)(a)	Adults	Juveniles	No. of Pax	Prosecution & Sentence	Court/Location
28/10/00 Ashmore Islands	Sani Sidik	X			1	116	Sentenced 12/02/01. 9M to serve 4M2W.	Perth Children's Crt
28/10/00 Ashmore Islands	Linus Adu	X		1		116	Sentenced 12/01/01. 3Y9M, to serve 1Y9M \$4000.	Broome Dist Crt
17/12/00 NW Kimberley coast	LUBIS, Edi Nurhadi	X		1		92	Sentence 02/04/01	Due Court 02/04/01
17/12/00 NW Kimberley coast	ANTONI (ANTON)	X		1		92	Sentence 02/04/01	Due Court 02/04/01
17/12/00 NW Kimberley coast	ARIFIN, Samsul	X			1	92	Sentenced 12/02/01. 9 M, to serve 4 M 2 W	Banksia
06/01/01 Christmas Island	AGUS, Mohamad	X					Sentence 02/04/01	
06/01/01 Christmas Island	DONI	X					Sentence 02/04/01	

X-Keten	29/06/99 Ashmore Reef	MAHYUDIN, Udin	1	53	Removed 07/07/99	
X-Keten	29/06/99 Ashmore Reef	DULAH, At	1	53	Removed 08/01/00	
X-Keten	29/06/99 Ashmore Reef	BIN UDIN,	1	53	Removed 29/09/99	
X-Keten	29/06/99 Ashmore Reef	HUSEIN, A	1	53	Removed 29/09/99	
X-Keten	29/06/99 Ashmore Reef	JUNAEDI,	1	53	Removed 29/09/99	
X-Keten	29/06/99 Ashmore Reef	KAMIL, Yu	1	53	Removed 29/09/99	
X-Keten	29/06/99 Ashmore Reef	SIMIN, Rud	1	53	Removed 29/09/99	
York/Zeil	12/07/99 Ashmore Reef	SAFFRUDIN, Imran	1	6 + 16	Removed 21/07/99	
York/Zeil	12/07/99 Ashmore Reef	MISAK, Ronal	1	6 + 16	Removed 21/07/99	
York/Zeil	12/07/99 Ashmore Reef	LOE, Ari	1	6 + 16	Removed 20/10/99	
York/Zeil	12/07/99 Ashmore Reef	GIRI, Asar	1	6 + 16	Removed 20/10/99	
York/Zeil	12/07/99 Ashmore Reef	TOMONO,	1	6 + 16	Removed 20/10/99	
York/Zeil	12/07/99 Ashmore Reef	GIRI, Milki	1	6 + 16	Removed 20/10/99	
York/Zeil	12/07/99 Ashmore Reef	LATIF, Haj	1	6 + 16	Removed 20/10/99	
York/Zeil	12/07/99 Ashmore Reef	LAABU, La	1	6 + 16	Removed 20/10/99	
York/Zeil	12/07/99 Ashmore Reef	MENCURA	1	6 + 16	Removed 20/10/99	

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

How many positions are there in the Human Rights Branch? Are there positions that are currently filled by permanent appointments? How many positions are filled by acting appointments?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The current funding for the Human Rights Branch envisages 14 ongoing positions, although this number will vary up and down depending on the workload and priorities of the Branch.

As at 20 March, there are 4 ongoing (permanent) and 5 non-ongoing (acting or temporary) employees in the Branch. An additional ongoing employee will return from placement with an overseas aid program on 22 March. An additional non-ongoing employee is due to commence on 2 April. Further recruitment action is under way.

The reasons for the high number of non-ongoing appointments and vacancies include:

- 2 ongoing employees accepting development opportunities in the Attorney-General's office;
- the secondment of 1 ongoing employee to a Parliamentary committee;
- 1 ongoing employee accepting a development opportunity (overseas) through AUSAID programmes;
- the recent promotion, transfer or temporary reassignment of several employees internally or to other Departments.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Is the amount of sick leave and annual leave or absences in the Human Rights Branch average for where it sits?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

For the 1999/2000 financial year and the current financial year to 31 January 2001, Departmental records indicate that the percentage of hours on all forms of leave (sick leave including absences on workers compensation, annual leave, long service leave and miscellaneous paid leave) for the Human Rights Branch was below the average for the Department. Of these, the percentage rate for sick leave was above the Departmental average for both years; the percentage rate for recreation leave was higher than the Departmental average for 1999/2000 and lower than the Departmental average for the current financial year to 31 January 2001 and the percentage rate for other leave was lower than the Departmental average for both years.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senators Ludwig and McKiernan asked the following questions at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

- (a) Why has the Government not responded to the recommendations of the ALRC report on the FOI Act?
- (b) How many other reports of a similar type have been presented and are awaiting a response?
- (c) Have responses been prepared and presented to the Attorney but not yet tabled in the parliament or otherwise publicly released?

**I am advised that the answers to the honourable Senator's questions are as follows:**

- (a) I note that there is no requirement for the Government to formally respond to the joint report of the Australian Law Reform Commission and the Administrative Review Council entitled 'Open Government: a review of the federal *Freedom of Information Act 1982*'. The Government has not produced a comprehensive response to all the recommendations in the report. However, recommendations in the report have been taken into account in the development of Government policy. The Government has specifically addressed particular recommendations in the following ways:
  - the draft Freedom of Information Amendment Bill 2000 contains amendments to ensure that access rights to information held by contractors in relation to services provided to clients on behalf of government are effective;
  - the consequential legislation related to the Administrative Review Tribunal Bill 2000 includes provisions to implement two recommendations in relation to the proposed Administrative Review Tribunal; and
  - the recommendations for technical amendments are likely to be included in the draft Freedom of Information Amendment Bill 2000, which is scheduled to be introduced in the current Sittings. Alternatively, these technical amendments will be included in the next available Law and Justice Legislation Amendment Bill.

The Department currently performs, to varying extents, all of the functions proposed for the Freedom of Information Commissioner in Recommendation 19 of the report, apart from the auditing function. These are:

- preparing an annual report on FOI;
- collecting statistics on FOI requests and decisions;
- publicising the Act in the community;
- issuing guidelines on how to administer the Act; and
- providing legislative policy advice on the FOI Act.



In addition the Department, the Australian Government Solicitor and other government legal advisers provide:

- FOI training to agencies; and
- information, advice and assistance in respect of FOI requests.

To date, the Attorney-General has favoured an approach whereby responsibility for the efficient and effective practices and performance in respect of FOI matters within agencies rests with the respective agency head.

Further, the Department has, in an effort to improve dissemination of FOI information, established an Internet FOI Home Page at <http://www.law.gov.au/foi>. The FOI Home Page contains a range of useful FOI information and research materials for agencies and members of the public.

- (b) Any response to an ALRC report is a matter for government. There is no requirement that a government respond to an ALRC report nor any requirement that any response be tabled in the parliament.

Although the following ALRC reports have not had response, many of them are under active consideration. It is noted that a number of the recommendations in the ALRC reports are matters for other Ministers or for the States and Territories rather than the Attorney-General.

ALRC 31 (1986)	The recognition of Aboriginal customary law
ALRC 70 (1994)	Child care for kids
ALRC 75 (1995)	Cost shifting – who pays for litigation Consultation is continuing with interested parties.
ALRC 84 (1997)	Seen and heard; Priority for children in the legal process The Government is considering the recommendations made by the Commission.
ALRC 85 (1998)	Australia’s Federal Record—A review of the <i>Archives Act 1983</i> The Government is considering the recommendations made by the Commission.
ALRC 87 (1999)	Confiscation that counts – A review of the <i>Proceeds of Crime Act 1987</i> The Government is considering the recommendations made by the Commission. The Government has under consideration proposals for legislation that would adopt a civil forfeiture scheme for confiscating assets that a court determined have been derived from relevant criminal activity without need for a conviction.
ALRC 89 (2000)	Managing Justice

The Government is considering the recommendations made by the Commission.

- (c) It has not been the practice of this government or former governments to table responses to ALRC reports. There is no requirement that any response be publicly released. There are no responses to ALRC reports currently with the Attorney-General.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Is there any reason for there being a delay by government in responding to that report [ALRC report], other than actions that have been so described earlier? Why has it not been formally responded to at this time?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

See the answer to Question On Notice No. 64.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

What is the status of the ACT in relation to the Electronic Transactions Bill?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The Australian Capital Territory Legislative Assembly enacted the Electronic Transactions Bill 2000 on Thursday 15 February 2001. The Bill is substantially identical to the uniform Electronic Transactions Bill that has been enacted in New South Wales, Victoria, the Northern Territory, South Australia and Tasmania (and which was introduced in Western Australia and Queensland but lapsed with the elections in those jurisdictions).

The Electronic Transactions Bills enacted in NSW, the Northern Territory and South Australia are identical to the agreed uniform Bill, while the Electronic Transactions Bills enacted in Victoria, Tasmania and the ACT contain a small number of minor drafting changes that do not affect the uniformity of the Bills.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
OFFICE OF FILM AND LITERATURE CLASSIFICATION  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan tabled the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Are you aware of any time lines that will be included in the review [of the film and computer game classifications]?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

Commonwealth, State and Territory Classification Ministers agreed on 16 November 2000 to conduct a combined review of the classification guidelines for films and computer games in consultation with the public and industry. It was agreed that a combined set of guidelines for these media would be prepared for public consultation purposes to enable consideration of issues arising from the convergence of films and computer games in new forms of digital recordings.

The review will be conducted in accordance with the process agreed by Commonwealth, State and Territory Classification Ministers. Advertisements will be placed in national, state and territory newspapers calling for submissions. An information package will be widely circulated. A period of at least six weeks will be allowed for submissions to the review.

Submissions will be analysed and further consultations may be conducted before proposals for the revision of the classification guidelines are finalised for the consideration of Classification Ministers. Accordingly, it is not possible to predict with certainty when the review will be completed. However, it is expected that proposals for the revision of the guidelines will be finalised for consideration at the November 2001 and March 2002 ministerial meetings.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

How many submissions were received [in relation to amending the Copyright Act 1968]?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

As at 2 March, 15 submissions had been received.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Were other interested parties to that review [Copyright Act] advised of what is happening, that there has been a delay and that there are efforts to get a united position from those organisations?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

When the Government conveyed to the representatives of the Australian Screen Directors Association and the Screen Producers Association of Australia its agreement to their delaying lodging their submissions, they were asked to notify other principal stakeholders, bearing in mind that those two associations represent most stakeholders with an interest in the change under consideration.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Were there any deadlines set in the early stages of the review process [Copyright Act] for the introduction and passage of legislation in this area? Have those deadlines or target dates been amended because of the delays? If so, what have they been amended to?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

(1) A press release issued by the Attorney-General, the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts and the Minister for the Arts and the Centenary of Federation on 17 August 2000 included the statement that, "If the Government's review concludes that amendments of the Copyright Act are appropriate, we would hope to have legislation ready for introduction by the end of the year".

(2) and (3) No. The delay in introducing legislation has been occasioned by ongoing negotiations between the Australian Screen Directors Association and the Screen Producers Association, who represent the main interests concerned with this issue.



SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Can the Committee be provided with a copy of the report prepared by the Law Foundation of New South Wales entitled *Phase One of a National Evaluation of Primary Dispute Resolution Programs in Legal Aid Commissions* ?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The report is currently with the Attorney-General for consideration and therefore the Department cannot accede to this request.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

What has been the cost of work to date towards the establishment of the Administrative Review Tribunal – that is, including costs paid to consultants working on the project and the costs for departmental resources committed to it?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The Department's costs to date in establishing the Administrative Review Tribunal (ART) total \$414,351. This includes direct employee expenses of \$336,504 for the ART Implementation Team and a proportion of salaries of officers in the Administrative and Procedural Justice Branch. It also includes supplier expenses, including consultancy expenses, of \$77,847. These costs do not include the time of senior management above SES Band 1 level involved in the development of the ART.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing on 19 February 2001**

Do you have any figures over, say, six-month intervals going back over the last 2 years {with positions within the Administrative Appeals Tribunal}?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The Registrar of the Administrative Appeals Tribunal has provided the following details of the membership of the Tribunal as at 1 January 1999; 1 July 1999; 1 January 2000; 1 July 2000 and 1 January 2001, respectively.

**Membership at 1 January 1999**

<b>CLASS OF MEMBER</b>	<b>Judges</b>	<b>Full-time</b>	<b>Part-time</b>	<b>Total</b>
President	1			1
Presidential Members: Federal Court Judges Family Court Judges Deputy Presidents	10 3	8	3	10 3 11
Senior Members		10	10	20
Members			52	52
<b>Total</b>	14	18	65	97

## Membership at 1 July 1999

<b>CLASS OF MEMBER</b>	<b>Judges</b>	<b>Full-time</b>	<b>Part-time</b>	<b>Total</b>
President	1			1
Presidential Members: Federal Court Judges Family Court Judges Deputy Presidents	10 3	8	3	10 3 11
Senior Members		10	11	21
Members			49	49
<b>Total</b>	14	18	63	95

## Membership at 1 January 2000

<b>CLASS OF MEMBER</b>	<b>Judges</b>	<b>Full-time</b>	<b>Part-time</b>	<b>Total</b>
President	1			1
Presidential Members: Federal Court Judges Family Court Judges Deputy Presidents	10 3	8		10 3 8
Senior Members		9	12	21
Members			44	44
<b>Total</b>	14	17	56	87

## Membership at 1 July 2000

<b>CLASS OF MEMBER</b>	<b>Judges</b>	<b>Full-time</b>	<b>Part-time</b>	<b>Total</b>
President	1			1
Presidential Members: Federal Court Judges Family Court Judges Deputy Presidents	10 3	8	1	10 3 9
Senior Members		9	10	19
Members			47	47
<b>Total</b>	14	17	58	89

## Membership at 1 January 2001

<b>CLASS OF MEMBER</b>	<b>Judges</b>	<b>Full-time</b>	<b>Part-time</b>	<b>Total</b>
President	1			1
Presidential Members: Federal Court Judges Family Court Judges Deputy Presidents	9 2	8	1	9 2 9
Senior Members		10	10	20
Members			47	47
<b>Total</b>	12	18	58	88

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Is it possible to break down that \$4 million to Centrelink by year by year expenditures and further to breakdown what it would cost to establish it and maintain it?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The total cost of developing and operating the national call centre for the 12-month period is \$4,011,809 (excluding GST).

The expected cost by financial years is:

Financial Year	Committed amount
2000/2001	\$693,690
2001/2002	\$3,318,119

The expected cost of establishing a national call centre for a 12-month period is \$468,690 (excluding GST) which includes:

Accommodation and IT infrastructure	\$230,000
Telecommunications infrastructure including call distribution system, telephone handsets, headsets, backup headsets and service access numbers	\$41,100
Staff in training	\$50,590
Training and general project costs	\$147,000
Total	\$468,690

The expected cost of operating a national call centre for a 12-month period is \$3,543,119 (excluding GST) which includes:

Staff costs, supervision, management, leasing and depreciation	\$3,219,009
Telecommunications charges	\$324,110
Total	\$3,543,119

The establishment and operating costs are based on an estimated demand of 250,000 calls lasting an average of 5 minutes with 2 minutes of post-call processing.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

What is the \$85,000 for project management services for and what is the exact figure?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The department has engaged a Project Manager through Morgan and Banks Ltd to manage the Law by Telecommunications project. The \$85,000 is an estimated amount based on the consultant's hourly rate of \$85 over the 25-week implementation period 6 December 2000 through to 31 May 2001.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

What are the ongoing costs of the national call centre and Internet portal initiatives for the out years from 2002?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The department will review the Law by Telecommunications initiatives including the call centre and the Internet services after 12 months of operation. This review will determine the appropriate resourcing required for these services.



SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

In relation to the Family Law Pathways Advisory Group:

- A) Were members of the group paid a per diem amount or reimbursed for expenses? If so, what was the amount of the per diem?
- B) Can you provide the total travel expenses for members of the group and also information on where each member of the group is based?
- C) What is the total costs associated with the establishment and running of the pathways group?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- A) The non-government members of the Group have been paid daily sitting fees for attendance at meetings of the Group and consultative meetings. The chair has received \$325 per day and the members \$250 per day.
- B) In addition members received travel allowance to attend meetings and consultations. Flights were paid at standard economy return rate. The Advisory Group has held 5 meetings in Canberra, with one further meeting scheduled at the end of March. There will have been four two day meetings and two one day meetings. Estimated travel and sitting fee costs of these meetings appear in the following table, calculated on the basis of full attendance at all meetings.

	<b>One day meetings</b>	<b>Two day meetings</b>
<b>Sitting fees</b>	\$3000	\$5500
<b>Travel allowance</b>	\$1500	\$3500
<b>Airfares</b>	\$5700	\$5700
<b>Total</b>	\$10200 x 2 = \$20,400	\$14700 x 4 = \$58,800

Five non-government members (including the chair) are based in Sydney, 3 in Melbourne, 2 in Brisbane, 1 in Hobart and 1 in Bunbury, WA. All the government members including one Family Court member, are based in Canberra. Government members' travel expenses, when incurred, were met by their home departments or agencies.

In addition consultative meetings were held in 10 locations around the country for which sitting fees were paid to 6 non-government members at the rate stated above. These consultations were held at Perth, Bunbury, Townsville, Melbourne, Darwin, Hobart, Canberra, Whyalla, Parramatta and Dubbo and wherever possible locally based members attended. A small number of meetings with the Chair have been held in Canberra for which he has received the appropriate sitting fee.

Exact total travel expenses are not currently available, but a full reconciliation will be conducted at the conclusion of the Group's work. To date, the main expenditure incurred for members attending meetings and consultations is \$57,476.18 for sitting fees and travel expenses, including travel allowance and air fares.

C) The establishment and running of the Group has been jointly funded by the Department of Family and Community Services and the Attorney-General's Department with an administered amount of \$250,000. An estimate of the projected total expenditure, assuming the meeting scheduled for 26 March is the last is approximately \$230,000. This covers sitting fees to members, travel, administrative costs of meetings, venue hire, consultants (including research), editorial and publication costs and advertising. Staff for the Secretariat have been provided by each agency involved, AGD, FaCS, Centrelink and CSA.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

- a) How much funding is going to be provided to each of the services covering the southern, western, central and northern regions?
- b) Have any of them previously received Commonwealth funding?
- c) Where were each of them previously located if they are not a new service?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

- a) Funding for each of the services covering the southern, western, central and northern regions is as follows:

**COMMONWEALTH FUNDING PER ANNUM**

**SOUTH**

Generalist.....	\$198,844
Child Support.....	\$115,305
	\$314,149

**WEST**

Generalist.....	\$200,637
Civil Litigation.....	\$67,932
	\$268,569

**CENTRAL**

Generalist.....	\$238,368
Disability Discrimination.....	\$105,000
Child and Youth.....	\$65,904
	\$409,272

**NORTH**

Generalist.....	\$177,085
Child Support.....	\$101,690
	\$278,775

b) All 4 services previously received Commonwealth funding. The services are:

- Noarlunga Community Legal Service (South);
- Parks Legal Service (West);
- Adelaide Inner Northern Community Legal Service (Central); and
- Para Districts Community Legal Service (North).

c) The services were previously located as indicated:

- Noarlunga Community Legal Service  
40 Beach Road  
CHRISTIES BEACH SA 5942
- Parks Legal Service  
Cowan Street  
REGENCY PARK SA 5942
- Adelaide Inner Northern Community Legal Service  
21 May Street  
SEFTON PARK SA 5083
- Para Districts Community Legal Service  
47 Wayford Street  
ELIZABETH VALE SA 5112

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

If the Committee has not received a copy of the final review document of the South Australian community legal centres, can one be provided to us?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The Department does not have a record of providing a copy of the final report of the South Australian review to the Committee. Accordingly, the final review document of the South Australian community legal centres is attached.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

With regard to the Women's Legal Service S.A. how much Commonwealth funding did they previously receive and how much will they receive as a result of the ministerial announcement of 9 February 2001?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

The table below sets out the amount of funding received by the Women's Legal Service S.A. from 1995-96 to 1999-2000 and the amount it will receive in 2000-01.

**WOMEN'S LEGAL SERVICE S.A.**

1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01
\$430,000	\$423,773	\$426,248	\$445,291	\$448,333	\$455,398

There will be no change to the funding amount as a result of the review in South Australia as the review's focus was on metropolitan and outer urban community legal centres. The Women's Legal Service is a state-wide service and was therefore not subject to review. The Women's Legal Service will continue to receive funding with annual indexation.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

Can the Department provide a list of all those community legal centres, including the 115, showing the address of each organisation, the annual amount of Commonwealth funding that each receives, the date on which each organisation has been assured of Commonwealth funding and the periodic arrangements by which funding is paid to each organisation?

Where possible, could you also provide information on other sources of funding for each organisation?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

To clarify information provided to the Estimates Committee, there are 126 community legal services currently funded by the Commonwealth rather than 115 as was suggested at the hearings. The address of each organisation and all funding details requested are contained in Attachment A.

The Program is underpinned by annual service agreements. Annual Service Agreements generally run from 1 July to 30 June of each financial year. Funding is provided to community legal centres on a quarterly basis.

In South Australia the service agreements for services involved in the tender process were extended from 31 December 2000 to 28 February 2001. Successful tenderers will shortly sign new agreements for the period to 30 June 2001. Agreements with unsuccessful tenderers finished on 28 February 2001. However, additional funds to meet wind up costs will be provided on an as needs basis.

In Victoria, service agreements have been extended until 30 June 2001 whilst the review is in progress.

The Department does not hold 2000-01 funding information from non-Commonwealth sources for individual services. Summary funding from State and Territory sources is provided in the table below.

**STATE FUNDING TO COMMUNITY LEGAL SERVICES  
IN 2000-01**

NSW	VIC	QLD	S.A.	WA	TAS	NT	ACT	TOTAL
\$3,141,578	\$2,009,145	\$1,566,000	\$752,316	\$31,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,590,039





## ATTACHMENT A

### Centres funded under the Commonwealth Community Legal Services Program

Funding in 2000-2001 \$

#### NATIONAL & TERRITORY SERVICES

The Canberra Welfare Rights & Legal Centre	Havelock House, Gould Street, TURNER ACT 2612	258,681
Environmental Defenders Office ACT	Level 1, Centre Cinema Bld, 1 Bunda St, CANBERRA ACT 2601	37,095
Women's Legal Centre ACT	Havelock House, Gould Street, TURNER ACT 2612	161,912
Darwin Community Legal Service	8 Manton Street, DARWIN NT 0801	338,251
Environmental Defenders Office, NT	8 Manton Street, DARWIN NT 0801	73,940
Top End Women's Legal Service	8 Manton Street, DARWIN NT 0801	159,079
Central Australian Women's Legal Service	Suite 3, 15 Leichhardt Terrace, ALICE SPRINGS NT 0871	159,232
Katherine Women's Information & Legal Service	Shop 1/6, Kintore Street, KATHERINE NT 0851	64,574
National Children's & Youth Law Centre	32 Botany Street, Randwick NSW 2031	140,103

**Centres funded under the Commonwealth Community Legal Services Program**

**Funding in 2000-2001 \$**

**NEW SOUTH WALES**

Blue Mountains Community Legal Centre	1st Floor, 80 Main Street, KATOOMBA NSW 2780	82,169
Central Coast Legal Centre	34 Hely Street, WYONG NSW 2259	160,308
Community Legal Service for Western NSW	51 Bultje Street, DUBBO NSW 2830	226,701
Consumer Credit Legal Centre NSW	Level 1, 72-80 Cooper Street, SURRY HILLS NSW 2010	113,159
Court Support Scheme of CRC Justice Support	174 Broadway (cnr Shepherd Street), BROADWAY NSW 2007	26,976
Northern Rivers Community Legal Centre	10 Club Lane, LISMORE NSW 2480	223,767
Environmental Defenders Office (NSW)	Level 9, 89 York Street, SYDNEY NSW 2000	76,726
Far West Community Legal Service	5 Chloride Street, BROKEN HILL NSW 2880	203,510
Hawkesbury Nepean Community Legal Centre	13 Bosworth Street, RICHMOND NSW 2753	113,282
HIV/AIDS Legal Centre	188 Goulburn Street, DARLINGHURST NSW 1300	55,329
Hunter Community Legal Centre	2nd Fl, Piccardi Centre, 123 King Street, NEWCASTLE NSW 2300	171,123
Illawarra Legal Centre	7 Greene Street, WARRAWONG NSW 2502	329,338
Immigration Advice and Rights Centre	Level 4, 414 Elizabeth Street, SURRY HILLS NSW 2010	79,789
Inner City Legal Centre	94 Oxford Street, DARLINGHURST NSW 2010	82,167
Kingsford Legal Centre	11 Rainbow Street, KINGSFORD NSW 2032	138,464
Macarthur Legal Centre	4 Broughton St, CAMPBELLTOWN NSW 2560	179,871
Macquarie Legal Centre	94 Harris Street, HARRIS PARK NSW 2150	126,840
Marrickville Legal Centre	338 Illawarra Road, MARRICKVILLE NSW 2204	125,406
Mt Druitt and Area Community Legal Centre	Shop 7, Daniel Thomas Plaza, Mount Street, MOUNT DRUITT NSW 2770	160,096
North & North West Community Legal Service	129 Rusden Street, ARMIDALE NSW 2350	160,967
NSW Disability Discrimination Legal Centre	Shop 99, 1-5 Meeks Street, KINGSFORD NSW 2032	164,162

**Centres funded under the Commonwealth Community Legal Services Program**

**Funding in 2000-2001 \$**

**NSW Cont**

Public Interest Advocacy Centre	Level 1, 46-48 York Street, SYDNEY NSW 2000	93,294
Redfern Legal Centre	73 Pitt Street, SYDNEY NSW 2000	127,667
Shoalcoast Community Legal Centre	50 Junction Street, NOWRA NSW 2541	204,657
South West Sydney Legal Centre	30 Pirie Street, LIVERPOOL NSW 2170	162,049
Tenants Union of New South Wales	68 Bettington Street, MILLERS POINT NSW 2000	61,332
The Aged Care Rights Service Inc	64 Kippax Street, SURRY HILLS NSW 2010	27,595
*Women's Legal Resource Centre	PO BOX 37, LIDCOMBE NORTH NSW 2141	693,873
Welfare Rights Centre (NSW)	Level 5B, 414 Elizabeth Street, SURRY HILLS NSW 2010	185,700

## Centres funded under the Commonwealth Community Legal Services Program

Funding in 2000-2001 \$

### QUEENSLAND

Brisbane Welfare Rights Centre	Suite 3, Alhambra Place 20 Old Cleveland Road, STONES CORNER QLD 4120	206,696
Cairns Community Legal Service	451 Draper Street, CAIRNS QLD 4870	176,175
Caxton Legal Centre	28 Heal Street, NEW FARM QLD 4005	366,484
Central Queensland Community Legal Service	121 West Street, ROCKHAMPTON QLD 4700	160,769
Environmental Defenders Office of Northern Queensland	c/- Cairns Community Legal Centre Inc., 451 Draper Street CAIRNS QLD 4870	75,174
Environmental Defenders Office (QLD)	Level 4, Travel House 243 Edward Street, BRISBANE QLD 4000	75,461
Financial Counselling Services QLD)	Level 1, 60 Berwick Street, FORTITUDE VALLEY QLD 4006	71,712
Highway Legal Service and Citizens Advice Bureau	45 Nerang Street, SOUTHPORT QLD 4215	163,753
Logan Youth Legal Service	2 Rowan Street, Slacks Creek, WOODRIDGE QLD 4114	67,708
North Queensland Women's Legal Service	3b/42 Sturt Street, TOWNSVILLE QLD 4810	384,871
Pine Rivers Welfare Association	730 Gympie Road, STRATHPINE QLD 4500	5,796
Prisoners Legal Service Inc	Level 1, 106 Boundary St, WEST END QLD 4101	56,639
Roma Community Legal Service	96 Arthur Street, ROMA QLD 4455	30,570
South Brisbane Immigration & Community Legal Service	170 Boundary St, WEST END QLD 4101	131,375
Suncoast Community Legal Service	5th Av, Cotton Tree, COTTON TREE QLD 4558	13,479
Tenants Union of Queensland	28 Robertson Street, FORTITUDE VALLEY QLD 4006	14,951
South West Brisbane Community Legal Centre	28 Wirraway Parade, INALA QLD 4077	2,419
Toowoomba Community Legal Service	19A Russell Street, TOOWOOMBA QLD 4350	164,746
Townsville Community Legal Service	Suite 1, St James Place, Denham Street Entrance, TOWNSVILLE QLD 4810	150,398
Western Queensland Justice Network	Trustee House, 18 Miles Street, MT ISA QLD 4825	204,199

**Centres funded under the Commonwealth Community Legal Services Program**

**Funding in 2000-2001 \$**

**QLD cont**

Women's Legal Service Inc (QLD)	387 Ipswich Road, ANNERLEY QLD 4103	424,817
Youth Advocacy Centre	52 Inwood Street, WOOLLOOWIN QLD 4030	78,113

## Centres funded under the Commonwealth Community Legal Services Program

Funding in 2000-2001 \$

### SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Adelaide Inner Northern Community Legal Service	21 May Street SEFTON PARK SA 5083	156,424
* Bowden Brompton Community Legal Service	19 Green Street, BROMPTON SA 5007	81,064
* Marion Community Legal Service	175 Oaklands Road cnr Morphett Road, WARRADALE SA 5046	79,820
Noarlunga Community Legal Service	40 Beach Road, CHRISTIES BEACH SA 5165	242,008
Para Districts Community Legal Service	47 Wayford Street, Elizabeth Vale SA 5112	120,979
Parks Legal Service	Cowan Street, REGENCY PARK SA 5942	278,249
Riverland Community Legal Service	7 Wilson Street, BERRI SA 5343	203,255
* Roma Mitchell Community Legal Centre (formerly Norwood Community Legal Service)	110 The Parade, NORWOOD SA 5067	154,059
South East Community Legal Service	9 Penola Road, MT GAMBIER SA 5290	203,285
Spencer Gulf Community Legal Service	60 Florence Street, PORT PIRIE SA 5540	204,495
Environmental Defender's Office (SA)	1st Floor, 118 Halifax Street, ADELAIDE SA 5000	75,161
Women's Legal Service SA	135 Waymouth Street, ADELAIDE SA 5000	455,398
Welfare Rights (SA)	220 Victoria Square, ADELAIDE SA 5000	155,830

\* Services received funding to 28 February 2001 only. Further funds will be provided on an as needs basis to assist with wind up costs.

**Centres funded under the Commonwealth Community Legal Services Program**

**Funding in 2000-2001 \$**

**TASMANIA**

Hobart Community Legal Service	166 Macquarie Street, HOBART TAS 7000	317,313
Environmental Defenders Office (Tas.)	131 Macquarie Street, HOBART TAS 7000	75,994
Women's Legal Service Tas	166 Macquarie Street, HOBART TAS 7001	202,799
Launceston Community Legal Service	4a George Street, LAUNCESTON TAS 7250	223,552
Tenants Union of Tasmania	166 Macquarie Street, HOBART TAS 7000	50,014
North West Community Legal Centre	62 Stewart Street DEVONPORT TAS 7310	83,345

**Centres funded under the Commonwealth Community Legal Services Program**

**Funding in 2000-2001 \$**

**VICTORIA**

Disability Discrimination Law Advocacy Service	11 <sup>th</sup> Floor, 343 Collins Street, Melbourne VIC 3000	149,672
Environment Defenders Office (VIC)	1/504 Victoria Street,NORTH MELBOURNE VIC 3051	75,108
Monash/Oakley Legal Service	60 Beddoe Avenue, NORTH CLAYTON VIC 3168	113,225
Murray Mallee Community Legal Service	Mallee Family Care 122 Ninth St, Mildura Office 210 Beveridge St, Swan Hill Office, MILDURA VIC 3502	225,076
Albury/Wodonga Community Legal Service	593 Olive Street, ALBURY NSW 2640	204,578
Brimbank Community Legal Centre	822 Ballarat Road, DEER PARK VIC 3023	58,814
Broadmeadows Community Legal Service	180 Widford Street, BROADMEADOWS VIC 3047	123,819
Casey Cardinia Community Legal Service Inc	42 Claredale Road, DANDENONG VIC 3175	93,731
Central Highlands Community Legal Centre	Ludbrook House 115 Lydiard Street North, BALLARAT VIC 3350	147,122
Coburg & Brunswick Community Legal & Financial Counselling Centre	78 Bell Street, COBURG VIC 3058	76,518



## Centres funded under the Commonwealth Community Legal Services Program

Funding in 2000-2001 \$

VIC cont.

The Legal Centre- Community Connections (VIC) Ltd	26 Fairy Street, WARRNAMBOOL VIC 3280	155,381
Consumer Credit Legal Service Inc	1st Floor, 11-19 Bank Place, MELBOURNE VIC 3000	58,060
Darebin Community Legal Centre	80 High Street, NORTHCOTE VIC 3070	43,630
Eastern Community Legal Centre	1st Floor, 60-64 Railway Road, BLACKBURN VIC 3130	108,829
Essendon Community Legal Centre	13A Wingate Avenue, ASCOT VALE VIC 3032	43,728
Fitzroy Legal Service	124 Johnston Street, FITZROY VIC 3065	139,373
Flemington & Kensington Community Legal Centre	Old Town Hall, Bellaire Street, KENSINGTON VIC 3031	73,608
Footscray Community Legal Centre	220 Nicholson Street, FOOTSCRAY VIC 3011	44,279
Geelong Community Legal Service	257 Moorabool Street, GEELONG VIC 3220	301,397
Gippsland Community Legal Service	C/- Anglicare Gippsland 53-55 Buckley Street, MORWELL VIC 3840	203,116
Peninsula Community Legal Centre	Chatsworth House 431 Nepean Highway, FRANKSTON VIC 3199 AND Bentleigh Branch 82 Brady Road, BENTLEIGH EAST VIC 3165	274,402
North Melbourne Legal Service	504 Victoria Street, NORTH MELBOURNE VIC 3051	134,355
Welfare Rights Unit (VIC)	155 Easey Street, COLLINGWOOD VIC 3066	155,519
Women's Legal Service Victoria	3rd Floor, 43 Hardware Street, MELBOURNE VIC 3000	533,291
Springvale Legal Service	5 Osborne Avenue, SPRINGVALE VIC 3171	246,353
Springvale CAAB	5 Osborne Street, SPRINGVALE VIC 3171	58,689
St Kilda Legal Service Co-op	161 Chapel Street, ST KILDA VIC 3182	78,438
Tenants Union of Victoria	55 Johnston Street, FITZROY VIC 3065	87,111

**Centres funded under the Commonwealth Community Legal Services Program**

**Funding in 2000-2001 \$**

**VIC cont**

Werribee Legal Service	Old Shire building Cnr Duncans Road & Watton Street, WERRIBEE VIC 3030	87,064
West Heidelberg Legal Service	Cnr Alamein & Catalina Streets, WEST HEIDELBERG VIC 3081	73,579
Western Suburbs Community Legal Service	30 Hall Street, NEWPORT VIC 3015	72,276

**Centres funded under the Commonwealth Community Legal Services Program**

**Funding in 2000-2001 \$**

**WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

Albany Community Legal Centre Inc	77 Albany Highway, ALBANY WA 6332	204,640
Bunbury Community Legal Centre	1st Fl, Lotteries House, 101 Victoria Street, BUNBURY WA 6231	147,747
Consumer Credit Legal Service	Level 4, City Arcade Office Tower, 207 Murray Street, PERTH WA 6000	48,782
Goldfields Community Legal Centre	23 Maritana Street, KALGOORLIE WA 6430	281,156
Gosnells Community Legal Centre	Unit 1, 2209 Albany Highway, GOSNELLS WA 6110	178,245
Kimberley Community Legal Service	9 Papuana St, KUNUNURRA WA 6743	279,887
North Perth Migrant Resource Centre	20 View Street, NORTH PERTH WA 6906	96,858
Northern Suburbs Community Legal Centre	Unit 2, 14 Chesterfield Rd, MIRRABOOKA WA 6061	161,329
Environmental Defender's Office WA	1st Floor, Law Society House 33 Barrack Street, PERTH WA 6000	75,025
Welfare Rights & Advocacy Service	98 Edward Street, PERTH WA 6000	156,720
Geraldton Resource Centre	Lotteries House, 180 Marine Terrace, GERALDTON WA 6531	268,120
Pilbara Community Legal Service	Lotteries House, 2 Leake Street, SOUTH HEDLAND WA 6722	251,848
Women's Legal Services WA	Level 1, 5 Barrack St St George's Terrace, PERTH WA 6831	287,504
Community Legal & Advocacy Centre	Birmingham Centre 24 Parry Street, FREMANTLE WA 6160	68,916
SCALES	Lotteries House Civic Boulevarde, ROCKINGHAM WA 6168	102,426
Sussex Street Community Law Service	29 Sussex Street, EAST VICTORIA PARK WA 6981	254,163
Tenants Advice Service	33 Moore Street, EAST PERTH WA 6849	112,226
Youth Legal Service	8 Pier Street, PERTH WA 6000	67,429

\* Centre has requested that its location is not disclosed due to the often sensitive nature of matters dealt with.



SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator McKiernan asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

In relation to minimising impact of mandatory sentencing on juvenile offenders:

Can the Department provide the Committee with a breakdown of the one-off set-up costs, as distinct from recurrent costs, paid by the Commonwealth to any of the subprograms that are covered by the \$20 million package (in relation to the whole of the package)?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

In the first year of the agreement between the Commonwealth and the Northern Territory, the \$5 million in Commonwealth funding is allocated to five main areas:

- to set up the Juvenile Diversion Unit and to conduct conferences and other diversionary measures;
- the purchase of community based diversion programs by the Northern Territory Police;
- to meet 50% of the recurrent costs of the Aboriginal Interpreter Service;
- to provide extra training for Aboriginal interpreters;
- the purchase of Aboriginal interpreter services by the Northern Territory Aboriginal Legal Services.

One-off set up costs are involved in the establishment of the juvenile diversion scheme. The Commonwealth has paid \$730,000 in set up costs since the Agreement came into effect. In addition, there may be one-off set up costs associated with the funding of new community based diversion programs. As extensive community consultations are currently underway to identify priorities in relation to new programs, details on funding for such programs will not be available until later in the year. The \$250,000 paid to the Office of Aboriginal Development for the extra training of Aboriginal interpreters represents a one-off cost to assist the early development of the service. The Commonwealth has also paid \$10,000 to the Aboriginal Interpreter Service to help meet the costs of establishing its database.

SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT  
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Senator West asked the following question at the hearing of 19 February 2001.**

In relation to the monitoring of 13 systems that were on the analog system:

Were any of those for the Department of Defence, an element within the Department of Defence or the Australian Defence Force?

**I am advised that the answer to the honourable Senator's question is as follows:**

There were two Defence locations. Both are armories which are located at.

1. 5 Combat Engineer Regiment  
The Crescent  
PENRITH
2. 4/3 Royal NSW Regiment  
B coy  
WOOLLONGONG

Senate Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee  
**Attorney-General's Portfolio**  
 Questions on notice from Additional Estimates Hearing 19 February 2001

No.	Hansard page	Reply received
	<b>Written questions on notice</b>	
1		8 March – 2 April
2		14 – 24 March
3		14 – 21 March
4		2 April
5		2 April
6		2 April
7		12 April
8		2 April
9		3 May
10		22 March
11		30 March
12		21 March
13		30 March
14		26 March
15		26 March
16		26 March
17		30 March
18		26 March
19		2 April
20		28 March
21		26 March
22		2 April
	<b>Questions from the Hansard Transcript</b>	
23	3	19 March
24	8	7 March
25	22	4 April
26	22-23	4 April
27	30	12 April
28	30	12 April
29	31	26 March
30	31	2 April
31	34	2 April
32	34	16 March
33	37	8 March
34	41	1 March
35	50	20 March
36	53	20 March
37	55	20 March
38	55-56	20 March
39	58	20 March
40	59	20 March
41	61	20 March
42	70,76	
43	71	
44	73	
45	73	
46	74	
47	74	

<b>No.</b>	<b>Hansard page</b>	<b>Reply received</b>
48	74	
49	76	20 March
50	82	20 March
51	82	20 March
52	87	20 March
53	88	20 March
54	88	20 March
55	88	20 March
56	88	20 March
57	91	20 March
58	92	20 March
59	93	2 March
60	95	1 March
61	95-96	16 March
62	98	16 March
63	99	16 March
64	99	20 March
65	100	19 March
66	100	16 March
67	100	22 March
68	101	19 March
69	101	19 March
70	101	20 March
71	102	2 March
72	102	2 March
73	102	1 March
74	109	16 March
75	109	16 March
76	109	16 March
77	109-110	22 March
78	110-111	14 March
79	112	14 March
80	112	14 March
81	112-113	14 March
82	118	27 March
83	188	20 March