Chapter 1

Home Affairs portfolio

1.1 This chapter summarises some of the matters raised during the committee's consideration of the budget estimates for the Home Affairs portfolio for the 2018–19 financial year.

1.2 The Department of Home Affairs (DHA, the department) appeared over two days of hearings, Monday, 21 May 2018 and Tuesday, 22 May 2018.

1.3 Home Affairs portfolio agencies appeared on Wednesday, 23 May 2018, including:

- Australian Federal Police (AFP);
- Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission (ACIC) and the Australian Institute of Criminology (AIC); and
- Australian Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre (AUSTRAC).

1.4 A brief discussion of the portfolio's appearance at the spill-over hearing on 3 August 2018 is at the end of this chapter (paragraph 1.41).

Department of Home Affairs

Opening statements

1.5 The Secretary of DHA and the Commissioner of the Australian Border Force (ABF) both made brief opening statements to the committee.

1.6 In his opening statement, the Secretary, Mr Michael Pezzullo, noted that the establishment of the portfolio had effectively been completed as a result of the changes to the Administrative Arrangements Orders (AAO) and the passage of the *Home Affairs and Integrity Agencies Legislation Amendment Act 2018* in May 2018:¹

With our colleagues in the Home Affairs portfolio agencies, the department will continue to build a portfolio which both respects the independence and traditions of the portfolio agencies, while also harnessing, in a way that has been hitherto impossible, the collective power and strength of the new national architecture of domestic security and law enforcement.²

1.7 The Secretary outlined achievements already completed within the newlyestablished portfolio within its five-month existence, including:

• promoting collaboration between work areas to address cyber threats, such as co-locating the Cyber Security Policy Division within the Australian Cyber Security Centre in the Australian Signals Directorate;

¹ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 21 May 2018, p. 4.

² *Proof Committee Hansard*, 21 May 2018, p. 4.

- the establishment of the Transnational Serious and Organised Crime unit, headed by a coordinator who will report to the Secretary on policy issues and to the Commissioner of the AFP on operational issues;³
- the establishment of the National Counter Foreign Interference unit, which will provide leadership in developing whole-of-Government strategies in addressing foreign interference in Australia;⁴
- countering child exploitation by launching the Australian Centre to Counter Child Exploitation, developed by the AFP as a joint agency standing taskforce;⁵ and
- the establishment of the National Resilience Taskforce, taking a whole-of-Government approach to preparing for 'intensifying natural hazards'.⁶

1.8 The Secretary also highlighted the commission of a strategic capability review across the portfolio, announced in the 2018–19 Budget:

The advent of the portfolio has also meant that the government, for the first time, has been able to commission a strategic capability review of the entire spectrum of domestic security and law enforcement functions, and to this end, following a decision taken by the government in the 2018–19 budget process, I have established a reform and reinvestment road map task force. This task force will work across the portfolio to ensure that an accurate picture of current and future capability needs is established—how best to fund them; how best to achieve scale, efficiency and better resource allocation; and how to reduce duplication and overlap—as well as investing more extensively in technology and automation in support of our highly skilled and expert workforces. This roadmap will inform decision-making by the government about future capabilities and priorities for the portfolio.⁷

1.9 The Commissioner, Mr Michael Outram APM, commenced his opening statement by noting that the ABF would shortly mark its third anniversary, having been established on 1 July 2015.⁸ The Commissioner provided an overview of the ABF's operational priorities, including:

• reinforcing the integrity of the migration and visa system by identifying and addressing systemic vulnerabilities, including the work of Operation Sovereign Borders and Taskforce Cadena;⁹

³ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 21 May 2018, p. 5.

⁴ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 21 May 2018, p. 5.

⁵ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 21 May 2018, p. 5.

⁶ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 21 May 2018, p. 6.

⁷ Proof Committee Hansard, 21 May 2018, p. 6. This matter was further discussed during the committee's examination of the Australian Federal Police – see Proof Committee Hansard, 23 May 2018, p. 20.

⁸ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 21 May 2018, p. 41.

⁹ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 21 May 2018, p. 42.

- monitoring customs and trade, particularly in relation to trade enforcement operations such as the recently announced illicit tobacco task force;¹⁰ and
- the cross-border movement of prohibited goods or persons who may cause harm, including the detection and seizure of illicit movements of firearms, weapons and parts, asbestos and narcotics, in addition to counter-terrorism activities.¹¹

1.10 The Commissioner was also congratulated by the committee on his recent appointment to the role.¹²

1.11 The committee proceeded to question the department on topics related to the budget estimates for the Home Affairs portfolio, including departmental administration and general corporate matters, and Outcomes 1, 2 and 3 of the department. Matters discussed by the committee and department are summarised below.

Cross-portfolio, departmental administration and other corporate matters

1.12 The committee asked the department about a number of cross-portfolio, administrative and corporate matters.

Machinery-of-government changes to the Home Affairs portfolio

1.13 Senators questioned the department regarding its strategic priorities after the machinery-of-government (MOG) changes. The Secretary noted that the department retained a strong focus on immigration, multicultural and social cohesion.¹³

1.14 The committee sought clarification regarding the ministerial arrangements within the portfolio. The Secretary explained that the new portfolio included three ministers and one assistant minister – the Minister for Home Affairs, the Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs, the Minister for Law Enforcement and Cyber Security, and the Assistant Minister for Home Affairs.¹⁴ When it was noted by the committee that the previous Immigration and Border Protection portfolio had had fewer ministers, the Secretary further stated that the number of ministers reflected the inclusion of ministers from other portfolios, such as the Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs, who was previously attached to the Social Services portfolio.¹⁵

1.15 Senators asked whether the inclusion of multiple ministers had caused measurable delays in decision-making, particularly in relation to immigration decisions. Officers informed the committee that there had been no perceived delays to

¹⁰ Proof Committee Hansard, 21 May 2018, p. 42.

¹¹ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 21 May 2018, p. 42.

¹² *Proof Committee Hansard*, 21 May 2018, pp. 41 and 43.

¹³ Proof Committee Hansard, 21 May 2018, p. 8.

¹⁴ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 21 May 2018, p. 8.

¹⁵ Proof Committee Hansard, 21 May 2018, pp. 8–9.

decision-making as a result of the portfolio changes, and that fluctuations in the demand for visas were common due to particular surges or peaks.¹⁶

1.16 The committee asked for the total cost of the MOG changes in relation to the portfolio. Ms Cheryl-anne Moy, Acting Deputy Secretary, Corporate and Enabling, Acting Chief Operating Officer, reported that the cost to date stood at \$5.5 million.¹⁷

1.17 Senators made inquiries regarding efficiencies of \$256.3 million over five years from 2017–18 through the MOG changes, as per Budget Paper No. 2.¹⁸ Mr Pezzullo explained how the efficiencies were identified:

That budget measure relates to the expectation that the government has, quite properly, that when you bring a number of different agencies together in that scale of portfolio in the way that you have—the portfolio consists of just under 24,000 staff now—you should be able to make advances in areas such as property, shared services, IT and the like. We have a broad plan upon which the government was sufficiently assured to enter that number into the budget profile, and now it's the hard, grinding work, as is always the case with anticipated savings, to work out the specifics of how we're going to achieve each and every item of that broad plan.¹⁹

1.18 Ms Stephanie Cargill, Acting First Assistant Secretary, Finance Acting Chief Financial Officer, further explained that the figure cited in the Budget papers included efficiencies from agencies and work areas within the Attorney-General's Department (AGD) which had transferred into the portfolio as a result of the MOG changes, in addition to a procure-to-pay system to be operated within the department.²⁰

1.19 On questioning from senators relating to the cross-portfolio benefits of the MOG changes, Mr Pezzullo noted the cooperative work being achieved across departments and portfolios, particularly in relation to the Defence portfolio:

We're building on a longstanding interaction with Defence in civil maritime security across surveillance, intelligence, reconnaissance, use of UAVs, and use of advanced technologies for surveillance across the broader ocean environment. That's obviously a longstanding research and capability engagement relationship that we have with Defence. What Home Affairs allows us to do is to take that capability block, or brick, if you like, align it with all the other capabilities that we need to examine, and then give government advice about all the relevant trade-offs that, inevitably, you have to do when you're in a budgeting process. So what's the net result of all that? Rather than each agency having to come forward with how best to optimise its own inputs—previously, Immigration, Customs and Border Protection, the Federal Police, et cetera—it really gives the government an opportunity to look across the entire spectrum, and it allows the government

¹⁶ Proof Committee Hansard, 21 May 2018, p. 9.

¹⁷ Proof Committee Hansard, 21 May 2018, p. 10.

¹⁸ Budget Paper No. 2, p. 130.

¹⁹ Proof Committee Hansard, 21 May 2018, p. 12.

²⁰ Proof Committee Hansard, 21 May 2018, p. 12.

to make better choices about, 'If I've got one dollar, where am I going to spend that one dollar?'—across this broad spectrum of capabilities.²¹

Workforce and staffing matters

1.20 The committee discussed a number of issues relating to departmental workforce and staffing, including the:

- the department's implementation of the Australian Government Guidelines on the Recognition of Sex and Gender in relation to staff and client information;²²
- details regarding the Strategic Review of the Department of Home Affairs, costed at \$7 million;²³
- adaptation of staff to the new portfolio arrangements;²⁴
- integrity policies and procedures for staff;²⁵ and
- the development of a new IT system across the Home Affairs portfolio, including upgrading capacity performance for enterprise identity management systems, analytics and threat management capabilities.²⁶

Operation Sovereign Borders

1.21 Senators asked questions regarding reports of a vessel carrying a number of persons which was prevented from departing Malaysia. Air Vice-Marshal Stephen Osborne AM CSC, Commander, Operation Sovereign Borders Joint Agency Task Force, explained that the Malaysian authorities had prevented the vessel, carrying 131 people on board with the alleged intention of reaching New Zealand, from departing Malaysia.²⁷ Air Vice-Marshall Osbourne also noted that the Malaysian authorities had since arrested 16 people in relation to people-smuggling.²⁸

1.22 The committee also commented on the success of Operation Sovereign Borders and queried how this can be maintained in future operations. Air Vice-Marshall Osbourne stated:

Probably the best way I would describe it is Operation Sovereign Borders is a model that's built on a defence in-depth. So in the first instance, the first aim is to deter and disrupt the ventures from taking to the water in the first instance. That's a lot more effective; it has a lot less risk, particularly for the people who want to use the people smugglers, so that's always our

²¹ Proof Committee Hansard, 21 May 2018, p. 11.

²² Proof Committee Hansard, 21 May 2018, pp. 24–26.

²³ Proof Committee Hansard, 21 May 2018, pp. 39–41.

²⁴ Proof Committee Hansard, 21 May 2018, p. 10.

²⁵ Proof Committee Hansard, 21 May 2018, p. 40.

²⁶ Proof Committee Hansard, 21 May 2018, p. 21.

²⁷ Proof Committee Hansard, 21 May 2018, p. 43.

²⁸ Proof Committee Hansard, 21 May 2018, p. 43.

preference. Failing that, the next layer, if you like, is the requirement to have an on-water response whereby we intercept and when safe to do so, return people to their place of origin or departure. Lastly, in those cases where that's not possible, regional processing is the fall-back, and that is underwritten by the quite clearly stated government position that anybody who comes illegally will never be resettled in Australia.²⁹

Visas

1.23 The committee sought information from the department on a number of issues in relation to visa programs.

1.24 Senators asked questions in relation to visas issued to athletes and others participating in the 2018 Commonwealth Games. Ms Malisa Golightly PSM, Deputy Secretary, Immigration and Citizenship Services, informed the committee that a number of visa holders had applied for protection visas while in Australia attending the Commonwealth Games and currently remained in the country lawfully on bridging visas.³⁰ The committee also heard that there were approximately 50 visa holders who had not left the country and also had not applied for a protection visa.³¹

1.25 The committee asked questions regarding the review of the visa framework, previously discussed in Additional Estimates 2017–18 hearings. Officers advised that the department had provided the Australian Government with a proposal for reform in March 2017, which was subsequently released to stakeholders for consultation over a six- to eight-week period.³² The Secretary provided further explanation on the consultation process for the department's proposed scheme:

It's a proposal that the department has worked on based on its detailed knowledge of the visa system. We went to government in—Ms Geddes will assist me—March of 2017. The government said, 'You should consult with interested stakeholders.' There is no proposal that's gone back to government that is to say it's 10 or 15 or 12 or 20. That's still a matter that will be considered by the government. But for purposes of—I think, Ms Geddes, it's fair to say—public consultation we went out in August of last year and said, nominally, 'If you were to streamline visas, rationalise how they work together, both in terms of their individual categories and how those categories are interrelated one with the other, what would you think about such a visa system?'

We got several hundred submissions back. Some of them touched on questions of a qualifying period. Some of them touched on questions of the ability of migrants to integrate into the Australian way of life. Some were on the regional type issues that Senator Patrick was referring to, that some parts of Australia need population growth and other parts, perhaps, less so. All of those questions came from very committed expert stakeholders. We

6

²⁹ Proof Committee Hansard, 21 May 2018, p. 43.

³⁰ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 21 May 2018, pp. 68–69.

³¹ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 21 May 2018, p. 69.

³² Proof Committee Hansard, 21 May 2018, p. 52.

are currently working through that feedback and preparing advice for government. 33

1.26 The committee sought further information about elements of the review, including proposed qualifying periods and the number of visa streams.³⁴

1.27 Senators queried the proposed introduction of the global visa delivery platform, particularly in relation to automated processing of visas:

Senator PRATT: How can you be sure, though, that you're not outsourcing those decisions that should be made by people within this process?

Mr Pezzullo: Because there is an overriding parameter that no decisions will be taken, other than by public officials, in relation to the grant or denial of a visa.

Senator PRATT: Okay.

Mr Pezzullo: I will give you a practical example. It goes back to Senator Macdonald's question about trying to target or be very precise in how you address skills shortages in one part of Australia and not take a blunt instrument to it. If you have an automated decision support system, you could have an algorithm that is constantly looking for the applications that most suit the need at the time. For instance, we need welders in one part of Australia but we need chefs elsewhere, and we don't particularly need a whole lot of people to go into the outer suburbs of some of our larger cities. If I can state it perhaps too simply, Senator, you and I would agree that you could get a whole lot of humans and paper files in a room, untie the ribbons, open the applications and say, 'Welder keen to live in the lovely parts of WA,' from which you come, or the lovely parts of Northern Queensland from which the chair comes, and a whole lot of humans could stack those files. Now, you could waste a lot of human time doing that, or you could have a very smart machine triage the applications in an instant and throw to the top of the decision pile-not for decision, but to the top of the decision conveyor belt—the applications that are most in tune with our requirement to get the best and brightest into the places and locations and jobs that we want them in.³⁵

1.28 The department provided additional information about the global visa delivery platform, including the effect on Home Affairs offices in Tasmania,³⁶ value-added services within a two-tiered visa system,³⁷ and the protection of applicants' data and privacy within the platform.³⁸

1.29 The committee also sought information on a number of other issues, including:

³³ Proof Committee Hansard, 21 May 2018, p. 52.

³⁴ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 22 May 2018, pp. 52–53.

³⁵ Proof Committee Hansard, 22 May 2018, p. 81.

³⁶ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 22 May 2018, pp. 83–87.

³⁷ Proof Committee Hansard, 22 May 2018, pp. 87–88.

³⁸ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 22 May 2018, p. 88.

- the global talent pilot scheme launched by the Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs, the Hon. Alan Tudge MP;³⁹
- the number of visas granted in the migration program;⁴⁰
- findings of the Continuous Survey of Australian Migrants;⁴¹
- media reports regarding ministerial intervention in the case of a person arriving in Australia in June 2015 on a tourist visa which was cancelled upon arrival at the airport;⁴²
- allegations of fraudulent behaviour regarding visa brokers encouraging applicants to purchase invalid visas;⁴³
- labour-market testing for temporary work visas;⁴⁴
- new processes between the Fair Work Ombudsman and the department under a new outcome in the Migrant Workers' Taskforce;⁴⁵ and
- departmental tracking of the work and study activities of persons holding student visas.⁴⁶

Citizenship

1.30 Senators sought information regarding the average waiting times for citizenship applications. Officers explained to the committee that there had been an increase in average waiting times for applications for citizenship between lodgement of the application and conferral of citizenship, rising from a 12 month wait in March 2016 to an 18 month wait in April 2018.⁴⁷

1.31 Mr Luke Mansfield, First Assistant Secretary, Refugee, Citizenship and Multicultural Programs, provided further details to the committee regarding the increased average waiting times:

The drivers of those increases in time are threefold. One is that the department has increased the integrity screening checking processes from a national security and criminality risk perspective and enhanced the way it does those activities. The second factor driving that change is growth in the number of applications overall. The number of applications has been increasing year on year from a very significant base. The third factor that's really driving those processing times is that the nature of the applications

³⁹ Proof Committee Hansard, 22 May 2018, pp. 47–48.

⁴⁰ Proof Committee Hansard, 22 May 2018, pp. 44–46.

⁴¹ Proof Committee Hansard, 22 May 2018, pp. 58–59.

⁴² *Proof Committee Hansard*, 22 May 2018, pp. 68–78.

⁴³ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 22 May 2018, pp. 94–96.

⁴⁴ Proof Committee Hansard, 22 May 2018, pp. 100–102.

⁴⁵ Proof Committee Hansard, 22 May 2018, pp. 102–103.

⁴⁶ Proof Committee Hansard, 22 May 2018, pp. 113–115.

⁴⁷ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 22 May 2018, p. 22.

coming through have changed. As was discussed by Ms Golightly at last estimates, there has been an increase in the number of applications from people who arrived some years ago without any form of identity documentation, and the processes around positively establishing identity, obviously, take quite some time to achieve.⁴⁸

1.32 It was also noted by the department that staffing had increased by 16 per cent from 1 July 2015 to 31 March 2018 to process citizenship applications.⁴⁹

1.33 The committee also inquired into the management of citizenship ceremonies. Department officials explained that, where local governments run citizenship ceremonies, they are funded by untied grants from the Commonwealth. Where local councils have their authority to conduct ceremonies withdrawn, the department can run ceremonies to meet demand.⁵⁰

1.34 The committee asked a number of other questions concerning citizenship, including:

- criteria used to assess a 'quality applicant' in relation to the performance criteria for Outcome 2, Program 2.1;⁵¹
- the Australian Government's proposed bill regarding citizenship;⁵² and
- the department's response to the *Delays in processing of applications for Australian Citizenship by conferral* report conducted by the Commonwealth Ombudsman in December 2017.⁵³

Shaping a Nation report

1.35 The committee inquired into the findings of the 2018 report *Shaping a Nation: Population growth and immigration over time*, which was jointly authored by the Treasury and the Department of Home Affairs.⁵⁴

1.36 When asked by the committee what the report had found regarding migration and its impact on job growth in Australia, Mr Jason Russo, Assistant Secretary, Statistics and Information Governance, stated:

The way I would describe that—there's a detailed analysis in there on participation rate trends in the Australian labour market. That part of the report really, I guess, points out the fact that Australia, like many other countries, has an ageing population. What that means over time is that in the absence of immigration you would see a situation where the participation rate would, generally, decline. It would have already started

⁴⁸ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 22 May 2018, p. 22.

⁴⁹ Proof Committee Hansard, 22 May 2018, p. 22.

⁵⁰ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 22 May 2018, pp. 25–26.

⁵¹ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 22 May 2018, pp. 24–25.

⁵² Proof Committee Hansard, 22 May 2018, p. 26.

⁵³ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 22 May 2018, p. 26.

⁵⁴ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 22 May 2018, pp. 32–37.

declining. In fact, the size of the Australian labour market, the labour force, would eventually decline itself.

In the influx or intake of migrants that are generally younger than the broader population we see a high degree of skills, and they are job ready. What that has done is offset that demographic ageing effect. That's allowed the participation rate to stabilise and, in fact, increase slightly over the recent decade or two.⁵⁵

Other matters raised with the department

1.37 The committee inquired into a number of other matters overseen by the department, including:

- reports relating to crime in Melbourne;⁵⁶
- concerns raised by the Australian Human Rights Commission and a number of state governments in relation to facial recognition technology utilised by the department;⁵⁷
- potential privacy issues relating to protected government data stored by thirdparty companies;⁵⁸
- the death of a person in a regional processing facility on Manus Island on 22 May 2018;⁵⁹
- primary assessment of applications made from persons within the fast-track group of the legacy case load;⁶⁰
- contracts for expenditure on information technology software and hardware;⁶¹
- parcels being processed by Customs, including the volume of packages entering Australia and costs associated with screening;⁶² and
- a summary of the status of the Trusted Trader program, including statistics regarding accredited participant traders and long-term objections of the program.⁶³

Australian Federal Police

1.38 The committee inquired into a number of matters in relation to the AFP, including:

⁵⁵ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 22 May 2018, p. 34.

⁵⁶ Proof Committee Hansard, 22 May 2018, pp. 23–24.

⁵⁷ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 22 May 2018, pp. 16–18.

⁵⁸ Proof Committee Hansard, 22 May 2018, pp. 8–11 and 15.

⁵⁹ Proof Committee Hansard, 22 May 2018, pp. 120–122.

⁶⁰ Proof Committee Hansard, 22 May 2018, p. 122.

⁶¹ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 22 May 2018, pp. 63–64.

⁶² Proof Committee Hansard, 22 May 2018, pp. 122–126.

⁶³ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 22 May 2018, pp. 128–130.

- proposed legislation to enable AFP officers to ask for proof of identity in airports, including funding from existing appropriations;⁶⁴
- a recorded operating loss of \$27.2 million in 2017–18 as detailed in the Portfolio Budget Statements (PBS) and the implications for the loss in that financial year over the forward estimates;⁶⁵
- the recruitment of 300 specialist members over four years;⁶⁶
- the establishment of the Australian Centre to Counter Child Exploitation, including its operations and coordination with other agencies within the Home Affairs portfolio;⁶⁷
- education of officers in distinguishing between child grooming offences and Carly's Law offences, including AFP collaboration with intelligence agencies;⁶⁸
- findings of the 168th report of the Senate Privileges Committee in relation to metadata and parliamentarians;⁶⁹
- workload and sources of the AFP office in Sydney;⁷⁰ and
- the AFP's response to an incident at Parliament House on 22 November 2017.⁷¹

Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission and the Australian Institute of Criminology

1.39 The committee had questions for the ACIC and AIC in regards to a number of matters, including:

- appropriations over the forward estimates for specific projects, including tranche 1 of the National Criminal Intelligence System and the national criminal intelligence checking;⁷²
- the National Order Reference System in relation to domestic violence orders across states and territories;⁷³ and
- reports conducted into identity misuse and public attitudes to biometrics in various settings.⁷⁴

- 67 Proof Committee Hansard, 23 May 2018, pp. 9–11.
- 68 Proof Committee Hansard, 23 May 2018, pp. 25–27.
- 69 *Proof Committee Hansard*, 23 May 2018, pp. 27–28.
- 70 Proof Committee Hansard, 23 May 2018, pp. 28–31.
- 71 Proof Committee Hansard, 23 May 2018, pp. 36–7.
- 72 Proof Committee Hansard, 23 May 2018, pp. 47–48.
- 73 *Proof Committee Hansard*, 23 May 2018, p. 48.

⁶⁴ *Proof Committee Hansard*, 23 May 2018, pp. 11–19, 21–22, and 31–35.

⁶⁵ Proof Committee Hansard, 23 May 2018, pp. 3–5.

⁶⁶ Proof Committee Hansard, 23 May 2018, pp. 7–8.

Australian Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre

- 1.40 Senators sought information from AUSTRAC on various matters including:
- departmental appropriation under section 74 retained revenue receipts and its impact on the budget outcomes;⁷⁵ and
- plans to increase FTE staff levels from 300 to 330 over the forward estimates.⁷⁶

Spill-over hearing

1.41 The committee held a spill-over hearing on the morning of 3 August 2018. The Home Affairs portfolio appeared between 9.00 am and 12.30 pm, with the committee recalling AFP and the department, including cross-portfolio, corporate and general matters, and Programs 1.4 and 2.4.

1.42 The committee asked the AFP and the department a number of questions in relation to:

- media reports alleging that AFP had transferred its ongoing case into the Australian Workers' Union offices to the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions, which the AFP claimed a Public Interest Immunity claim in order to avoid prejudicing ongoing investigations;⁷⁷
- the implementation of the recommendations of reviews into the mental health of AFP staff; ⁷⁸ and
- details contained in a response to a question on notice from the Budget Estimates hearings in May in relation to a case of ministerial intervention.⁷⁹

Questions on Notice

1.43 A full index of questions taken on notice during the budget estimates hearings (including the spill-over hearing) will be available on the committee's website and responses will be published as they are received.

- 75 *Proof Committee Hansard*, 23 May 2018, pp. 50–51.
- 76 Proof Committee Hansard, 23 May 2018, p. 52.
- 77 *Proof Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2018, pp. 2–9 and 11.
- 78 *Proof Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2018, pp. 16–17.
- 79 *Proof Committee Hansard*, 3 August 2018, pp. 18–28.

⁷⁴ Proof Committee Hansard, 23 May 2018, p. 50.