

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications**  
**Answers to Senate Estimates Questions on Notice**  
**Budget Estimates Hearings May 2014**  
**Communications Portfolio**  
**Department of Communications**

**Question No: 601**

**Program No. Corporate**

**Hansard Ref: Page 79 (29/5/2014)**

**Topic: Additional Estimates Feb – QoN 333**

**Senator Urquhart asked:**

I have a few more questions, but I think we are getting almost out of time. I have one question that I want to ask. It is in relation to part 2 of question on notice 333 from Senator Ludwig regarding ministerial office newspaper subscriptions from the February 2014 estimates. The answer says that the office subscribes to eight newspapers yet it only lists four titles. Is the count of subscriptions in error or the list of titles or both? I will just go through them. The titles listed are the *Sydney Morning Herald*, the *Financial Review*, the *Australian Financial Review*, and the *Daily Telegraph*. Is the reference to the *Financial Review* a duplication of the *Australian Financial Review* or is it a reference to the *Australian* or is it some other concoction? Minister, earlier, you claimed that Minister Turnbull never misleads. If the minister is going to delay his responses to questions on notice, he should make sure they are accurate and not misleading.

**Senator Fifield:** You are serious?

**Senator Urquhart:** Well, it is not very clear.

**Senator Fifield:** We will take on notice the—

**Senator Urquhart:** You will take on notice the take on notice question 333 and clarify that?

**Senator Fifield:** The titles of the newspapers that the minister gets. This is the great matter of state that you want the committee detained on?

**Senator Urquhart:** No. The point I am making, Minister—

**Senator Fifield:** No. We take it as a serious question. We will take it on notice.

**Senator Urquhart:** The point I am making is that the information talked about eight. We got four. Out of that four, only three are really titles. I think if you are going to provide questions on notice in writing, they should at least be accurate. That is the point I am making.

**Answer:**

Question on Notice 333 from Additional Estimates in February 2014 was amended and resubmitted to the Committee on Friday, 30 May 2014.