

**Economics Legislation Committee**  
**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**  
Industry Portfolio  
Budget Estimates Hearing 2014-15  
2-3 June 2014

---

**AGENCY/DEPARTMENT:** DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY

**TOPIC:** Conditions of Government Contracts and Agreements

**REFERENCE:** Written Questions – Senator Ludwig

**QUESTION No.:** BI-98

Since 7 September 2013;

1. Do any contracts managed by the Department/Agency contain any limitations or restrictions on advocacy or criticising Government policy? If so, please name each contract. When was it formed or created?
2. What are the specific clauses and/or sections which state this, or in effect, create a limitation or restriction?
3. Do any agreements managed by the Department/Agency contain any limitations or restrictions on advocacy or criticisms of Government policy? If so, please name each agreement. When was it formed or created?
4. What are the specific clauses and/or sections which state this, or in effect, create a limitation or restriction?
5. For each of the contracts and agreements, are there any particular reason, such as genuine commercial in confidence information, for this restriction?
6. Have any changes to financial or resource support to services which advocate on behalf of groups or individuals in Australian society been made? If so, which groups? What was the change?
7. Has any consultation occurred between the Department/Agency and any individuals and/or community groups about these changes? If so, what consultation process was used? Was it public? If not, why not? Are public submissions available on a website?
8. If no consultation has occurred, why not?
9. Did the Minister/Parliamentary Secretary meet with any stakeholders about changes to advocacy in their contracts and/or agreements? If so, when? Who did he/she meet with?

**ANSWER**

- 1-8. The standard contract templates used by the Department of Industry do not contain any limitations or restrictions on advocacy or criticising Government policy. To identify individual contracts and/or agreements that may have inserted such provisions would be an unreasonable diversion of resources.
9. No.