

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

Parliamentary Inquiry : 29 November 2018

HOME AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(ACIC – AR/015) – Tasmania and Northern Territory inclusion in Wastewater

Asked:

Senator ABETZ: So when Tasmania and the Northern Territory baulked—were they included in the reports?

Mr Phelan: It clearly showed that they weren't.

Senator ABETZ: They weren't in two. Which were they?

Mr Phelan: I'd have to take on notice which ones they were.

Answer:

The Tasmanian and Northern Territory data has been included in all reports except report two.

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

Parliamentary Inquiry : 29 November 2018

HOME AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(ACIC – AR/016) – Tasmania and Northern Territory cooperation for Wastewater reports

Asked:

Senator ABETZ: It's very helpful information in relation to law enforcement, drugs, you name it, so good on you for doing it. I suppose the issue is—and take this on notice—can you tell us why TasWater and the Northern Territory decided not to cooperate? What did you have to do—or did you mug them with the benefits of them cooperating—to get them to agree to cooperate, and do we have on the radar any suggestion that any jurisdiction might pull this stunt again?

Mr Phelan: I'll take the first part of your question on notice, and, on the second part—about in the future— we've got no indication that people don't want to be involved.

Answer:

The relevant authorities in Tasmania and the Northern Territory cited administrative and resourcing issues as reasons for not supplying the required samples for the second report. Representations were made to the respective authorities on a number of levels, emphasising the benefits of a national wastewater program, and samples have been supplied ever since.

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

Parliamentary Inquiry : 29 November 2018

HOME AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(ACIC – AR/017) – Securrency and Note Printing Australia case

Asked:

CHAIR: The allegation against those four individuals, you said, was that they'd broken the law as far as the foreign bribery act. Was there an allegation that they'd obtained a personal gain or was the gain for the—

Mr Phelan: I'd have to take that on notice because I'm not actually familiar with the case. I'm familiar with the ACC's role in terms of what came out of the High Court but with the actual AFP investigation 10 years ago.

Answer:

The allegations against the four accused persons who had charges permanently stayed by the High Court in *Strickland (A Pseudonym) v CDPP* [2018] HCA 53 arise from the Australian Federal Police investigation. The Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission is unable to provide advice on the investigations of other agencies.