

TREASURY PORTFOLIO
Additional Estimates 2005-06

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
AT1	Sherry	Treasury	15/2/06	<p><i>Trend of property prices in NSW</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Just going to the issue of housing prices, which you mentioned, what has been the trend of housing property prices—when I say ‘housing’ I include units—in New South Wales, particularly Sydney, versus the rest of the country?</p> <p>Dr Kennedy—I do not have the numbers to hand, but there has been a decline in house prices in New South Wales whereas in other states—in WA, and particularly in Perth—house prices are in fact still rising. The Australia-wide number is dead flat. Basically, house prices have been flat since about the December quarter 2003/March quarter 2004, but house prices in Sydney in particular have fallen by around five or 10 per cent, I think, but I would have to check the details of that.</p>	E7	22/3/2006	22/3/2006	
AT2	Sherry	Treasury	15/2/06	<p><i>Increase in trade deficit with the US</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—I have a few questions on Australian and US trade. The trade deficit with the United States, I notice, increased in 2005. I saw a recent reference to this in an article. What is the magnitude of increase in our trade deficit with the US?</p> <p>Dr Kennedy—I do not have that number to hand. Mr Pearl, do you?</p> <p>Mr Pearl—No, I do not.</p> <p>Dr Kennedy—I would be happy to take that on notice for you.</p>	E20			
AT3	Murray	Treasury	15/2/06	<p><i>Modelling provided in the OECD brief</i></p> <p>Senator MURRAY—Could you clarify for me: did you do modelling to support the information you</p>	E26	31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>provided for the OECD reports on Australia? Mr Tune—In general? Senator MURRAY—On the specific issue. Mr Tune—No, we would not have. The OECD would form their own views about these issues. Senator MURRAY—Treasury give a brief to the OECD. Mr Tune—They discuss these things with us. Senator MURRAY—Did modelling on this issue accompany that brief? Mr Tune—I do not think so, no. Senator MURRAY—You do not think so? Mr Tune—No. I would need to check. I am pretty positive, but I will check for you.</p>				
AT4	Sherry	Treasury	15/2/06	<p><i>Provide full copy of Attachment B of Minute 6 October 2005 briefing to the Treasurer</i></p> <p>Mr Heferen—Attachment B was originally much longer and was scaled down for the Treasurer’s briefing. Senator SHERRY—It was scaled down? Mr Heferen—Of course. We do want to distil the key issues. Senator SHERRY—Can I have a copy of the original on notice? Mr Heferen—I think what we will do is attach this material. Senator SHERRY—Was that the original to the Treasurer?</p>	E27	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT5	Sherry	Treasury	15/2/06	<p><i>Provision in the act regarding work choices</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—But we are not talking about the act here. We are talking about the document and the conversation we are having on that. Mr Heferen—This is about the government’s package, and a key element of the government’s package, as I understand it—and I must</p>	E29	31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				confess that I do not know the particular provision in the now act, but certainly officers from DEWR will be able to locate it, and I could take it on notice—is the provision of ensuring that people’s current entitlements do not fall.				
AT6	Sherry	Treasury	15/2/06	<p><i>List of appointments that each section looks after</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Perhaps this is a question on notice: could you give us a list of the responsibilities of each respective section of the department in terms of recommended appointments—for future reference, that is all.</p> <p>Dr Parkinson—Yes.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Thanks. I just want to be clear—this is with respect to Mr Gerard and his appointment to the Reserve Bank board.</p>	E30	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT7	Sherry	Treasury	15/2/06	<p><i>Citizenships and appointments to boards</i></p> <p>Senator MURRAY—But it is not part of your conflict of interest declaration that you are a dual citizen or not a citizen.</p> <p>Mr Coombs—No.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—There is that issue and the direct legal issue of whether a noncitizen can be appointed to the RBA or, for that matter, other boards, but it is not an issue here.</p> <p>Dr Parkinson—I am racking my brains on this, but I do not recall the act saying anything about citizenship, but we can check that if you wish.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—I do not know, but there may be a constitutional issue as well. However, you are not asking about it. What is the length of time for this process?</p> <p>Dr Parkinson—It can vary dramatically. If it is a simple reappointment, it can be dealt with very quickly. If it is a new appointment, it will depend on how long it takes us to find the</p>	E36	31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				relevant information about the people that we might be putting forward for the Treasurer's consideration and then for iterations with the Treasurer as to whether any of those individuals are the ones that he wishes to appoint or whether he wishes us to undertake more checking.				
AT8	Sherry	Treasury	15/2/06	<p>Company search on Aranj Pty Ltd</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—I understand from the publicly available information that Treasury performed a company search on a company by the name of Aranj Pty Ltd ACN 075289824. Why did Treasury perform a company search on that company as distinct from the other companies?</p> <p>CHAIR—Before you can ask that, you had better ask him whether that is the case.</p> <p>Dr Parkinson—I cannot answer whether that is the case. I do not have that information in front of me.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Under the material provided under FOI, that is the case. It is in the FOI material.</p> <p>Dr Parkinson—I would have to check why that company in particular was focused on.</p> <p>Dr O'Mara—I think we need to remember that the material on the public record was released by the Treasurer's office. It is not actually FOI material provided by Treasury as such. So we are not privy to the detail of what was or was not provided.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—It indicates that Treasury performed a company search on that company. No-one can recollect why this particular company?</p> <p>Dr Parkinson—Can I take that on notice?</p>	E36-37	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT9	Sherry	Treasury	15/2/06	<p>Checking companies to see if they are deposit taking institutions when doing appointments</p>	E38	31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>Senator SHERRY—Let us go back to the list of 79 companies that were identified—the directorships. The first one on the list was checked for further information—in other words, there was a further exploration beyond the name. We know that, if he had in fact been a director of a deposit-taking institution—which apparently he is not, but you certainly did not know that at the time—that is an automatic exclusion from RBA consideration. So why didn't Treasury check behind each of the company names to see if any of them were in fact deposit-holding institutions?</p> <p>CHAIR—Deposit-holding or deposit-taking?</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Deposit-taking institutions; sorry.</p> <p>Dr Parkinson—I would have to check what exactly was done.</p>				
AT10	Sherry	Treasury	15/2/06	<p><i>Is a super fund a deposit taking institution</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Yes, that is what I thought. I take it that a deposit-taking institution is not defined as a superannuation fund in this case.</p> <p>Dr O'Mara—That is something that we would need to confirm.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Presumably, you would have checked this at the time, because your first company brings up a super fund.</p> <p>Dr Parkinson—If you set up your own super fund—so it is a self-managed fund—I cannot see that that would exclude you from the board.</p>	E39	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT11	Wong	FRC	15/2/06	<p><i>Background of FRC Contractor - Bill Bartlett</i></p> <p>Senator WONG—What is Mr Bartlett's background? Is he currently a practising auditor?</p> <p>Ms Wijeyewardene—I do not think he is a practising auditor at the moment, no.</p>	E103	31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>Senator WONG—Was he previously?</p> <p>Ms Wijeyewardene—I do not have his details. The FRC secretary could probably help you.</p> <p>Mr Murphy—We will check that out for you.</p>				
AT12	Wong	FRC	15/2/06	<p><i>Process of appointing Bill Bartlett</i></p> <p>Senator WONG—What was the process of decision making to appoint this particular consultant?</p> <p>Ms Wijeyewardene—We went through a tender process. I think it was an open tender process.</p> <p>Senator WONG—Can you confirm that?</p> <p>Mr Murphy—Page 155 of the annual report of the FRC for 2004-05 deals with the auditor independence report. I cannot recollect whether there was a tender. The annual report reads: The purpose of the consultancy is to assist the FRC in the performance of the auditor independence functions conferred on the FRC by the CLERP Act. Before retiring as a partner of accounting firm Ernst & Young in June 2003, Mr Bartlett spent 35 years working in the accountancy field, including as auditor of firms in the financial services industry. He is presently a director of a number of Australian public companies and also a company which is listed on the New York Stock Exchange. As to the process of his appointment, we will take that on notice and get back to you.</p> <p>Senator WONG—Sure. I think Ms Wijeyewardene was saying she thought it was by tender.</p> <p>Ms Wijeyewardene—Yes. It was either an open tender—</p> <p>Senator WONG—Please let me know about that.</p> <p>Mr Murphy—Yes.</p>	E103	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT13	Wong	FRC	15/2/06	<p><i>Provide forward program and project history for audit independence sub committee</i></p>	E104	31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>Senator WONG—Would it be possible for you to provide on notice an indication of this information? I would like in a written form an indication of the forward program.</p> <p>Mr del Busto—Yes, most definitely.</p>				
AT14	Wong	FRC	15/2/06	<p>Details and amounts of FRC consultants</p> <p>Senator WONG—Are there any other consultants engaged by the FRC in this area currently?</p> <p>Ms Wijeyewardene—No. We are just going through this tender process for the short-term consultants on the projects just mentioned—on the quality review and on professional ethics. I think they were looking at three. There are three tenders out at the moment.</p> <p>Senator WONG—Perhaps I could have details on that—I would appreciate it.</p>	E105	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT15	Wong	FRC	15/2/06	<p>AFR article re prescriptive changes</p> <p>Senator WONG—The article in the <i>Australian Financial Review</i> of 4 November describes the comment from the FRC that I outlined earlier—that is, that it would investigate whether the changes were too prescriptive. Can you identify for me where they came from? Is that from a report or a media statement?</p> <p>Ms Wijeyewardene—I am not sure if it is in the FRC's actual report. I would have to take that on notice.</p>	E105	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT16	Wong	FRC	15/2/06	<p>Provide copy of FRC submission to ASIC/PCAOB</p> <p>Senator WONG—I understand Treasury is examining possible cooperative arrangements between ASIC and foreign audit regulators. Does the FRC have any role in that?</p> <p>Ms Wijeyewardene—This is really an arrangement that is between</p>	E105-106	31/5/06	31/5/06	Also see attachment

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>ASIC and the PCAOB, which is the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, in the US. The FRC has an interest in this in the sense that the arrangement relates to inspection regimes for auditors. This is an area that the FRC is interested in. It has a specific role in relation to auditor independence. But the arrangement per se does not necessarily impact on the FRC's work.</p> <p>Senator WONG—But has the FRC been asked to provide any input into that review?</p> <p>Ms Wijeyewardene—The FRC has put in a submission.</p> <p>Senator WONG—Is that public? It is to Treasury, presumably?</p> <p>Ms Wijeyewardene—It is to Treasury, yes. Usually with our submissions we say that they are public unless the person making the submission asks for them to be confidential.</p> <p>Senator WONG—Is the FRC's submission public?</p> <p>Ms Wijeyewardene—We have not had a request to release it.</p> <p>Senator WONG—Could you provide it. Thank you.</p>				
AT17	Sherry	Treasury	15/2/06	<p><i>Communications with ATO re Westpoint</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—I was a little surprised that there had been no direct exchange between the persons regulating this area in the tax office and ASIC—according to the tax office today—given what I think is likely to involve a very substantial number of people and a substantial amount of money flowing through that form of superannuation fund. You have had no communication with the tax office on this issue of Westpoint?</p> <p>Mr Murphy—No. We can check, but not that I am aware of.</p>	E112	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT18	Wong	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>Provide copy of proposed amendments to section 49 of the ASIC Act</i></p> <p>Senator WONG—Can you provide us with a copy of the proposed amendments?</p>	E6			

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>Ms Macauley—Yes, I can. Senator WONG—Are you taking that on notice? Mr Lucy—Yes, we will.</p>				
AT19	Wong	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>Provide copies of correspondence to the DPP for the last two years</i></p> <p>Senator WONG—How often would you write to the DPP? Mr Lucy—Once or twice a year. Senator WONG—Are you able to provide copies of that correspondence over the last two years? Mr Lucy—I will take that on notice.</p>	E7	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT20	Wong	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>Section 19 in the context of Vizard issue</i></p> <p>Senator WONG—Mr Lucy, why was this not disclosed to the committee previously when questions were asked about the section 19 issue? Mr Lucy—I am not sure that we were asked that question. Senator WONG—We did ask quite a lengthy range of questions, in the context of the Vizard matter, about why section 19 had not been utilised. Mr Lucy—I would have to take that on notice and refer back to the questions that were specifically asked. Obviously we do not make the laws, but, as to that particular reference, I would need to go back to <i>Hansard</i>. Senator WONG—I am not suggesting you make the laws, Mr Lucy. I am asking why, when the committee was inquiring into this issue, it was not raised. If you want to take that on notice, obviously you can do that.</p>	E8	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT21	Wong	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>Analysis by the Corporate Governance International of the AWB structure</i></p>	E11	31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>Senator WONG—Is ASIC aware of the analysis by Corporate Governance International of the AWB structure?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I would have to take that on notice. I am not—</p> <p>Senator WONG—You are not aware that Corporate Governance International was highly critical of the structure, from a governance perspective, of the AWB, and stated this publicly: The question should be asked of governments and regulators how they ever let this governance Frankenstein loose on the largely unsuspecting investment public.</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I am not aware of the report to which you refer.</p> <p>Senator WONG—Has anyone within ASIC looked at this issue? There are very serious issues raised—and I appreciate that this is only the view of one group</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I would have to take it on notice, Senator, because I am not aware of it.</p>				
AT22	Wong	ASIC	16/2/06	<p>ASIC thoughts about the governance structure within the AWB</p> <p>Senator WONG—Is this something that ASIC has previously considered? Had ASIC turned its mind to the governance structure within AWB prior to these allegations being raised?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I cannot speak for ASIC in its entirety since the time that that prospectus was issued, so therefore I need to take that question on notice.</p> <p>Senator WONG—There have been a number of commentators, including CGI, over some time who have raised concerns about the governance structure within AWB. I am interested to know whether that issue had ever been the subject of consideration by ASIC prior to these allegations in relation to the oil for wheat.</p> <p>Mr Lucy—That will be part of the matter that I take on notice.</p> <p>Senator WONG—I would appreciate it if you would. I would be</p>	E11	31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				interested in knowing whether any investigation or consideration by ASIC officers regarding the AWB governance structure occurred prior to the current round of allegations being raised. Mr Lucy —I understand.				
AT23	Wong	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>Provide a copy of the response to the ASIC audit inspection powers consultation paper</i></p> <p>Senator WONG—I understand that there is a current Treasury review process. A consultation paper was issued last year in relation to ASIC’s audit inspection powers. Do you have any concerns regarding the proposed modifications of ASIC’s domestic inspection powers?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—No. Our attitude is that aspects of the profession have misread what was initially intended, but we are comfortable with the proposed amendments.</p> <p>Senator WONG—In terms of the suggestions that are set out in the consultation paper, does ASIC have any concerns about the thrust of those proposals?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—No. We think that this is an important piece of legislation and, to the extent that there need to be changes made to accommodate concerns of others, we are comfortable with those changes.</p> <p>Senator WONG—Have you responded in writing to the consultation paper?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I would have to take that on notice. Certainly we have had a very close level of dialogue with Treasury. To the extent that we have formally responded in writing, I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator WONG—Okay. If you have, I ask that you provide a copy of that.</p>	E11	31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
AT24	Conroy	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>ASIC statement about Telstra brought forward</i></p> <p>Senator CONROY—No. I am just trying to find out what the sequence of events was. I got the impression that you rushed out a statement—that you were not quite in a position to announce your outcomes and you seemed to rush a statement out during the course of the day in response to the newspaper article.</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I do not have any recollection of such an action.</p> <p>Senator CONROY—Can you take that on notice and see if you brought forward the date?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—Yes.</p>	E17	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT25	Conroy	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>7.30 report interview - political interference in Telstra case</i></p> <p>Senator CONROY—Do you recall your interview on the <i>7.30 Report</i> on 14 December with Emma Alberici? I have a transcript here.</p> <p>Mr Lucy—On 14 September?</p> <p>Senator CONROY—On 14 December. I will just check the date. It was Wednesday, 14 December 2005. Ms Alberici made the very reasonable observation—and she was talking about the, in general, Telstra case—that:</p> <p>It is hard to escape the conclusion that there has been some political interference—</p> <p>To which you relied:</p> <p>There has been that suggestion. And indeed, there was the suggestion, I think, that indeed it may not have been necessarily the Government but it might have been the Opposition. Could you explain that comment?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I would need to take that on notice to be precise but I am happy to give an off-the-cuff response.</p> <p>Senator CONROY—It looked like an off-the-cuff response then, so</p>	E17, 19, 30-31	31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>I am hoping that you are going to give me some sort of response now. I take that sort of imputation pretty seriously and was considering—and still would consider—referring you to the Privileges Committee of the Senate over an allegation like that; that is, that we tried to interfere in one of your investigations.</p> <p>Senator CONROY—I am going back to Mr Lucy’s definition of political interference. Who suggested the opposition had interfered with ASIC’s investigation?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I do not believe that I suggested that there was any interference with our investigation.</p> <p>Senator CONROY—The question was about political interference. ‘There was the suggestion, I think, that it may not have been necessarily the government but it might have been the opposition.’ I want know which member of the opposition and what the political interference was.</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I do not have a recollection. I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY—It is a fairly serious charge.</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I understand the point that you are making. I will take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator CONROY—In taking it on notice, Mr Lucy, I would like you to specifically identify where there was a suggestion that the opposition had interfered and whether or not you got it from a source, if you are able to. I appreciate that you may not be able to identify a source, although I would say that would probably be the subject of some questions here next time. I would like you to identify if there is any media report or any source anywhere that suggested that about the opposition before you decided to suggest that you had heard</p>				

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				suggestions that the opposition had interfered. It is a fairly serious charge to suggest the opposition had interfered in an ASIC investigation, Mr Lucy. I am sure you appreciate that.				
AT26	Watson	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>Five year trends in relation to SCT, BFSO and FICS</i></p> <p>Senator WATSON—Mr Lucy, I will repeat my question because I think you have difficulty hearing me. I am asking about five-year trends in the resolution of disputes before three different tribunals. The first one is the Superannuation Complaints Tribunal, the second is the Banking Ombudsman and the third is the FI Complaints Service. What are the five-year trends in relation to each of those dispute resolution arrangements?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I think I understand the senator's question and that is whether we have access to five-year trends of the resolution of disputes coming from the Superannuation Complaints Tribunal, the Banking Ombudsman and FICS. I do not have that information with me but I am happy to take that on notice and provide it to you.</p>	E25	31/5/06	1/6/06	
AT27	Sherry	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>Approximate sum of money involved with respect to the people switched with Westpoint</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—It is on the high end; I am glad you note that. We will get to the extreme with Westpoint. I am concerned about a super product here. That commission of 2.2 per cent is on top of other fees and charges presumably, or is it inclusive of admin, financial investment et cetera?</p> <p>Mr Cooper—It is inclusive.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—So it is 2.2. What is the approximate sum of money involved in respect of the people who were switched?</p> <p>Mr Cooper—There were 180 clients involved. They were all school</p>	E36	31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>teachers. We would have to assume that their superannuation balances were within normal ranges, so it is just a matter of doing the maths. If you like, I can take on notice what the figure is.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Take it on notice, but given the profile of the individuals involved I suspect it is in the millions.</p>				
AT28	Sherry	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>Length of document given to teachers with regard to Westpoint</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Are you aware of the length of the document that was given to the teachers? Are we talking about a five- to 10-page document here—I am yet to see any of them—or a 50- to 100-page document, which is normally presented?</p> <p>Mr Cooper—I am afraid I do not have that specific information. We can take that on notice.</p>	E36	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT29	Sherry	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>Had any of the individuals actually switched their money</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—... Had any of the individuals actually switched their money?</p> <p>Mr Cooper—How many of the 180 switched we could take on notice, but I am driving at the conduct of the adviser not so much at what proportion of the 180 clients actually switched. We can certainly take that on notice.</p>	E36	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT30	Sherry	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>Examination of the details provided by all licenses by financial planners</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Did ASIC examine all of the detail provided by all licence applicants for planning? Did you examine all the detail? My understanding is that you were not able to within the time frame and with the resources you had allocated.</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I think it is more to do with the documentation. We were criticised because we were not able to demonstrate the extent to</p>	E37	31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>which we have examined, and we accept that criticism, but that is not to say, though, that the examination itself was deficient. We did examine the documents and they were assessed on their merits and licences were issued accordingly.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—I understand that, but I have had financial planners and officers say to me, as part of this process, that they would admit that there were inaccuracies on the documents they provided—inadvertent, perhaps, but there were inaccuracies on the documents. What I am getting at is: to what extent did you examine the accuracy of names and background details on the documents provided to you for licensing purposes?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—Extensively; but, again, to really provide some meat to that answer we should take it on notice. There is no doubt that we had skilled, competent people assessing. They were supervised. The whole licensing program was undertaken with a lot of discipline and rigour.</p>				
AT31	Sherry	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>Requested and actual amounts for budget for licensing process</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—The Audit Office identified a diversion of resources from compliance to the licensing regime.</p> <p>Mr Lucy—A timing issue; but that is quite correct, they did.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—My understanding is that you were given approximately \$50 million for this licensing process.</p> <p>Mr Lucy—Over a period of, I think, four years.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—My understanding is that you actually requested 60.</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I would have to take that on notice because it was before my time. I do not have an intimate knowledge of that.</p>	E37	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT32	Sherry	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>Numbers of people affected by Westpoint</i></p>	E38	31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>Mr Lucy—The dollars are about 300 million. The numbers of investors I could take on notice, but I am not sure that it is necessarily going to be a very reliable figure.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Approximately—I am not going to hold you to the figure.</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I appreciate that you are just looking for a sounding. But many of the investments were undertaken, for example, by trustees of super funds. To know who is underneath and who is affected by it there is a danger in looking at global figures. I respectfully suggest that they can be misleading.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Yes. I have seen figures of 6,000 and 4,000.</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I have seen figures of 4,000.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—So we are dealing in the thousands.</p> <p>Mr Lucy—Definitely.</p>				
AT33	Sherry	ASIC	16/2/06	<p>Checks on Property Investment Research Pty Ltd</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—We talked earlier, when Senator Watson was questioning, about where it is clear that you have the power. This Property Investment Research Pty Ltd—and I have a copy of their ‘Leaders in independent research’; I do not know whether you have seen it—is the research house that provided a three out of five star rating for Westpoint Management Ltd. The document is signed off by KPMG, which is another issue. Property Investment Research Pty Ltd are licensed by ASIC. What checks did ASIC carry out of this independent research house?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I will have to take that specific question on notice.</p>	E39	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT34	Sherry	ASIC	16/2/06	<p>ASIC response to complaint from WA Dept of Consumer Employment and Protection re Westpoint</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—The point I am getting at is that it is my</p>	E40-41	31/5/06	31/5/06	Also see attachment

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>understanding that on 2 August 2002, as you have acknowledged, you received the letter and that is when those matters were first brought to your attention.</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I am not able to respond as to what we were advised by the Western Australian office at this time, so I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Did ASIC respond to that letter from the WA Department of Consumer and Employment Protection?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—Again, I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Could you take on notice the production of the response if there was one given. Is ASIC represented on the Fair Trading Operations Advisory Committee?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I do not know. I will have to check.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Can you check that, because my understanding is that, on 21 October 2002, risks associated with Westpoint were raised at their meeting. My understanding is that there was a representative from ASIC there. Can you take that on notice. Is ASIC aware that the Western Australian Minister for Consumer and Employment Protection wrote to the federal Treasurer on 21 August 2002 in respect to the activities of Westpoint?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I am not aware of that.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Have you received any correspondence—I do not want to go to the nature of it—or has the Treasurer's office forwarded any material to ASIC in respect to concerns about Westpoint?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—To give a complete and reliable response, again, I would have to take that on notice.</p>				
AT35	Sherry	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>Correspondence from the Treasurer's office to ASIC re Westpoint</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Has ASIC responded directly to the issues</p>	E41	31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>raised by the Western Australian Department of Consumer and Employment Protection and/or the Minister for Consumer and Employment Protection—I think it was Mr Kobelke—as a result of that 2002 correspondence?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I think that comes under the matter you raised earlier. We will take that on notice and become more aware of that communication.</p>				
AT36	Sherry	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>Were Westpoint Finance Pty Ltd relicensed when they applied</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Let us go to Westpoint Finance Pty Ltd. Were they relicensed by ASIC when they applied for their licence?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I will have to take that on notice. I suspect so but we would have to provide you with a response on the nature of that relicence.</p>	E43	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT37	Sherry	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>Writing to holders of promissory notes re Westpoint</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Yes. Was there a direction or a commitment given by ASIC to write to the holders of each promissory note with respect to Westpoint?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I will have to take that on notice. I am not aware of that requirement and I do not have anything in front of me to enable me to answer that.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Could you check that? My information is that there was a direction from the court for ASIC to do that but that that did not happen.</p>	E46	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT38	Sherry	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>Private Collection</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—In terms of financial planners and Westpoint, has ASIC heard of the company called Private Collection?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I have not, but we will take it on notice to see whether or</p>	E47	31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>not that has been brought to our attention.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—I am not informed as to whether it is a licensed planner. I understand they are a research facilitation business development company. You may examine their activities in respect of Westpoint if you have not already done so. You can take it on notice.</p> <p>Mr Lucy—If you are able to let us have any of that material, that might be constructive.</p>				
AT39	Sherry	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>National online super advertising campaign</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Did you investigate the online super advertising campaign which was run across the country in a number of metropolitan areas?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I would have to take that on notice.</p>	E47	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT40	Sherry	ASIC	16/2/06	<p><i>Kebbel bank</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Is ASIC aware whether or not there is such a licensed entity as the Kebbel bank?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I am not able to respond to that. I will have to take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—I might check that with APRA. But I do not think there is a Kebbel bank licence.</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I would be surprised to find out that was the case.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—But part of the activities involved an indication to individuals that there was a bank, in this case the Kebbel bank, involved. You have no knowledge of the role played by this purported bank in the selling of these products?</p> <p>Mr Lucy—I will take that on notice.</p>	E48	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT41	Sherry	APRA	16/2/06	<p><i>Provide more information in relation to Kebbel bank</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—But in the course of those visits there may—I</p>	E51	31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>use the word ‘may’—have been an account as to why how the term ‘bank’ was being used. Perhaps you could take on notice whether there is any further information you can provide.</p> <p>Dr Laker—I will take that on notice. Our first response was the cease and desist. Our second response was to follow up to ensure that when we were on the ground we saw the way in which the institution was representing itself. Our inquiries would normally stop at that point.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—I accept that. But there may have been an outline of the circumstances during those investigations that would be useful to know.</p> <p>Dr Laker—Okay.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—What institution were you visiting? Was it a registered company? Was it the ‘Kebbel Bank’, an office with signage? Did you know what was being visited?</p> <p>Dr Laker—Unless my colleague has the answer, I would take that on notice.</p> <p>Mr Khoo—We visited their offices, but I cannot tell you any more than that. We would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Perhaps you could take on notice whether it was a company entity of some kind and the individuals who were given the cease and desist order. Presumably there are some individuals to which it was given who gave an undertaking, presumably, to cease and desist, describing themselves and/or their financial institution as a bank.</p>				
AT42	Sherry	APRA	16/2/06	<p><i>Reporting of quarterly reports of fees and charges</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Reflecting back on the conversation that occurred on this matter, what struck me was that some institutions, major and middle range, did provide the data requested; others did</p>	E51	31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>not, for a whole range of reasons and excuses. When will APRA require the production of this information?</p> <p>Mr Khoo—I might have to take that one on notice and refer that back to my colleague. As I said to you, we are actively working now with industry to try to get that resolved.</p> <p>Dr Laker—It may well be that we have to go back and look at the way in which that particular return has been set up and make an amendment through the Financial Sector (Collection of Data) Act. That is a more formal process, and that takes time. So we need to look at whether or not we can work within the existing reporting framework or whether or not we need to go through the formal consultation steps to make that return clear in what it is seeking from the superannuation industry.</p>				
AT43	Watson	APRA	16/2/06	<p>Regulated funds having independent custodians</p> <p>Senator WATSON—Does APRA insist that all regulated funds have an independent custodian?</p> <p>Mr Khoo—No, we do not.</p> <p>Senator WATSON—It is not a condition of licence?</p> <p>Mr Khoo—No, it is not.</p> <p>Senator WATSON—Why not? Would you like to take it on notice?</p> <p>Mr Khoo—Yes. Is there a context which you would like us to respond to or are you asking the question in general?</p> <p>Senator WATSON—I would have thought that it would have been a prudential requirement for licensing. I am happy for you to take the question on notice, because I think it deserves a serious response.</p>	E55	31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT44	Watson	APRA	16/2/06	<p>Rationalisation of post licensing audits for super funds</p> <p>Senator WATSON—I now come to the situation of post APRA licensing. Do you plan to also rationalise the number of audit reports</p>	E58	31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>requested by superannuation funds? At present, public offer funds require 10 audit reports, which seems a very high number. Can there not be some rationalisation post licensing?</p> <p>Mr Khoo—I am not of the view that there were reports of that number. Can we take that on notice, please?</p> <p>Senator WATSON—Yes, I am happy for you to.</p>				
WRITTEN QUESTIONS ON NOTICE								
AT45	Watson	AASB	N/A	<p><i>Accounting Standards and the Public Sector</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Why does the Australian Accounting Standards Board (AASB) wish to withdraw Australian Accounting Standards (AAS) AAS27 Financial Reporting by Local Governments, AAS 29 Financial Reporting by Government Departments and AAS31 Financial Reporting by Governments? Does the AASB acknowledge that there are significant differences between the public sector and the private sector? What would the AASB say in response to this statement from Ian McPhee FCPA, at a recent CPA Australia meeting: <i>"It is appropriate, in my view, to have a presumption in favour of sector-neutral standards, but where a case can be made, departures from this approach should be allowed. On this basis, in light of the marked differences between the for-profit and public sectors, and the scale of public sector activities, I am strongly in favour of the AASB continuing to develop public sector standards"</i>. How does the AASB propose that government departments value such assets as heritage buildings, natural assets, and 	N/A			

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				museum collections? 5. What benefit would valuing such assets provide? 6. How does the AASB propose that Government Departments account for the value of land under roads? Is it worth billions of dollars or nothing? 7. Removing the proposed standards would greatly increase the accounting costs for the public sector. What benefit would it provide and does it outweigh the costs?				
AT46	Webber	APRA	N/A	<i>Reward insurance</i> 1. Can you please explain what an 'introduction fee' is and the normal approval procedures for such a fee? 2. What are the normal operating costs for an insurance company, including the salary packages for staff and executives? Did Reward Insurance operate at a comparable level of expenditure to other like companies, and if not, why? 3. What are the normal procedures for release of information (primarily financial) within a group such as the Reward companies? 4. When organising a sponsorship contract, such as that entered into by Geelong Football Club and Reward Insurance, what are the usual procedures for gaining approval of said contract? Can you explain why the Reward Insurance Board believed that the liability for the GFC contract would be borne by Reward Advantage?	N/A	31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>5. On 13 September 2002 the Reward Insurance Board discussed the debt owed to it by Reward Advantage (re: PN24). The Board believed that the amount owed was in the amount of \$800,000.00 and a further \$153,000.00 in receivables. A further Financial Report for Reward Insurance for the financial year ending 30 June 2002 places the figure owed at \$1.7 million as of 30 June 2002, rising to \$2.7 million as of 30 October 2002 (PN25). Could you please explain the discrepancies between these figures?</p> <p>6. On 31 December 2002 a Profit and Loss Statement for the financial year ending 30 June 2002 showed that Reward Insurance had made a profit of \$550, 882.00 – later figures revealed that in fact the company had made a loss of \$1,668,268.00 for that year. Similarly, figures presented to the Board for the financial year ending 30 June 2003 disclosed a profit of approximately \$800,000.00 for that year, when in fact Reward Insurance had made a loss of \$2,681,959.00. Could you please explain the discrepancies between these statements and the actual figures?</p> <p>7. The above reports fail to disclose the liability that Reward Insurance held for the \$250,000.00 per annum owed to the Geelong Football Club; and \$954,000.00 in marketing and advertising costs. They also overestimate the level of third party recoveries to be recovered by Reward Insurance. Who was responsible for the inaccuracy of these reports, and what effect did they have on the company's ability to operate?</p>				

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>8. What is the average rate of commission charged by insurance agents? How does this compare to the rate that Reward Insurance was charged by Australian Home Warranty?</p> <p>9. What were the terms of the agency agreement negotiated on 3 January 2002 between Reward Insurance and Australian Home Warranty and was this an exclusive agency agreement?</p> <p>10. What are the usual procedures by which the Board would approve such a contract and were these procedures followed in this case?</p> <p>11. What is the relationship between Australian Home Warranty and OAMPS? Did Australian Home Warranty in any way gain from the sale of Reward Insurance to OAMPS?</p> <p>12. Do you believe that an undisclosed conflict of interest existed via the relationship between the Reward Insurance shareholders and the shareholders of Australian Home Warranty? If so, did this conflict have a detrimental effect on the ability of Reward Insurance to conduct business?</p>				
AT47	Conroy	ACCC	N/A	<p><i>Optus/Transact use of ULL over HFC</i></p> <p>I have a few questions for the ACCC associated with the ULL issue. I'm sure the ACCC is aware of Telstra's public claims that Optus is using Telstra ULL services in preference to its own HFC network, even in areas of the HFC's footprint. Dr Tony Warren told the ECITA Committee on Monday that:</p>		31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p><i>We saw in Canberra, where TransACT was rolling out a lot of its own fibre and then suddenly became a ULL purchaser because the price of ULL went down. We have seen that in the Optus footprint where Optus is using ULL rather than its own HFC to deliver services to customers. So clearly relative prices do work and do have some effect.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the ACCC's view on this issue? Has the ACCC investigated whether Optus is using ULL services in preference to its own network? 2. If Optus were using ULL in preference to its own network, would the ACCC be concerned by this? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Why/Why not? 3. This is an issue that appears to be of some importance to Telstra. Will the ACCC be considering issue as part of its inquiry into the future of fixed line regulation? 				
AT48	Conroy	ACCC	N/A	<p><i>Backhaul inquiry</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ACCC initiated an inquiry into the pricing of backhaul services in Australia in early May of last year with a view to potentially issuing indicative for declared transmission services. Can you provide us with an update on where that inquiry is up to? 2. While we are talking about backhaul, will the findings of this inquiry feed into the development of the pricing equivalence 		31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>framework required by the government's operational separation model?</p> <p>3. Will the prices that Telstra charges itself for backhaul services on specific routes be visible within this pricing equivalence framework?</p> <p>4. If these prices aren't visible, how could competitors who are considering installing competitive infrastructure in regional exchanges be sure that Telstra is acquiring backhaul services to that exchange on the same terms as they are?</p> <p>5. I mean given the potential for the introduction of averaged ULL pricing in Australia, and given that the stated objective of this pricing construct is to encourage the installation of competitive DSLAMs in rural and regional areas, won't the importance of access to backhaul services at competitive costs only grow?</p> <p>6. If there is no transfer pricing for the backhaul services that Telstra provides itself for specific routes, how can competitors be confident that they are obtaining backhaul services at equivalent prices? It doesn't do regional infrastructure competitors much use to have a \$30 ULL rate if they are paying twice what Telstra is for backhaul to service the DSLAMs in their exchanges.</p> <p>7. Is it fair to say that if we don't get backhaul pricing right there is no chance that an averaged ULL price will encourage ADSL infrastructure investment in rural and regional</p>				

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				Australia?				
AT49	Conroy	ACCC	N/A	<p><i>Telstra FOIing the ACCC in support of High Court Action</i></p> <p>1. I have some questions about a recent newspaper report concerning Freedom of Information requests lodged against the ACCC by Telstra seeking documents and correspondence referring to s152EB(2) of the <i>Trade Practices Act</i>.</p> <p>I understand that Telstra is collecting this information in preparation for a potential High Court challenge to the telecommunications access regime established under the trade practices act on the ground that it breaches the "just terms" acquisition of property clause of the Constitution.</p> <p>Has the ACCC sought legal advice on the prospects for success of such a claim?</p> <p>2. What would be the implications of the success of such a claim for the telecommunications access regime?</p> <p>3. What would be the implications of the success of such a claim for access regimes monitored by the ACCC in the gas, electricity and transport sectors?</p>		31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT50	Conroy	ACCC	N/A	<p><i>ACCC – Petrol pricing case</i></p> <p>The ACCC has talked a lot about cracking down on cartels in the last year or so. I have a number of questions about developments in one</p>		31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>of the cases that you have been pursuing involving allegations of petrol price fixing in Geelong.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the status of that litigation? Is that matter still ongoing? 2. Last November there was substantial press coverage that the ACCC had fabricated evidence in the case? Can the ACCC explain what happened here? 3. The judge in the case, Justice Gray, is reported as criticising the ACCC's approach to the case and said and I quote "it may not be evidence of a closed mind, but its evidence of an attitude". He is accusing the ACCC of prejudging this matter isn't he? That you basically decided these people were guilty and worked backwards. What is the ACCC's response to that? 4. What's going on here? Has the ACCC had any difficulties with Justice Gray in previous cases? Has he taken a set against you? 				
AT51	Conroy	ACCC	N/A	<p><i>Advertising market</i></p> <p>I understand that the ACCC has done some work recently on the employment and real estate advertising markets.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the ACCC done any research on the extent to which internet advertising is a substitute for print advertising? 		31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>2. Is there any evidence to indicate that internet and print advertising may be complementary products rather than substitutes?</p> <p>3. If this the case, what are the implications for market definition in these advertising markets?</p> <p>4. Does the ACCC believe that print, radio, television and internet advertising services are substitutes?</p>				
AT52	Conroy	ACCC	N/A	<p><i>ACCC News Markets</i></p> <p>In November 2005, the ACCC indicated that it was doing some work in defining news and information markets in Australia.</p> <p>1. Can the ACCC update the Committee on the progress of this work?</p> <p>2. Can you outline the methodology that the ACCC is using seeking to define news and information markets?</p> <p>3. Has the ACCC attempted to construct a diversity index for Australia similar to the one that has been used by the FCC in the United States? If so can you provide the Committee with details of this work?</p> <p>4. Does the ACCC believe that all media (ie free to air television, radio, pay television, newspaper and the internet) should be considered substitutes for news and information purposes?</p>		31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
AT53	Ludwig	ABS	N/A	<i>Hillsong Church</i> How many grants have you issued to Hillsong Church, its associated corporations and entities? List name, price and duration of funding by department.		22/3/2006	22/3/2006	
AT54	Ludwig	ACCC	N/A	<i>Hillsong Church</i> How many grants have you issued to Hillsong Church, its associated corporations and entities? List name, price and duration of funding by department.		31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT55	Ludwig	AOFM	N/A	<i>Hillsong Church</i> How many grants have you issued to Hillsong Church, its associated corporations and entities? List name, price and duration of funding by department.		22/3/2006	22/3/2006	
AT56	Ludwig	APRA	N/A	<i>Hillsong Church</i> How many grants have you issued to Hillsong Church, its associated corporations and entities? List name, price and duration of funding by department.		31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT57	Ludwig	ASIC	N/A	<i>Hillsong Church</i> How many grants have you issued to Hillsong Church, its associated corporations and entities? List name, price and duration of funding by department.		31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT58	Ludwig	CAMAC	N/A	<i>Hillsong Church</i> How many grants have you issued to Hillsong Church, its associated corporations and entities? List name, price and duration of funding		31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				by department.				
AT59	Ludwig	IGT	N/A	Hillsong Church How many grants have you issued to Hillsong Church, its associated corporations and entities? List name, price and duration of funding by department.		22/3/2006	22/3/2006	
AT60	Ludwig	NCC	N/A	Hillsong Church How many grants have you issued to Hillsong Church, its associated corporations and entities? List name, price and duration of funding by department.		22/3/2006	22/3/2006	
AT61	Ludwig	PC	N/A	Hillsong Church How many grants have you issued to Hillsong Church, its associated corporations and entities? List name, price and duration of funding by department.		31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT62	Ludwig	RAM	N/A	Hillsong Church How many grants have you issued to Hillsong Church, its associated corporations and entities? List name, price and duration of funding by department.		31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT63	Ludwig	Treasury	N/A	Hillsong Church How many grants have you issued to Hillsong Church, its associated corporations and entities? List name, price and duration of funding by department.		22/3/2006	22/3/2006	
AT64	Ludwig	ABS	N/A	DPP 1. How many briefs have you forwarded to the DPP for 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05?		31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>(a) How many briefs were returned without action, and how many were actioned?</p> <p>2. For each year, what was the average time (as well as indicating the minimum and maximum time in each case) in which it took the DPP to:</p> <p>(a) Bring charges against the accused party</p> <p>(b) Formally bring the matter to a conclusion through either a verdict of guilty or not guilty, the entrance of a nolle prosequi or dropping the charges</p> <p>(c) Return the brief for no further action</p> <p>3. Did the department or agency forward any formal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief?</p> <p>(a) If so, give details.</p> <p>4. Did the department or agency forward any informal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief?</p> <p>(a) If so, give details.</p>				
AT65	Ludwig	ACCC	N/A	<p>DPP</p> <p>1. How many briefs have you forwarded to the DPP for 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05?</p> <p>(a) How many briefs were returned without action, and how many were actioned?</p> <p>2. For each year, what was the average time (as well as indicating the minimum and maximum time in each case) in which it took the DPP to:</p> <p>(a) Bring charges against the accused party</p> <p>(b) Formally bring the matter to a conclusion through either a verdict of guilty or not guilty, the entrance of a nolle prosequi or dropping the charges</p> <p>(c) Return the brief for no further action</p>		31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				3. Did the department or agency forward any formal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief? (a) If so, give details. 4. Did the department or agency forward any informal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief? (a) If so, give details.				
AT66	Ludwig	AOFM	N/A	DPP 1. How many briefs have you forwarded to the DPP for 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05? (a) How many briefs were returned without action, and how many were actioned? 2. For each year, what was the average time (as well as indicating the minimum and maximum time in each case) in which it took the DPP to: (a) Bring charges against the accused party (b) Formally bring the matter to a conclusion through either a verdict of guilty or not guilty, the entrance of a nolle prosequi or dropping the charges (c) Return the brief for no further action 3. Did the department or agency forward any formal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief? (a) If so, give details. 4. Did the department or agency forward any informal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief? (a) If so, give details.		22/3/2006	22/3/2006	
AT67	Ludwig	APRA	N/A	DPP 1. How many briefs have you forwarded to the DPP for 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05?		23/5/06	23/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>(a) How many briefs were returned without action, and how many were actioned?</p> <p>2. For each year, what was the average time (as well as indicating the minimum and maximum time in each case) in which it took the DPP to:</p> <p>(a) Bring charges against the accused party</p> <p>(b) Formally bring the matter to a conclusion through either a verdict of guilty or not guilty, the entrance of a nolle prosequi or dropping the charges</p> <p>(c) Return the brief for no further action</p> <p>3. Did the department or agency forward any formal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief?</p> <p>(a) If so, give details.</p> <p>4. Did the department or agency forward any informal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief?</p> <p>(a) If so, give details.</p>				
AT68	Ludwig	ASIC	N/A	<p>DPP</p> <p>1. How many briefs have you forwarded to the DPP for 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05?</p> <p>(a) How many briefs were returned without action, and how many were actioned?</p> <p>2. For each year, what was the average time (as well as indicating the minimum and maximum time in each case) in which it took the DPP to:</p> <p>(a) Bring charges against the accused party</p> <p>(b) Formally bring the matter to a conclusion through either a verdict of guilty or not guilty, the entrance of a nolle prosequi or dropping the charges</p> <p>(c) Return the brief for no further action</p>		31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				3. Did the department or agency forward any formal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief? (a) If so, give details. 4. Did the department or agency forward any informal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief? (a) If so, give details.				
AT69	Ludwig	CAMAC	N/A	DPP 1. How many briefs have you forwarded to the DPP for 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05? (a) How many briefs were returned without action, and how many were actioned? 2. For each year, what was the average time (as well as indicating the minimum and maximum time in each case) in which it took the DPP to: (a) Bring charges against the accused party (b) Formally bring the matter to a conclusion through either a verdict of guilty or not guilty, the entrance of a nolle prosequi or dropping the charges (c) Return the brief for no further action 3. Did the department or agency forward any formal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief? (a) If so, give details. 4. Did the department or agency forward any informal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief? (a) If so, give details.		31/5/06	31/5/06	
AT70	Ludwig	IGT	N/A	DPP 1. How many briefs have you forwarded to the DPP for 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05?		22/3/2006	22/3/2006	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>(a) How many briefs were returned without action, and how many were actioned?</p> <p>2. For each year, what was the average time (as well as indicating the minimum and maximum time in each case) in which it took the DPP to:</p> <p>(a) Bring charges against the accused party</p> <p>(b) Formally bring the matter to a conclusion through either a verdict of guilty or not guilty, the entrance of a nolle prosequi or dropping the charges</p> <p>(c) Return the brief for no further action</p> <p>3. Did the department or agency forward any formal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief?</p> <p>(a) If so, give details.</p> <p>4. Did the department or agency forward any informal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief?</p> <p>(a) If so, give details.</p>				
AT71	Ludwig	NCC	N/A	<p>DPP</p> <p>1. How many briefs have you forwarded to the DPP for 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05?</p> <p>(a) How many briefs were returned without action, and how many were actioned?</p> <p>2. For each year, what was the average time (as well as indicating the minimum and maximum time in each case) in which it took the DPP to:</p> <p>(a) Bring charges against the accused party</p> <p>(b) Formally bring the matter to a conclusion through either a verdict of guilty or not guilty, the entrance of a nolle prosequi or dropping the charges</p> <p>(c) Return the brief for no further action</p>		22/3/2006	22/3/2006	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				3. Did the department or agency forward any formal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief? (a) If so, give details. 4. Did the department or agency forward any informal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief? (a) If so, give details.				
AT72	Ludwig	PC	N/A	DPP 1. How many briefs have you forwarded to the DPP for 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05? (a) How many briefs were returned without action, and how many were actioned? 2. For each year, what was the average time (as well as indicating the minimum and maximum time in each case) in which it took the DPP to: (a) Bring charges against the accused party (b) Formally bring the matter to a conclusion through either a verdict of guilty or not guilty, the entrance of a nolle prosequi or dropping the charges (c) Return the brief for no further action 3. Did the department or agency forward any formal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief? (a) If so, give details. 4. Did the department or agency forward any informal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief? (a) If so, give details.		29/5/06	29/5/06	
AT73	Ludwig	RAM	N/A	DPP 1. How many briefs have you forwarded to the DPP for 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05?		31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>(a) How many briefs were returned without action, and how many were actioned?</p> <p>2. For each year, what was the average time (as well as indicating the minimum and maximum time in each case) in which it took the DPP to:</p> <p>(a) Bring charges against the accused party</p> <p>(b) Formally bring the matter to a conclusion through either a verdict of guilty or not guilty, the entrance of a nolle prosequi or dropping the charges</p> <p>(c) Return the brief for no further action</p> <p>3. Did the department or agency forward any formal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief?</p> <p>(a) If so, give details.</p> <p>4. Did the department or agency forward any informal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief?</p> <p>(a) If so, give details.</p>				
AT74	Ludwig	Treasury	N/A	<p>DPP</p> <p>1. How many briefs have you forwarded to the DPP for 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05?</p> <p>(a) How many briefs were returned without action, and how many were actioned?</p> <p>2. For each year, what was the average time (as well as indicating the minimum and maximum time in each case) in which it took the DPP to:</p> <p>(a) Bring charges against the accused party</p> <p>(b) Formally bring the matter to a conclusion through either a verdict of guilty or not guilty, the entrance of a nolle prosequi or dropping the charges</p> <p>(c) Return the brief for no further action</p>		31/5/06	31/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				3. Did the department or agency forward any formal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief? (a) If so, give details.				
				4. Did the department or agency forward any informal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief? (a) If so, give details.				

AUSTRALIAN TAXATION OFFICE
Additional Estimates 2005-06

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
AT75	Sherry	ATO	N/A	<p><i>Constitutional Education Fund Australia (CEFA)— Deductible Gift Recipient (DGR) status</i></p> <p>I understand CEFA's finances to be as follows:</p> <p>85 per cent of CEFA's outgoings in 2003-04 was spent on wages, rent and office administration. A mere \$14,400 was spent on direct activities for which CEFA was supposedly established, namely the Governor-General's prizes. Things weren't much different for 2004-05. 81 per cent of total outgoings of \$456,589 was spent on wages, rent and office administration. Expenditure on direct activities rose, but to a still very meagre \$62,600.</p> <p>On the face of it it appears that CEFA does not meet the DGR requirements under the Tax Act? Is this correct?</p> <p>Can the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) advise what processes are in place to police, review and ultimately withdraw such tax deductibility arrangements?</p> <p>Can the ATO examine the accounts of the Australians for Constitutional Monarchy and CEFA to see that CEFA's tax deductibility status is immediately withdrawn? If not, why not?</p>	Written	29/3/06	30/3/06	
AT76	Sherry	ATO	15/2/06	<i>HoR QoN 703 (laptops) - date reply sent to Assistant</i>	E44	11/4/06	12/4/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p><i>Treasurer</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Okay, but I still have unanswered: do you know on approximately what date the answer that you provided to the Assistant Treasurer’s office was actually sent to the Assistant Treasurer’s office?</p> <p>Mr Farr—I may have. No, I am sorry, I do not.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Can you take that on notice?</p> <p>Mr Farr—Sure.</p>				
AT77	Murray	ATO	15/2/06	<p><i>Bribery provisions</i></p> <p>Senator MURRAY—Just on that same line of questioning, if I may, one thing that might trigger the need for a re-examination by Treasury is if the existing provision was ineffective, namely, that you were not discovering and acting on instances of bribery in our community, because it is impossible to envisage a country where no bribery ever occurs. The question is—and you might want to take it on notice, because I am not sure you would have it readily to hand—in a general sweep of tax returns to you have you had cause to exercise and use that bribery provision so that you overturn a previous self-assessment and impose a penalty because what somebody has claimed was a fee was in fact a bribe?</p> <p>Ms Martin—I can talk in general terms about how we would approach an issue like this. The legislation is relatively recent.</p> <p>Senator MURRAY—My question is quite specific. I want to know if the provision in the law has been used and, if it</p>	E50-51	29/3/06	30/3/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>has been used, how often, if it is possible to tell me. It might not be possible to tell me that.</p> <p>Mr D'Ascenzo—I do not know if it is possible. We will certainly take that and see whether or not we can work out whether adjustments have been made under that provision, but I probably forewarn the committee that I do not think our systems are sufficiently flexible to do that.</p>				
AT78	Parry	ATO	15/2/06	<p>Interest benchmark rates determination</p> <p>Senator PARRY—The rate is published on the website on an annual basis. This basically stems from constituent inquiries. How is the rate determined?</p> <p>Mr Konza—I think I am going to have to take that question on notice, because it is a specific question and I think I would be speculating if I answered it today.</p> <p>Senator PARRY—The rate is published on the website on an annual basis. This basically stems from constituent inquiries. How is the rate determined?</p> <p>Mr Konza—I think I am going to have to take that question on notice, because it is a specific question and I think I would be speculating if I answered it today.</p> <p>Senator PARRY—That is fine. The rate is published on the internet a year in advance, and I notice for the year 2004-05 the interest rate, which was 7.05 per cent, was published on 7 July 2004, and there is nothing on the website to indicate the rate for 2005-06. You might need to take that on notice as well.</p> <p>Mr Konza—Yes, we will.</p>	E52			Answer provided at hearing (see Proof Hansard E69-70)

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>Senator PARRY—... Finally, once you have established how the rate is determined, is that rate used in any other application apart from sections 109E and 109M of the Income Tax Assessment Act?</p> <p>Mr Konza—Not to my knowledge. To my knowledge, that rate is set as a result of a survey of commercial interest rate terms and it is only used in that context, setting that benchmark rate.</p> <p>Senator PARRY—There has not been one over the past few years, but if there was a huge interest rate differential on the commercial market for that year would that benchmark rate be altered at all or is there a provision for that to be altered by the commissioner?</p> <p>Mr Konza—You are asking whether there is a discretion to manually change it?</p> <p>Senator PARRY—To reflect it, yes.</p> <p>Mr Konza—I would need to take that on notice.</p>				
AT79	Fielding	ATO	15/2/06	<p>Remaining budget for Change Program</p> <p>Senator FIELDING—How much of the overall budget still remains to be spent on the Change Program?</p> <p>Mr Farr—I would have to take that on notice. I could give you an approximate answer.</p> <p>Senator FIELDING—Approximately?</p> <p>Mr Farr—In round terms \$300 million of the \$453 million, perhaps a little bit less—somewhere between \$250 million and \$300 million.</p>	E54	11/4/06	12/4/06	
AT80	Fielding	ATO	15/2/06	<p>How much spent so far on change program</p> <p>Senator FIELDING—How much has been spent on the first</p>	E54	11/4/06	12/4/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				phase so far of that? Mr Farr —Once again, I would take that on notice. In the last year I think it is around \$150 million to \$170 million.				
AT81	Fielding	ATO	15/2/06	Provide report of the independent assessment of the achievements so far on the Change program Senator FIELDING —So can you provide the committee with a report of the independent assessment of what has been achieved so far? Mr Farr —We can, yes.	E55	11/4/06	12/4/06	See also two attachments (November 2005 and January 2006 Reports)
AT82	Fielding	ATO	15/2/06	What percentage of the budget is allocated to the replacement of the taxpayer system Senator FIELDING —I think you referred before to the national taxpayer system. Is it part of the— Mr Farr —The national taxpayer system is our main income tax processing system, yes. Senator FIELDING —What percentage of the budget is allocated to that replacement? Mr Farr —One of the problems that we have, without getting too technical, is that we have any number of different processing systems. So we have the national taxpayer system processing our income tax. We have another system doing our GST and our BAS payments. We have another one doing our FBT payments. We have different accounting systems, different processing systems, different registration systems. That makes it very difficult to get a complete picture of a taxpayer—their history, their accounts and things. So all of those systems essentially will be replaced and we will have one processing system, one registration system and one	E56	29/3/06	30/3/06	ATO refers to this as QON "AT84"

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				accounting system, irrespective of what sort of tax it is. So it is not really possible to put a figure on replacing that system, but certainly when we do that that will be a pretty big chunk of our funds, probably at least a third of the funds, and I can take it on notice to give you a more accurate figure. Senator FIELDING —That is fine.				
AT83	Murray	ATO	15/2/06	<i>Measures for tax return lodgement</i> Senator MURRAY —Are you telling me that there are no ready measures such as benchmarks or targets for tax return lodgment that you are able to monitor and see if you are improving? Mr Konza —We do monitor on-time lodgments and we do monitor absolute growth in tax returns. We do try and see whether or not the number of returns lodged is keeping pace with the economy, so to speak. But I would be unable to give you any details of those, because we would need to take them on notice, and Mr Reardon perhaps might be able to answer that.	E61-62	18/5/06	18/5/06	
AT84	Murray	ATO	15/2/06	<i>Convictions of drug barons</i> Senator SHERRY —On this issue specifically, I think Senator Murray was referring to drug barons in Victoria. Can you tell the committee how many drug barons have been convicted in the past couple of years as a consequence of any activity by the tax office? Mr D'Ascenzo —If you are getting to the broad proposition of organised crime, we will be working with other agencies, and usually under the leadership of the Australian Crime Commission and the Director of Public Prosecutions.	E63	29/3/06	30/3/06	ATO refers to this as QON "AT87"

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>Offhand, I do not know that answer. That is the context of it. Mike, if you can add any more?</p> <p>Mr Monaghan—I would not have a figure that precise.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Have you got any figure? Has there been one, two, three?</p> <p>Mr Monaghan—I will take it on notice to provide some detail, but the nature of the work in this area takes various forms, and the proceeds of crime path is one of those, and there are both federal and state proceeds of crime regimes. There is also supporting the law enforcement agencies in financial analysis to assist them in identifying the full scale of the crime that has occurred, which may or may not lead to a tax assessment.</p>				
AT85	Sherry	ATO	15/2/06	<p>Outcomes of Treasurer's statement in May 2004 about drug barons</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Yes, I agree with Senator Murray. What you are doing in the minutia is interesting, but here we are in February 2006 and the Treasurer made a very strong statement in May 2004. We would like to know what the outcomes have been. That would be useful.</p> <p>Mr D'Ascenzo—We can consult with the other government agencies that are usually the leaders of our joint task forces and see what they feel is appropriate or what they are able to provide.</p>	E64	29/3/06	30/3/06	ATO refers to this as QON "AT88"
AT86	Watson	ATO	15/2/06	<p>2002/122 re imputations credits</p> <p>Senator WATSON—Where is the mischief that denies a life tenant an imputation credit? I refer you to an invalid person who has subsequently committed suicide, who was in receipt</p>	E67	29/3/06	30/3/06	ATO refers to this as QON "AT89"

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>of moneys from a trust which was set up by his late mother, where the total income of that trust was less than \$25,000 and just provided ongoing support. There was nothing complicated in it. We have the problem of ATO interpretation decision 2002/122, which indicates that 'life tenants are not entitled to imputation credits from shares or units acquired by the estate after 31 December 1997 if their imputation credit from all sources exceeds \$5,000'. I ask where is the justice in that interpretation for that particular person?</p> <p>Mr D'Ascenzo—I might have to take that on notice in the sense of what the background to the ATO ID 2002/122 is all about. My proposition is ultimately, without pre-empting what the answer might be—</p> <p>Senator WATSON—That was interpretive decision 2002.</p> <p>Mr D'Ascenzo—I understood that. The answer might be that that might well be the effect of the law, I do not know. I just do not know that interpretive decision.</p>				
AT87	Watson	ATO	15/2/06	<p>Section 31</p> <p>Senator WATSON—So they are not identified as section 31. Do you not think it would be a desirable feature for good transparency that section 31 be there? It is a significant change from the fundamental requirement that all appropriations have got to go through a process under section 81 of the act, which is approved by parliament.</p> <p>Ms Moody—Certainly we could include disclosure of that in the financial statements. I will come back to you on notice about whether there already is some disclosure in there, because certainly in terms of expenditure appropriations</p>	E69	29/3/06	30/3/06	ATO refers to this as QON "AT90"

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>there is a series of different notes within the financial statements but I cannot, off the top of my head, tell you whether section 31 is one of them. The other thing is that we have done a series of disclosure notes ourselves around issues raised with us by the Audit Office, which I think also cover this issue.</p> <p>Senator WATSON—I am not querying that you are not returning it in some form, but rather that you are returning it in the form of other income. I would have thought that a special arrangement to get around the requirements of section 83, namely a section 31 approach, really should be a separate disclosure, and that is what worries me.</p> <p>Mr D'Ascenzo—Ms Moody is going to check whether or not that is the case, and it may well be disclosed; if it is not, we will in our next financial statement make that disclosure in that way.</p>				
AT88	Watson	ATO	15/2/06	<p>Number of employers in default for their PAYE</p> <p>Senator WATSON—So there are a huge number of employers in default of their withholding deductions for PAYE?</p> <p>Mr Farr—There are some other big ones. It is probably the biggest. We would need to check that, but there are things like—</p> <p>Senator WATSON—How many taxpayers are in breach of not regularly remitting PAYE withholding deductions?</p> <p>Mr D'Ascenzo—I do not have that figure offhand. I will take that on notice</p>	E73	2/5/06	2/5/06	
AT89	Sherry	ATO	15/2/06	<p>Self managed super funds</p>	E75	2/5/06	2/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>Senator SHERRY—ASIC have indicated that an amount less than \$200,000—and I think they were right but brave in nominating a figure—as an amount below which should not be in an SMSF. Do we have any data on that? How many contain an amount less than that figure of \$200,000?</p> <p>Ms Vivian—I can certainly take that on notice to have a look. I do not have that with me here.</p>				
AT90	Sherry	ATO	15/2/06	<p>Budget for regulation of self managed super funds</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—What is your budget for the regulation of this particular area?</p> <p>Ms Vivian—For the regulation of self-managed super funds, I would have to take that on notice because the way that I look at my budget is probably how we spend money across our education and cost compliance, and it is not structured as such. In fact, I think it would be difficult to get to the actual budget we spend on selfmanaged super funds.</p>	E75	2/5/06	2/5/06	
AT91	Sherry	ATO	15/2/06	<p>Trustees paying themselves as the administrator of a self managed super fund</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—It is still a long way away. Just one other brief point on this area: is it permissible, allowable, for an individual who is a trustee of their own fund to effectively pay themselves from the investment savings proceeds of the fund as the administrator and investment manager if they do that themselves?</p> <p>Ms Vivian—I will check that out, but my understanding is that, as the trustee or administrator of selfmanaged super funds, a part of being a self-managed super fund is that you</p>	E76	2/5/06	2/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>cannot pay.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—What if the individual who is the trustee owns and operates their own administration and investment company/structure/entity? So it is legally a separate entity. It just seems to me difficult, but I have heard of this practice going on. It seems to me it would be difficult under the current SI(S) Act to argue, provided the fees were not consuming a significant proportion of the moneys under investment—I will give you an example, the admin fee and the management fee were \$20,000 or \$30,000 a year and the investment totalled half a million dollars in the fund—why that would not be permissible. I am not suggesting it should happen, but this issue has been brought to my attention and it does seem to me, if you use that hypothetical example in your examination in this area, that that would not be in breach of the sole purpose test and could happen.</p> <p>Ms Vivian—I think that is where we would have to look at the facts of the case, and obviously you would be looking at whether the sole purpose test was in breach.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—If you could take that on notice, anyway.</p>				
AT92	Sherry	ATO	15/2/06	<p><i>Tax affairs of Gerard in relation to Crown Solicitor's advice regarding public/private information</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Can you recall approximately when this legal view was presented to you, or the tax office?</p> <p>Mr Farr—Not exactly, but well and truly over 12 months ago—18 months or more.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Over 12 months ago?</p>	E77	11/4/06	12/4/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				<p>Mr Farr—Yes.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—You would be aware that the Treasurer’s office made a request of the tax commissioner in early 2003 in regard to the tax affairs of Mr Gerard; are you aware of that?</p> <p>Mr Farr—Yes.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—That was in early 2003. Was that before this opinion was received?</p> <p>Mr Farr—No, that would have been well after it.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—After?</p> <p>Mr Farr—We would have had the opinion well before that.</p> <p>Mr D’Ascenzo—Sorry, is that right, in the sequence sense?</p> <p>Mr Farr—I am sorry.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—The opinion was received—</p> <p>Mr Farr—I would have to take that on notice. It might be around the same time.</p>				
AT93	Sherry	ATO	15/2/06	<p><i>Cases referred to the DPP over the last five years</i></p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Do you have statistics on an annual basis of the number of cases that you have referred to the DPP, let us say, for an amount over \$1 million, a significant amount?</p> <p>Mr D’Ascenzo—I am sure we would have that information.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—Then of that referral, how many the DPP chose to prosecute and how many were prosecuted successfully?</p> <p>Mr D’Ascenzo—The first part is certainly within my bailiwick. I am just wondering perhaps whether the second part might be more in the public prosecutor’s bailiwick.</p> <p>Senator SHERRY—We will deal with the DPP. If you</p>	E80	18/5/06	18/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				could give us the data on that number, say over the last five years, a quantum more than \$1 million. Mr D'Ascenzo —I know we have that information. It is quite appropriate to provide that to you.				
WRITTEN QUESTIONS ON NOTICE								
AT94	Ludwig	ATO	N/A	Hillsong Church How many grants have you issued to Hillsong Church, its associated corporations and entities? List name, price and duration of funding by department.	Written	29/3/06	30/3/06	ATO refers to this as QON "AT98"
AT95	Ludwig	ATO	N/A	DPP 1. How many briefs have you forwarded to the DPP for 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05? (a) How many briefs were returned without action, and how many were actioned? 2. For each year, what was the average time (as well as indicating the minimum and maximum time in each case) in which it took the DPP to: (a) Bring charges against the accused party (b) Formally bring the matter to a conclusion through either a verdict of guilty or not guilty, the entrance of a nolle prosequi or dropping the charges (c) Return the brief for no further action 3. Did the department or agency forward any formal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief?	Written	18/5/06	18/5/06	

Q No.	Senator	Agency	Hearing date	Subject	Proof Hansard Page	Date answered	Date sent to Senator	Additional Information
				4. (a) If so, give details. Did the department or agency forward any informal complaints to the DPP regarding the handling of the brief? (a) If so, give details.				