SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS
AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE

Question No. 65

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 23 May 2007:

a) ….Additional reply to QoN 103 from May 2006:
Please provide an explanation of the difference between the original and additional reply

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

At the Hearing under Standing Order 25(2)(b) regarding the performance of the Australian Federal Police, Commissioner Keelty offered the following opening remarks.

> In continuing my commitment to this committee in preparation over the weekend but more recently—about an hour ago—I became aware of a mistake in one of the answers to a question on notice, question 103, that was asked of us on 25 May 2006. I just thought that before we start this session I should advise you of a mistake that was provided in response to that question. Our answer to the question looked at the receivable projections reported over the past four years, specifically relating to the 2004-05 portfolio budget statement and our response to that question. In a table that is provided as part of that response, which is on page 2 of our response, referring to the financial year 2003-04 of receivables of $191.714 million, we said that a significant upward movement in receivables in 2003-04 is due to the forecast surplus of $80 million in deferred capital expenditure of $64 million. We then went on to explain that and said the main drivers of the surplus were delays in implementing new measures, 'particularly recruitment activities', which is in brackets, and an underspend of $32 million for PNG related activities.
>
> The first point to make is that $32 million should have been $62 million. That $62 million is included in response to the additional question of 103, which is a question that was asked of us on 15 September 2006. The answer to that question has only been recently provided, so the $32 million should have been $62 million—I only discovered that tonight. Secondly, on reflection, the words in brackets, 'particularly recruitment activities in relation to PNG', are probably an overstatement because, as will probably be derived from the questions and answers provided tonight, recruitment has not been an issue for us.

The correction of QoN 103 provided to the Committee was in relation to these remarks and further subsequent discussion between the Committee and the Australian Federal Police.