

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 21-22 May 2007

IMMIGRATION AND CITIZENSHIP PORTFOLIO

(162) Output 1.1: Migration and Temporary Entry

Senator Carr asked:

1. In Ms Jacka's 22 May 2006 testimony before this committee, she stated the reason that DIMA had taken 10 months to contact Mr. McBurney regarding his complaint was that "a more junior officer essentially did not pass it on". The Department has recently provided advice to this Committee which revises by some 10 months the date departmental staff became aware of this matter. Could you please explain why? What new piece of information prompted the Department to make this revision?
2. Please be specific on the dates that DIAC first knew, the date DIAC in Canberra first knew, the date the DIAC privacy section first knew, the date Ms Jacka personally first knew and the date the DIAC Secretary first knew of Mr McBurney's complaint?

Answer:

1. In a response contained in the department's written answer to Question on Notice (21) Output 1.1: Non-Humanitarian Entry and Stay, Budget Estimates Hearing 22 May 2006, the department advised that it first knew about Mr McBurney's complaint on 5 July 2005. This was to correct Ms Jacka's statement that the Department first knew of the complaint in June 2005. The Department has not revised "*by some 10 months the date departmental staff became aware of this matter*".
2. The dates requested are as follows:
 - a. The date that DIAC first knew of the complaint was 5 July 2005.
 - b. The date DIAC in Canberra first knew of the complaint was 23 July 2005.
 - c. The date DIAC then Ombudsman, HREOC and Privacy Section first knew of a complaint by Mr McBurney was 11 August 2005.
 - d. The date Ms Jacka personally first knew of the complaint was 9 May 2006.
 - e. The date the DIAC Secretary first knew of the complaint was late May 2006.