

2002-03

THE PARLIAMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

THE SENATE

NOTICE PAPER

No. 95

WEDNESDAY, 10 SEPTEMBER 2003

The Senate meets at 9.30 am

Contents

Business of the Senate	
Orders of the Day	2
Government Business	
Notices of Motion.....	2
Orders of the Day	3
Orders of the Day relating to Committee Reports and Government Responses and Auditor-General's Reports.....	5
General Business	
Notices of Motion.....	5
Orders of the Day relating to Government Documents.....	16
Orders of the Day	16
Business for Future Consideration.....	25
Bills Referred to Committees	35
Bills Discharged, Laid Aside or Negatived.....	37
Questions on Notice	38
Orders of the Senate	286
Contingent Notices of Motion.....	303
Temporary Chairs of Committees	307
Categories of Committees.....	307
Committees	308
Senate Appointments to Statutory Authorities	336
Ministerial Representation	337
A Guide to the Daily Notice Paper	338
A Guide to the Full Notice Paper	339

Notifications prefixed by an () appear for the first time.*

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

Orders of the Day

1 Superannuation—Select Committee

Report to be presented on draft Superannuation Industry (Supervision) Amendment Regulations 2003 and draft Retirement Savings Accounts Amendment Regulations 2003.

2 Economics Legislation Committee

Report to be presented on the provisions of the Taxation Laws Amendment Bill (No. 7) 2003. (*Referred pursuant to Selection of Bills Committee report.*)

***3 Economics Legislation Committee**

Report to be presented on annual reports tabled by 30 April 2003.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Notices of Motion

Notice given 9 September 2003

***1 Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer (Senator Coonan):** To move—
That:

- (a) the second reading of the Superannuation (Surcharge Rate Reduction) Amendment Bill 2003 be restored to the Notice Paper and be made an order of the day for the next day of sitting; and
- (b) that bill may be taken together with the Superannuation (Government Co-contribution for Low Income Earners) Bill 2003 and the Superannuation (Government Co-contribution for Low Income Earners) (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2003 for their remaining stages.

Notice of motion altered on 9 September 2003 pursuant to standing order 77.

***2 Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer (Senator Ian Campbell):** To move—

- (1) That the order of the Senate of 12 November 2002, relating to days of meeting of the Senate for 2003, be varied to provide that the Senate not sit on Monday, 3 November 2003 and Tuesday, 4 November 2003.
- (2) That the order of the Senate of 11 December 2002, relating to estimates hearings, be varied as follows:

At the end of paragraph (1), add:

2003-04 Budget estimates – supplementary hearings

Monday, 3 November and Tuesday, 4 November 2003 (*Group A*)
Wednesday, 5 November and Thursday, 6 November 2003
(*Group B*).

***3 Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer (Senator Ian Campbell):** To move—That the provisions of paragraphs (5), (6) and (8) of standing order 111 not

apply to the Australian National Training Authority Amendment Bill 2003, allowing it to be considered during this period of sittings.

Orders of the Day

- 1 **Health Legislation Amendment (Private Health Insurance Reform) Bill 2003—(Senate bill)**
In committee (9 September 2003).
- 2 **Quarantine Amendment (Health) Bill 2003—(Senate bill)—(Minister for Defence, Senator Hill)**
Second reading—Adjourned debate (21 August 2003).
(Bill exempted on 9 September 2003 from the provisions of paragraphs (5) to (7) of standing order 111—see Orders of the Senate—Legislation)
- 3 **Education Services for Overseas Students (Registration Charges) Amendment Bill 2003—(Minister for Defence, Senator Hill)**
Second reading—Adjourned debate (adjourned, Senator Buckland, 21 August 2003).
- 4 **Migration Legislation Amendment (Sponsorship Measures) Bill 2003—(Minister for Forestry and Conservation, Senator Ian Macdonald)**
Second reading—Adjourned debate (adjourned, Senator Crossin, 25 June 2003).
- 5 **Superannuation (Government Co-contribution for Low Income Earners) Bill 2003**
Superannuation (Government Co-contribution for Low Income Earners) (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2003—(Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts, Senator Alston)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (adjourned, Senator Moore, 23 June 2003).
- 6 **Workplace Relations Amendment (Fair Termination) Bill 2002**
Consideration in committee of the whole of message no. 362 from the House of Representatives (14 August 2003).
- 7 **Australian Protective Service Amendment Bill 2003—(Senate bill)—(Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell)**
Second reading—Adjourned debate (26 June 2003).
- 8 **Communications Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3) 2003—(Minister for Defence, Senator Hill)**
Second reading—Adjourned debate (adjourned, Senator Buckland, 21 August 2003).
- 9 **Financial Sector Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2002—(Minister for Health and Ageing, Senator Patterson)**
Second reading—Adjourned debate (2 December 2002).
- 10 **Family Law Amendment Bill 2003—(Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts, Senator Alston)**
Second reading—Adjourned debate (adjourned, Senator Mackay, 20 August 2003).

- 11 **Australian Human Rights Commission Legislation Bill 2003**—(*Special Minister of State, Senator Abetz*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Mackay, 11 August 2003*).
- 12 **Migration Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 1) 2002**—(*Minister for Justice and Customs, Senator Ellison*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Buckland, 5 February 2003*).
- 13 **Superannuation Legislation Amendment (Family Law) Bill 2002**—(*Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Mackay, 15 May 2003*).
- 14 **Trade Practices Amendment (Personal Injuries and Death) Bill 2003**—(*Minister for Forestry and Conservation, Senator Ian Macdonald*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*25 June 2003*).
- 15 **New Business Tax System (Taxation of Financial Arrangements) Bill (No. 1) 2003**—(*Special Minister of State, Senator Abetz*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Mackay, 24 June 2003*).
- 16 **Workplace Relations Amendment (Transmission of Business) Bill 2002**
Consideration in committee of the whole of message no. 368 from the House of Representatives (*20 August 2003*).
- 17 **Workplace Relations Amendment (Protecting the Low Paid) Bill 2003**—(*Special Minister of State, Senator Abetz*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Crossin, 6 March 2003*).
- 18 **Customs Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2002**—(*Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Webber, 3 March 2003*).
- 19 **Criminal Code Amendment (Terrorist Organisations) Bill 2003**—(*Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer, Senator Coonan*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Minister for Justice and Customs (Senator Ellison), 16 June 2003*).
- 20 **Family and Community Services Legislation Amendment (Further Simplification of International Payments) Bill 2002**—(*Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation, Senator Ian Macdonald*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Mackay, 13 March 2002*).
- 21 **Superannuation (Government Co-contribution for Low Income Earners) Bill 2002**
Superannuation Legislation Amendment Bill 2002
Adjourned debate on the motion of Minister for the Arts and Sport (Senator Kemp)—That these bills be now read a second time.
And on the amendment moved by Senator Sherry in respect of the Superannuation Legislation Amendment Bill 2002—At the end of the motion, add “but the Senate is of the opinion that the bill should be withdrawn and redrafted to:

- (a) ensure that the proposed surcharge tax reduction to high-income earners, the splitting of superannuation contributions and the closure of the public sector funds do not proceed; and
- (b) provide for a fairer contributions tax cut that will boost retirement incomes for all superannuation fund members to assist in preparing the nation for the ageing population”.

And on the amendment moved by Senator Cherry in respect of the Superannuation (Government Co-contribution for Low Income Earners) Bill 2002—At the end of the motion, add “but the Senate notes that analysis provided to the Select Committee on Superannuation shows that extending the co-contribution to workers on average earnings would have a significant positive effect on national savings, and that this could be funded by better targeting of the Government’s superannuation measures”—(adjourned, Special Minister of State (Senator Abetz), 18 November 2002).

22 Budget statement and documents 2003-04

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Minister for Finance and Administration (Senator Minchin)—That the Senate take note of the statement and documents (adjourned, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Transport and Regional Services (Senator Boswell), 15 May 2003).

23 Budget statement and documents 2002-03

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Minister for Finance and Administration (Senator Minchin)—That the Senate take note of the statement and documents (adjourned, Special Minister of State (Senator Abetz), 16 May 2002).

**ORDERS OF THE DAY RELATING TO COMMITTEE REPORTS
AND GOVERNMENT RESPONSES AND
AUDITOR-GENERAL’S REPORTS**

Orders of the Day relating to Auditor-General’s reports

- 1 **Auditor-General—Audit report no. 3 of 2003-04—Business support process audit—Management of risk and insurance**
Consideration (8 September 2003).
- 2 **Auditor-General—Audit report no. 4 of 2003-04—Performance audit—Management of the extension option review—Plasma fractionation agreement: Department of Health and Ageing**
Consideration (8 September 2003).

GENERAL BUSINESS

Notices of Motion

Notice given 14 February 2002

- 17 **Senator Tierney:** To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes the serious problem of overcrowding in New South Wales public schools, especially when compared with other states across the country;
- (b) acknowledges the shameful results of a New South Wales Teachers Federation survey showing 20 per cent of all classes in each of the first 3 years of primary school being over the Carr Government's own limit, and 32 per cent of all kindergarten classes exceeding suggested class sizes during 2001;
- (c) condemns the Carr Government for putting New South Wales children's education at risk by increasing class numbers and not reducing them as other states are now doing;
- (d) congratulates the Howard Government for increasing funding to New South Wales government schools by 5.2 per cent in 2001, as opposed to Premier Carr's paltry 2.6 per cent; and
- (e) recognises the low priority given to education by the Carr Government, as evidenced by the fact that the amount spent on education as a percentage of total state budget has dropped from 25.5 per cent to 22 per cent in the 7 years since Labor came to power in New South Wales.

Notice given 11 March 2002

23 Senator McGauran: To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes that:
 - (i) it is the 100th anniversary of the execution of Harry 'Breaker' Morant and Peter Handcock, killed by firing squad during the Boer War for following the orders, take no prisoners,
 - (ii) the court case held for Morant and Handcock was a sham, set up by Lord Kitchener, the giver of the orders Morant and Handcock followed,
 - (iii) the injustice to Breaker and Handcock has plagued Australia's conscience since their execution on 27 February 1902,
 - (iv) in 1902 the then Federal Parliamentarian and later first Governor-General of Australia, Issac Issacs, raised the matter of the execution in Parliament stating that this issue was agitating the minds of the people of this country in an almost unprecedented degree, and questioned the validity of the decision,
 - (v) the reason we need to go back 100 years to now right this wrong, is because Breaker Morant is one of the fathers of our ANZAC tradition; a friend of Banjo Patterson and an inspiration for much of his poetry and described as a man of great courage who would never betray a mate; and a man of whom many of the young ANZACs in World War I had heard and on whom they modelled themselves, and
 - (vi) Lord Kitchener was the Commander-in-Chief of the British Military who made the decision to commit troops to Gallipoli and is responsible for that disastrous campaign;
- (b) calls on the Government to petition directly the British Government for a review of the case, with the aim to quash the harsh sentence of death for Harry 'Breaker' Morant and Peter Handcock; and
- (c) take action to include the names of these two Australians on the Roll of Honour at the Australian War Memorial.

30 Senator Brown: To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes that the Ministerial Code in the United Kingdom includes a system which deals with acceptance of appointments for ministers after leaving office; and
- (b) calls on the Government to:
 - (i) implement an advisory committee on business appointments, from which a minister would be required to seek advice before accepting business appointments within 5 years from the date from which he or she ceased to be a minister, and
 - (ii) ban any minister from taking an appointment that is directly related to his or her portfolio for 5 years from the date of resignation.

Notice given 16 May 2002

78 **Senator Tierney:** To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes that south-eastern Australia is the most fire prone region in the world;
- (b) commends the support provided by the Howard Government to New South Wales in January 2002, in particular, the provision of aerial fire fighting equipment;
- (c) expresses its concern that the state government is whitewashing the causes of the bushfire catastrophe of Christmas 2001 by just blaming pyromaniacs during the current bushfires inquiry;
- (d) calls on the New South Wales Government to give serious consideration to the evidence of State Forests of NSW, which believes that inadequate back-burning was the primary cause of the devastating fires;
- (e) rejects calls from the Nature Conservation Council to restrict hazard reduction;
- (f) calls on the Carr Government to allow non-government committee members to receive witnesses' submissions without having to first request them;
- (g) encourages the inquiry to reach a conclusion based on evidence and not party politics resulting from pressure from extreme green groups; and
- (h) hopes that the lessons learned from the bushfire inquiry will be shared to other state governments so all Australians can avoid such an unnecessary disaster.

Notice given 26 June 2002

108 **Senator Sherry:** To move—That there be laid on the table, on the next day of sitting, the advice by the Australian Prudential Regulation Authority to the Assistant Treasurer under section 230A of the *Superannuation Industry (Supervision) Act 1993*, in relation to applications for financial assistance for superannuation funds where Commercial Nominees of Australia was trustee.

112 **Senator Ridgeway:** To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes that:
 - (i) the week beginning 24 June 2002 is Drug Action Week, aimed at generating community awareness about drug and alcohol abuse and the solutions being used to tackle these issues,
 - (ii) each day of Drug Action Week highlights a different theme and the theme on 27 June 2002 is Indigenous issues,

- (iii) the misuse of alcohol and other drugs has long been linked to the deep levels of emotional and physical harm suffered by Indigenous communities since the colonisation of Australia,
 - (iv) alcohol and tobacco consumption rates continue to remain high in the Indigenous population, against declining rates in the general population, and the increasing use of heroin in urban, regional and rural Indigenous communities is also of particular concern,
 - (v) substance misuse is probably the biggest challenge facing Indigenous communities today, as it affects almost everybody either directly or indirectly and is now the cause as well as the symptom of much grief and loss experienced by Indigenous communities, and
 - (vi) the demand for the services of existing Indigenous-controlled drug and alcohol rehabilitation centres far exceeds the current level of supply;
- (b) acknowledges the essential role of Indigenous community-controlled health services in providing long-term, culturally-appropriate solutions for substance abuse; and
- (c) calls on the Government to:
- (i) fund the national substance misuse strategy, developed by the National Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Organisation, which is designed to build the necessary capacity within the Indigenous health sector so communities can address their health and well-being needs in a holistic and culturally-appropriate manner, and
 - (ii) improve coordination between Commonwealth, state, territory and local governments on these issues and ensure this facilitates greater Indigenous control over the development and implementation of all health programs.

Notice given 19 August 2002

120 **Senator Ray:** To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes:
- (i) the claims in the *Age* newspaper of 15 August 2002 that the McGauran family is financially supporting the Democratic Labour Party of Australia (DLP) in its attempt to retain registration under the provisions of the Electoral Act,
 - (ii) that two of the three Victorian National Party representatives in the Federal Parliament are from the McGauran family and have, on occasions, relied on DLP preferences,
 - (iii) the comments of the DLP Secretary, Mr John Mulholland, when he said, 'It would be in Senator Julian McGauran's interests for the DLP to survive this de-registration moved by the Electoral Commission', and
 - (iv) the immense amount of money made by the McGauran family from its poker machine interests in Altona, some of which is apparently going to fund the DLP's legal expenses; and
- (b) calls on Senator McGauran and the Minister for Science (Mr McGauran), to explain their knowledge of their family's involvement in funding the DLP's legal bills.

Notice given 22 August 2002

139 **Senator Mackay:** To move—That the Senate—

- (a) congratulates the Australian Capital Territory Legislative Assembly:
 - (i) on becoming the first state or territory legislature to remove abortion from the criminal code, and
 - (ii) for repealing the appalling law which required women seeking abortions to first look at pictures of fetuses;
- (b) notes that this landmark legislation should serve to encourage all remaining states and territories to enact similar legislative changes; and
- (c) notes that the Australian Capital Territory legislation recognises that abortion is a decision for women and is not something that should carry the threat of a jail term.

Notice given 16 September 2002

156 **Senator Allison:** To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes that:
 - (i) the Deaflympic Games will be held in Melbourne in 2005; and
 - (ii) Deaf Sports Recreation Victoria has set up a Games Organising Committee to begin planning and organising this international event which will see the participation of 4 000 deaf athletes and officials from over 90 countries; and
- (b) urges the Prime Minister (Mr Howard) to respond to the correspondence from Deaf Sports Recreation Victoria and to offer support for the Deaflympic Games.

Notice given 19 September 2002

175 **Senator Tierney:** To move—That the Senate—

- (a) deplures comments made in the New South Wales Parliament on Tuesday, 17 September 2002, by the State Minister for Education and Training (Mr Watkins), which misrepresented the future direction of universities in Australia and, in particular, the role of rural and regional universities;
- (b) notes that the Minister for Education, Science and Training (Dr Nelson) has put on the record that regional universities will not be disadvantaged by the current reform process;
- (c) further notes that the Federal Minister told all state education ministers, including Mr Watkins, in July 2002 that Australia would not be returning to second tier, teaching-only, higher education institutions; and
- (d) congratulates the Federal Minister for his comprehensive and inclusive review of higher education in Australia.

Notice given 24 September 2002

184 **Senator Stott Despoja:** To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes:
 - (i) the commitment of the Government and Mr John Loy, Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA), to a demonstrated store for radioactive waste by 2005,

- (ii) the commitment of the Government and Mr Loy to a second spent fuel reprocessing pathway for spent fuel from the Lucas Heights reactor,
- (iii) the commitment in the Lucas Heights environmental impact statement (EIS), EIS supplementary report and EIS assessment report to a radioactive waste store by 2005,
- (iv) the ARPANSA site licence assessment regarding a potential operating licence at Lucas Heights that, 'A license to operate would not be issued by ARPANSA without there being clear and definite means available for the ultimate disposal of radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel',
- (v) that the recent comments by Mr Loy on the Australian Broadcasting Corporation's *PM* program indicating that the 'new' deadline for a store is now 2025 and that provision for second country reprocessing is no longer required are in direct contradiction to previous commitments, and
- (vi) that it recently passed a second reading amendment that:
 - (A) noted the view of the CEO of ARPANSA that arrangements for taking the spent fuel and turning it into a reasonable waste form need to be absolutely clear before the new reactor at Lucas Heights commences operation, and there needs to be clear progress on siting a store for the waste that returns to Australia, and
 - (B) expressed its opinion that until all matters relating to safety, storage and transportation of nuclear materials associated with the new reactor at Lucas Heights are resolved, no operating licence related to the new reactor at Lucas Heights should be issued by ARPANSA; and
- (b) calls on the CEO of ARPANSA to:
 - (i) reaffirm commitments made to the Australian people as part of the EIS process, and
 - (ii) act in conformity with the Senate's second reading amendment.

Notice given 17 October 2002

215 Senator Tierney: To move—That the Senate—

- (a) recognises that the Federal Coalition Government has increased investment in education each year, with \$2.4 billion being provided for public schools in 2002-03, an increase of 5.7 per cent over the past year and a 52 per cent increase since 1996;
- (b) expresses alarm that New South Wales state government spending on education currently lags \$318 million a year below the Australian national average;
- (c) notes that New South Wales primary schools have the worst student-to-teacher ratios in Australia and some of the largest class sizes in the country;
- (d) further notes that the Vinson report into public education demonstrates the under resourcing of the public education system in New South Wales by the Carr Government; and
- (e) congratulates New South Wales Opposition Leader, John Brogden, who vowed on 24 September 2002 to spend more on public schools and backed the need to reduce class sizes.

Notice given 24 October 2002

- 227 **Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Bartlett):** To move—That there be laid on the table, no later than 4 pm on 19 November 2002:
- (a) all documents relating to the acquisition of the north-east margin search and rescue (SAR) data, including but not limited to the authorisation for acquisition, and any related internal correspondence;
 - (b) briefing documents or briefing notes relating to the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority interest in SAR data, as referenced in Dr Trevor Powell's letter to the authority, dated 18 September 2002;
 - (c) covering letter accompanying the Shell/Woodside Consortium proposal, May 2000;
 - (d) all materials distributed at the Bali 2000 conference attended by Geoscience Australia;
 - (e) outputs leading to the outcome listed in the 2001-02 workplan under section 2, Geoscience for Oceans and Coasts, subsections 2.9, Petroleum and Regional Geology and 2.11 Eastern Region, as 'A geological overview of the east coast basins in order that decisions can be made regarding petroleum exploration opportunities and acreage release; and
 - (f) all documents and materials relating to the outcome and outputs described above, including preliminary discussions for the outcome and outputs, discussions, memorandums, budget materials, notes of phone conversations and e-mails.

Notice given 12 November 2002

- 245 **Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Bartlett):** To move—That there be laid on the table, no later than 2 pm on Thursday, 5 December 2002, all documents associated with the formation, funding and membership of the Foundation for a Sustainable Minerals Industry, including but not limited to: reports, correspondence, e-mail, records of conservation, memos, margin notes and minutes of meetings.

Notice given 13 November 2002

- 258 **Senator O'Brien:** To move—That the Senate—
- (a) notes, with grave concern, the crisis enveloping rural and regional Australia;
 - (b) condemns the Howard Government for its neglect of rural and regional Australians, in particular, its failure to:
 - (i) adequately respond to the growing drought,
 - (ii) provide timely and appropriate assistance to the sugar industry, and
 - (iii) support essential services including health, banking, employment and telecommunications; and
 - (c) calls on the Howard Government to reverse its neglect of rural and regional communities.

Notice given 9 December 2002

- 300 **Senator Tierney:** To move—That the Senate—
- (a) expresses concern about the extreme bushfire danger facing the citizens of New South Wales;

- (b) praises the unstinting and brave work of the voluntary bushfire fighters in combating the fires and protecting and saving property and lives;
- (c) congratulates the Australian Government for its high tech support for the firefighting effort with the provision of air crane fire bombing technology;
- (d) recognises that the current extreme fire conditions have been exacerbated by a build-up of forest fuel resulting from the Carr Australian Labor Party Government's anti-back-burning policies over the past 7 years;
- (e) condemns the Carr Government for ignoring the recommendations of the state parliamentary inquiry into the 2001-02 New South Wales fires brought down 6 months ago; and
- (f) calls on the Carr Government in New South Wales to recognise that south-eastern Australia is the most fire-prone region in the world and to develop more appropriate policies to protect life, property and the environment.

Notice given 18 March 2003

393 **Senator Stott Despoja:** To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes, with concern, the serious hardship facing coffee producers of the developing world as a result of low coffee prices and, in particular, that:
 - (i) many coffee farmers are being forced to abandon their livelihoods and sell their land at a loss,
 - (ii) the financial strain on coffee farming families reduces their capacity to meet their basic needs, including schooling, food and medicines,
 - (iii) a lack of money in coffee-producing communities, together with overburdened health-care systems, threatens the stability of already vulnerable economies, and
 - (iv) intensive farming methods, adopted by reason of financial necessity, seriously damage the natural environment;
- (b) acknowledges the financial support provided by the Government through AusAid to rural development and other assistance for coffee producing nations; and
- (c) requests that the Government provide further political and economic support for:
 - (i) the International Coffee Organisation's Coffee Quality Scheme, which aims to restrict coffee exportation on the basis of quality,
 - (ii) the destruction of lowest quality coffee stocks, and
 - (iii) direct poverty alleviation programs targeted at coffee producing communities.

Notice given 25 March 2003

431 **Senator Stephens:** To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes that:
 - (i) the New South Wales Labor Premier (Mr Bob Carr) has secured an historic third four-year term of government in the New South Wales Parliament,
 - (ii) the re-election of the New South Wales Labor Government is an endorsement of Mr Carr's plan to secure New South Wales' future, and
 - (iii) the people of New South Wales have voted for a government that unequivocally rejects the legitimacy of the unilateral war on Iraq;

- (b) congratulates:
 - (i) Mr Carr and the New South Wales Labor administration for their election campaign, and
 - (ii) Labor candidates and campaign teams for their part in a campaign that has reduced Liberal/National representation to its lowest level in almost two decades; and
- (c) expresses its condolences to the family of Mr Jim Anderson, former Member for Londonderry, following his sudden death on the morning of polling day.

432 **Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Bartlett):** To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes:
 - (i) the announcement on 24 March 2003 by the Queensland State Government that it will legislate to protect the pristine sand dunes of Shelburne Bay on Cape York Peninsula by not renewing two mining leases over the Shelburne Bay dune fields,
 - (ii) that Shelburne Bay is one of the largest and least disturbed areas of active parabolic dunes in the world, and is listed on the National Estate,
 - (iii) that any mining would have involved the removal of two dune systems and the construction of a major port facility on the edge of the Great Barrier Reef, and
 - (iv) that the cancellation of the leases had been called for by the traditional owners, the Wuthathi people, to enable them to have greater access to, and involvement in, this special area of their traditional lands; and
- (b) congratulates the Beattie Government for its sensible decision, and the many conservation, indigenous, political and community groups who have campaigned so long to achieve this outcome.

Notice given 18 August 2003

542 **Senator Mackay:** To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes that:
 - (i) the Special Minister of State (Senator Abetz) has launched a petition in Tasmania calling on the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) to overturn its decision to cancel the program *Behind the News*, and
 - (ii) this decision by the ABC was taken in response to insufficient funding to allow the ABC to deliver its full range of services; and
- (b) given the Government's direct responsibility for the lack of funding, calls on Senator Abetz to more usefully use his ministerial influence to lobby his colleagues, the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts (Senator Alston) and the Prime Minister (Mr Howard), to provide sufficient funding to the ABC to allow the show to be continued.

Notice given 19 August 2003

544 **Senator Ridgeway:** To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes that

- (i) the United States (US) Under Secretary of Commerce, Mr Grant Aldonan, has stated publicly that the US wishes to challenge reference pricing as part of the Free Trade Agreement negotiations with Australia, saying, according to the *Australian Financial Review* of 13 August 2003, 'there is a sense of unfairness in the US' because US consumers paid high prices under a free market while consumers in Australia and elsewhere benefited from low 'reference prices' under schemes like the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme (PBS),
 - (ii) the price of pharmaceuticals and the PBS would increase significantly in Australia if our PBS 'reference pricing scheme' was diminished or abandoned, and
 - (iii) any free trade agreement with Australia must pass the US Congress; and
- (b) calls on the Australian Government to:
- (i) advise the US that it will not agree to change Australia's 'reference pricing' on the PBS and remove the matter from US free trade agreement negotiations, and
 - (ii) bring any free trade agreement to the Parliament for ratification.

Notice given 8 September 2003

566 Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Bartlett): To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes the call to the United Nations Conference on Accelerating Entry-Into-Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) made by prominent Non-Governmental Organisations from around the world, in Vienna on 5 September 2003, including:
- A ban on testing is an essential step towards nuclear disarmament because it helps to block dangerous nuclear competition and new nuclear threats from emerging. However, it must be recognised that technological advances in nuclear weapons research and development mean that a ban on nuclear test explosions by itself cannot prevent qualitative improvements of nuclear arsenals. Efforts to improve nuclear arsenals and to make nuclear weapons more useable in warfare will jeopardise the test-ban and non-proliferation regimes. We call on all states possessing nuclear weapons to halt all qualitative improvements in their nuclear armaments, whether or not these improvements require test explosions;
- (b) supports a comprehensive global ban on nuclear weapon testing;
 - (c) notes that the United States is not attending the CTBT conference in 2003 and is planning the development of new nuclear weapons; and
 - (d) calls on the Government to urge all nations to commit to the CTBT.

569 Senator Brown: To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes:
- (i) the current stand-off between Papua New Guinea's Prime Minister (Mr Somare) and Australia's Minister for Foreign Affairs (Mr Downer) over Australia's aid budget to Papua New Guinea (PNG), and
 - (ii) that there is widespread concern in PNG over Australia's 'boomerang aid', whereby some 80 per cent of Australian aid goes

straight back to consulting companies, construction companies and individuals; and

- (b) calls on:
- (i) Mr Downer to accept PNG's request that Australia conduct its own review of how Australian aid is given and spent, and
 - (ii) the Australian Government to adopt a new relationship with PNG, one that respects PNG as an equal partner and that does not subordinate PNG's interests to Australia's interests.

Notice given 9 September 2003

***570 Chair of the Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade (Senator Ferguson):** To move—That the Foreign Affairs Sub-Committee of the Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade be authorised to hold a public meeting during the sitting of the Senate on Monday, 15 September 2003, from 5.30 pm to 6.30 pm, to take evidence for the committee's inquiry into Australia's relationship with Indonesia.

***571 Senator Allison:** To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes that:
- (i) the recent report *Bipolar disorder: Costs: An analysis of the burden of bipolar disorder and related suicide* commissioned by SANE Australia reveals that one in every six Australians with bipolar disorder commit suicide, a total of 12 per cent of all suicides,
 - (ii) 60 per cent develop a substance abuse problem,
 - (iii) average treatment levels are less than one-quarter of what is considered 'best practice', and
 - (iv) over two-thirds of people with bipolar disorder are likely to be misdiagnosed three times before an accurate diagnosis is made;
- (b) recognises the impact of bipolar disorder on the community, affecting not only the health of those living with it, but also their work, study and ability to maintain relationships and friends; and
- (c) calls upon the Federal Government to:
- (i) move for better training of medical professionals in diagnosing bipolar disorder, and
 - (ii) provide increased community education about this disorder.

***572 Senator Nettle:** To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes:
- (i) the nationally-significant cultural and heritage values contained in the Department of Defence land at Point Nepean in Victoria, and
 - (ii) the recommendation of the Community Reference Group in the draft master plan for the Point Nepean land, commissioned by the Federal Government, that the entire site at Point Nepean remain in public hands as a 'public park managed as a whole';
- (b) condemns the Government for ignoring this recommendation and instead offering a 90-hectare portion of the land for long-term commercial lease by private developers;
- (c) notes that:
- (i) the admission by the Government that the terms of the lease could permit education, recreational, community and tourism uses leaves open the possibility that hotels, shops, jetties and sporting arenas

- could be developed on the land, robbing the general public of the right to access and enjoy the land, and potentially compromising or destroying its nationally-significant heritage and cultural values, and
- (ii) under a long-term leasing arrangement between the Commonwealth and a private developer, the Victorian community will have no say in, or control over, what happens to the 90-hectare parcel of land, and the developer will be able to avoid proper local and state planning and heritage controls; and
- (d) calls on the Federal Government to respect the wishes of the Victorian community by:
- (i) reversing its decision to lease the 90-hectare portion of the site, and
 - (ii) gifting the land to the State Government as a national park, as recommended by the Victorian National Parks Authority and the National Trust of Australia (Victoria).

Orders of the Day relating to Government Documents

- *1 **Queensland Fisheries Joint Authority—Report for 2001-02**
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Murphy—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator Murphy, in continuation, 9 September 2003*).
- *2 **Roads to Recovery Programme—Report for 2002-03**
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Murphy—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator Murphy, in continuation, 9 September 2003*).
- *3 **Defence Housing Authority—Statement of corporate intent, 2003-04**
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Murphy—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator Murphy, in continuation, 9 September 2003*).
- *4 **APEC—Australia's individual action plan 2003**
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Cook—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator Cook, in continuation, 9 September 2003*).

Orders of the Day

- 1 **ABC Amendment (Online and Multichannelling Services) Bill 2001 [2002]—(Senate bill)**
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*3 April 2001*)—(*restored pursuant to resolution of 13 February 2002*).
- 2 **Air Navigation Amendment (Extension of Curfew and Limitation of Aircraft Movements) Bill 1995 [2002]—(Senate bill)**
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*27 March 1995*)—(*restored pursuant to resolution of 13 February 2002*).
- 3 **Anti-Genocide Bill 1999 [2002]—(Senate bill)—(Senator Greig)**
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*5 April 2001*)—(*restored pursuant to resolution of 13 February 2002*).
- 4 **Australian Broadcasting Corporation Amendment Bill 1999 [2002]—(Senate bill)**

- Second reading—Adjourned debate (25 March 1999)—(restored pursuant to resolution of 13 February 2002).
- 5 **Charter of Political Honesty Bill 2000 [2002]**—(*Senate bills*)—(Senator Murray)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (10 October 2000)—(restored pursuant to resolution of 13 February 2002).
- 6 **Constitution Alteration (Appropriations for the Ordinary Annual Services of the Government) 2001 [2002]**—(*Senate bill*)—(Senators Murray and Stott Despoja)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (26 June 2001)—(restored pursuant to resolution of 13 February 2002).
- 7 **Constitution Alteration (Electors' Initiative, Fixed Term Parliaments and Qualification of Members) 2000 [2002]**—(*Senate bill*)—(Senator Murray)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (4 April 2000)—(restored pursuant to resolution of 13 February 2002).
- 8 **Corporate Code of Conduct Bill 2000 [2002]**—(*Senate bill*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (6 September 2000)—(restored pursuant to resolution of 13 February 2002).
- 10 **Parliamentary Approval of Treaties Bill 1995 [2002]**—(*Senate bill*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (31 May 1995)—(restored pursuant to resolution of 13 February 2002).
- 12 **Reconciliation Bill 2001 [2002]**—(*Senate bill*)—(Senator Ridgeway)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (5 April 2001)—(restored pursuant to resolution of 13 February 2002).
- 14 **Public liability insurance premiums**
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Conroy—That the Senate—
(a) expresses its concern about the significant increase in public liability insurance premiums and the effect it is having on the viability of many small businesses and community and sporting organisations;
(b) condemns the Government for its inaction; and
(c) urges the Minister to propose a solution to this pressing issue, as quickly as possible, not just look at the problem (*Senator Ferguson, in continuation, 14 February 2002*).
- 15 **Ministers of State (Post-Retirement Employment Restrictions) Bill 2002**—(*Senate bill*)—(Senator Stott Despoja)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Stott Despoja, in continuation, 13 March 2002*).
- 16 **Lucas Heights reactor—Order for production of documents—Statement by Minister**
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Carr—That the Senate take note of the statement (*Senator Carr, in continuation, 19 March 2002*).
- 17 **Great Barrier Reef Marine Park (Boundary Extension) Amendment Bill 2002**—(*Senate bill*)—(*Leader of the Australian Democrats, Senator Bartlett*)

- Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Calvert, in continuation, 16 May 2002*).
- 18 **Genetic Privacy and Non-discrimination Bill 1998 [2002]**—(*Senate bill*)—(*Senator Stott Despoja*)
 Second reading—Adjourned debate (*5 October 2000*)—(*restored pursuant to resolution of 14 May 2002*).
- 19 **Patents Amendment Bill 1996 [2002]**—(*Senate bill*)—(*Senator Stott Despoja*)
 Second reading—Adjourned debate (*27 June 1996*)—(*restored pursuant to resolution of 14 May 2002*).
- 20 **Republic (Consultation of the People) Bill 2001 [2002]**—(*Senate bill*)—(*Senator Stott Despoja*)
 Second reading—Adjourned debate (*26 September 2001*)—(*restored pursuant to resolution of 14 May 2002*).
- 21 **Australian Broadcasting Corporation (Scrutiny of Board Appointments) Amendment Bill 2002**—(*Senate bill*)
 Second reading—Adjourned debate (*15 May 2002*).
- 22 **Workplace Relations Amendment (Paid Maternity Leave) Bill 2002**—(*Senate bill*)—(*Senator Stott Despoja*)
 Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Stott Despoja, in continuation, 16 May 2002*).
- 24 **Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry (Forest Practices) Bill 2002**—(*Senate bill*)—(*Senator Brown*)
 Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Brown, in continuation, 20 June 2002*).
- 25 **Family Law Amendment (Joint Residency) Bill 2002**—(*Senate bill*)—(*Senator Harris*)
 Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Harris, in continuation, 20 June 2002*).
- 26 **ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Organisation (AIPO)—Report of the Australian parliamentary delegation to the 22nd AIPO General Assembly, Thailand, 2 to 5 September 2001; Visits and briefings, Bangkok, 6 to 8 September 2001; and Bi-lateral visit to Singapore, 9 to 13 September 2001**
 Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Calvert—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator Calvert, in continuation, 27 June 2002*).
- 27 **Family and Community Services—Family tax benefits**
 Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Ludwig—That the Senate—
- (a) condemns the Howard Government's decision to strip, without warning, the tax returns of Australian families who have been overpaid family payments as callous and unfair to parents trying to survive under increasing financial pressures;
 - (b) notes that this is not consistent with the statement of the Minister for Family and Community Services (Senator Vanstone) in July 2001 in which she assured families that, 'The Government has also decided that it would be easier for any family who still had an excess payment to have it recovered by adjusting their future payments, rather than taking it from

their tax refund. This is because people may have earmarked their refund for use for specific things’;

- (c) considers that the Government’s 2-year-old family payments system is deeply flawed, given that it delivered average debts of \$850 to 650 000 Australian families in the 2001-02 financial year and continues to punish families who play by the rules; and
- (d) condemns the Howard Government and its contemptible attack on Australian families (*Senator Tierney, in continuation, 22 August 2002*).

28 **Health—Medicare—Bulk billing**

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Evans—That the Senate—

- (a) notes that:
 - (i) since the election of the Howard Government, the rate of bulk billing by general practitioners (GPs) has dropped from 80.6 per cent to 74.5 per cent, and that the average patient cost to see a GP who does not bulk bill has gone up 41.8 per cent to nearly \$12, and
 - (ii) in every year from the commencement of Medicare in 1984 through to 1996, bulk billing rates for GPs increased, but that, in every year since the election of the Howard Government, bulk billing rates have decreased;
- (b) recognises that the unavailability of bulk billing hurts those Australians who are least able to afford the rising costs of health care and those who are at greatest risk of preventable illness and disease;
- (c) condemns the Howard Government’s failure to take responsibility for declining rates of bulk billing; and
- (d) calls on the Minister for Health and Ageing (Senator Patterson) to release publicly the June 2002 quarter bulk billing figures so that the true extent of the problem is made known (*Senator Moore, in continuation, 29 August 2002*).

29 **Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety (Licence Charges) Amendment Bill 2002—Document**

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Ludwig—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator Ludwig, in continuation, 16 September 2002*).

30 **Kyoto Protocol (Ratification) Bill 2002—(Senate bill)—(Senator Brown)**

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Brown, in continuation, 19 September 2002*).

31 **Communications—Regional telecommunication services—Inquiry**

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Mackay—That the Senate—

- (a) condemns the Howard Government for establishing an inquiry into regional telecommunications services, the Estens inquiry, which is chaired by a member of the National Party and friend of the Deputy Prime Minister, and has a former National Party MP as one of its members;
- (b) condemns the Government’s decisions that the inquiry will hold no public hearings and must report within little more than 2 months of its commencement; and
- (c) calls on the Government to address all issues associated with Telstra’s performance, including rising prices, deteriorating service standards and

inadequate broadband provision (*Senator Tierney in continuation, 19 September 2002*).

32 Trade Practices Amendment (Public Liability Insurance) Bill 2002 [No. 2]—(Senate bill)—(Senator Conroy)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Conroy, in continuation, 23 September 2002*).

33 Corporations Amendment (Improving Corporate Governance) Bill 2002 [No. 2]—(Senate bill)—(Senator Conroy)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Conroy, in continuation, 23 September 2002*).

34 Trade Practices Amendment (Credit Card Reform) Bill 2002 [No. 2]—(Senate bill)—(Senator Conroy)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Conroy, in continuation, 23 September 2002*).

35 Superannuation

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Sherry—That the Senate notes the Howard Government's third term failures on superannuation, including:

- (a) the failure to provide for a contributions tax cut for all Australians who pay it, rather than a tax cut only to those earning more than \$90 500 a year;
- (b) the failure to adequately compensate victims of superannuation theft or fraud;
- (c) the failure to accurately assess the administrative burden on small business of the Government's third attempt at superannuation choice and deregulation;
- (d) the failure to support strong consumer protections for superannuation fund members through capping ongoing fees and banning entry and exit fees;
- (e) the failure to provide consumers with a meaningful, comprehensive and comprehensible regime for fee disclosure; and
- (f) the failure to cover unpaid superannuation contributions in the case of corporate collapse as part of a workers' entitlements scheme (*Senator Ferguson, in continuation, 26 September 2002*).

38 Parliament House security—Statement by President

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Ray—That the Senate take note of the statement (*Senator Ray, in continuation, 11 November 2002*).

39 Convention on Climate Change (Implementation) Bill 1999 [2002]—(Senate bill)—(Senator Brown)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*2 September 1999*)—(*restored pursuant to resolution of 12 November 2002*).

40 Customs Amendment (Anti-Radioactive Waste Storage Dump) Bill 1999 [2002]—(Senate bill)—(Senator Brown)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*20 October 1999*)—(*restored pursuant to resolution of 12 November 2002*).

41 Human Rights (Mandatory Sentencing for Property Offences) Bill 2000 [2002]—(Senate bill)—(Senator Brown)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (6 September 2000)—(*restored pursuant to resolution of 12 November 2002*).

- 42 **Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Amendment (Invasive Species) Bill 2002**—(*Senate bill*)—(*Leader of the Australian Democrats, Senator Bartlett*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Bartlett, in continuation, 19 November 2002*).

- 43 **Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry (Bali Bombings) Bill 2002**—(*Senate bill*)—(*Senator Brown*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Brown, in continuation, 4 December 2002*).

- 44 **Health—Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme—Order for Production of Documents—Statement by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer (Senator Ian Campbell)**

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Nettle—That the Senate take note of the statement (*Senator Nettle, in continuation, 4 December 2002*).

- 45 **Trade—Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme—Order for Production of Documents—Statement by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer (Senator Ian Campbell)**

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Nettle—That the Senate take note of the statement (*Senator Nettle, in continuation, 4 December 2002*).

- 46 **Public Interest Disclosure (Protection of Whistleblowers) Bill 2002**—(*Senate bill*)—(*Senator Murray*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Murray, in continuation, 11 December 2002*).

- 47 **Uranium Mining in or near Australian World Heritage Properties (Prohibition) Bill 1998 [2002]**—(*Senate bill*)—(*Senator Allison*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (28 May 1998)—(*restored pursuant to resolution of 11 December 2002*).

- 48 **Environment—National radioactive waste repository**

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Carr—That the Senate condemns the Government for:

- (a) its failure to respect the rights of the people of South Australia in its consultation process over the location of the planned low-level radioactive waste repository;
- (b) its decision to replace effective and meaningful consultation and discussion with a \$300 000 propaganda campaign, designed to sway the opinions of South Australians towards locating the repository in that state, in the absence of genuine efforts to provide accurate and exhaustive information on the suitability of the selected site, close to Woomera; and
- (c) its lack of a thorough examination of the environmental impact of this plan, in particular the possible dangers caused by the site's proximity to the Woomera rocket range, and the serious concerns of both the Department of Defence and private contractors on this issue (*Senator Buckland, in continuation, 6 February 2003*).

- 49 **Immigration—East Timorese asylum seekers—Document**

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Bartlett)—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator Crossin, in continuation, 3 March 2003*).

- 50 **Great Barrier Reef Marine Park (Protecting the Great Barrier Reef from Oil Drilling and Exploration) Amendment Bill 2003 [No. 2]**—(*Senate bill*)—(*Senator McLucas and the Leader of the Australian Democrats, Senator Bartlett*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*6 March 2003*).

- 52 **Islamic Republic of Iran and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan—Report of the Australian parliamentary delegation, October to November 2002**

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Ferris—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator Ferris, in continuation, 6 March 2003*).

- 53 **Taxation—Small business**

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Conroy—That the Senate—

- (a) calls on the Government to take action to crack down on late payments by big business and government customers to their small business suppliers; and
- (b) notes that:
 - (i) late payments by big businesses are a major issue for small businesses as they create cash flow problems,
 - (ii) this comes on top of the cumbersome administrative arrangements of the new tax system, and
 - (iii) the problems faced by small business are being ignored by the Howard Government—(*adjourned, 20 March 2003*).

- 54 **Environment—Rehabilitation of former nuclear test sites at Emu and Maralinga (Australia)—Ministerial statement**

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Carr—That the Senate take note of the statement (*Senator Chapman, in continuation, 25 March 2003*).

- 55 **Building and Construction Industry—Royal Commission—Ministerial statement and documents**

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Sherry—That the Senate take note of the documents (*Senator Santoro, in continuation, 26 March 2003*).

- 56 **Defence Amendment (Parliamentary approval for Australian involvement in overseas conflicts) Bill 2003**—(*Senate bill*)—(*Leader of the Australian Democrats, Senator Bartlett, and Senator Stott Despoja*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Bartlett, in continuation, 27 March 2003*).

- 57 **Electoral Amendment (Political Honesty) Bill 2003**—(*Senate bill*)—(*Senator Murray*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Murray, in continuation, 27 March 2003*).

- 58 **Sexuality Anti-Vilification Bill 2003**—(*Senate bill*)—(*Senator Greig*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Greig, in continuation, 27 March 2003*).

- 59 **Governor-General**

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate (Senator Faulkner)—That the Senate—

- (a) notes with concern that:
- (i) the Government has failed to respond to evidence of sexual abuse of children in our society and within our public institutions,
 - (ii) the independent report of the Diocesan Board of Inquiry found that Dr Peter Hollingworth, while occupying a position of public trust as Archbishop of Brisbane, allowed a priest to remain in the ministry after an admission of sexual abuse, and the Board of Inquiry found this decision to be ‘untenable’,
 - (iii) the Governor-General has admitted that he made a serious error in doing so,
 - (iv) Dr Peter Hollingworth, through his actions while in the Office of Governor-General, in particular his interview on ‘Australian Story’ and his apparent ‘reconstruction’ of evidence before the Diocesan Board of Inquiry, has shown himself not to be a person suitable to hold the Office of Governor-General,
 - (v) members of the House of Representatives, senators, and premiers and members of state parliaments have called upon the Governor-General to resign, or failing that, to be dismissed by the Prime Minister,
 - (vi) the Governor-General is now no longer able to fulfil his symbolic role as a figure of unity for the Australian people,
 - (vii) the Governor-General is now no longer able to exercise the constitutional powers of the Office in a manner that will be seen as impartial and non-partisan,
 - (viii) the Governor-General’s action in standing aside until the current Victorian Supreme Court action is resolved, does not address any of the issues surrounding his behaviour as Archbishop of Brisbane, and is therefore inadequate,
 - (ix) the Governor-General has failed to resign and the Prime Minister has failed to advise the Queen of Australia to dismiss him, and
 - (x) the Australian Constitution fails to set out any criteria for the dismissal of a Governor-General or a fair process by which this can be achieved; and
- (b) urges:
- (i) the Prime Minister to establish a Royal Commission into child sexual abuse in Australia, and
 - (ii) the Governor-General to immediately resign or, if he does not do so, the Prime Minister to advise the Queen of Australia to terminate the Commission of the Governor-General—(Senator Ludwig, in continuation, 13 May 2003).

And on the amendment moved by Senator Murphy—Omit all words after “That”, substitute “the Senate—

- (a) notes with concern that:
- (i) Dr Peter Hollingworth, while in the Office of Governor-General, gave in an interview on ‘Australian Story’, a version of events which have been found by the diocesan Board of Inquiry to be untrue, and

- (ii) the same Board of Inquiry found that they could not accept Dr Hollingworth had a belief that the child sexual abuse was an isolated incident and that his handling of the matters was untenable;
- (b) finds that:
 - (i) the circumstances that have developed around the Office of Governor-General are doing irreparable damage to the Office and must be resolved,
 - (ii) the conclusions of the report of the Anglican Church clearly demonstrates that Dr Hollingworth failed in his duty as Archbishop,
 - (iii) such failing in a position of significant public trust renders Dr Hollingworth an unsuitable person to fill the Office of Governor-General,
 - (iv) the Governor-General's action in standing aside until the current Victorian Supreme Court action is resolved does not address any of the issues surrounding his behaviour as Archbishop of Brisbane, and is therefore inadequate,
 - (v) the Governor-General is now no longer able to fulfil his symbolic role as a figure of unity for the Australian people, and
 - (vi) the Governor-General is now no longer able to exercise the constitutional powers of the Office in a manner that will be seen as impartial and non-partisan; and, therefore, in light of these unacceptable circumstances
- (c) urges:
 - (i) the Governor-General to immediately resign or, if he does not do so, the Prime Minister to advise the Queen of Australia to terminate the Commission of Governor-General, and
 - (ii) the Prime Minister to establish a Royal Commission into child sexual abuse in Australia.”—(*Senator Collins, in continuation, 14 May 2003*).

60 Textbook Subsidy Bill 2003—(Senate bill)—(Senator Stott Despoja)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Stott Despoja, in continuation, 18 June 2003*).

61 Health—Medicare—Bulk billing

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator McLucas—That the Senate—

- (a) condemns the most damaging effects of the Government's proposed reforms to Medicare, which will create a user-pays, two-tiered health system in Australia and dismantle the universality of Medicare;
- (b) acknowledges that the first of the damaging effects of the Government's reform package is to cause bulk-billing rates to decline further, and that these reforms do nothing to encourage doctors to bulk bill any Australians other than pensioners and concession cardholders but make it clear that the Government considers bulk billing to be a privilege that accrues only to a subset of Australians, not an entitlement that all Australians have as a result of the Medicare charge;
- (c) notes that the second most damaging effect of the Government's proposed changes to Medicare is the facilitation and encouragement of higher and higher co-payments to be charged by medical practitioners, and that a central plank of the Government's package is the facilitation of co-payments to be charged by doctors who currently bulk bill Australian

families, as well as to make it easier for doctors who currently charge a co-payment to increase the amount of this co-payment; and

- (d) notes, with concern, that the Government seeks to allow private health funds to offer insurance for out-of-pocket expenses in excess of \$1 000, a measure which, if implemented, would inflate health insurance premiums as well as be a real step towards a user-pays system in Australia where people who can afford co-payments and insurance premiums will be treated when they are sick, whereas those individuals and families on lower incomes will be forced to go without medical assistance—*(Senator Eggleston, in continuation, 19 June 2003)*

62 Freedom of Information Amendment (Open Government) Bill 2003—(Senate bill)—(Senator Murray)

Second reading—Adjourned debate *(Senator Murray, in continuation, 25 June 2003)*.

63 Looking to the Future: A review of Commonwealth fisheries policy—Ministerial statement

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator O'Brien—That the Senate take note of the statement *(adjourned, Senator McGauran, 25 June 2002)*.

64 Social Security Amendment (Supporting Young Carers) Bill 2003—(Senate bill)—(Senator Lees)

Second reading—Adjourned debate *(Senator Lees, in continuation, 26 June 2003)*.

65 National Animal Welfare Bill 2003—(Senate bill)—(Leader of the Australian Democrats, Senator Bartlett)

Second reading—Adjourned debate *(Senator Bartlett, in continuation, 11 August 2003)*.

66 Transport—Ethanol—Manildra Group

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator O'Brien—That the Senate condemns the Prime Minister (Mr Howard) for his ongoing pattern of deceit in relation to his dealings with the chair of the Manildra Group, Mr Dick Honan, prior to a Cabinet decision that delivers direct financial benefits to that company—*(Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation (Senator Ian Macdonald), in continuation, 14 August 2003)*

BUSINESS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION

Next day of sitting (11 September 2003)

Business of the Senate—Orders of the Day

1 Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee

Report to be presented on the provisions of the Migration Legislation Amendment (Identification and Authentication) Bill 2003. *(Referred pursuant to Selection of Bills Committee report.)*

2 Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee

Report to be presented on the provisions of the Non-Proliferation Legislation Amendment Bill 2003. *(Referred pursuant to Selection of Bills Committee report.)*

Committee Reports and Government Responses and Auditor-General's Reports—Notice of Motion

Notice given 26 June 2002

1 **Chair of the Standing Committee of Senators' Interests (Senator Denman):**

To move—That the following amendments to the resolutions relating to senators' interests and declaration of gifts to the Senate and the Parliament be agreed to:

Resolution 1—Registration of senators' interests

Paragraph (1), omit—

“Within 14 sitting days after the adoption of this resolution by the Senate and 28 days of making and subscribing an oath or affirmation of allegiance as a senator”,

substitute—

“Within:

- (a) 28 days after the first meeting of the Senate after 1 July first occurring after a general election; and
- (b) 28 days after the first meeting of the Senate after a simultaneous dissolution of the Senate and the House of Representatives; and
- (c) 28 days after making and subscribing an oath or affirmation of allegiance as a senator for a Territory or appointed or chosen to fill a vacancy in the Senate”.

Resolution 3—Registrable interests

Paragraph (i), omit “\$5,000”, substitute “\$10,000”.

Paragraphs (k), (l) and (m), omit “\$500” wherever occurring, substitute “\$1,000”; omit “\$200” wherever occurring, substitute “\$500”.

Resolution 4—Register and Registrar of Senators' Interests

Paragraph (3), omit “the commencement of each Parliament”, substitute “receipt of statement of registrable interests in accordance with resolution 1(1)”.

[Consequential on amendment to paragraph 1(1)]

Resolution 5—Declaration of interest in debate and other proceedings

To be omitted.

Resolution relating to declaration of gifts to the Senate and the Parliament

Paragraph (1)(a), omit “practical”, substitute “practicable”.

Sub-paragraph (ba), omit “\$500”, substitute “\$1,000”; omit “\$200” substitute “\$500”.

Sub-paragraph (d), line 2, omit “is to”, substitute “may”.

After sub-paragraph (h), insert—

- (i) When a senator who is using or displaying a gift ceases to be a senator, the senator may retain the gift:

- (i) if its value does not exceed the stated valuation limits of \$1,000 for a gift received from an official government source, or \$500 from a private person or non-government body; or
 - (ii) if the senator elects to pay the difference between the stated valuation limit and the value of the gift, as obtained from an accredited valuer selected from the list issued by the Committee for Taxation Incentives for the Arts. The Department of the Senate will be responsible for any costs incurred in obtaining the valuation.
- (j) If the senator does not retain the gift in accordance with paragraph (i), the senator must return the gift to the registrar, who shall:
- (i) dispose of it in accordance with instructions from the Committee of Senators' Interests, as set out in paragraph 1(d) of this resolution; or
 - (ii) arrange its donation to a nominated non-profit organisation or charity, at the discretion of the senator who has returned the gift and the Committee of Senators' Interests.
- (k) Any senator subject to paragraph (j) must formally acknowledge relinquishment of the senator's claim to ownership of any surrendered gifts.

General Business—Notice of Motion

Notice given 9 September 2003

- *573 **Senator Brown:** To move—That the Senate calls on the Government to ensure that the proposed Barrow Island gas development not proceed if it:
- (a) threatens endangered species or their habits; and
 - (b) has a negative environmental impact on the Barrow Island marine and land ecosystems.

On 15 September 2003

Business of the Senate—Notice of Motion

Notice given 24 June 2003

- 1 **Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Bartlett):** To move—That the Migration Amendment Regulations 2003 (No. 1), as contained in Statutory Rules 2003 No. 57 and made under the *Migration Act 1958*, be disallowed.

Three sitting days remain for resolving.**

** *Indicates sitting days remaining, including today, within which the motion must be disposed of or the Regulations will be deemed to have been disallowed.*

Business of the Senate—Orders of the Day

1 **Economics Legislation Committee**

Report to be presented on the provisions of the ACIS Administration Amendment Bill 2003 and the Customs Tariff Amendment (ACIS) Bill 2003. (*Referred pursuant to Selection of Bills Committee report.*)

2 **Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts Legislation Committee**

Report to be presented on the Communications Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2003. (*Referred pursuant to Selection of Bills Committee report.*)

Government Business—Orders of the Day

- 1 **Communications Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2003**—(*Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Moore, 19 August 2003*).
- *2 **ACIS Administration Amendment Bill 2003**
Customs Tariff Amendment (ACIS) Bill 2003—(*Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Mackay, 9 September 2003*).

On 16 September 2003

Business of the Senate—Orders of the Day

- 1 **Legal and Constitutional References Committee**
Report to be presented on progress towards national reconciliation.
- 2 **Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee**
Report to be presented on an examination of the Government's foreign and trade policy strategy.
- 3 **Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts References Committee**
Report to be presented on the role of libraries as providers of public information in the online environment.
- 4 **Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts References Committee**
Report to be presented on environmental performance at the Ranger, Jabiluka, Beverley and Honeymoon uranium operations.
- *5 **Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**
Report to be presented on annual reports tabled by 30 April 2003.
- 6 **Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**
Report to be presented on the provisions of the Aviation Transport Security Bill 2003 and the Aviation Transport Security (Consequential Amendments and Transitional Provisions) Bill 2003. (*Referred upon the introduction of the bill in the House of Representatives pursuant to Selection of Bills Committee report.*)

On 18 September 2003

Business of the Senate—Orders of the Day

- 1 **Finance and Public Administration References Committee**
Report to be presented on recruitment and training in the Australian Public Service.
- 2 **Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee**
Report to be presented on the provisions of the Age Discrimination Bill 2003. (*Referred pursuant to Selection of Bills Committee report.*)

On 3 October 2003

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

1 Regulations and Ordinances—Standing Committee

Report to be presented on the provisions of the Legislative Instruments Bill 2003 and the Legislative Instruments (Transitional Provisions and Consequential Amendments) Bill 2003.

Government Business—Order of the Day

*1 Legislative Instruments Bill 2003

Legislative Instruments (Transitional Provisions and Consequential Amendments) Bill 2003—(*Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Mackay, 9 September 2003*).

On 7 October 2003

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

1 Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts Legislation Committee

Report to be presented on the Plastic Bag Levy (Assessment and Collection) Bill 2002 [No. 2] and the Plastic Bag (Minimisation of Usage) Education Fund Bill 2002 [No. 2]. (*Referred pursuant to Selection of Bills Committee report.*)

General Business—Orders of the Day

36 Plastic Bag (Minimisation of Usage) Education Fund Bill 2002 [No. 2]—(*Senate bill*)—(*Senator Brown*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Brown, in continuation, 21 October 2002*).

37 Plastic Bag Levy (Assessment and Collection) Bill 2002 [No. 2]—(*Senate bill*)—(*Senator Brown*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Brown, in continuation, 21 October 2002*).

Six sitting days after today (7 October 2003)

Business of the Senate—Notice of Motion

Notice given 9 September 2003

*1 **Senator Sherry:** To move—That the Migration Amendment Regulations 2003 (No. 6), as contained in Statutory Rules 2003 No. 224 and made under the *Migration Act 1958*, be disallowed.

Fifteen sitting days remain for resolving.**

** *Indicates sitting days remaining, including today, within which the motion must be disposed of or the Regulations will be deemed to have been disallowed.*

On 8 October 2003

Business of the Senate—Orders of the Day

1 **Finance and Public Administration References Committee**

Report to be presented on staff employed under the *Members of Parliament (Staff) Act 1984*.

2 **Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee**

Report to be presented on forestry plantations.

On 13 October 2003

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

1 **Employment, Workplace Relations and Education Legislation Committee**

Report to be presented on the Workplace Relations Amendment (Compliance with Court and Tribunal Orders) Bill 2003 and the provisions of the Workplace Relations Amendment (Codifying Contempt Offences) Bill 2003. (*Referred pursuant to Selection of Bills Committee report.*)

Government Business—Orders of the Day

1 **Workplace Relations Amendment (Compliance with Court and Tribunal Orders) Bill 2003**—(*Minister for Health and Ageing, Senator Patterson*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Mackay, 14 August 2003*).

2 **Workplace Relations Amendment (Codifying Contempt Offences) Bill 2003**—(*Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts, Senator Alston*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Mackay, 20 August 2003*).

On 14 October 2003

General Business—Notice of Motion

Notice given 15 May 2003

- 466 **Senator Lees:** To move—That the following bill be introduced: A Bill for an Act to enhance the protection of biodiversity on private land, and for related purposes. ***Protection of Biodiversity on Private Land Bill 2003.***

On 15 October 2003

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

1 **Employment, Workplace Relations and Education References Committee**

Report to be presented on the refusal of the Government to respond to the order of the Senate of 21 August 2002 for the production of documents relating to financial information concerning higher education institutions.

Twelve sitting days after today (16 October 2003)

Business of the Senate—Notice of Motion

Notice given 21 August 2003

- 1 **Chairman of the Standing Committee on Regulations and Ordinances (Senator Tchen):** To move—That the Iraq (Reconstruction and Repeal of Sanctions) Regulations 2003, as contained in Statutory Rules 2003 No. 97 and made under the *Customs Act 1901*, the *Air Navigation Act 1920*, the *Charter of the United Nations Act 1945* and the *Migration Act 1958*, be disallowed.

Thirteen sitting days remain for resolving.**

** *Indicates sitting days remaining, including today, within which the motion must be disposed of or the Regulations will be deemed to have been disallowed.*

On 16 October 2003

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

- 1 **Economics Legislation Committee**

Report to be presented on the Late Payment of Commercial Debts (Interest) Bill 2003. (*Referred pursuant to Selection of Bills Committee report.*)

General Business—Order of the Day

- 51 **Late Payment of Commercial Debts (Interest) Bill 2003—(Senate bill)—**
(*Senator Conroy*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Conroy, in continuation, 6 March 2003*).

On 28 October 2003

Business of the Senate—Orders of the Day

- 1 **Employment, Workplace Relations and Education References Committee**

Report to be presented on labour market skills requirements.

- 2 **Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts Legislation Committee**

Report to be presented on the provisions of the Fuel Quality Standards Amendment Bill 2003. (*Referred pursuant to Selection of Bills Committee report.*)

On 30 October 2003

Business of the Senate—Orders of the Day

- 1 **Employment, Workplace Relations and Education References Committee**

Report to be presented on proposed budget changes to higher education.

- 2 **Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts Legislation Committee**

Report to be presented on the provisions of the Telstra (Transition to Full Private Ownership) Bill 2003. (*Referred pursuant to Selection of Bills Committee report.*)

- 3 **Medicare—Select Committee**

Report to be presented.

4 Medicare—Select Committee

Report to be presented on the Health Legislation Amendment (Medicare and Private Health Insurance) Bill 2003.

***5 Legal and Constitutional References Committee**

Report to be presented on the State Elections (One Vote, One Value) Bill 2001 [2002].

Government Business—Orders of the Day

1 Health Legislation Amendment (Medicare and Private Health Insurance) Bill 2003—(Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Mackay, 17 June 2003*).

2 Telstra (Transition to Full Private Ownership) Bill 2003—(Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, Senator Troeth)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Mackay, 21 August 2003*).

General Business—Order of the Day

13 State Elections (One Vote, One Value) Bill 2001 [2002]—(Senate bill)

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Murray—That this bill be now read a second time.

And on the amendment moved by Leader of the Opposition in the Senate (Senator Faulkner)—Omit all words after “That”, substitute “the bill be referred to the Legal and Constitutional References Committee for inquiry and report by 30 October 2003”—(Senator Murray, in continuation, 21 August 2003)—(restored pursuant to resolution of 13 February 2002).

On 3 November 2003

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

1 Ministerial Discretion in Migration Matters—Select Committee

Report to be presented.

On 4 November 2003

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

1 Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee

Report to be presented on the performance of government agencies in the assessment and dissemination of security threats in South East Asia in the period 11 September 2001 to 12 October 2002.

On 25 November 2003

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

1 Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts References Committee

Report to be presented on the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Amendment (Invasive Species) Bill 2002. (*Referred pursuant to Selection of Bills Committee report.*)

On 27 November 2003

Business of the Senate—Orders of the Day

1 **Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee**

Report to be presented on issues involved in the negotiation of the General Agreement on Trade in Services in the Doha Development Round.

2 **Community Affairs References Committee**

Report to be presented on poverty and financial hardship.

On 2 December 2003

Business of the Senate—Orders of the Day

1 **ASIO, ASIS and DSD—Joint Statutory Committee**

Report to be presented on intelligence information received by Australia's intelligence services in relation to weapons of mass destruction.

2 **Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts References Committee**

Report to be presented on the Australian telecommunications network.

General Business—Notice of Motion

Notice given 15 May 2003

- 467 **Senator Lees:** To move—That the following bill be introduced: A Bill for an Act to encourage a stronger civic culture in Australia, and for related purposes. *Encouraging Communities Bill 2003.*

On 3 December 2003

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

1 **Community Affairs References Committee**

Report to be presented on children in institutional care.

On 4 December 2003

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

1 **Economics References Committee**

Report to be presented on whether the *Trade Practices Act 1974* adequately protects small business.

By the last sitting day in 2003 (4 December 2003)

Business of the Senate—Orders of the Day

- 1 **Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee**
Report to be presented on rural water resource usage.
- 2 **Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**
Report to be presented on the administration of the Civil Aviation Safety Authority.
- 3 **Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**
Report to be presented on the import risk assessment on New Zealand apples.
- 4 **Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**
Report to be presented on the administration of AusSAR in relation to the search for the *Margaret J.*

On the first sitting day in 2004

Business of the Senate—Notice of Motion

Notice given 25 June 2003

- 1 **Senator Tierney:** To move—That the following matter be referred to the Employment, Workplace Relations and Education References Committee for inquiry and report by the last sitting day in June 2004:
Parents as educators in the early childhood years, with particular reference to:
 - (a) the extent to which parenting skills and family support are factors in reducing educational and social risks of children in the 3 years and under age group;
 - (b) whether current patterns of parental involvement in community and school-based programs are adequate to respond to the challenge of assisting children with early learning and social behaviour problems;
 - (c) the current state and territory provisions and programs, whether based on pre-schools, schools, play groups or day-care centres etc, established to assist parents with early childhood learning support;
 - (d) best practice in home to school transition programs for children, and an assessment as to whether they can be adapted for national implementation; and
 - (e) the most appropriate role for the Commonwealth in supporting national programs for raising parental consciousness and levels of knowledge and competence in relation to the early educational, social and emotional and health needs of children.

On 3 March 2004

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

- 1 **Legal and Constitutional References Committee**
Report to be presented on the capacity of current legal aid and access to justice arrangements to meet the community need for legal assistance.

By the last sitting day in March 2004

Business of the Senate—Orders of the Day

1 **Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts References Committee**

Report to be presented on competition in broadband services.

2 **Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts References Committee**

Report to be presented on the regulation, control and management of invasive species.

By the first sitting day of the 2004 winter session

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

1 **Community Affairs References Committee**

Report to be presented on Hepatitis C in Australia.

By the last sitting day in June 2004

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

1 **Economics References Committee**

Report to be presented on the structure and distributive effects of the Australian taxation system.

On the next day of sitting after the government fully complies with the order for the production of documents relating to a proposed excise and production subsidy on ethanol made on 16 October 2002

Government Business—Order of the Day

1 **Customs Tariff Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2003**

Excise Tariff Amendment Bill (No. 1) 2003—(*Special Minister of State, Senator Abetz*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*12 August 2003*).

BILLS REFERRED TO COMMITTEES

Bills currently referred†

Communications Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2003‡

Referred to the Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts Legislation Committee (*referred 20 August 2003; reporting date varied 9 September 2003; reporting date: 15 September 2003*).

Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Amendment (Invasive Species) Bill 2002‡

Referred to the Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts References Committee (*referred 26 March 2003; order varied 26 June 2003; reporting date: 25 November 2003*).

Health Legislation Amendment (Medicare and Private Health Insurance) Bill 2003

Referred to the Select Committee on Medicare (*referred 19 June 2003; reporting date varied 21 August 2003; reporting date: 30 October 2003*).

Late Payment of Commercial Debts (Interest) Bill 2003‡

Referred to the Economics Legislation Committee (*referred 19 March 2003; reporting date varied 11 August and 21 August 2003; reporting date: 16 October 2003*).

Plastic Bag Levy (Assessment and Collection) Bill 2002 [No. 2]‡

Plastic Bag (Minimisation of Usage) Education Fund Bill 2002 [No. 2]‡

Referred to the Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts Legislation Committee (*referred 5 March 2003; reporting date: 7 October 2003*).

State Elections (One Vote, One Value) Bill 2001 [2002]

Referred to the Legal and Constitutional References Committee (*referred 9 September 2003; reporting date: 30 October 2003*).

Workplace Relations Amendment (Compliance with Court and Tribunal Orders) Bill 2003‡

Referred to the Employment, Workplace Relations and Education Legislation Committee (*referred 20 August 2003; reporting date: 13 October 2003*).

Provisions of bills currently referred†

ACIS Administration Amendment Bill 2003‡

Customs Tariff Amendment (ACIS) Bill 2003‡

Referred to the Economics Legislation Committee (*referred 13 August 2003; reporting date: 15 September 2003*).

Age Discrimination Bill 2003‡

Referred to the Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee (*referred 13 August 2003; reporting date: 18 September 2003*).

Aviation Transport Security Bill 2003‡

Aviation Transport Security (Consequential Amendments and Transitional Provisions) Bill 2003‡

Referred to the Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee (*referred upon the introduction of the bills in the House of Representatives pursuant to the Selection of Bills Committee report no. 4, 26 March 2003; bills introduced 27 March 2003; reporting date varied 14 May, 16 and 25 June, 14 August and 9 September 2003; reporting date: 16 September 2003*).

Fuel Quality Standards Amendment Bill 2003‡

Referred to the Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts Legislation Committee (*referred 20 August 2003; reporting date: 28 October 2003*).

Legislative Instruments Bill 2003

Legislative Instruments (Transitional Provisions and Consequential Amendments) Bill 2003

Referred to the Standing Committee on Regulations and Ordinances (*referred 13 August 2003; reporting date: 3 October 2003*).

Migration Legislation Amendment (Identification and Authentication) Bill 2003‡

Referred to the Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee (*referred 20 August 2003; reporting date: 11 September 2003*).

Non-Proliferation Legislation Amendment Bill 2003‡

Referred to the Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee (*referred 20 August 2003; reporting date: 11 September 2003*).

Taxation Laws Amendment Bill (No. 7) 2003‡

Referred to the Economics Legislation Committee (*referred 13 August 2003; reporting date varied 8 September 2003; reporting date: 10 September 2003*).

Telstra (Transition to Full Private Ownership) Bill 2003‡

Referred to the Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts Legislation Committee (*referred 13 August 2003; reporting date: 30 October 2003*).

Workplace Relations Amendment (Codifying Contempt Offences) Bill 2003‡

Referred to the Employment, Workplace Relations and Education Legislation Committee (*referred 20 August 2003; reporting date: 13 October 2003*).

†Further information about the progress of these bills may be found in the Department of the Senate's Bills to Committees Update.

‡Pursuant to adoption of report of Selection of Bills Committee.

BILLS DISCHARGED, LAID ASIDE OR NEGATIVED

Government Bills

Family and Community Services Legislation Amendment (Australians Working Together and other 2001 Budget Measures) Bill 2002

Redundant order relating to the bill discharged from *Notice Paper*, 12 December 2002.

Family and Community Services Legislation Amendment (Disability Reform) Bill (No. 2) 2002

Second reading negatived, 19 November 2002.

Family and Community Services Legislation Amendment (Disability Reform) Bill (No. 2) 2002 [No. 2]

Second reading negatived, 24 June 2003.

Migration Legislation Amendment (Further Border Protection Measures) Bill 2002

Second reading negatived, 9 December 2002.

Migration Legislation Amendment (Further Border Protection Measures) Bill 2002 [No. 2]

Second reading negatived, 16 June 2003.

National Health Amendment (Pharmaceutical Benefits—Budget Measures) Bill 2002

Second reading negatived, 20 June 2002.

National Health Amendment (Pharmaceutical Benefits—Budget Measures) Bill 2002 [No. 2]

Second reading negatived, 4 March 2003.

Superannuation (Surcharge Rate Reduction) Amendment Bill 2003

Second reading negatived, 24 June 2003.

Trade Practices Amendment (Small Business Protection) Bill 2002

Third reading negatived, 19 August 2002.

Trade Practices Amendment (Small Business Protection) Bill 2002 [No. 2]

Third reading negatived, 3 March 2003.

Workplace Relations Amendment (Secret Ballots for Protected Action) Bill 2002

Third reading negatived, 25 September 2002.

Workplace Relations Amendment (Secret Ballots for Protected Action) Bill 2002 [No. 2]

Third reading negatived, 24 March 2003.

Workplace Relations Amendment (Termination of Employment) Bill 2002

Third reading negatived, 11 August 2003.

Private Senator's Bills**Constitution Alteration (Right to Stand for Parliament—Qualification of Members and Candidates) 1998 (No. 2) [2002]**

Laid aside pursuant to standing order 135, 15 May 2003.

Electoral Amendment (Political Honesty) Bill 2000 [2002]

Discharged from *Notice Paper*, 27 March 2003.

Freedom of Information Amendment (Open Government) Bill 2000 [2002]

Discharged from *Notice Paper*, 25 June 2003.

Public Interest Disclosure Bill 2001 [2002]

Discharged from *Notice Paper*, 11 December 2002.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Questions remaining unanswered

Question Nos, as shown, from 55 to 1750 remain unanswered for 30 or more days (see standing order 74(5)).

Notice given 12 February 2002

55 Senator Allison: To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—

- (1) Is it the case that the Melbourne office of the Australian Prudential Regulation Authority (APRA) failed to notify trustees of pre-existing pooled superannuation trusts (PSTs) that, under new regulations, they were required to notify APRA in writing that they wished their trusts to continue to be treated as PSTs by 31 October 2000.
- (2) Is it the case that trusts that have failed to so notify APRA will become non-complying superannuation funds, attracting a tax rate of 48.5 per cent on fund earnings instead of the concessional 15 per cent.

- (3) How long has APRA been aware of the failure to notify outlined in (1).
- (4) How long has the Minister or the department been aware of the failure to notify.
- (5) Has APRA or the Government taken any action to resolve this matter.
- (6) What action will the Government and APRA be taking to resolve this matter.

Notice given 15 March 2002

196 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—Did Mr Ron Walker attend the recent Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting; if so, in what capacity.

Notice given 8 April 2002

222 **Senator Faulkner:** To ask the Special Minister of State—With reference to travel undertaken to Melbourne between 1 October 2001 and 18 November 2001, by all staff employed under the *Members of Parliament (Staff) Act 1984*, in each instance can the following details be provided:

- (1) The name of each staff member, and the name of the member or senator for whom that staff member worked.
- (2) The dates for which travel allowance (TA) was claimed, including whether the claim was for consecutive nights.
- (3) The rate of TA paid and the total amount of TA paid to each staff member relating to that period.
- (4) The dates of airline flights taken to and from Melbourne by that staff member during that period.
- (5) Whether the staff member claimed for commercial or non-commercial accommodation, and the name of hotels stayed at by the staff member (if known).
- (6) The cost of any Cabcharge and/or other hire car charges, including Comcar.
- (7) The name and position of the person who certified the TA claim form and/or acquittal submitted to the Department of Finance and Administration.

Notice given 18 April 2002

Senator O'Brien: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 247-273)—

- (1) What programs and/or grants administered by the department provide assistance to people living in the federal electorate of Kennedy.
- (2) What was the level of funding provided through these programs and/or grants for the 2000-01 and 2001-02 financial years.
- (3) Where specific projects were funded: (a) what was the location of each project; (b) what was the nature of each project; and (c) what was the level of funding for each project.

271 Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer

Notice given 19 June 2002

388 **Senator Harris:** To ask the Minister representing the Treasurer—

- (1) Can the Treasurer confirm whether minutes were kept by the Australian Taxation Office Part IVA Panel of the meeting in which a recommendation

was made against the first cooperative investment project considered by the panel in late 1997; if so, can a copy of those minutes be provided.

- (2) How do the loans in the cooperative investment projects differ from those in Lau's case.

Notice given 2 July 2002

411 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—With reference to all forms of end product report by the Defence Signals Directorate (DSD reports) which summarise raw intelligence product:

- (1) Which ministers received any of the DSD reports that were found by the Inspector-General to be in breach of the Rules on Sigint and Australian Persons.
- (2) On what precise dates did this occur.
- (3) Which minister's offices, that is personal staff members or departmental liaison officers, received the DSD reports that were in breach of the Rules on Sigint and Australian Persons.
- (4) On what precise dates did this occur.
- (5) Did any departments receive any of the DSD reports that were in breach of the Rules on Sigint and Australian Persons; if so, which ones and on what dates.
- (6) For both (1) and (3), were all four DSD reports that the Inspector-General found breached the rules received by any minister or minister's office; if not, how many of the four reports were received by each of the ministers and/or minister's office.
- (7) Of those reports that were made in breach of the rules and were received by a minister and/or minister's office, did they include either of the two reports containing intelligence information on communications by an Australian lawyer with a foreign client.

(In this question, the phrase 'DSD reports' refers to all forms of end product by the DSD which summarise raw intelligence product. Such reports are variously referred to in the summary of the Inspector-General for Security and Intelligence's *MV Tampa* investigation as 'reports summarising the results of collection activity', 'end product reports' and 'situation updates'.)

Notice given 11 July 2002

450 **Senator Harris:** To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—

- (1) Is it a fact that loans to investors in the Active Cattle project were found by the Federal Court never to have been made.
- (2) Is the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) now a shareholder in Active Cattle on the basis that tax has nevertheless been levied on the loan amounts as income in the hands of the project manager, and could not be paid.
- (3) Is the ATO still the largest creditor of the Australian Tea Tree Oil Research Institute, even though the Federal Court found in the Phai See case that the Australian Research and Development Board had wrongly decided that the institute did not qualify as a research institute, and hence it was actually entitled to tax exempt status.

451 **Senator Harris:** To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—

- (1) Is it the case that it was possible up until 30 June 2002 to invest in an existing infrastructure bond, relinquished by another investor, through the Commonwealth Bank of Australia (CBA) or Westpac.
- (2) Did that investment, by offering a large loan, potentially allow an upfront tax deduction such that the cash amount contributed was exceeded by the tax refund and hence would confer a tax benefit.
- (3) Was that loan non-recourse, and for a term of as little as one year.
- (4) Did the loan which could be taken out actually include an amount to be paid tax free to the investor as interest on the loan at the end of 12 months.
- (5) Is it the case that the Economics References Committee inquiry into mass-marketed tax effective schemes was told by First Assistant Commissioner, Mr Peter Smith, that some of these infrastructure borrowings could fall under Part IVA of the Income Tax Assessment Act.
- (6) Has any action been taken by the Australian Taxation Office to investigate whether Part IVA applies to the infrastructure bonds offered in 2002 to investors by the CBA and Westpac.

Notice given 22 July 2002

Senator Faulkner: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 464-481)—

- (1) How many mobile phones has the department, or any agency within the portfolio, provided to the following: (a) a minister (please include the name of the minister or ministers); (b) staff of a minister employed under the Members of Parliament (Staff) (MoP(S) Act); (c) a departmental liaison officer in a minister's office; (d) a parliamentary secretary (please include the name of the parliamentary secretary or secretaries); (e) the staff of a parliamentary secretary employed under the MoP(S) Act; and (f) a departmental liaison officer in the office of a parliamentary secretary.
- (2) What was the total cost of the provision of mobile phones to the above-named persons during the 2000-01 and 2001-02 financial years.

- 464 Minister representing the Prime Minister
- 465 Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services
- 466 Minister representing the Treasurer
- 467 Minister representing the Minister for Trade
- 468 Minister for Defence
- 469 Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts
- 470 Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs
- 471 Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations
- 472 Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs
- 473 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage
- 474 Minister representing the Attorney-General
- 475 Minister for Finance and Administration
- 476 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
- 477 Minister for Family and Community Services
- 478 Minister representing the Minister for Education, Science and Training
- 479 Minister for Health and Ageing
- 480 Minister representing the Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources

481 Minister representing the Minister for Veterans' Affairs

Notice given 15 August 2002

Senator O'Brien: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 535-536)—What action, if any, has the Minister or the department taken to protect or increase Australian wheat sales to Iraq in the 2002-03 financial year.

536 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Notice given 20 August 2002

569 **Senator Ludwig:** To ask the Minister representing the Treasurer—With reference to Part X Bankruptcy Agreements lodged in each of the 2000-01 and 2001-02 financial years:

- (1) How many barristers and lawyers applied for, and were successful in obtaining, Part X agreements in each Australian state and territory.
- (2) How much tax revenue to the Australian Taxation Office was forgone through part payments resulting from Part X agreements filed by barristers and lawyers in each Australian state and territory.
- (3) What was the total amount of tax revenue lost to the Australian Taxation Office through part payments resulting from Part X agreements in each Australian state and territory.
- (4) How many Part X creditors' meetings did officers of the department attend in each Australian state and territory.

Notice given 13 September 2002

628 **Senator McLucas:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) How many applications for exceptional circumstances (EC) declarations have been lodged since 1996.
- (2) How many applications have resulted in EC declarations.
- (3) With respect to EC declarations, can the following information be provided: (a) the source of the applications (state government or peak body); (b) the geographic regions or industries concerned; (c) the dates on which the applications were lodged; and (d) the dates on which the declarations were made.
- (4) Were any EC declarations made concerning geographic regions contained wholly or partly within the electorates of Gwydir or Wide Bay.
- (5) With respect to unsuccessful applications, can the following information be provided: (a) the source of the applications (state government or peak body); (b) the geographic regions or industries concerned; (c) the dates on which the applications were lodged; and (d) the dates on which the decisions to refuse the declarations were made.
- (6) Of the unsuccessful applications, were any made concerning geographic regions contained wholly or partly within the electorates of Gwydir or Wide Bay.
- (7) With respect to all unsuccessful applications, has the Government provided other special assistance, including ex gratia income support, to the regions or industries identified in the applications.
- (8) Was any such special assistance given to geographic regions contained wholly or partly within the electorates of Gwydir or Wide Bay.

- (9) Have there been any occasions since 1996 in which the Government has not accepted the recommendation of the Rural Adjustment Scheme Advisory Council (RASAC) or the National Rural Advisory Council (NRAC) in respect to EC applications; if so, can details of these occasions and the applications concerned be provided.
- (10) Have there been any occasions since 1996 in which EC applications have not been subject to an independent assessment by the RASAC or NRAC; if so, can details of these occasions and the applications concerned be provided.
- (11) In the case of each EC declaration: (a) what was the income threshold used; (b) did all applications meet the income threshold criterion; if not, can details be provided where applications for an EC declaration were made despite the income threshold not being met; and (c) for each of these applications: (i) what was the income level identified in the application, and (ii) what was the applicable income threshold.

Notice given 17 September 2002

638 **Senator Nettle:** To ask the Minister representing the Treasurer—

- (1) Is the Motomed, a therapeutic exerciser, subject to the goods and services tax (GST).
- (2) Has the Australian Taxation Office made a ruling that the Motomed is not GST-exempt.
- (3) Does the Treasurer acknowledge that the Motomed is a medically-prescribed movement therapy product specifically designed to treat profound physical disabilities and is entirely unsuited for use by able-bodied persons; if not, why not.
- (4) Will the Government take steps to amend taxation legislation to make this device GST-exempt; if so, will the Government make this amendment retrospective and provide GST refunds to the people who have already purchased this appliance.

Notice given 23 September 2002

678 **Senator Webber:** To ask the Minister representing the Treasurer—

- (1) When will legislation be introduced that will allow for workers to be paid their entitlements ahead of banks and other creditors.
- (2) Will that legislation apply to any current liquidations.
- (3) In the case of Computerised Holdings Pty Ltd, did the liquidator identify the cause of liquidation as being insolvent trading; if so, why did the Australian Securities and Investment Commission not prosecute.
- (5) What are the criteria being used for making claims against the liquidator in the case of Computerised Holdings.
- (6) Is it intended that legal advice be sought on any distribution of assets ahead of the payment of workers' entitlements.

679 **Senator Webber:** To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—

- (1) What is the anticipated cost of the decision to allow a corporate group to transfer losses and be taxed as a single entity.

- (2) Is there any truth to the claim by some mining executives that this new arrangement will allow them to unlock \$11 billion in losses and enjoy a tax holiday for 20 years.
- (3) Is it true that, under these new arrangements, businesses will be able to revalue all assets to 'market value' without having to pay capital gains tax on the revaluations.
- (4) Is it true that for depreciation purposes the new 'market value' can be used as an expense over the estimated useful life of the asset.

Notice given 24 September 2002

682 **Senator Sherry:** To ask the Minister representing the Treasurer—For each month of the past 2 full calendar years, what are the figures for staff absent on stress leave in the Department of the Treasury.

687 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Treasurer—

- (1) Does the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) investigate instances of profiteering in relation to grains, fodder and other livestock animal feeds; if so, how many instances of profiteering in relation to grains, fodder and other livestock animal feeds have been investigated in each of the past 10 financial years.
- (2) How many prosecutions have been obtained in each of the past 10 financial years for profiteering from grains, fodder or other foodstuffs used as livestock feed.
- (3) How many convictions have been obtained in each of the past 10 financial years for profiteering from grains, fodder or other foodstuffs used as livestock feed.
- (4) What are the current penalties for profiteering from grains, fodder or other foodstuffs used as livestock feed.
- (5) Have these penalties changed within the past 10 years; if so, can details of these changes be provided.

Notice given 15 October 2002

778 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) (a) Was the Minister or his office contacted by the proponents of a steel profiling plant at Moruya, New South Wales, listed in the Dairy Regional Assistance Program project summary of round 6 for the 2001-02 financial year; and (b) was the Minister or his office contacted by any person on behalf of the proponents of the above project.
- (2) Was the Minister or his office contacted by the Federal Member for Eden Monaro (Mr Nairn) in relation to the above project.
- (3) Was the Minister or his office contacted by any member of the South East New South Wales Area Consultative Committee in relation to the above project.
- (4) Was the Minister or his office contacted by the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, or his staff, or officers of the Department of Transport and Regional Services in relation to the above project.
- (5) With reference to any contact by the persons listed above with the Minister or his office: (a) when did each communication take place; (b) who was involved in each communication; (c) what was the nature of each

communication; (d) what was the form of each communication; and (e) which officers from the department were involved in any way in these contacts.

779 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) (a) Was the Minister or his office contacted by Australian Solar Timbers about an application for funding through the Dairy Regional Assistance Program for the development of a short floor manufacturing project in Kempsey; and (b) was the Minister or his office contacted by any person on behalf of the proponents of the above project.
- (2) Was the Minister or his office contacted by the Federal Member for Lyne (Mr Vaile) in relation to the above project.
- (3) Was the Minister or his office contacted by any member of Australia's Holiday Coast Area Consultative Committee in relation to the above project.
- (4) Was the Minister or his office contacted by the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, or his staff, or officers of the Department of Transport and Regional Services in relation to the above project.
- (5) With reference to any contact by the persons listed above with the Minister or his office: (a) when did each communication take place; (b) who was involved in each communication; (c) what was the nature of each communication; (d) what was the form of each communication; and (e) which officers from the department were involved in any way in these contacts.

Notice given 7 November 2002

867 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) What assessment has been made of Australia's actual environmental and economic loss from the incursion of marine pests.
- (2) What assessment has been made of the potential environmental and economic loss from the incursion of marine pests.
- (3) What contribution has the department made to the development of a national management system for managing marine pests.
- (4) Which stakeholders have participated in the development of a national management system.
- (6) When will a national management system be implemented.

Notice given 8 November 2002

879 **Senator Sherry:** To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—With reference to the following information in the 2001-02 Annual Report of the Australian Prudential Regulation Authority (APRA), tabled on 23 October (and where APRA cannot disclose names and other sensitive information relating to particular cases can as much other detail as possible be provided):

- (a) the statement on page 8 that in December 2001 APRA accepted an enforceable undertaking from a superannuation fund for the first time: can APRA provide details of: (i) that enforceable undertaking and all subsequent enforceable undertakings, including any breaches of the Superannuation Industry (Supervision) Act 1993, (ii) any other problems

- involved, and (iii) the specific commitments made by the trustee(s) in these undertakings;
- (b) the statements on page 9 that in June 2002 APRA commenced prosecutions against trustees of regulated superannuation entities who failed to lodge an annual return for 2000-01 and on page 27 that 13 trustees had been referred to the Director of Public Prosecutions and two successfully charged: (i) have any further charges been made, and (ii) have any trustees been convicted for offences named in these charges, if so, what penalties have been imposed;
 - (c) the statement on page 21 that APRA is currently reviewing the operations of a number of multi-employer corporate superannuation funds: can APRA provide details of: (i) the problems it has encountered in such funds, and (ii) any enforcement actions to date, particularly in relation to the equal representation requirements in the Superannuation Industry (Supervision) Act 1993;
 - (d) the list on page 24 of enforcement activities undertaken during the year: can APRA provide details of the specific breaches of the Superannuation Industry (Supervision) Act 1993, or other APRA-enforced conditions, that gave rise to each of these enforcement activities;
 - (e) the statement on page 40 that a number of joint visits to financial institutions were conducted with the Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC) in 2001 as part of an APRA review of unit pricing in the superannuation industry: can APRA provide details of this review including: (i) any problems encountered, (ii) actions taken by trustees to address these problems, and (iii) enforcement actions taken by APRA or ASIC; and
 - (f) the noting on page 41 of the establishment of the International Network of Pensions Regulators and Supervisors (INPRS): can APRA provide further details of: (i) the INPRS activities, and (ii) APRA's contribution to date.

Notice given 11 November 2002

886 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) What recommendations were contained in the Rural Economic Services review of the AAA-Farm Management Deposit scheme, completed in June 2002.
- (2) Have these recommendations been adopted by the Government; if so, when were the recommended changes adopted; if not, why have the recommendations been rejected.
- (3) What did the review cost.
- (4) Can a copy of the review be provided; if not, why not.

Notice given 21 November 2002

954 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Prime Minister—

- (1) On what date did the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet first become aware that some Farm Management Deposit (FMD) products may not comply with legislation applicable to the Government's FMD scheme.
- (2) (a) What was the source of this information; and (b) in what form was this information conveyed, for example, correspondence, e-mail, telephone conversation or direct conversation.

- (3) What was the nature of the problem specifically identified in this information.
- (4) On what date did the department inform the Prime Minister, or his office, of this problem.
- (5) Did the Prime Minister, or his office, receive advice about this problem from a source other than the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet; if so: (a) on what date was this information first received; (b) what was the source of this information; (c) in what form was this information conveyed; and (d) what was the nature of the problem specifically identified in this information.
- (6) (a) On what date, or dates, did the department take action in response to this identified problem; and (b) what action did the department take.
- (7) (a) What departments, agencies, banks or non-bank financial institutions did the department communicate with in relation to this matter; (b) on what date, or dates, did that communication occur; and (c) what form did that communication take.
- (8) (a) What responses, if any, has the department received in respect to those communications; (b) in what form have those responses been received; and (c) what was the content of those responses.
- (9) What action has the department taken in response to communications from departments, agencies, banks or non-bank financial institutions.
- (10) Was the Prime Minister aware when he spoke to the Committee for Economic Development of Australia, on 20 November 2002, about the FMD scheme, of:
 - (a) the report on page 3 of the Australian Financial Review, of 20 November 2002, stating that the Government 'has been forced to seek an Australian Taxation Office ruling over a potential legal flaw in its \$2 billion farm management deposit scheme'; and/or
 - (b) evidence given by the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry to the Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee, on 20 November 2002, that the department had been aware of uncertainty over some FMD products since July 2001.

957 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Treasurer—

- (1) On what date did the Department of the Treasury and/or the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) first become aware that some Farm Management Deposit (FMD) products may not comply with legislation applicable to the Government's FMD scheme.
- (2) What was the source of this information; and (b) in what form was this information conveyed, for example, correspondence, e-mail, telephone conversation or direct conversation.
- (3) What was the nature of the problem specifically identified in this information.
- (4) On what date did the department and/or the ATO, inform the Treasurer, or his office, or the Assistant Treasurer, or her office, of this problem.
- (5) Did the Treasurer, or his office, receive advice about this problem from a source other than the Treasurer's department or the ATO; if so: (a) on what date was this information first received; (b) what was the source of this

information; (c) in what form was this information conveyed; and (d) what was the nature of the problem specifically identified in this information.

- (6) On what date, or dates, did the department and/or the ATO take action in response to this identified problem; and (b) what action did they take.
- (7) (a) What departments, agencies, banks or non-bank financial institutions did the department and/or the ATO communicate with in relation to this matter; (b) on what date, or dates, did that communication occur; and (c) what form did that communication take.
- (8) (a) What responses, if any, has the department and/or the ATO received in respect to those communications; (b) in what form have those responses been received; and (c) what was the content of those responses.
- (9) What action has the department and/or the ATO taken in response to communications from departments, agencies, banks or non-bank financial institutions.

Notice given 26 November 2002

959 **Senator Conroy:** To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—With respect to those persons who hold private health insurance which is eligible for the 30 per cent private health insurance rebate and who receive the benefit of the rebate as a rebate through the tax system:

- (1) How many persons are covered by private health insurance by postcode and by federal electorate division, as at: (a) 31 December 2000; (b) 30 June 2002; and (c) the most current date for which information has been compiled.
- (2) How many contributor units hold private health insurance by postcode and by federal electorate division, as at: (a) 31 December 2000; (b) 30 June 2002; and (c) the most current date for which information has been compiled.

Notice given 29 November 2002

973 **Senator Sherry:** To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—

- (1) How many matters relating to insolvencies or external administrations in which applications were made for payment of entitlements under the Federal Government's Employee Entitlements Support Scheme or General Employee Entitlements and Redundancy Scheme have been referred by the Department of Employment and Workplace Relations to each of: (a) the Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC); and (b) the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC).
- (2) In each matter, what concerns were identified.
- (3) What was the outcome of the ASIC's and the ACCC's consideration of each of these matters.

Notice given 3 December 2002

980 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) Is the Government examining options for tracking livestock via systems such as a national livestock identification system.
- (2) Which identification systems has the Government examined in the past 5 years.

- (3) What was the quantum of funding spent by the department during each of the past 5 financial years on feasibility studies on national livestock identification systems.
- (4) What was the quantum of funding spent by the department on feasibility studies of each system examined in past 5 financial years.
- (5) Is the Minister aware of any meetings between the department, and state and territory departments on the issue of a national approach to livestock identification in the past 2 years.
- (6) (a) When did these meetings occur; (b) who attended each meeting; (c) what was discussed at each meeting; and (d) what records have been kept of the discussion at these meetings.

Notice given 10 December 2002

1012 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Veterans' Affairs—

- (1) In how many cases have claimants for compensation by personnel with East Timor service, pursuant to the Veterans' Entitlements Act 1986, been referred to and examined by the Australian Defence Force (ADF) Medical Service.
- (2) At what level of injury under the scale set out in the Guide for the Assessment of Rates of Pension, under the Veterans' Entitlements Act 1986, would a serving member be considered unfit for duty.
- (3) What penalty is provided to serving members who conceal an injury or make false statements about their fitness.
- (4) Is evidence of disabilities claimed and accepted under the Veterans' Entitlements Act 1986 considered as part of that assessment.
- (5) Will the Minister ask the Inspector-General to conduct an investigation into alleged fraud by serving ADF personnel making claims under the Veterans' Entitlements Act 1986 and representing themselves as fit for duty.
- (6) What steps are being taken to remove the effect of the Privacy Act 1988 which prevents the Department of Veterans' Affairs advising the Department of Defence of disability claims lodged and accepted from serving personnel.
- (7) With reference to the answer given to question on notice no. 743 (Senate Hansard, 4 December 2002, p. 6796) on Gulf War compensation, how many personnel with accepted claims are still serving.

1014 **Senator Harris:** To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—

- (1) Is the Minister aware that in the recent decision of the Federal Court of Australia in the case of MLC Limited v Deputy Commissioner of Taxation [2002] FCA 149, in responding to the Commissioner's statement of reasons which accompanied notification of the disallowance of the applicants' objections, the judge stated: 'It may be said that it is hard to see how the applicants or their agent could have taken into account in preparing the returns lodged in 1996 and 1997 the views expressed in TD 1999/1 when those views did not appear publicly for some years after the returns were lodged.'
- (2) Is the Minister prepared to make any changes to tax law to avoid the need for a taxpayer to have the crystal ball the Commissioner apparently expects.

Senator Lundy: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1019-1020)—

- (1) Can the following information in the form of a spreadsheet be provided, in both hard copy and electronically, for each contract entered into by agencies within the department which has not been fully performed or was entered into during the 2001-02 financial year, and that is wholly, or in part, information and communications technology-related with a consideration of \$20 000 or more: (a) a unique identifier for the contract, for example contract number; (b) the contractor name and Australian Business Number or Australian Company Number; (c) the domicile of the parent company; (d) the subject matter of the contract, including whether the contract is substantially for hardware, software, services or a mixture, with estimated percentages; (e) the starting date of the contract; (f) the term of the contract, expressed as an ending date; (g) the amount of the consideration in Australian dollars; and (h) whether or not there is an industry development requirement and, if so, details of the industry development requirement (in scope and out of scope).
- (2) With reference to any contracts that meet the above criteria, can a full list of sub-contracts valued at over \$5 000 be provided, including: (a) a unique identifier for the contract, for example contract number; (b) the contractor name and Australian Business Number or Australian Company Number; (c) the domicile of the parent company; (d) the subject matter of the contract, including whether the contract is substantially for hardware, software, services or a mixture, with estimated percentages; (e) the starting date of the contract; (f) the term of the contract, expressed as an ending date; (g) the amount of the consideration in Australian dollars; and (h) whether or not there is an industry development requirement and, if so, details of the industry development requirement (in scope and out of scope).

1019 Minister representing the Attorney-General

Notice given 11 December 2002

1026 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) Can a full list be provided of real property owned by the department, indicating: (a) the address; (b) the type of property (for example, vacant building etc.); (c) the size of the property; and (d) the property valuation.
- (2) Can a full list be provided of the real property sold by or on behalf of the department in the 2002-03 financial year, indicating: (a) the address; (b) the type of property (for example, vacant building etc.); (c) the size of the property; (d) the type of sale (auction or advertised price); (e) the date of sale; (f) the reason for the sale; and (g) the price obtained.
- (3) Can a full list be provided of the real property proposed to be sold by or on behalf of the department in the 2002-03 financial year, indicating: (a) the address; (b) the type of property (for example, vacant building etc.); (c) the size of the property; (d) the type of sale proposed (auction or advertised price); (e) the expected price range; and (f) the likely timing of the sale.
- (4) Can a full list be provided of real property currently leased by the department, indicating: (a) the owner of the property; (b) the address; (c) the type of property; (d) the size of property; (e) the length of current lease; (f) the value of the lease; (g) the departmental activities conducted at the property; and (h) any sub-leases entered into at the property, including

details of: (i) the name of sub-tenants; (ii) the length of sub-leases; (iii) the value of sub-leases; and (iv) the nature of sub-tenant activities.

Notice given 13 December 2002

1036 **Senator Cook:** To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—

- (1) (a) How many taxpayers, in circumstances similar to those of Julie Vincent's have settled and agreed to pay amounts to the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) that have now been found not to be owing, as a result of the Full Court decision in *Vincent v Commissioner of Taxation* [2002] FCA 656; and (b) what is the amount of money that has been, will be or would otherwise have been collected irrespective of the Vincent case.
- (2) (a) Is it the case that most taxpayers issued with amended assessments for 1994, 1995 and 1996 potentially fall within the ambit of the Vincent decision based on the Commissioner's own assessment of the deductibility of their claimed expenditure; and (b) what is the amount of money collected from taxpayers during these years of income.
- (3) Has the ATO accepted settlement offers from taxpayers after the decision in the Vincent case in circumstances in which the taxpayers are agreeing to settle for an amount that the full court decision has shown is not owing; and (b) how many have they accepted in these circumstances.
- (4) Can the ATO provide any statistics on the number of taxpayers who have entered into bankruptcy in circumstances where the decision in the Vincent case indicates that the amended assessments issued to them were in fact not owing.
- (5) Has the ATO notified taxpayers that one of the implications of the decision in the Vincent case is that a tax deductible loss may be claimed on the cessation of their projects, in circumstances where their projects were commercial failures.
- (6) If the decision of Justice Stone in *Cooke v Commissioner of Taxation* [2002] FCA 1315 is upheld on appeal, how much money will have been collected from taxpayers in circumstances where the court has found that no money is owing by these taxpayers.
- (7) Why did the ATO refuse test case funding for the Vincent appeal.
- (8) Why did the ATO select 'Budplan' as a so-called representative test case when the Vincent case and the Cooke case have shown it was not representative of other tax effective investment projects.
- (9) Given that immediately prior to the settlement offer closing the Commissioner was suggesting that the first instance decision in the Vincent case had broad application to all taxpayers: Now that the decision has been overturned on appeal, why is the Commissioner now stating that the decision of the Full Court in the Vincent case has limited application to other taxpayers.
- (10) Does the Assistant Treasurer believe that the Commissioner, in forcing ordinary taxpayers to settle prior to court appeals being decided, is acting as a model litigant in accordance with the Attorney-General's policy statement.

Notice given 7 January 2003

1072 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—Will the Government indemnify the family of Rola McCabe for legal costs incurred in taking action against British American Tobacco relating to her death.

Notice given 14 January 2003

Senator Brown: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1079-1082)—With reference to energy policy and greenhouse gas emissions:

- (1) Does the department have copies of any reports or documents produced by Roam Consulting in the past 5 calendar years; if so, in each case: (a) for whom was the report or document prepared; (b) what is the full title and date of the report or document; (c) what was the brief; (d) what were the main findings; and (e) can a copy of the report or document be provided.
- (2) Have any documents prepared by the department or its agencies, including by the Chief Scientist, used information supplied by Roam Consulting; if so, in each case: (a) what was the full title and date of the document from which the information was used; and (b) what other data supported any conclusions drawn.

1082 Minister representing the Minister for Science

Notice given 17 January 2003

Senator O'Brien: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1090-1120)—

- (1) What programs and/or grants administered by the department provide assistance to the people living in the federal electorate of Gippsland.
- (2) When did the delivery of these programs and/or grants commence.
- (3) What funding was provided through these programs and/or grants for the people of Gippsland in each of the following financial years: (a) 1999-2000; (b) 2000-01; and (c) 2001-02.
- (4) What funding has been appropriated for these programs and/or grants in the 2002-03 financial year.
- (5) What funding has been appropriated and/or approved under these programs and/or grants to assist organisations and individuals in the electorate of Gippsland in the 2002-03 financial year.

1100 Minister representing the Attorney-General

1102 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

1107 Minister for Justice and Customs

1116 Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer

1119 Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for the Status of Women

1120 Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation

Notice given 17 February 2003

1163 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) With reference to the Minister's media release of 19 July 2001 announcing a 3-year project to examine the feasibility of segregating genetically-modified products across their entire production chains: what are the specific stated objectives of this study.
- (2) Does the study deal with issues of food safety and food quality; if so, how.

- (3) Does the study deal with making sure that products are identified to meet labelling laws and to preserve the identity of products in the market place; if so, how.
- (4) How specifically do the objectives of the study announced on 19 July 2001 differ from those of the four case studies announced on 10 February 2003.

1168 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the Minister's joint statement of 11 February 2003, reference AFFA03/023WTJ, regarding the \$5.3 million water saving pilot program in the Murrumbidgee Valley:

- (1) What are the specific stated objectives of the pilot program as presented to the Commonwealth by Pratt Water and upon which Commonwealth funding was approved.
- (2) Can a copy be provided of the Pratt Water proposal upon which Commonwealth funding was approved; if not, why not.
- (3) What is the total budgeted cost of the pilot program.
- (4) Which Commonwealth departments are contributing to the funding of the pilot program; and (b) how much will each department contribute.
- (5) Which non-government organisations or individuals are contributing to the pilot program and what is their budgeted contribution.
- (6) (a) When will the pilot program commence; and (b) when is it due to be completed.
- (7) In relation to the joint media statement, which quotes Mr Pratt as saying that his 'company has contributed significant resources to get the proposal to its current stage of development and is contributing key staff to manage the project': (a) what is the quantum and exact type of resources Mr Pratt is referring to; (b) what is the number of staff Pratt Water will contribute to the management of this project; and (c) what are the names and qualifications of those staff.
- (8) Where exactly in the Murrumbidgee Valley the pilot program will be conducted.
- (9) (a) What consultations have been undertaken with residents within the Murrumbidgee Valley; and (b) who will be affected by the pilot program.
- (10) If no consultations have yet taken place: (a) when will these consultations take place; and (b) how will these consultations be conducted.

Notice given 25 February 2003

1202 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the department's evidence to the Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee on 10 February 2003 concerning under-reporting of executive remuneration in the department's 2000-01 and 2001-02 financial statements:

- (1) On what day did the department seek advice from the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO) about whether the under-reporting constituted a 'material breach'.
- (2) Which officer sought that advice.
- (3) Was the request oral or written.
- (4) On what day did the ANAO provide advice to the department.
- (5) Which officer provided this advice.

- (6) What was the content of this advice.
 - (7) Was this advice oral or written.
 - (8) If oral, can confirmation of this advice be provided; if not, why not.
 - (9) If written, can a copy of this advice be provided.
 - (10) Has the department sought advice from the ANAO on whether it is necessary to issue a corrigendum to the 2000-01 and 2001-02 financial statements: (a) if so: (i) on what day was this advice sought, (ii) which officer sought this advice, and (iii) was the request for this advice oral or written; and (b) if not, (i) from which agency was this advice sought, (ii) which officer sought this advice, and (iii) was the request oral or written.
 - (11) On what day was advice on the matter of the corrigendum received.
 - (12) What was the content of this advice.
 - (13) Was this advice oral or written.
 - (14) Which officer and agency provided this advice.
 - (15) What specific change to departmental procedures has occurred since the under-reporting of executive remuneration was revealed in November 2002.
- 1203 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the department's portfolio additional estimates statements for the 2002-03 financial year:
- (1) Why has the estimate of revenue from the all milk levy increased by \$5 509 000 from \$30 000 000 to \$35 509 000.
 - (2) Can the data for the revised estimate be provided.
- 1204 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the Minister's media statement AFFA03/033WT:
- (1) To what time period does the expenditure in the 'EC Expenditure' column relate.
 - (2) Can an explanation of the figures, including a state and financial year breakdown, be provided.
- 1208 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—What was the date of formation and what is the composition of the following committees involving departmental staff working on the development of a free trade agreement between the United States of America and Australia: (a) Deputy Secretary-Level Committee; (b) Officials Committee on Agriculture; and (c) Industry-Government Committee.
- 1209 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—
- (1) On what date did the department first receive a request from the Department of Finance and Administration (DOFA) for payment of \$1 144.64 relating to the Minister's police escort during a 2002 visit to the Philippines.
 - (2) On what dates have the department and DOFA communicated in relation to this matter.
 - (3) Has the department complied with the request from DOFA for payment of this account; if so, when was the account paid; if not, why not.

- (4) Did the negotiation of heavy traffic facilitated by the police escort enable the Minister to attend his key meetings on time.

1211 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—In relation to the administration of Australia's United States (US) beef quota:

- (1) Why is it that the US Customs figures do not correspond with export figures maintained by the department for the 2002 quota year.
- (2) What are the details of the 5 500 tonne discrepancy for the 2002 quota year, on a month-by-month basis.
- (3) When did the department first become aware that the Australian quota would be under-filled for the 2002 quota year.
- (4) How will the 5 500 tonnes of quota be allocated.
- (5) On what date or dates did the department consult with US authorities on this proposal.
- (6) (a) On what date or dates did the department consult with Australian beef exporters on this proposal; and (b) which exporters were consulted.
- (7) What action has been taken to ensure the discrepancy between Australian and US export figures does not recur in the 2003 quota year.

1212 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the current *Quarantine Matters!* campaign:

- (1) Is the total budget for the 2002-03 financial year \$6.894 million.
- (2) How much has been expended.
- (3) Can a detailed breakdown be provided of the budget and expenditure figures including media, production, talent and non-media costs.
- (4) What is the total proposed campaign budget for: (a) metropolitan television; (b) non-metropolitan television; (c) metropolitan radio; (d) non-metropolitan radio; (e) metropolitan newspapers; and (f) non-metropolitan newspapers.
- (5) What amount has been expended to date on: (a) metropolitan television; (b) non-metropolitan television; (c) metropolitan radio; (d) non-metropolitan radio; (e) metropolitan newspapers; and (f) non-metropolitan newspapers.
- (6) Can a copy of the complete media schedule for the campaign, including that for international in-bound in-flight television, be provided; if not, why not.
- (7) Is it the case that the campaign began on 14 December 2002; if not, when did it commence.
- (8) Has the campaign concluded; if so, when did it conclude; if not, when will it conclude.
- (9) What is the campaign's target audience.
- (10) What percentage of the budget has been allocated to communication with overseas audiences.
- (11) What assessment was made of the need for the campaign prior to its commencement.
- (12) Was benchmark research undertaken prior to the commencement of the campaign.

- (13) Assuming that focus group research was conducted into the advertising concept, can a copy of the report from the research company in relation to the outcomes of focus group testing be provided; if not, why not.
- (14) Besides the Quarantine Matters! campaign, what other concepts were considered and developed.
- (15) What performance indicators have been established to measure the effectiveness of this campaign.
- (16) How has the effectiveness of the campaign been measured against these indicators.
- (17) Is the department undertaking ongoing tracking research; if so, how often are reports received by the department and can copies of the reports received by the department be made available.
- (18) When will the overall performance of the campaign be measured.
- (19) How will the overall performance of the campaign be measured.
- (20) What provision has the campaign made for audiences from non-English speaking backgrounds (NESB).
- (21) Was an NESB consultant engaged to advise on the campaign.
- (22) Was an advertising agency engaged in relation to the campaign; if so: (a) was the engagement subject to tender; if so, was the tender open or select; if not, why not; (b) which agency was engaged; (c) when was the agency engaged; (d) what is the value of the contract with the agency; (e) can a copy of the contract with the agency be provided; if not, why not.
- (23) Was a production agency engaged to produce the television and/or radio advertisements; if so: (a) was the engagement direct or indirect; (b) was the engagement subject to tender; if so, was the tender open or select; if not, why not; (c) which agency was engaged; (d) when was the agency engaged; (e) what is the value of the contract with the agency; and (f) can a copy of the contract with the agency be provided; if not, why not.
- (24) Did Mr Steve Irwin and/or a talent agency charge a fee for Mr Irwin's participation in the campaign; if so, what was the fee.
- (25) How many shooting days were required to film the television advertisements.
- (26) With reference to the Minister's media statement AFFA02/354WT, what 'range of other targeted campaign activities including press and radio advertising, offshore internet activity and stakeholder relations' does the campaign complement.

Notice given 18 March 2003

Senator O'Brien: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1270-1272)—With respect to the additional \$8 per passenger increase in the Passenger Movement Charge that came into effect on 1 July 2001 to fund increased passenger processing costs as part of Australia's response to the threat of the introduction of foot and mouth disease:

- (1) What was the total additional revenue raised by this extra \$8 in each of the following financial years: (a) 2001-02; and (b) 2002-03 to date.
- (2) What is the total additional revenue estimated to be raised by this extra \$8 in each of the following financial years: (a) 2002-03; (b) 2003-04; (c) 2004-05; and (d) 2005-06.

- (3) What was the total amount of Passenger Movement Charge collected at each airport and port for each of the following financial years: (a) 2001-02; and (b) 2002-03 to date.
- (4) What is the total amount of Passenger Movement Charge estimated to be collected at each airport and port for each of the following financial years: (a) 2002-03; (b) 2003-04; (c) 2004-05; and (d) 2005-06.
- (5) How much has been spent by the Government on new quarantine screening equipment at each airport and port since 1 July 2001.
- (6) (a) How much additional money has the Government spent on other quarantine processing costs at each airport and port since 1 July 2001; and (b) what services, measures or expenses comprise that additional expenditure at each airport and port.
- (7) How much additional money is estimated to be spent on new quarantine screening equipment and other processing costs respectively at each airport and port for each of the following financial years: (a) 2002-03; (b) 2003-04; (c) 2004-05; and (d) 2005-06.
- (8) (a) Which programs are administering costs associated with increased passenger processing costs as part of Australia's response to the threat of the introduction of foot and mouth disease; (b) how much has been spent, and is it estimated will be spent, from each program in each year it has or is budgeted to operate; and (c) which department is responsible for the administration of each program.
- (9) Are there any outstanding claims by any organisation or individual for expenditure on equipment or measures as part of Australia's response to the threat of foot and mouth disease; if so: (a) who are the claimants; (b) what is each claim for; and (c) will each be paid and when.
- (10) (a) How many passengers departing Australia were exempted from paying the Passenger Movement Charge; and (b) what is the legal basis and number of passengers for each category of exempted passengers.
- (11) Will the \$8 foot and mouth response component of the Passenger Movement Charge be removed, increased or reduced commensurate with the movement in costs associated with Australia's response to the threat of the introduction of foot and mouth disease; if so, when; if not, why not.

1271 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

1273 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the Minister's statement, dated 31 October 2001, concerning support for the bio-fuels industry:

- (1) Did the statement announce a \$50 million capital subsidy for new or expanded bio-fuel capacity.
- (2) Did the Minister consult with any bio-fuel producers, or bio-fuel industry organisations, prior to his announcement; if so, which producers or organisations did he consult.
- (3) When was the capital subsidy introduced.
- (4) What department is administering this subsidy.
- (5) Under which program is the subsidy funded.
- (6) What rules apply to subsidies under the scheme.
- (7) Can a copy of an application form and the scheme rules be provided; if not, why not.

- (8) What subsidy expenditure was budgeted for in the following financial years: (a) 2001-02; and (b) 2002-03.
- (9) How much has been expended on the subsidy, by year, in each of the following financial years: (a) 2001-02; and (b) 2002-03 to date.
- (10) How much is budgeted, by year, in the period 2003-04 to 2006-07.
- (11) What was the basis of the Minister's assertion that the subsidy would generate 'at least five new ethanol distilleries' and 'around 2 300 construction jobs and 1 100 permanent jobs, mostly in rural areas'.
- (12) (a) What companies have received the capital subsidy; and (b) what subsidy amount has each company received.
- (13) How many new ethanol distilleries have been constructed.
- (14) Where have these distilleries been constructed.
- (15) Which existing distilleries have been expanded.
- (16) How many of the promised 2 300 construction jobs have been generated.
- (17) How many of the promised 1 100 permanent jobs have been generated.
- (18) What percentage of these permanent jobs has been generated in rural areas.
- (19) When did construction of each new distillery, or distillery expansion, commence.
- (20) How many construction jobs have been created in respect to each distillery construction project.
- (21) When did construction of each new distillery, or expanded distillery, conclude.
- (22) How many permanent jobs, full-time and part-time, have been created in respect to each new or expanded distillery project.
- (23) How much additional ethanol has each new or expanded ethanol distillery produced.

1274 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the Minister's statement, dated 31 October 2001, concerning support for the bio-fuels industry:

- (1) Was the statement issued during the 2001 Federal Election campaign.
- (2) Did the Minister promise that, 'the current excise exemption for fuel ethanol will be retained'.
- (3) Was the Minister consulted before the Prime Minister announced the imposition of an excise on fuel ethanol on 12 September 2002.

1276 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Treasurer—How much excise on fuel ethanol has been collected, by month, since 17 September 2002.

Senator O'Brien: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1280-1287)—What payments, subsidies, grants, gratuities or awards have been made to the Manildra group of companies, including but not necessarily limited to Manildra Energy Australia Pty Ltd, since March 1996.

1285 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

1288 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) What has been the measurable increase in use of sugar and/or sugar by-products as feedstock for fuel ethanol since the introduction of the ethanol production subsidy on 17 September 2002.

- (2) What is the projected increase in the use of sugar and/or sugar by-products as feedstock for fuel ethanol over the 12-month life of the ethanol production subsidy introduced on 17 September 2002.

Senator O'Brien: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1289-1290)—

- (1) What representations has the Government received from Brazil about its decision to impose a customs duty of 38.143 cents per litre on fuel ethanol and provide a subsidy to domestic ethanol producers.
- (2) (a) When were those representations received; and (b) what was the Government's response.
- (3) Has the Government received representations from countries other than Brazil about its decision to impose a customs duty of 38.143 cents per litre on fuel ethanol and provide a subsidy to domestic ethanol producers.
- (4) (a) When were those representations received; and (b) what was the Government's response.

1289 Minister representing the Minister for Trade

1290 Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs

1291 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Trade—

- (1) Did any government seek consultations through the World Trade Organization in relation to the Government's decision in September 2002 to impose a customs duty of 38.143 cents per litre on fuel ethanol and provide a subsidy to domestic ethanol producers; if so: (a) on what date did each country seek consultations; and (b) on what basis were consultations sought.
- (2) Did any third party participate in these consultations.
- (3) In each case, has the matter been resolved; if so, on what date and how was the matter resolved; if not, what resolution process is underway.

Senator O'Brien: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1292-1298)—

- (1) On what date or dates did: (a) the Minister; (b) the Minister's office; and (c) the department, become aware that Trafigura Fuels Australia Pty Ltd proposed to import a shipment of ethanol to Australia from Brazil in September 2002.
- (2) What was the source of this information to: (a) the Minister; (b) the Minister's office; and (c) the department.
- (3) Was the Minister or his office or the department requested to investigate and/or take action to prevent the arrival of this shipment by any ethanol producer or distributor or industry organisation; if so: (a) who made this request; (b) when was its made; and (c) what form did this request take.
- (4) Did the Minister or his office or the department engage in discussions and/or activities in August 2002 or September 2002 to develop a proposal to prevent the arrival of this shipment of ethanol from Brazil; if so, what was the nature of these discussions and/or activities, including dates of discussions and/or activities, personnel involved and cost.

1292 Minister representing the Prime Minister

1293 Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services

1294 Minister representing the Minister for Trade

1295 Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs

1296 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

1299 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Trade—

- (1) Did the Minister, his office and/or the department ask the Australian Embassy in Brazil in August 2002 and/or September 2002 to make enquiries about the proposed export of ethanol to Australia by Trafigura Fuels Australia Pty Ltd.
- (2) How did the Minister, his office and/or the department become aware of the proposed shipment.
- (3) On what date did the Minister, his office and/or the department become aware of the proposed shipment.
- (4) Who made this request.
- (5) Why was the request made.
- (6) Was the request made at the behest of the Prime Minister, another minister, an ethanol producer, and/or an industry organisation.
- (7) On what date was this request made.
- (8) In what form was the request made.
- (9) Who received this request.
- (10) Did the Australian Embassy in Brazil make this enquiry on behalf of the Minister, his office and/or the department; if so, on what date or dates was this enquiry made and what form did it take.
- (11) What information was provided to the Minister, his office and/or the department.
- (12) On what date and in what form was this information provided.
- (13) On what dates and to whom did the Minister, his office and/or the department communicate the information provided by the Embassy.

1300 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—

- (1) Did the Minister receive a request from the Minister for Trade to authorise staff at the Australian Embassy in Brazil in August 2002 and/or September 2002 to gather and provide information about a proposed shipment of ethanol to Australia by Trafigura Fuels Australia Pty Ltd.
- (2) Did staff at the Australian Embassy in Brazil in August 2002 and/or September 2002 gather and provide information about a proposed shipment of ethanol to Australia by Trafigura Fuels Australia Pty Ltd; if so: (a) who requested the staff to engage in that task; (b) who authorised staff to agree to the request; (c) what action did staff take; (d) which staff engaged in the task; (d) on what date or dates did staff engage in the task; (e) what was the cost of engaging in the task; (f) to whom did the staff deliver this information in Australia; and (g) what form did that communication take.

1301 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) Did the Minister meet with representatives of the Australian Institute of Petroleum on 21 August 2002; if so: (a) at what time did the meeting commence; (b) at what time did the meeting conclude; (c) where did the meeting take place; (d) who was present at the meeting; (e) who initiated the meeting; (f) what was the purpose of the meeting; and (g) what matters were discussed at that meeting.

- (2) Did the Minister refer to a detailed record of that meeting made by his office in answer to a question without notice in the House of Representatives on 25 September 2002.
- (3) Can a copy of that record be provided; if not, why not.

1302 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) Has the Minister received written or oral representations from representatives of the Manildra group of companies, including but not necessarily limited to Manildra Energy Australia Pty Ltd, concerning government support for the ethanol industry; if so: (a) on what dates were those representations received; and (b) in what form were they made.
- (2) Has the Minister received written or oral representations from representatives of the Australian Bio-fuels Association concerning government support for the ethanol industry; if so: (a) on what dates were those representations received; and (b) in what form were they made.

Notice given 20 March 2003

1319 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—For each of the following financial years: 1996-97, 1997-98, 1999-2000, 2000-01, 2001-02 and 2002-03: (a) how many overseas trips did the minister responsible for primary industries and agriculture undertake; (b) what countries were visited on those trips; and (c) on how many of those trips was the Minister accompanied by a business delegation.

1340 **Senator Harris:** To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—With reference to the recent decision in the Federal Court determining that Ms Julie Vincent was not liable to pay taxes to the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) and did not owe the tax debt attributed to her:

- (1) Will the ATO contact Ms Vincent's fellow investors who have made settlement offers to the ATO and inform them that they are not liable to pay the tax claimed by the ATO on their amended assessments.
- (2) Can assurance be given that no other taxpayers will be financially disadvantaged as a result of ATO actions against them, particularly those who have made settlement offers to the ATO.
- (3) Why did the settlement process require that taxpayers make an offer to the ATO on a document prepared by the ATO which could not be accepted if there were any deletions or additions.
- (4) Has the ATO undertaken a review of the approximately 174 tax effective projects on which it has disallowed deductions, to determine the categories that would define projects in good, bad or alternative groups (eg structure, investor investment/deductions ratios, investor risk, profitability potential, export potential, certification and endorsement levels and employment opportunities); if so, will the ATO release the results of that review.
- (5) Has the ATO undertaken a review of the project type and/or such ratings, against the decisions made by the Federal Court to date.
- (6) How does the ATO explain the original letters sent to investors, with the prominent use of Budplan and Vincent case names, implying that these projects were typical and applied to all tax effective projects, given that rulings in the Federal Court to date paint a completely different picture and suggest that the average mum and dad investor has been misled by the ATO.

- (7) Does the ATO intend to issue to all investors a letter of explanation and an opportunity to withdraw any settlement offer.

1341 **Senator Harris:** To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—

- (1) Following Ms Julie Vincent's win before the Full Bench of the Federal Court, does the Minister accept that the amended assessment sent to her was wrong.
- (2) Does the Minister accept that Ms Vincent would have been required to pay tax for which she was not liable had she followed the settlement process provided by the ATO.
- (3) Can a guarantee be given that not one of the approximately 45 000 people caught up in this campaign will be similarly disadvantaged.
- (4) Does the Minister believe that the 'one size fits all' approach taken by the Commissioner of Taxation to the mass marketed tax effective investments campaign has resulted in gross unfairness to taxpayers who sought professional advice and told the truth when filling out their returns.
- (5) What is the Minister prepared to do about the growing feeling that the Commissioner of Taxation has taken advantage of his powers by bullying and intimidating taxpayers into accepting offers that can seriously disadvantage them.

1342 **Senator Harris:** To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—With reference to mass marketed tax effective investment (MMTEI) schemes:

- (1) Does the Minister believe that the Taxpayers' Charter of Rights should be dissolved.
- (2) Can the Minister confirm: (a) that the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) had concerns about the charter in the early 90s or even earlier; and (b) that the ATO took no action.
- (3) Does the Minister agree that if the taxpayer has to 'get it right' or face the repercussions then so, too, the ATO must also 'get it right' or also face the repercussions.
- (4) (a) Is the Minister aware that the settlement process document provided by the ATO to taxpayers states that the Budplan and Vincent court wins for the ATO prove the ATO was right, however in a letter to Australians for Tax Justice, the ATO states that the result of the Federal Court win for Ms Vincent was confined to a small number of participants in the project; and (b) why is this the case.
- (5) Does the Minister agree that the actions of the ATO in regard to the freedom of information (FOI) requests from MMTEI taxpayers, including originally attempting to charge five and six figure fees, were designed to avoid the ATO's obligations under FOI law.
- (6) Will the Minister admit that the failure on the ATO's side to meet FOI requests by the deadline for settlement meant that MMTEI taxpayers were forced to decide on settlement without being fully informed.
- (7) Does the Minister agree that the ATO failed to comply with directions from the AAT to provide documents to at least one appellant and sought repeated stays of hearing as the deadline for settlement approached.
- (8) Why does the ATO operate on the basis that it does not have to apply the principles of natural justice (ie procedural fairness) when conducting an internal review of a taxation decision.

- (9) Can the Minister confirm that the decision to disallow MMTEIs was taken at Casselden Place, Melbourne 5 months before the ATO had informed the public of its views by issuing Draft Ruling TR97/D17.
- (10) Will the Minister confirm that the ATO issued at least seven Private Binding Rulings (PBR) concerning the following primary production MMTEIs between 3 December 1992 and 19 January 1998, as follows: (a) 1/ Main Camp Tea Tree Oil Project No. 1 (at least 2 PBRs were issued); (b) 2/ Main Camp Tea Tree oil Project No. 2; (c) 3/ Tumut River; (d) 4/ Orchard Project; (e) 5/ Golden Vintage 1996; (f) 6/ WA Paulownias; (g) and 7/ Plantations and Red Claw Partnerships.
- (11) Does the Minister agree that all but one of these seven PBRs are unqualified as to Part IVA provisions of the Income Tax Assessment Act, and that the financing arrangements (associated companies, non recourse loans, round robin of cheques) are specifically acknowledged in four of them.
- (12) Does the Minister agree that the Commonwealth's stated position (after the Sherman report) on the applicability of PBRs is that they should be available to ATO officers and taxation advisers for guidance, and 'legally binding on the Commissioner for a taxpayer whose circumstances are comparable to those dealt with by the ruling'.
- (13) Why is it that the ATO continues to resile from the applicability of these (and possible other) PBRs to many of the 174 disallowed MMTEIs.

1343 **Senator Harris:** To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—With reference to mass marketed tax effective investment (MMTEI) schemes:

- (1) Can details be provided of how much the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) has spent on the MMTEI campaign.
- (2) Has the Treasurer allocated additional funds to the ATO to carry out this campaign; if so, can details of additional funds be provided.
- (3) Can the Minister confirm that the ATO has spent over \$100 million on the MMTEI investigations.
- (4) (a) Has the Minister failed in her duty to the Parliament by not taking earlier action; and (b) why should Australian taxpayers pay for this level of inadequacy.
- (5) Will the Minister make a commitment that she will not waste any more public money when it is clear that the ATO has been proven wrong in the eyes of the law.
- (6) (a) Does the Minister accept the ruling of the Federal Court in the cases Vincent, Puzey and Cooke; and (b) will the Minister put a plan in action if it becomes more obvious that the ATO cannot sustain arguments in the court.
- (7) If a taxpayer has availed himself of the settlement process issued by the ATO and it is subsequently found that investors in the project have their deductions allowed by the court, as in the Vincent case, can the Minister confirm that the ATO will contact the acceptors and inform them that their deductions are allowed.
- (8) Will the Minister inform the Senate what mischief there is in aggressive tax planning.
- (9) Is aggressive planning illegal; if so, under what head of power.

- (10) Is it possible for an ATO product ruling to allow a project manager to go out and mass market an aggressive tax planning strategy.
- (11) Is tax minimisation illegal; if so, under what head of power.
- (12) Is it true that, in May 1997, officers of the ATO met in Casselden Place, Melbourne to discuss the disallowance to the deductions in MMTEIs.
- (13) Why was a further \$2 billion in tax deductions recovered by the ATO and accepted as claims in the following 2 years before the market effectively knew that the ATO had agreed to disallow the deductions.
- (14) Was the Treasurer made aware of the ATO's intentions in this matter before action was taken; and, if so, what was his reaction.
- (15) Given that the Treasurer re-appointed the Commissioner of Taxation for another 7 years, a full year before he was required to, and given that, in a press release, he stated that the re-appointment was because of his work on aggressive tax planning: is this just another way of securing 7 years for the Commissioner to promise the Treasurer hundreds of millions of dollars.

Notice given 25 March 2003

1346 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to comments by a spokesperson for the Minister, reported in AAP story number 3132, dated 24 March 2003:

- (1) Since January 2000, on how many occasions have rural groups, state agencies and veterinary surgeons been contacted by the Government about animal disease threats to Australia.
- (2) (a) What rural groups were contacted; (b) on how many occasions was each group contacted; (c) when was each contact made and who made the contact; (d) what was the nature of the disease threat that required contact with each group; and (e) what action was taken by each group and by the Government as a result of the contact.
- (3) (a) What state agencies were contacted; (b) on how many occasions was each state agency contacted; (c) when was each contact made and who made the contact; (d) what was the nature of the disease threat that required contact with each state agency; and (e) what action was taken by each state agency and by the Government as a result of the contact.
- (4) (a) Which veterinary surgeons were contacted; (b) on how many occasions was each veterinary surgeon contacted; (c) when was each contact made and who made the contact; (d) what was the nature of the disease threat that required contact with each veterinary surgeon; and (e) what action was taken by each veterinary surgeon and by the Government as a result of the contact.

1348 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—How many consignments of genetically-modified seeds have been imported into Australia with an import permit in each of the following financial years: (a) 2001-02; and (b) 2002-03.

1349 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to public quarantine alert PQA0251:

- (1) How many consignments of genetically-modified seeds have been imported into Australia without an import permit in each of the following financial years: (a) 2001-02; and (b) 2002-03.

- (2) Have all these consignments been detected by the Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service.
- (3) What action was taken when these unauthorised consignments were detected.

1350 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—What are the details of the import conditions and treatment requirements that apply to imported stock feed, including but not limited to conditions C5278 and C8779 and treatment T9902.

1351 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—In respect of the 2002-03 financial year:

- (1) How many expressions of interest for the importation of grain for stock feed have been received.
- (2) (a) How many applications for the importation of grain for stock feed have been received; and (b) how many tonnes have these applications concerned.
- (3) (a) How many applications for the importation of grain for stock feed have been approved; and (b) how many tonnes have these approvals concerned.
- (4) (a) How many applications for the importation of grain for stock feed have been rejected; and (b) how many tonnes have these rejections concerned.
- (5) How many shipments of grain for stock feed have been imported.
- (6) How many tonnes have been imported.
- (7) In relation to each shipment: (a) what country and region was the source of the grain; (b) how many tonnes have been imported; (c) at what port or ports has the grain been off-loaded and on what dates; and (d) what pre-entry and post-entry quarantine measures have been applied.

1353 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to public quarantine alert PQA0221:

- (1) When did the Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service review of import conditions for frozen fruit and vegetables commence.
- (2) Was the review due to be completed by 31 December 2002.
- (3) Why was the review not completed by 31 December 2002.
- (4) Has the review been completed; if so, what changes, if any, have been made to the import conditions for frozen fruit and vegetables; if not: (a) why not; and (b) when will the review be completed.

Senator O'Brien: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1355-1356)—

- (1) Does the European Union prohibit the export of ruminant livestock from Australia; if so, when was this prohibition applied.
- (2) Has the European Union recently moved to regularise third-country trade in live animals.
- (3) Has a draft amendment to Council Decision 79/542/EEC been prepared.
- (4) When did the Minister become aware the draft amendment was in preparation.
- (5) Would the application of this amendment further restrict live animal exports from Australia to member countries of the European Union.
- (6) Has the amendment been agreed to by the European Union; if so, when was it agreed to; if not, when is it likely to be agreed to.

- (7) Has the Minister sought advice on the impact on Australian exporters of the application of this amendment; if so, what is the likely impact, including affected breeds, export volume, export value and number of affected producers and exporters.
- (8) Has the Minister made representations to the Commission of European Communities, or individual member countries of the European Union, about this matter; if so: (a) when were these representations made; and (b) what form did they take.
- (9) Has the Minister received any representations from Australian producers and/or exporters about this matter; if so: (a) when were those representations received; and (b) what form did they take.

1356 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Notice given 27 March 2003

1363 **Senator McLucas:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Education, Science and Training—With reference to the answer to question no. E763-03 taken on notice by the department during estimates hearings of the Employment, Workplace Relations and Education Legislation Committee:

- (1) Can a full list be provided of all reports that have been published, including on the Internet, without an accompanying press release since 11 November 2001, including the dates and form of publication for those reports.
- (2) What is the name and position of the person who judged that the publication of the Anderson report was a 'routine matter'.
- (3) What is the name and position of the person who decided that the Anderson report should not be accompanied by a media alert.
- (4) Who is typically responsible for judging whether the publication of a report should be accompanied by a media alert.

1366 **Senator Harris:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) With reference to the establishment of Dairy Australia Limited as a corporate entity: What procedures does the department have to ensure that legislation, regulations or principles and guidelines for the establishment of a new entity are followed; and (b) can a copy of those procedures be provided.
- (2) With reference to the imposition of a levy payable to Dairy Australia Limited: What procedures does the department have to ensure that legislation, regulations or principles and guidelines for the implementing of levies payable to a corporation are complied with; and (b) can a copy of those procedures be provided; if there are no departmental procedures, why do they not exist.
- (3) What measures have been taken to ensure that the existing levy payers were consulted, regarding the proposed establishment of Dairy Australia Limited.
- (4) Can the following information be provided: (a) Full details of the public meetings held to discuss the formulation of Dairy Australia Limited; (b) details of the numbers present at these meetings; and (c) the details of the votes taken at each public meeting supporting or opposing the establishment of Dairy Australia Limited, expressed in both numerical terms and as a percentage of attendees.

- (5) Can a list be provided of any departmental media advertisements placed for these meetings.

Notice given 2 April 2003

Senator Brown: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1371-1374)—

- (1) (a) Does the department or any of its agencies hold unpublished data from Roam Consulting, dated 2002, relating to electricity costs for new entrants, comparing 'zero emissions' coal with other fuels including conventional coal, gas combined cycle and renewables; (b) for whom was this data prepared; (c) what was the cost of the work; (d) who paid for it; (e) what was the estimated cost of electricity generated from 'zero emissions' coal and what information was used to derive this estimate; and (f) can a copy of the data be provided.
- (2) (a) Has unpublished data from Roam Consulting relating to the cost of 'zero emissions' coal been used in reports or advice provided to the Minister in the past 2 years, including reports and advice from the Chief Scientist; if so, can the following details be provided: title, author, date, nature of the advice or report, and its purpose; (b) what was the estimated cost of electricity generated from 'zero emissions' coal and what information was used to derive this estimate; (c) for whom was the data prepared; and (d) can a copy of the information be provided.

1374 Minister representing the Minister for Science

Notice given 17 April 2003

1393 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the Minister's statement AFFA02/289WT of 17 October 2002 announcing the provision and requirements under the Sugar Industry Reform Program relating to Sugar Enterprise Viability Assessments (SEVAs) and Sugar Enterprise Activity Plans (SEAPs):

- (1) How many applications have been received to date for the preparation of SEVAs and SEAPs from: (a) cane farmers; and (b) cane harvesters.
- (2) How many SEVAs and SEAPs have been completed to date for: (a) cane farmers; and (b) cane harvesters.
- (3) With reference to Fact Sheet SE020.0210 (page 1) accompanying the Minister's statement: (a) what are the 'special provisions' that customers who have accessed Farm Help within the past 12 months prior to claiming will be subject to; (b) how many calls have been received on the 1800 050 585 telephone number from: (i) cane farmers, and (ii) cane harvesters, querying their position regarding these 'special provisions' and the preparations of SEVAs and SEAPs; and (c) how many, (i) cane growers, and (ii) cane harvesters, have had their access eligibility for funds to pay for SEVAs or SEAPs reduced or rejected on the basis of these 'special provisions'.
- (4) What has been the total expenditure by the Commonwealth on SEVAs or SEAPs to date under the Sugar Industry Reform Program.
- (5) What is the total projected expenditure by the Commonwealth on SEVAs or SEAPs under the Sugar Industry Reform Program.

1394 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the Minister's statement

AFFA03/008WT of 5 February 2003 announcing the provision under the Sugar Industry Reform Program of the availability of sugar industry exit grants:

- (1) On what date do applications for these grants close.
- (2) How many application forms for these grants have been distributed to date.
- (3) On what date did the application form become available on a Commonwealth website.
- (4) On what date did the printed application form become available.
- (5) On what date were the first application forms mailed to potential applicants.
- (6) To date how many applications for these grants have been: (a) received; (b) rejected; and (c) approved.
- (7) What has been the total expenditure by the Commonwealth on these grants to date.
- (8) What is the total projected expenditure on these grants under the Sugar Industry Reform Program.

1395 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the Minister's statement AFFA02/300WT of 29 October 2002 announcing the provision under the Sugar Industry Reform Program of 50 per cent interest rate subsidies over two years on loans of up to \$50,000 taken out for replanting purposes:

- (1) On what date do applications for these subsidies close.
- (2) How many application forms for these subsidies have been distributed to date.
- (3) On what date did the application form become available on a Commonwealth website.
- (4) On what date did the printed application form become available.
- (5) On what date were the first application forms mailed to potential applicants.
- (6) To date, how many applications for these subsidies have been: (a) received; (b) rejected; and (c) approved.
- (7) What has been the total expenditure by the Commonwealth on these subsidies to date.
- (8) What is the total projected expenditure on these subsidies under the Sugar Industry Reform Program.

1396 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the Minister's statement of 10 September 2002 (reference AFFA02/233WT) announcing the provision of short-term income support measures to help stabilise the industry and to help those in immediate need:

- (1) How many applications had been received from cane farmers for these measures as at 31 December 2002 and as at 31 March 2003.
- (2) How many applications from cane farmers had been approved for these measures as at 31 December 2002 and as at 31 March 2003.
- (3) How many applications from cane farmers had been rejected for these measures as at 31 December 2002 and as at 31 March 2003.
- (4) How many applications had been received from cane harvesters for these measures as at 31 December 2002 and as at 31 March 2003.
- (5) How many applications had been approved for cane harvesters for these measures as at 31 December 2002 and as at 31 March 2003.

- 6) How many applications from cane harvesters had been rejected for these measures as at 31 December 2002 and as at 31 March 2003.
- 7) What has been the total expenditure by the Commonwealth on these measures as at 31 December 2002 and as at 31 March 2003 for: (a) cane farmers; and (b) cane harvesters.
- 8) What is the total projected expenditure under these measures for: (a) cane farmers; and (b) cane harvesters.

1397 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) (a) When did the Minister become aware that the CSIRO plant laboratories in Canberra were suspected of being infected with wheat streak mosaic virus; (b) who advised the Minister; and (c) how was the Minister advised.
- (2) (a) When did the Minister become aware that the CSIRO plant laboratories in Canberra were confirmed as being infected with wheat streak mosaic virus; (b) who advised the Minister; and (c) how was the Minister advised.
- (3) When did CSIRO first suspect that its plant laboratories in Canberra were infected with wheat streak mosaic virus.
- (4) With reference to the suspicion by CSIRO that its Canberra or other plant laboratories were infected with wheat streak mosaic virus (i.e. before the virus was confirmed as being present in the Canberra laboratories in April 2003): (a) what actions were taken by the Commonwealth (and on what dates) to advise the following stakeholders: (i) rural industry peak bodies, (ii) state government agriculture ministers and/or their departments, (iii) individual growers, (iv) appropriate government agencies within overseas trading nations, and (v) any other stakeholders; and (b) in each instance: (i) who was advised, and (ii) how were they advised.
- (5) Did the Department advise Plant Health Australia (PHA) of CSIRO's suspicion that wheat streak mosaic virus may be present in its Canberra or other plant laboratories; if so, when and how was PHA advised.
- (6) With reference to the confirmation by CSIRO that its Canberra plant laboratories were infected with wheat streak mosaic virus: (a) what actions were taken by the Commonwealth (and on what dates) to advise the following stakeholders: (i) rural industry peak bodies, (ii) state government agriculture ministers and/or their departments, (iii) individual growers, (iv) appropriate government agencies within overseas trading nations, and (v) any other stakeholders; and (b) in each instance: (i) who was advised, and (ii) how were they advised.
- (7) Did the Minister's Department advise Plant Health Australia (PHA) of CSIRO's confirmation that wheat streak mosaic virus was present in their Canberra or other plant laboratories; if so, on what day and how was PHA advised.
- (8) With reference to the suspicion by CSIRO that its Canberra plant laboratories were infected with wheat streak mosaic virus (i.e. before the virus was confirmed as being present in April 2003) what actions were taken by the Commonwealth to trace the destination of plant seeds or other plant material from CSIRO plant laboratories in Canberra.
- (9) With reference to the confirmation by CSIRO that its Canberra plant laboratories were infected with wheat streak mosaic virus: (a) what actions were taken by the Commonwealth to trace the destination of plant seeds, or

other plant material from CSIRO plant laboratories in Canberra; and (b) can a list of confirmed destinations be provided.

- (10) On what date did the Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service (AQIS) commence investigations to determine the source of the suspected introduction of wheat streak mosaic virus into the CSIRO Canberra plant laboratories.
- (11) (a) What actions were taken by AQIS to determine the source of the introduction of wheat streak mosaic virus into the CSIRO Canberra plant laboratories; and (b) what was the outcome of those enquiries (if completed).
- (12) If AQIS has not completed its investigations, when are those investigations likely to be concluded.

1399 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the Minister's statement AFFA02/300WT of 29 October 2002 announcing that a "levy will be placed on all domestic sugar sales (for manufacturing, food service and retail uses) at 3 cents a kilogram for approximately 5 years" (sugar tax) and that exports of refined sugar will be exempt from the levy, and that a rebate will be available for sugar used in manufactured products for export (sugar tax rebate):

- (1) How many Australian companies or other enterprises are currently paying the sugar tax.
- (2) For each of the 5 years of its proposed existence, what is the total projected amount to be collected under the sugar tax.
- (3) How much has been collected under the sugar tax to date.
- (4) How many Australian companies or other enterprises have applied for a sugar tax rebate to date.
- (5) For each of the 5 years of its proposed existence, what is the total projected amount to be repaid to Australian companies or other enterprises under the sugar tax rebate.
- (6) What steps is the Commonwealth taking to monitor the effect of the sugar tax on Australian companies or other enterprises in terms of: (a) international price competitiveness of Australian manufactured products which use sugar as an input; (b) employment growth or decline within Australian manufacturing sectors which produce goods which use sugar as an input; (c) the increase or decrease in sugar imports by Australian manufacturing sectors which produce goods which use sugar as an input; (d) the increase or decrease in sugar exports by Australian manufacturing sectors which produce goods which use sugar as an input; (e) the substitution of sugar with non-sugar products by Australian manufacturing sectors which produce goods which normally use sugar as an input; and (f) the substitution within the Australian market of the consumption of manufactured sugar bearing products manufactured in Australia with imported manufactured sugar bearing products.
- (7) What is the department's current estimate of how much the sugar tax will cost to administer for: (a) the department; and (b) industry.
- (8) What is the department's current estimate of how much the sugar tax rebate will cost to administer for: (a) the department; and (b) industry.

Notice given 22 April 2003

1403 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister representing the Prime Minister—

- (1) With reference to a claim made by the Prime Minister before the war that only the threat of force by the United States of America (US) allowed the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) weapons inspectors back into Iraq, and given that it was the threat of force by Washington which pulled the weapons inspectors out of Iraq in March 2003 before they could complete their work (as in December 1998), does the Prime Minister now concede that the threat of force failed again to disarm Iraq of its weapons of mass destruction.
- (2) What is the Government's response to the claim of the Executive Chairman of UNMOVIC, Dr Blix, that the US was guilty of 'fabricating' evidence against Iraq to justify the war, and his belief that the discovery of weapons of mass destruction had been replaced by the main objective of the US of toppling Saddam Hussein (The Guardian, 12 April 2003).
- (3) With reference to claims made by the Prime Minister before the war that there was no doubt that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction and that that was the primary reason for Australia's participation in the 'coalition of the willing', what is the Prime Minister's position now that, even after the collapse of the regime in Baghdad, no weapons of mass destruction have been found despite United States Defence Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's claim to know where they are.
- (4) Given the Prime Minister's statements that 'regime change' was only a secondary concern for Australia, does the Government agree that the primary justification for the war may prove to be a lie.
- (5) If, as the Prime Minister repeatedly claimed, Iraq had weapons of mass destruction and Saddam Hussein could not be contained or deterred, what is the Government's analysis of why they were not used in the regime's terminal hours against the invading US, United Kingdom and Australian forces.
- (6) With reference to the Prime Minister's argument that stopping the spread of weapons of mass destruction was a primary motive for Australia's participation in a war against Iraq: (a) is the Government concerned that one of the direct effects of the war may be the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to third parties, including other so called 'rogue states' and possibly terrorist groups, and (b) what analysis has the Government done of this likelihood, and (c) can details be provided.
- (7) Does the Prime Minister now regret saying just before the war (at the National Press Club and elsewhere) that Saddam Hussein could stay on in power providing he got rid of his weapons of mass destruction, thus allowing him to continue the repression of Iraqis; if so, what circumstances altered the Prime Minister's view.

Notice given 7 May 2003

1441 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Veterans' Affairs—

- (1) For each of the past 3 financial years, how much has been spent in Outcome 2 on: (a) chiropractry; (b) osteopathy; (c) physiotherapy; (d) ophthalmology; (e) optometrical; (f) aids and appliances; (g) diagnostic imagery; and (h) pathology.
- (2) Can an update be provided of the tables showing compensation claims accepted for service in Timor and the Gulf, as contained in the answer to part (6) of question on notice no. 743 (Senate Hansard, 4 December 2002,

- p.7212) and part (2) of question on notice no. 744 (Senate Hansard, 12 December 2002, p. 8175).
- (3) Further to the answer to question on notice no. 747 (Senate Hansard, 13 November 2002, p. 6318): What is the current position with respect to the review of dosimetry data from the atomic testing program.
 - (4) What is the current position with respect to tendering for transport services, as sought in the answer to question on notice no. 748 (Senate Hansard, 15 November 2002, p. 6557).
 - (5) Further to the answer to question on notice no. 802 (Senate Hansard, 15 November 2002, p. 6558): (a) what commission has been paid to Defence Service Homes Insurance (DSHI) by QBE/Mercantile Mutual over each of the past 3 years; and (b) what proportion has that commission been of DSHI's running costs in each year.
 - (6) Can an update be provided of the data in the answer to parts (4), (5), (6), (19), (23) and (26) of question on notice no. 819 (Senate Hansard, 18 March 2003, p. 9581).
 - (7) Further to the answer to question on notice no. 968 (Senate Hansard, 5 February 2003, p. 8661): Can an update be provided to March 2003 of the data on Department of Veterans' Affairs health card usage and costs.
 - (8) With reference to the answer to question on notice 1004 (Senate Hansard, 18 March 2003, p. 9621): Were prosecutions launched against those medical providers identified by type in part (2); if not, why not; if so, with what outcome in each case.
 - (9) With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 697 (Senate Hansard, 11 November 2002, p. 6042) concerning the review of tier-one hospitals: Can an answer be provided to those parts which remained unanswered.

Notice given 9 May 2003

1447 **Senator Harris:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) (a) Can the Minister advise why the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator (OGTR) was set up with such restricted terms of reference; (b) why is it that the OGTR can only look at aspects of the introduction of genetically-modified (GM) material into Australia under the terms of 'health and environment'.
- (2) Why was the Gene Technology Grains Committee (GTGC) put together with a majority of 'pro-GM' interests; and (b) why did it ignore submissions that do not agree with its philosophy.
- (3) (a) Is the Minister aware that the 'Canola Industry Stewardship Protocols' ignore any aspect of possible and very probable on-farm contamination of GM canola into non-GM canola, either through direct grains contamination or, the most likely and by far the greatest source of probable contamination, environmental transfer via pollen, bees, etc.; and (b) what steps has the department taken to scrutinise the possibility of contamination of non-GM canola.
- (4) Can the Minister explain how and why the GTGC has been able to place the onus, responsibility and, ultimately, liability on everyone else except the technology providers in its 'Canola Industry Stewardship Protocols'.

- (5) Can a copy of the final report relating to Bayer for Invigor Canola, Crop Management Plan, that was passed by the OGTR, be provided to the Senate and the industry.
- (6) Why is it that the New South Wales Farmers' Association (NSWFA) and the Victorian Farmers Federation (VFF) refuse to survey their own members to gain a grass roots feeling of GM canola.
- (7) Can documentation be provided on how many members or executive members of the NSWFA and the VFF were invited or taken on a fact-finding tour to the United States of America by the technology providers.
- (8) (a) Is the Minister aware that the New Zealand Agricultural Minister said, in late 2002, that 'New Zealand was very unlikely to gain a Free Trade Agreement with America because of our stance on GM crops and our stance on nuclear ships'; and (b) what commitments has the Australian Government made to be able to have a free trade agreement with America.

Notice given 14 May 2003

1463 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—

- (1) For each of the past 5 years, what sum has been spent from Commonwealth funds on legal aid to veterans by each state Legal Aid Commission.
- (2) What is the current rate payable in each state for veterans' matters.
- (3) For each of the past 5 years: (a) how many applications were received from veterans for legal aid in each state, (b) what percentage were rejected in each year, and (c) how many were for: (i) Federal Court, (ii) High Court, and (iii) state Supreme Court applications.
- (4) For each of the past 5 years, what sum was spent by state, on: (a) Federal Court; (b) High Court; (c) Supreme Court; and (d) other court applications.

Notice given 22 May 2003

1478 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources—Was any information prepared by consultant Rio Tinto Ltd as part of the mining and energy biotechnology sector study, undertaken under contract for the department in the 1999-2000 financial year; if so, what was that information and can a copy be provided.

Notice given 6 June 2003

Senator Brown: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1490-1493)—With reference to the answers to questions on notice nos 1122 to 1125:

- (1) Who contributed to and who owns: (a) the Forestry Eco Centre at Scottsdale; (b) the centre at Freycinet National Park; and (c) each of the centres and facilities networked in the vicinity of the Great Western Tiers.
- (2) Was, or is, Forestry Tasmania involved in any of these centres; if so, how and to what degree.
- (3) Have any of the centres been sold or subject to transfer of ownership; if so, can details be provided.
- (4) If any of the centres were sold or ownership transferred was the Government consulted; if so, how and what was the Government's input.

1490 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

1491 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

- 1492 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
 1493 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Notice given 10 June 2003

- 1502 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—Can a list be provided of all Defence aircraft charters over the past 5 financial years, indicating in each instance: (a) the date of charter; (b) the cost of the charter; (c) the purpose of the charter; (d) the company from which the aircraft was chartered; and (e) the type of plane that was chartered.

Notice given 16 June 2003

- 1519 **Senator McLucas:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—
- (1) What is the total budget for the 91 Commonwealth Natural Heritage Trust (NHT) and National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality facilitator positions recently advertised in national newspapers (and now listed on the department's web site) and being recruited through Effective People Pty Ltd and; and (b) from which program or programs is this funding coming.
 - (2) (a) How much is Effective People Pty Ltd being paid to recruit these people; and (b) from which program or programs is this funding coming.
 - (3) Can an organisational chart for the positions be provided showing how they will report to the department.
 - (4) How is coordination of NHT activities managed with Environment Australia.
 - (5) How will these facilitators work with state department-employed NHT facilitators and project officers.
 - (6) Can a copy be provided of all documentation which outlines the rationale for the employment of these facilitators, including how their effectiveness will be measured and/or evaluated.

Notice given 17 June 2003

- 1532 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—
- (1) What internal resources has Telstra allocated to the monitoring of the Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts References Committee inquiry into the Australian telecommunications network.
 - (2) At how many hearings of the inquiry has Telstra had a staff member present for monitoring purposes.
 - (3) What is the name and position of the Telstra employee who has been attending inquiry hearings on a regular basis.
 - (4) Of what Telstra Business Unit is he a part.
 - (5) Who does he report to in Telstra.
 - (6) What is his annual salary.
 - (7) What has been the cost of travel and travel allowance for the purpose of monitoring this inquiry.
 - (8) What is his position description and/or brief in regard to this inquiry.

- (9) What hearings of the Australian telecommunications network has this person attended.
- (10) (a) Does he present a report to Telstra after each hearing; and (b) who is given a copy of that report.

1533 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—

- (1) How many RAM 8s are used in the Bendigo, Gippsland and Southern Gippsland regions.
- (2) Does Telstra agree with the assertion that the quality of service is reduced with RAM 8s, such as slower Internet connections and static; if so, what is Telstra doing to improve the service.
- (3) How many complaints, concerning network faults, has Telstra received in the past year from customers in the Bendigo, Gippsland and Southern Gippsland regions.
- (4) (a) What is slavey cable; and (b) what it is used for.
- (5) Is Telstra using slavey cable to aid the provision of services to customers.
- (6) Can the Minister confirm whether Telstra is not allowing 'expense works' unless they are emergency patch ups only.
- (7) Given that at the Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts Legislation Committee additional estimates hearings in November 2002 Telstra stated that under the Regional Network Taskforce program cable replacement was conducted in the Southern Gippsland area (QoN 47), can Telstra provide a percentage figure for old and new cable in the area.

1534 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—With reference to the Cable Air Pressure Program:

- (1) How many staff are being assigned to work on the this program in each of the priority areas of Illawarra, Newcastle, Sydney, Perth, Adelaide, Tasmania and Canberra.
- (2) Can figures be provided on how many of those assigned under the program, for each of the above priority areas, are: (a) Network Design and Construction staff; (b) National Network Solutions staff, (c) contractors; and (d) Telstra field staff.
- (3) How many cables were in alarm in each of these priority areas at the start of this program.
- (4) How many cables in each of the categories of platinum, gold and silver, were identified as being in alarm in New South Wales.
- (5) How many cables are now in alarm in each of these priority areas.
- (6) How many of the cables in alarm are due to inaccessible leaks.
- (7) What is the process for repairing inaccessible leaks.
- (8) How many inaccessible leaks in New South Wales are being repaired by cable length replacement under this program.
- (9) Given that cables in Tasmania are not under APCAMS but under the AMS system, are AMS reports available; if so, can a copy of the most recent AMS report be provided; if not, how are the priority areas being determined in Tasmania.

- (10) What broadly is the state of the cables in Tasmania as far as this issue is concerned.
- (11) Is the APCAMs alarm system being installed in any new areas; if so, where.
- (12) How much is being spent on APCAMS installation.

1535 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—With reference to the Customer Network Improvement (CNI) database:

- (1) How many CNIs are there in the database at present, given that on 6 December the total figure quoted by Telstra was 112 159, an increase from the number quoted by Mr Estens in his report, which was 104 500 for February 2002.
- (2) How many CNIs are there in each of the five priority classifications at present.
- (3) What is the oldest CNI in each of the five priority classifications at present.
- (4) What is the volume of CNIs that have been cleared from the database since 6 December 2002, in each of the priority classifications.
- (5) Is it true that Telstra has changed the reporting process for CNIs, given the evidence presented by the Communications, Electrical, Electronic, Energy, Information, Postal, Plumbing and Allied Services Union at the Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts References Committee hearing into the Australian telecommunications network in Sydney on 19 May 2003 that there is a new process which involves a telephone call to the CNI phone number, and that the paperwork that used to be utilised is no longer required under this new process.
- (6) (a) When did this system change; and (b) what is the rationale behind it.
- (7) How are CNI tasks now allocated to customer field staff.
- (8) Who can access the CNI database.
- (9) Can team leaders in specific regional areas access the CNI database.

1536 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—

- (1) At what date did Pracom commence supplying contractors to Telstra in Perth.
- (2) (a) How many Pracom contractors, by dates of contracts, have been contracted by Telstra for the 2002-03 financial year.
- (3) How many Citadel Securix contractors, by dates of contracts, have been contracted by Telstra for the 2002-03 financial year.
- (4) How does the Corporate Sourcing Group operate; and (b) is there a separate Corporate Sourcing Group in each Telstra region.
- (5) Who does the General Manager of Metro Services Infrastructure Services report to in the Telstra organisation.
- (6) Can details be provided of which expenses are covered by Telstra and which expenses are covered by contractors when contractors are flown in to a capital city to do work for Telstra; for example does Telstra pay for the cost of travel, travel allowance and other expenses.
- (7) If any of these expenses are covered by Telstra, which part of Telstra's budget are these costs covered by.

- (8) Has Telstra made any changes in the 2002-03 financial year to the way these expenses are recorded.
- (9) What investigations has Telstra done into the connections between Ms T Jakszewicz, or members of her immediate family, and the contracting company Pracom.
- (10) (a) Is Ms Jakszewicz still an employee of Telstra; and (b) can the dates of her employment with Telstra be provided.
- (11) With regard to the use of contractors generally: For each Telstra region, on how many occasions has the inspection of work done by contractors resulted in a re-report of that work.

1537 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—

- (1) (a) How much money did Telstra spend on advertising its specialised services for the aged and disabled in the last year; (b) what advertising medium did Telstra use to promote these services; and (c) where did Telstra predominantly advertise these services.
- (2) (a) Where are the aged and disability managers located in Australia; and (b) how many staff work with the managers.
- (3) (b) Will Telstra be training other staff in dealing with aged and disability problems; if so, where will these staff be located; and (b) how much training will be provided per staff member, for example, days or weeks.

1538 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—

- (1) With reference to Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts Legislation Committee Hansard, 27 May 2003 page 142, can the Minister confirm the statement by Mr Rix that it is only in 'contingency' workload that Telstra has 'an opportunity to look for additional resources such as the use of overtime'.
- (2) (a) Does Telstra use additional resources such as overtime or external contractors under any other workload condition, such as low workload, normal workload, high workload or contingency; and (b) can details be provided of each category of additional resources for each workload for each area this financial year, including Network Design and Construction, National Network Solutions resources.
- (3) (a) If no preventative maintenance work is done under contingency, is preventative maintenance work done under any other workload condition, such as low workload, normal workload or high workload; and (b) can details be provided of the percentage of resources for preventative maintenance work under each other workload condition.
- (4) How many days of normal workload were there this financial year for each Telstra region including: (a) Sydney Metro; (b) NSW Regional; (c) Melbourne Metro; (d) Vic Regional; (e) Brisbane Metro; (f) Qld Regional; (g) Perth Metro; (h) WA Regional; (i) Adelaide Metro; (j) SA Regional; (k) NT; and (l) Tas.
- (5) How many days of high workload were there this financial year for each Telstra region including: (a) Sydney Metro; (b) NSW Regional; (c) Melbourne Metro; (d) Vic Regional; (e) Brisbane Metro; (f) Qld Regional; (g) Perth Metro; (h) WA Regional; (i) Adelaide Metro; (j) SA Regional; (k) NT; and (l) Tas.

- (6) How many days of low workload were there this financial year for each Telstra region including: (a) Sydney Metro; (b) NSW Regional; (c) Melbourne Metro; (d) Vic Regional; (e) Brisbane Metro; (f) Qld Regional; (g) Perth Metro; (h) WA Regional; (i) Adelaide Metro; (j) SA Regional; (k) NT; and (l) Tas.
- (7) How many days of contingency were there this financial year for each Telstra region including: (a) Sydney Metro; (b) NSW Regional; (c) Melbourne Metro; (d) Vic Regional; (e) Brisbane Metro; (f) Qld Regional; (g) Perth Metro; (h) WA Regional; (i) Adelaide Metro; (j) SA Regional; (k) NT; and (l) Tas.
- (8) What is the fault level at which each of these regions would be considered in contingency if in Melbourne Metro contingency is above 1 900 faults: (a) Sydney Metro; (b) NSW Regional; (c) Brisbane Metro; (d) Qld Regional; (e) Perth Metro; (f) WA Regional; (g) Adelaide Metro; (h) SA Regional; (i) NT; and (j) Tas.
- (9) With reference to evidence by Mr Rix, Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts Legislation Committee Hansard, 27 May 2003, page 144, if the normal range of faults for Melbourne is between 850 and 1 300 faults, what is the normal range of faults for each other area including: (a) Sydney Metro; (b) NSW Regional; (c) Brisbane Metro; (d) Qld Regional; (e) Perth Metro; (f) WA Regional; (g) Adelaide Metro; (h) SA Regional; (i) NT; and (j) Tas.

1539 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—

- (1) (a) Has 'FuturEdge' been implemented across Telstra yet; and (b) can an update be provided on how this has been proceeding.
- (2) (a) Was this system trialled in any location before it was implemented across the company; if so, where was it trialled, and for how long; and (b) is it still being trialled anywhere.
- (3) (a) Is it correct that there was a trial of 'FuturEdge' in Brisbane earlier this year; and (b) has the program been fully implemented in Brisbane now.
- (4) With reference to information provided to the Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts Legislation Committee: (a) is it true that the Brisbane Work Management Centre experienced so many problems with 'FuturEdge' that it had to assign hundreds of jobs manually; and (b) what sorts of problems were these and what did Telstra do to fix these.
- (5) How has Telstra changed the way fieldwork calendars are managed to improve fault rectification times as reported by Telstra in the Estens Report (page 85).

1540 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—

- (1) Can a list be provided of the names of the cities and towns that have had Telstra employees from other home base locations working in them, the number of employees in each, and the city or town of origin and number from that place of those workers for each month of the 2002-03 financial year.
- (2) How much does Telstra pay in travel allowance for its employees for each night away from their home base.

- (3) How many nights of travel allowance has Telstra paid its employees in the customer field workforce in the past financial year.
- (4) What is the total amount of travel allowance paid in the past financial year by Telstra to its customer field employees.
- (5) What is the total cost of: (a) airfares; and (b) other travel expenses, ie, car travel, to transport Telstra customer field employees from their home base to another location for this financial year.
- (6) Have the internal accounting or costing codes that Telstra uses to classify these expenses changed at all in the past few years; if so, how.
- (7) What section of the Telstra budget are these costs reported in.

1541 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—

- (1) What measures does Telstra take to ‘lightning proof’ its cable network.
- (2) Does Telstra know of any new technology that is available to minimise damage to cables from lightning strikes.
- (3) What damage do lightning strikes do to cables and how does it affect services.
- (4) With reference to the mass service disruption (MSD) notice declared in Tasmania in March 2003, which referred to a lightning storm on 19 March and declared an exemption from customer service guarantee (CSG) performance standards from Friday, 21 March, to Saturday, 29 March: What was the exact damage caused by this lightning storm (given the evidence to the Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts References Committee hearing in Launceston on 24 April 2003, in relation to the Australian telecommunications network inquiry, that this storm caused minimal damage in Tasmania).
- (5) When and how did Telstra notify customers of this MSD in Tasmania.
- (6) Were the CSG provisions adhered to in this case.
- (7) Has Telstra paid any compensation to Tasmanian customers in respect of this case.

1542 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—With reference to the Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts References Committee *Hansard*, 27 May 2003, pp 175-177:

- (1) How many hours of overtime were worked by Telstra customer field staff in each year of the past 5 financial years.
- (2) What is the average amount of overtime per customer field staff employee in each year of the past 5 financial years.
- (3) Have any Telstra customer field staff worked for any continuous periods in excess of 30 days; if so, in which location did these employees work and what was the number of days of continuous work.
- (4) Have any Telstra staff or Telstra contractors ever worked more than 20 hours straight within a 24 hour period; if so, in which location did these employees work and what has been the number of hours of overtime worked.
- (5) Have Telstra team leaders been asked to rank their staff by performance or productivity.

- (6) (a) How have Telstra team leaders decided which staff members are to be offered redundancies; and (b) was this on the basis of productivity or performance.
- (7) Can information be provided on the measures that Telstra has used to measure field staff against the quality of work, amount of work done each day, their utilisation and how often they are available, and what these criteria have been benchmarked at.
- (8) How is the criterion of 'how often they are available' for customer field staff measured and benchmarked.
- (9) What is the benchmark for the number of installations for a Telstra customer field employee.
- (10) What is the benchmark for the number of fault repairs for a Telstra customer field employee.

1543 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—

- (1) What is the process for clearing cash out of pay phones; and (b) how does Telstra know when a phone is ready to be cleared.
- (2) Is it the case that when a coin box in a public phone is full that this means the telephone cannot be operated by someone attempting to use it with coins.
- (3) When a 'coin box full' message is received at a Telstra call centre from a pay phone, how quickly does Telstra send out someone to clear this box.
- (4) Who clears phone boxes.
- (5) Is there any difference in the timeframe or process for doing this in metropolitan areas or regional areas; if so, can details be provided.
- (6) What does Telstra say about reports that Telstra does not act on this information until the third 'coin box full' message is received.

1544 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—

- (1) Can an update be provided on how the new Priority Service Program is working.
- (2) What is the budget for administering this program for the 2003-04 financial year.
- (3) (a) How many staff will be allocated to work on this program in the 2003-04 financial year; and (b) if there is a variation to 2002-03 figures, what positions are involved and what is the reason for the variation.
- (4) How many customers are currently registered on this program.
- (5) What is the rate of assistance being provided by the Priority Assistance Program to customers: ie, what percentage, and number of the registered priority assistance customers have received assistance from the Telstra priority program.
- (6) Can a geographical breakdown be provided of where this assistance was given, and how many times for each customer and in each area this assistance was provided, since the program began.
- (7) Has the program been well received by registered customers.

- (8) Have there been any customers who wished to register that Telstra has refused registration to; if so, can details be provided of the reasons for rejection and the number rejected.
- (9) What steps is Telstra taking to promote this program to customers.

1545 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—

- (1) How much notice did Telstra give its 'communic8' customers in Southern Tasmania that the promotion providing free 15 minute calls to other Telstra mobiles would not be renewed after 15 February.
- (2) With reference to the statement by a Telstra spokesperson on 18 February 2003 in the Mercury that 'there was a need to review the promotion', has Telstra conducted the review; if so, what was the outcome.

1546 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—

- (1) Can an update be provided on the \$187 million Regional Network Taskforce that was announced in July 2002.
- (2) Has there been any change to these funding amounts; if so, can details be provided.
- (3) (a) How much of the above budget was spent in 2002-03 and how much will be carried forward to future years; and (b) can details be provided.
- (4) (a) Under what part of Telstra's capital expenditure budget, or general budget, is this program funded; (b) is it included in the \$420 million capital spending; and (c) can funding details be provided.
- (5) (a) Does the program for 'copper network rehabilitation' include any remedial work on the 'seal the CAN' corrosive gel affected cables; if so, how much; (b) what work is covered in this category; and (c) can details be provided.
- (6) (a) Does the \$88 million on 'copper network rehabilitation' include any cable air pressure remedial work, such as the \$40 million program to bring cable air pressure up to 40kpa in certain priority areas; and (b) can details be provided.
- (7) For each category of spending listed, please indicate in which geographical locations each category of this program has done work.

1547 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—With reference to the use of encapsulant sealant gel:

- (1) Does Telstra still stand by the statement that in 97 percent of cases where the gel is in place that it continues to work well.
- (2) How much of the \$110 million allocated to this program has been spent in the 2002-03 financial year.
- (3) Has this funding level changed at all; if so, can details be provided.
- (4) What is the sub-category of the domestic capital expenditure budget that this program is funded under.
- (5) (a) Is it the case that if it is costing \$110 million to fix 100 000 cable joints then each cable joint costs \$100 000 to fix; (b) how was this figure calculated; and (c) can a breakdown of projected costings be provided.
- (6) How many of these 100 000 joints identified have so far been fixed.

- (7) (a) What are the geographical locations that are priorities for the repair of the 100 000 joints which have been targeted for remedial action; and (b) can a list of priority location areas be provided.
- (8) (a) Is Perth one of the priority areas under the Telstra program; and (b) how many cable joints have been repaired in Perth under this program.
- (9) (a) Are there still 100 people across Telstra exclusively focusing on identifying, prioritising and repairing cable joints where the gel has degraded the network; and (b) have any of these 100 people been moved from cable rehabilitation to other fault repair work this year for any period of time; if so, how many and where, and for what periods of time.

1548 **Senator Harris:** To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—With reference to the following list of firms that have given written advice about their mass marketed tax-effective investments schemes:

Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu: Budplan, Central Highlands wine Grape, Connect the World, Educational Devices, Equity Match, Harcourt Ridge, No Regrets, Satcom, Tentas;

Ernst & Young: Northern Rivers Tea Tree, Pacific Tea Tree;

KPMG: Freedom Express, Interest Recount, Tentas; and

Pricewaterhouse Coopers: Austvin, Equity Match, Liar Liar (Film), Oil Fields Project, Simple Simon/Mercury Rising (Film), Tradematch Licence:

- (1) Have any representatives of the above firms served on advisory panels to the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) or the Board of Taxation.
- (2) Can taxpayers undertaking self-assessment of tax be reasonably sure that they can rely on the opinion of the above firms, particularly if their representation have served on advisory panels to the ATO or the Board of Taxation.

1549 **Senator Harris:** To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—With reference to mass-marketed tax effective investment schemes:

- (1) (a) Have the Part IVA determinations which constitute the formal notice of tax avoidance been withdrawn from members of the federal ministry and state ministries; and (b) will the remaining 40 000 Australians that invested in cooperative agriculture and film projects receive the same benefit.
- (2) Can the Minister confirm that the Commissioner of Taxation advised the Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer (Senator Ian Campbell) that investors who chose not to settle would need to comprehensively succeed in any litigation of the case to be better off than the investors that settled.
- (3) Is it true that the Commissioner of Taxation has indicated to the Parliamentary Secretary that the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) intend to challenge any future mass marketed tax-effective investment cases taken before the courts, even though the Assistant Commissioner, Mr Peter Smith, wrote in 2001 that the ATO would test case two projects and that the outcomes from those selected cases would provide greater certainty for other participants in similar structured cases.
- (4) With reference to the Vincent decision, in which the determination that deductions were not allowed under the general deductibility provisions was not made, and the amendment assessment was not issued, until more than 4 years after the original assessment allowing the deductions: Can the

Minister indicate to how many unfinalised settlement offers in relation to projects and reassessments will the same outcome apply.

- (5) (a) How many cases are there in which the ATO failed to issue a reassessment by the final date to accept settlement (21 June 2002) and in which deductions were therefore disallowed under the general deductibility provisions; (b) would any of the reassessments issued at that date have fallen out of the 4 year period; (c) did the ATO indicate that if taxpayers did not settle it would have to contest the matter in court after objection; and (d) did the ATO maintain this view even after the Vincent appeal decision.

Notice given 18 June 2003

Senator Nettle: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1550-1551)—With reference to the Regional Solutions Program, can a breakdown be provided of funding in Western Australia for the years 2001 to 2003, including: (a) areas receiving funding; (b) the amount of funding received by each area; and (c) a brief job description.

1550 Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services

1551 Minister representing the Minister for Regional Services, Territories and Local Government

Notice given 19 June 2003

1558 **Senator Harris:** To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—Given the ruling by the Federal Court in 2001 in relation to mass marketed tax-effective investments (MMTEIs) and the seriousness with which the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) regarded MMTEIs: Have any firms been brought before the Tax Agents Board as a consequence of the failed MMTEI's Federal Court case; if so, can a list of those firms be provided; if not, why has the ATO not commenced any action.

1559 **Senator Harris:** To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—

- (1) Can the Minister confirm that in the recent Cooke case involving Horticultural Project No.1, Justice Stone said that:

- (a) the Spotless case had little relevance to an Australian-based project with a clear commercial purpose;
- (b) the 'scheme' considered by the Australian Taxation Office in relation to Messers Cooke and Jamieson must include only those financial aspects of the project of which Messers Cooke and Jamieson were aware; and
- (c) Messrs Cooke and Jamieson's testimony about the dominant purpose of the investment must be accorded due weight;

if so: (a) can the Minister provide an explanation as to why the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) relied primarily on Spotless in its administration of mass marketed tax-effective investment (MMTEI) taxpayers' reassessments; and (b) in its administration of MMTEI taxpayer reassessments, how does the ATO treat a person who enters into a MMTEI, which included financial aspects of projects of which the taxpayer was unaware when entering the scheme.

- (2) Has the ATO, in its administration of MMTEI taxpayer reassessments, ignored evidence presented by taxpayers, at the ATO's invitation, in regard to the dominant purpose of their investment, contrary to the requirements in Section 177A(5) of the Income Tax Assessment Act 1936.

Notice given 20 June 2003

1561 **Senator Webber:** To ask the Minister for Family and Community Services—

- (1) For the state of Western Australia, for each of the financial years ending 30 June 1997, 30 June 1998, 30 June 1999, 30 June 2000, 30 June 2001 and 30 June 2002: what was the proportion of total Centrelink debt incurred for each of the following benefit categories: (a) age pension; (b) Austudy; (c) disability support pension; (d) Newstart allowance; (e) parenting payment; (f) partner allowance; (g) youth allowance; (i) carer allowance; and (j) family tax benefit.
- (2) For the state of Western Australia, by local government authority: (a) what is the total number of debts incurred for each of the benefits listed above; and (b) what is the average amount of these debts for each of the benefits.

Notice given 23 June 2003

Senator Brown: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1564-1565)—

- (1) (a) Does the Minister support the integrated management of surface run-off, river water and ground water, recognising that these systems are physically interconnected; and (b) will the Minister make this a pre-requisite for water reform through the Council of Australian Governments process.
- (2) What steps are being taken to achieve integrated water management, including protection of the environment and common systems of allocating water so that switching between sources is accounted for.

1565 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Senator Webber: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1570-1575)—

- (1) How many staff at the senior executive service (SES) level are employed in the department within Western Australia.
- (2) Given Western Australia's contribution to the nation's economy, is the department adequately represented in Western Australia to ensure that development opportunities are maximised.
- (3) Does the lack of senior Commonwealth departmental representatives or SES staff have a negative impact on Commonwealth program funds in Western Australia.
- (4) Would Western Australia be advantaged by an increase in the number of SES staff located within the state.

1571 Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts

1572 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Notice given 24 June 2003

1578 **Senator Carr:** To ask the President of the Senate—Can the President request the Speaker to provide answers to the following questions in respect of the Department of the House of Representatives, noting that these questions have also been asked of the other parliamentary departments and executive departments and agencies through the estimates process:

- (1) What was the number of senior executive service (SES) staff at each SES band level at 30 June 1996 and at 30 June for each subsequent year, and the number and level of SES staff as at 31 March 2003.
- (2) What were the minimum and maximum salary levels for each SES band, whether determined by Australian Workplace Agreements or otherwise, as

at 30 June 1996 and at 30 June in each subsequent year, and at 31 March 2003.

- (3) (a) What was the number of staff with salaries overlapping SES salaries as at 30 June 1996 and at 30 June in each subsequent year, and at 31 March 2003; and (b) what were the minimum and maximum levels of these salaries.
- (4) (a) How many people are currently employed other than under the Parliamentary Service Act 1999, including under contract arrangements, at salary levels equivalent to the SES; and (b) what are the minimum and maximum levels of the salaries paid.
- (5) Has the department introduced arrangements whereby SES or other staff who are entitled to a motor vehicle as part of their remuneration are able to cash the vehicle out and have the cashed out amount count as salary for superannuation purposes; if so: (a) when were these arrangements introduced and do they still apply; (b) what was the policy justification for long-term costs of these arrangements; and (c) were any actuarial calculations made of the long-term costs of these arrangements; if so, what were the details of the estimates; if not, why was this not done.

Notice given 25 June 2003

1582 **Senator Marshall:** To ask the Minister for Defence—With reference to surplus former Defence land at Point Nepean:

- (1) Will the Minister make public the expressions of interest received by the Government from individuals, organisations and governments for the 85 hectares of land at Point Nepean; if not, why not.
- (2) (a) Can the Minister confirm when the Government intends to make a decision as to its preferred submission of interest; and (b) will the decision be made public; if so, when; if not, why not.
- (3) Can an outline be provided of the process and timeline for putting the 85 hectares to tender.
- (4) Has the Government closed the door on negotiations with the Victorian Government over a transfer of the remaining 85 hectares of land to the State of Victoria; if so, why; if not: (a) what has been undertaken to further these negotiations with the Victorian Government; and (b) how are these negotiations proceeding.
- (5) Why was the decision taken not to gift the entire 315 hectare site at Point Nepean to the Victorian Government.
- (6) Why will the Government not gift the 85 hectares of remaining surplus Defence land at Point Nepean to the State of Victoria, on the same basis that it did with similar land in New South Wales and Western Australia.
- (7) Can the Minister explain the differing circumstances between the land at Sydney Harbour and in Western Australia and the land at Point Nepean, which would prevent it from being gifted to the State of Victoria.
- (8) Can the Minister clarify the Government's position in relation to placing obligations upon any potential buyers of the 85 hectares of surplus Defence land, for example, will the Government be regulating future uses and/or proscribing activities or uses of the land; if so, can details be provided; if not, why not.
- (9) Can the Minister categorically rule out the land being sold for either private residential use or tourist-style accommodation.

- (10) Will the Minister oblige a potential buyer of the 85 hectares to uphold and implement the objectives of the departmentally-commissioned Portsea Defence Land Community Master Plan; if so, can details be provided; if not, why not.
- (11) What was the overall budget for undertaking the Portsea Defence Land Community Master Plan; and (b) can this budget be broken down into appropriate budget lines noting different areas of spending on the project.

Notice given 26 June 2003

- 1587 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—
With reference to Tasmania’s rainforests, including those on private lands, and their conversion to plantations under the Government’s Regional Forest Agreement:
- (1) What area and percentage of the original area remained in 1996.
 - (2) Since 1996, what area and percentage of the rainforests has been converted to plantations.
 - (3) From 1996, what area and percentage of the rainforests will be converted to plantations.
- 1588 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—
With reference to Tasmania’s native forests and their conversion to plantations under the Government’s Regional Forest Agreement (RFA):
- (1) What area and percentage of Tasmania’s original native forest cover remained in 1996.
 - (2) Since 1996, what additional area and percentage of the remaining area has been converted.
 - (3) From 1996, what further area and percentage of the remaining area will be converted.
 - (4) Where, in the RFA, are these parameters set out and agreed to.
- 1589 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—
With reference to Tasmanian forests on public and private lands, under the Regional Forest Agreement planning:
- (1) (a) How many specific coupes have been assured for: (i) clearfell logging, and (ii) selective logging; and (b) in each case, how many of the coupes were assessed by a qualified: (i) archaeologist or anthropologist, (ii) botanist, (iii) zoologist, (iv) geologist, and (v) pleontologist.
 - (2) If figures are not kept, is it a fact, in each case, that much less than one quarter of the coupes were assessed.
- 1590 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—
- (1) On how many occasions since 1997 have representatives of the Commonwealth Government inspected proposed or active logging sites under the Tasmanian Regional Forest Agreement to make independent assessments.
 - (2) What did these assessors report.

Notice given 27 June 2003

- 1594 **Senator Harris:** To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—

- (1) Can details be provided of all individuals and their quantities of production units for all mass marketed tax-effective investments (MMTEIs).
- (2) If an accountancy firm, rather than an individual, were to procure all production units for any MMTEI would they also have received a Part IVA determination, which remains withdrawn.
- (3) Are firms that procured production units subject to the same exclusion as financial planners from the settlement offer.

1595 **Senator Santoro:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—

- (1) When did Australia Post sell the post office building and land at 1 Bowser Parade, Sandgate, in Queensland.
- (2) To whom was this property sold.
- (3) What was the sale price.
- (4) Is any land adjoining this property currently owned by, or has it ever been owned by, Australia Post; if so, what is: (a) the current ownership status of this adjoining land; and (b) the sale history of such land.
- (5) Does Australia Post consider that the sale price paid represented value for money for the vendor.
- (6) On what basis did Australia Post decide that this property should be sold at the time that it was sold.
- (7) Did Australia Post ever receive any expressions of interest to purchase this property prior to making the decision to sell; if so, can details of where these expressions of interest came from and when they were made be provided.
- (8) What was the improved land value of this property at the time of the sale.
- (9) (a) What is the zoning of the property; and (b) are there any restrictions on the use of the property.
- (10) (a) What valuations did Australia Post received for this property prior to its sale; and (b) what was the estimated value of the property provided in these valuations.
- (11) Was the sale of the property put out to public tender; if so, how was it publicly tendered and advertised; if not: (a) why not; and (b) who made the decision not to have a public tender and on what basis.
- (12) By what means was the property sold, for example, privately, by auction or by other means.
- (13) Did Australia Post engage an agent or any other intermediary to conduct the sale of the property; if so, can the following details be provided: (a) the name, or company name, of the agent or intermediary; (b) the commission paid to them; and (c) the period over which they were engaged.
- (14) Has any state or federal Member of Parliament or local councillor or member of their staff or any representatives of a political party ever made representations to Australia Post about the purchase of this property; if so, can the following details of any such representations be provided: (a) who made them; (b) what they were; (c) on whose behalf they were made; (d) when they were made; and (e) what response or action resulted from them.

Notice given 3 July 2003

1600 **Senator Bartlett:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) Has the Minister authorised the aerial baiting of pests using 1080 on Commonwealth land in Western Australia in the past 12 months; if so: (a) where was the aerial baiting conducted or where will it be conducted; and (b) when was the aerial baiting conducted or when will it be conducted.
- (2) Has the aerial baiting program been referred to the Minister for the Environment and Heritage under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

Notice given 7 July 2003

1606 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) What was the quantum of funding provided to the Grains Research and Development Corporation (GRDC) by the department for each of the following financial years: (a) 1997-98; (b) 1998-99; (c) 1999-2000; (d) 2000-01; (e) 2001-02; and (f) 2002-03.
- (2) What was the quantum of funding provided by the GRDC to the Gene Technology Grains Council (GTGC) for each of the financial years mentioned in (1).
- (3) What role does the department or the GRDC play in the selection of members to the GTGC.
- (4) In what way is the GRDC accountable to the Minister for expenditure made to the GTGC.
- (5) Can a synopsis be provided for each GTGC member, including: (a) full name; (b) details of formal qualifications; (c) details of current industry experience and employment; (d) details of past industry experience and employment; (e) details of the process of selection; and (f) term of membership.
- (6) Are members of the GTGC required to disclose their financial interests to the Government as a means of preventing any perception of a conflict of interest; if so, can a copy of the current register of interests be supplied; if not, why not.

Notice given 10 July 2003

1609 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—

- (1) Was detainee Hammed Qhatani (VIL 14) ever refused delivery of postcards handed to centre officers at Woomera by nursing staff or anyone else; if so, why.
- (2) Was Mr Qhatani tortured as a child in Iraq.
- (3) Did Mr Qhatani have a bullet in his body.
- (4) Did Mr Qhatani request (at Villawood or Woomera) for this bullet to be removed.
- (5) Was a bullet removed from Mr Qhatani; if not, why not.
- (6) (a) How long was Mr Qhatani under special surveillance in detention in Australia; and (b) why.

- 1612 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—With reference to asylum seekers in detention who go on hunger strikes: (a) What instructions are given to staff to deal with these circumstances; and (b) can a copy of these instructions be provided.
- 1619 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—
- (1) What has been the total Commonwealth funding given to Telstra since the Coalition came to government.
 - (2) Given that Telstra is 49 per cent privately-owned, does the Commonwealth funding given to Telstra provide a benefit to these private shareholders; if so, what is the rationale for funding the private half of the company.

Notice given 11 July 2003

- 1621 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Prime Minister—Given Australia's new interest in helping Pacific 'friends', such as the Solomon Islands, and the special concerns of the Pacific island states regarding the potentially disastrous effects upon them of global warming:
- (1) Will Australia sign the Kyoto Protocol.
 - (2) What steps will Australia take to reduce the impact of global warming on Pacific islands.

Notice given 14 July 2003

- 1625 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—
- (1) With reference to the Minister's Media Statement (reference AFFA03/095WT, 28 April 2003), can the Minister confirm who the Chief Executive Officer of Harvest FreshCuts Pty Ltd was at the time that this company was provided with a Food Innovation Grant (FIG) of \$1.25 million.
 - (2) When did Harvest FreshCuts Pty Ltd apply for the grant.
 - (3) What was the quantum of the grant applied for by Harvest FreshCuts Pty Ltd.
 - (4) Who signed the application on behalf of Harvest FreshCuts Pty Ltd.
 - (5) Which members of the National Food Industry Council assessed the Harvest FreshCuts Pty Ltd application for this grant.
 - (6) Can the Minister advise whether applications for FIGs have been received from any of the following companies or their related entities: (a) Fletcher International Exports Pty Limited; (b) SPC Ardmona Ltd; (c) Peters and Brownes Foods Ltd; (d) Luken and May Pty Ltd; (e) National Foods Ltd; (f) Goodman Fielder Ltd; (g) Coca-Cola Amatil Ltd; and (h) Coles Myer Group Ltd.
 - (7) Where applications for FIGs have been received from any of the above companies or their related entities, can the Minister advise in each case: (a) when was the application received; (b) what was the quantum of the grant applied for; (c) what was the stated purpose of the grant applied for; (d) who signed the application on behalf of the applying company or their related entity; (e) which members of the NFIC are assessing or have assessed each application; and (f) what is the status of the application.

1626 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Science—

- (1) Can the Minister advise the quantum of royalties earned for each of the past 8 years by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Organisation (CSIRO) for each of the following breeds of wheat: (a) Lawson; (b) Brennan; (c) Gordon; (d) Dennis; (e) Patterson; (f) Rudd; (g) Tennant; (h) Mackellar.
- (2) Has the CSIRO modelled the expected future royalty revenue to be earned by it from the above varieties; if so, can the Minister advise for each variety: (a) the expected quantum of royalties to be paid to CSIRO; and (b) the expected time frame over which these royalties are to be paid to CSIRO.
- (3) Can the Minister advise how many breeds of wheat have been affected by the decision by CSIRO to destroy their wheat research crops as a result of the discovery during March 2003 of the presence of Wheat Streak Mosaic Virus (WSMV) at its research facilities.
- (4) For each breed of wheat affected by the above CSIRO decision, can the Minister advise: (a) the varietal name; (b) the details of the trait being developed under research (for example, higher yield, specific disease resistance, lower water usage, tolerance to saline soils, etc); (c) the projected delay in bringing the variety to commercial production as a result of CSIRO's actions on discovering WSMV at its facilities; (d) the quantum of Commonwealth funds expended on research to date; (e) the details of extra Commonwealth funds expected to be expended on research as a result of CSIRO's actions on discovering WSMV at its facilities; (f) the original projections of the benefit (in monetary and yield terms) to the Australian wheat industry from this research; (g) the projected delay or reduction in benefit (in monetary and yield terms) to the Australian wheat industry from this research as a result of CSIRO's actions on discovering WSMV at its facilities; (h) the original projections of royalties to be earned by CSIRO from these varieties; and (i) the projections of the delay or reduction in royalties to be earned by CSIRO from these varieties as a result of CSIRO's actions on discovering WSMV at its facilities.

1627 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Science—Can the Minister confirm that the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation is currently conducting, and has in the past 5 years conducted, research within Australian facilities on viable specimens of diseases which are communicable to Australia's human population, native flora or fauna or Australia's production herds or crops; if so, can the following information be provided: (a) a list of these diseases; (b) the start and end dates of projects involving each disease; (c) the stated goals of the research involving these diseases; (d) the status of research projects involving these diseases; and (e) the outcomes of any completed research projects involving these diseases.

Notice given 15 July 2003

1631 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—

- (1) Does the Australian Government have a position on the acquisition and use of munitions containing depleted uranium; if so, can an outline of this position be provided.
- (2) Does the Australian Defence Force (ADF) have a position on the acquisition and use of munitions containing depleted uranium; if so, can an outline of this position be provided.

- (3) Do members of the ADF receive training on the use and handling of munitions containing depleted uranium; if so, what is the nature of this training.
- (4) What measures are in place to monitor and protect members of the ADF who may be exposed to munitions containing depleted uranium, such as in the recent conflict in Iraq.
- (5) Have munitions containing depleted uranium ever been used in exercises within Australia; if so, can a list be provided of the occasions on which such munitions were used, including the nature of the exercises.
- (6) (a) Does the ADF have a stock of munitions containing depleted uranium; and (b) has the ADF ever had a stock of depleted uranium munitions.
- (7) What Australian weapons systems have in the past used, or still do use, munitions containing depleted uranium.
- (8) Is the United States military permitted to transport munitions containing depleted uranium on Australian soil or within Australian waters.

Notice given 17 July 2003

1636 **Senator Nettle:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—

- (1) How much money has the Australian Government spent on human rights training in Burma.
- (2) How much money does the Government propose to spend in the future on human rights training in Burma.
- (3) Why is the AusAID report on the Burma human rights workshops not open to public scrutiny.
- (4) Can the human rights workshops in Burma be postponed until there is official dialogue between the National League for Democracy, the State Peace and Development Council and ethnic minority groups.

1637 **Senator Collins:** To ask the Minister for Justice and Customs—With reference to the Australian Federal Police (AFP) response to Senator Collins' question on notice 58, from the additional estimates hearings of the Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee in November 2002, in which it was indicated by the AFP that assistance was sought of the Royal Australian Navy (RAN) personnel at Post to calculate where the vessel [SIEV X] may have foundered:

- (1) What was the outcome of the RAN's investigations into calculating where the SIEV X sank.
- (2) (a) What was the information that the RAN obtained about the company believed to have owned SIEV X; and (b) can the AFP name that company.
- (3) Was the North Jakarta Harbourmaster's report of the SIEV X survivor rescue coordinates, dated 24 October 2001 (10241530 G), taken into account when the RAN made attempts to calculate where the SIEV X foundered; if not, why not.
- (4) Did the AFP or any other Australian agency, whilst investigating where the SIEV X had foundered, ever interview the Harbourmaster at the Sunda Kelapa Port, North Jakarta; if so, what was the outcome of this interview; if not, why not.
- (5) If the Harbourmaster's coordinates have not been fully investigated by the AFP, how then can the AFP claim 'all avenues of enquiry have been exhausted' with regard to calculating where SIEV X foundered.

1639 **Senator Collins:** To ask the Minister for Defence—With reference to the P3 patrol map data obtained during the period 18 to 20 October 2001, which appears in chapter 8 of the report of the Select Committee on a Certain Maritime Incident, dated October 2002, and the P3 Orion maps of 20 October 2001 that were supplied to the committee, which indicate that the flight (see maps A-9, A-10, A-11) from the NW end of the flight path to the NE end of the flight path, some 250 nautical miles away, took 2 hours:

- (1) Is it the case that the flight should have taken only one hour between these two points if the plane was flying at a rate of 200 to 330 knots per hour.
- (2) Can the department indicate why the flight of 20 October 2001 took longer than the normal one hour to fly this path.
- (3) What were the names of the crew on the P3 Orion flight on 20 October 2001.
- (4) Can any of the data recorded for, or by, the crew members on the P3 Orion flights between 18 and 20 October 2001 (under Operation Relex) be made public, for example, sortie green, inflight REDS, Post Mission Form PURPLE, and mission tapes.

Notice given 18 July 2003

1640 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister for Family and Community Services—With reference to the Carer's Allowance:

- (1) What adjustment did the Commonwealth make to the Carer's Allowance in the 2003-04 Budget.
- (2) What assessment was made of the impact of the goods and services tax in eroding the real value of the Carer's Allowance.
- (3) What assessment has the Commonwealth conducted of the financial cost savings to government of the provision of unpaid community care.
- (4) What assessment did the Commonwealth conduct with regard to the adequacy of the Carer's Allowance.

Notice given 21 July 2003

1642 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—With reference to Migration Series Instruction No. 371 titled, 'Alternative Places of Detention', dated 2 December 2002:

- (1) How many 'unlawful non-citizens' are currently accommodated in alternative places of detention, in each of the following categories: (a) residential housing projects; (b) hospitals/nursing homes; (c) mental health facilities; (d) foster carer homes; (e) hotels/motels; and (f) community care facilities.
- (2) Can details be provided of the general considerations or circumstances behind the decisions to place people in each of these alternative places of detention, including the decisions to place people in alternative places of detention other than the Woomera Housing Project.
- (3) Can data be provided in respect of people in alternative places of detention, to show in each case: (a) gender; (b) age; (c) familial relationship grouping; (d) state; (e) duration in alternative places of detention to date; and (f) whether the detention was part- or full-time.

- (4) How many instances have there been of women and children being housed full-time in alternative places of detention and fathers held in immigration detention centres being permitted to join them on a full- or part-time basis.
- (5) On how many occasions and for what periods of time has permission been given for family members who remain in immigration detention centres to visit family in alternative places of detention.
- (6) Can details be provided of what specific 'places of detention' have so far been approved by the Minister as alternative places of detention.
- (7) How many people have lodged expressions of interest in alternative accommodation but not met the condition of: (a) residential housing places being available; (b) health and character checks being completed and clear; (c) there being no high risk of the detainee absconding; and (d) any operational issues particular to the detainee and/or smooth management of the residential housing placement (RHP).
- (8) Can details be provided, by immigration detention centre, of how many people are currently on the 'discreet list of detainees who have volunteered and are eligible to participate in RHP but are still in detention'.
- (9) For each of the following years, 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003 to date; can data be provided for individual immigration detention centres of how many unaccompanied minors 'of tender years' remained or remain in those immigration detention centres.
- (10) For each of the following years, 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003 to date; how many unaccompanied minors older than those in (9) were or are in immigration detention centres.
- (11) For each of the following years, 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003 to date; how many children were or are placed in foster care whose parent or parents were or are held in immigration detention centres.
- (12) (a) How many people have chosen to return to detention after placement in alternative accommodation; and (b) can reasons be provided for their return.
- (13) Given that paragraph 1.1.7 of the instruction indicates that 'every effort should be made to enable the placement of women and children in RHP as soon as possible': (a) what efforts are being made; (b) by month, what percentage of women and children have been housed in alternative accommodation since December 2002; (c) what are the barriers to a greater take-up of the scheme.
- (14) What Commonwealth funding is provided for those placed in alternative accommodation for: (a) rent; (b) furniture; (c) food; (d) clothing; (e) footwear; (f) bedding; (g) education; (h) sporting, recreational, and leisure activities; and (i) religious needs.
- (15) For each of the categories mentioned in (1) and by state: (a) what was the total cost to the Commonwealth of alternative accommodation in June 2003; and (b) how does this compare with the cost of housing the same number of people in detention.
- (16) What has been the cost per head of accommodating people in the Woomera Housing Project since May 2002.
- (17) What is the current status of the Government's stated intention to extend to Port Augusta and Port Hedland the recent review of the success or otherwise of its objective to 'enable the placement of women and children in a RHP as soon as possible'.

- (18) Can copies be provided of correspondence between the Minister's office and/or the department and the Port Augusta and Port Hedland councils or mayors with regard to the proposed review extension.
- (19) Can copies be provided of correspondence between the Immigration Detention Advisory Group and the Minister's office and/or the department with regard to safety and duty of care at Woomera Immigration Detention Centre.
- (20) When is the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Committee report on children in detention due to be released.
- (21) What is the current status of the report.
- (22) When was the report received by the Minister.
- (23) (a) When was the report sent to the department; (b) for what reason; and (c) if the reason was to 'correct factual errors', why has it taken so long to do so.
- (24) Will the report be sent to the Attorney General or his department; if so, when and for what purpose.

Notice given 22 July 2003

1644 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Minister for Defence—

- (1) (a) How many personnel recently deployed to Iraq were in payment of a Department of Veterans' Affairs disability pension, under the Veterans' Entitlements Act 1986; and (b) at what level.
- (2) What physical and medical examinations were conducted prior to departure of each person deployed to Iraq.
- (3) In the event that there is conflict between the medical assessment and the compensation assessment, what action has been or will be taken.

1645 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Veterans' Affairs—

- (1) How many: (a) dentists; (b) dental specialists; and (c) other dental health providers, are currently registered with the department for the provision of dental health to veterans and war widows.
- (2) (a) Have negotiations commenced with the Australian Dental Association on a new schedule of fees; and (b) when is the schedule expected to be finalised.
- (3) (a) How many representations have been received from dentists and others seeking an increase in fees; and (b) in how many representations have there been threats to refuse to treat veterans with the Gold Card.
- (4) How many dentists and other dental health providers have already withdrawn from the scheme.
- (5) For the 2003-03 financial year; what was the cost of dental care to: (a) Gold Card holders; and (b) White Card holders.
- (6) Will any increase in dental fees and any agreement to that effect require Cabinet approval.
- (7) Is there any linkage between this issue and other dental fee issues as managed by the Department of Health and Aged Care.
- (8) What advice has been provided to veterans and war widows concerning the fee negotiations and options for treatment in the event that dental care is denied.

1646 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Veterans' Affairs—

- (1) Has the Minister's attention been drawn to press reports of 19 July 2003 concerning the assertions made by the Friends of the 15th Brigade that a mass grave of as many as 250 Australians killed in action at Fromelles, France, exists on private land at Pheasant Farm.
- (2) Can the Minister confirm that almost 2 000 Australians were killed in the battle of Fromelles in July 1916.
- (3) On how many occasions has the Friends of the 15th Brigade communicated with the Minister's office and the Office of Australian War Graves (OAWG) on this matter in the past 5 years.
- (4) What specific attempts and inquiries have been undertaken to verify the assertion that a mass grave of Australians prepared by German troops exists at this location.
- (5) What basis does the Director of OAWG have, as reported on 19 July 2003, for saying that 'there is absolutely no evidence that there are 250 war dead at this site'.
- (6) What investigations have been conducted already by the Department of Defence.
- (7) What is the current intention of OAWG with respect to the placement of a commemorative plaque at this location, should the belief of the Friends of the 15th Brigade be proven to have substance.
- (8) Will the Government as a matter of urgency seek the assistance of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission to investigate the claim of the Friends of the 15th Brigade, with a view to its validation, and with a view to erecting a commemorative plaque on the site, with the land owner's consent.
- (9) (a) What is the current procedure relating to the search for those lost in action and whose bodies are never recovered; and (b) does this rest with the Department of Defence, the Department of Veterans' Affairs, or the OAWG.
- (10) On the provision of similar information on the possible location of Australian remains abroad, whether it be in Papua New Guinea, Germany, the Middle East or France, what is the procedure for verification, recovery and burial.
- (11) What is the current procedure for commemoration of the burial of those located, with respect to repatriation, travel of relatives and payment of costs.
- (12) (a) What was the total cost of the recent commemorative burial of the former World War II Lancaster crew in Germany; and (b) who attended from Australia.

Notice given 24 July 2003

1660 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—With reference to Operation Anode, the Australian Defence Force contribution to the Solomon Islands Assistance Mission, can a table (as shown below) be provided indicating: (a) the exact number of personnel attached to each element of the deployment; (b) the home base of the personnel; (c) the monthly cost of the deployment of each element; and (d) the role of each element in the deployment:

Element of deployment	Number of personnel	Home base	Monthly cost of deployment	Role in deployment
Special Military Adviser				
Joint Task Force Headquarters				
Australian Battalion Group				
Battalion Headquarters				
Iroquois Helicopters				
Engineering Group				
Combat Service Support Team				
Caribou Aircraft				
HMAS <i>Manoora</i>				
Medium Landing Craft				
Minor War Vessels				
Landing Craft Heavy				
C130 Hercules				

Notice given 25 July 2003

1662 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the actions of Australian-owned mining companies operating in Indonesia:

- (1) Does the Australian Government support overturning Indonesian Forestry Law 41 of 1999 to give access to protected forest areas in Indonesia to mining companies.
- (2) What support of any kind has the Australian Embassy in Jakarta given to mining companies, in particular BHP Billiton or its subsidiaries, in their efforts to overturn Indonesian Forestry Law 41 of 1999.
- (3) Has the Australian Embassy made any space or resources available to those employed by, or associated with, mining companies lobbying for the overturn of Indonesian Forestry Law 41 of 1999; if so, can details be provided.
- (4) Has any person representing the Australian Government in Indonesia or elsewhere had any meetings with Indonesian Government officials regarding Forestry Law 41 of 1999; if so: (a) who was the Australian representative; (b) with whom did they meet; and (c) what was discussed.

- (5) Have any protests been held outside the Australian Embassy in Jakarta regarding this issue; if so: (a) when were these protests held; and (b) were there any arrests.

Notice given 28 July 2003

1665 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—With reference to the F/A-18 Hornet Upgrade project (Project AIR 5376) in the Defence Capability Plan:

- (1) Can a description of all of the phases of this project be provided.
- (2) (a) What was the original timeline for the completion of the project, including the dates for each of the phases in the project; and (b) when was the project due to be completed.
- (3) (a) What was the original budget for this project; and (b) what were the individual budgets for each of the phases in the project.
- (4) (a) What is the current schedule for the completion of this project; (b) what are the completion dates for each of the phases in the project; and (c) when is the project due to be completed.
- (5) Has the schedule for this project changed; if so, why.
- (6) How would any schedule change with this project impact on future capability.
- (7) (a) What is the current budget for the project; and (b) what are the the budgets for each of the phases in the project.
- (8) What has been the cost of this project to date.
- (9) Has the projected budget for this project increased; if so, why.

1668 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—With reference to the Defence and Industry Advisory Council

- (1) When was the council established.
- (2) Who established the council.
- (3) For what purpose was the council established.
- (4) Can a copy of the council's terms of reference be provided.
- (5) What is the membership of the council.
- (6) What are the reporting arrangements for the council, for example: (a) to whom does it report; (b) how regularly are such reports made; and (c) what do the reports contain.
- (7) Can a list be provided of meeting dates for the council since its establishment.

1674 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Finance and Administration—

- (1) Can a breakdown be provided of all expenditure (such as advertising costs, administrative costs, staff costs, agents fees, consultants fees, design fees etc) incurred by the Government in preparing for the sale and leaseback of Russell Offices in Canberra.
- (2) Given that the proposed sale of Russell Offices has been abandoned, has any compensation been paid to the property sales consultant that won a \$264 000 contract to manage the sale process.
- (3) Has any money out of the \$264 000 been paid to the contractor.
- (4) Has the contractor made any claim against the Commonwealth for damages and/or compensation as a result of the abandonment of the proposed sale.

Notice given 1 August 2003

- 1681 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—
- (1) What are the common principles and criteria underpinning the Government's decisions to intervene in East Timor, Iraq and the Solomon Islands.
 - (2) How does the situation in Zimbabwe compare with East Timor, Iraq and the Solomon Islands, against these principles and criteria.
 - (3) Is intervention in Zimbabwe by Australia, similar to that undertaken East Timor, Iraq and the Solomon Islands, an option.
- 1683 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—
- (1) What is the Government's current assessment of the situation in Zimbabwe compared with its assessment at the time of the last Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM).
 - (2) What action will the Government be requesting at the next CHOGM, scheduled for December 2003, in relation to Zimbabwe's possible re-admission to the Commonwealth.
 - (3) Does the Government support Zimbabwe's expulsion from the Commonwealth.
 - (4) What other options are open if the Commonwealth fails to take appropriate action to improve the situation in Zimbabwe; could options include action by the United Nations and coalitions of countries.
 - (5) Would Australia be willing to send a delegation of election supervisors to Zimbabwe if the electoral challenge by opposition leader Morgan Tsvangirai in November 2003 is successful.
- 1684 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 1370 concerning the northern peninsula of Research Bay, Tasmania, in which it was stated that 'sites are currently being assessed by the Tasmanian Heritage Council':
- (1) Is the Minister aware that the Tasmanian Heritage Council has resolved that 'the onus of providing information which would be considered in establishing significance was a matter for the nominator(s) and accordingly it [the Heritage Council] would not be carrying out any further research'.
 - (2) Given the potential and international significance of the area, does the Minister consider it adequate for an assessment by the Tasmanian Heritage Council to rely on the efforts of volunteer members of the community.
 - (3) In relation to the assessment and protection of the northern peninsula of Research Bay: (a) what communication has the Commonwealth had with the Tasmanian Government, Gunns Pty Ltd and the owners of relevant land; and (b) can details be provided of correspondence and meetings, including the parties involved, dates and the matters discussed.
- 1685 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—Further to the answer to question on notice no. 1370 concerning the northern peninsula of Research Bay, Tasmania

- (1) What steps is the Commonwealth taking to establish the significance of the cultural landscape of the northern peninsula of Research Bay, including all the areas occupied and traversed by the D'Entrecasteaux expedition.
- (2) Has the Commonwealth commissioned research to establish the significance of the area; if so: (a) who is undertaking the research; (b) how much will it cost; (c) when will it be completed; and (d) will the report be made public.
- (3) When will the Commonwealth be in a position to consider the issue of acquisition.

1687 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—

- (1) What is the policy of Australasian Correctional Management (ACM) regarding the care of children who are left unattended when their parent is, or parents are, placed in isolation units for lengthy periods.
- (2) Are any ACM staff trained professional child care workers.
- (3) Can the Minister clarify why one detainee was locked into an isolation cell that had to be drilled open, as shown on the ABC Four Corners program during May 2003.
- (4) Why have all the Woomera DC 2000 and most of the Villawood DC 2001 medical files of the detainee Mohammad Hassan Sabbagh, who suffered a mental breakdown and has been held in detention since December 1999, disappeared.
- (5) (a) What is the ratio of staff to detainees in all centres; and (b) is this ratio uniform.
- (6) What does the Minister propose to do with the long-term detainees who cannot be returned to their country of birth, for example, stateless Kuwaitis.
- (7) Given that the Government has been unable to deport the detainee Hassan Sabbagh, who has been held for more than three and a half years, to Iraq, why can he not be released into the care of willing community support groups, such as the Jesuit Refugee Services or the Uniting Church, rather than burdening the taxpayer unnecessarily.

1689 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$32 617 to the South East Packing Operation in Moruya, New South Wales in round five of the Dairy Regional Assistance Program (DRAP):

- (1) What are the names of the principals of the project proponent, Advocate Support Pty Ltd.
- (2) On what date did the South East New South Wales Area Consultative Committee first engage in discussions with representatives of Advocate Support Pty Ltd and/or other parties in relation to the project proposal.
- (3) (a) On what date was the project application endorsed by the committee; and (b) which members of the committee were present at the meeting that endorsed the application.
- (4) On what date was the project application forwarded to the department by the committee; and (b) on what date was the application received by the department.
- (5) Did the chair of the committee, Mr Greg Malavey, engage in any discussions, or participate in any deliberations, by the committee in relation

to the project proposal; if so, can the Minister describe Mr Malavey's participation.

- (6) Did Mr Malavey's signature endorse the proponent's written application on behalf the committee; if so, can a copy of Mr Malavey's written endorsement be provided.
- (7) If Mr Malavey did not sign the written application: (a) why not; (b) can the Minister advise which member of the committee provided the endorsement; and (c) can a copy of the member's written endorsement be provided.

1690 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 860 (Senate *Hansard*, 9 December 2003, p. 7524) concerning the grant of \$32 617 to the South East Packing Operation in Moruya, New South Wales, in round five of the Dairy Regional Assistance Program:

- (1) On what date did the department obtain details of the development application associated with the project.
- (2) Is the person identified as Mr G Malavey in the Eurobodalla Shire Council Minute PM224 as having formed a deputation to council on behalf of the owner of the property in relation to the development application also the chairperson of the South East New South Wales Area Consultative Committee; if so: (a) on what date and in what form did the chairperson of the committee, Mr Greg Malavey, declare his interest in the South East Packing Operation to the committee and/or the department; (b) when was the Minister informed; and (c) what action did the committee or the department or the Minister take in response to the declaration of Mr Malavey's interest.
- (3) Has the chairperson of the committee declared any conflict of interest in relation to the project; if so: (a) on what date was that declaration made; (b) what form did that declaration take; (c) what was the basis of the conflict of interest; and (d) what were the consequences of that declaration.
- (4) On what date was the department advised that the Eurobodalla Shire Council approved the development application lodged by the grant recipient, Advocate Support Group Pty Ltd, subject to a special condition that confectionery packing is limited to 2 days per week and packing and deliveries shall not occur before 7 am and after 6 pm on Sundays or public holidays.
- (5) What impact has the special condition had on the capacity of the project to generate employment outcomes of six full-time and twelve part-time jobs nominated in the project application.

1691 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 861 (Senate *Hansard*, 9 December 2003, p. 7524) concerning the grant of \$32 617 to the South East Packing Operation in Moruya, New South Wales, in round five of the Dairy Regional Assistance Program:

- (1) (a) How many full-time positions has the project generated; and (b) when were the jobs generated.
- (2) (a) How many part-time jobs has the project generated; and (b) when were the jobs generated.

1692 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 863

(Senate *Hansard*, 9 December 2003, p. 7525) concerning the grant of \$32 617 to the South East Packing Operation in Moruya, New South Wales, in round five of the Dairy Regional Assistance Program:

- (1) How has the project been monitored by the South East New South Wales Area Consultative Committee.
- (2) (a) On what dates has the proponent reported to the committee's Moruya-based officer; and (b) what form did these project reports take.

1693 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources—With reference to the announcement on 22 July 2003 of short-term assistance to the ethanol industry:

- (1) (a) What companies and/or industry bodies made representations to the Minister or his department seeking the payment of the current fuel ethanol subsidy in advance of the payment of excise; (b) which companies will benefit from this new arrangement; and (c) what is the estimated cost to revenue of this arrangement by financial year.
- (2) How will the measure ensure the ethanol industry is able to appropriately manage the transition to the E10 blend.
- (3) On what date did the Government commence negotiations with the Manildra group of companies on the proposal to appoint a facilitator to assist these companies in its commercial negotiations with potential purchasers of ethanol.
- (4) Did the Manildra group of companies seek the appointment of a Government facilitator; if so: (a) what reasons did these companies provide in their request; (b) on what date did the Government receive the request; and (c) in what form was that request made.
- (5) Who is the facilitator.
- (6) (a) What is the new role of the facilitator; and (b) what is the term of his or her appointment.
- (7) What is the total expected cost of the facilitator's position by financial year.
- (8) What financial contribution is the Manildra group of companies making to the cost of engaging the facilitator.
- (9) What is the facilitator's work address.
- (10) What deficiencies in Manildra's management has the Government identified that necessitates the appointment of a facilitator to assist its commercial negotiations.
- (11) Why is the facilitator's role in assisting commercial negotiations on ethanol fuel sales limited to negotiations involving the Manildra group of companies.
- (12) How will the measure assist companies other than the Manildra group of companies to appropriately manage the transition to the E10 blend.
- (13) For each financial year since 1996-97, can a list be provided of previous and current Commonwealth appointments of facilitators to assist individual companies to undertake commercial negotiations.

1694 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources—With reference to the announcement on 25 July 2003 of the assistance package for the biofuels industry:

- (1) What evidence will applicants for capital subsidies be required to produce to: (a) demonstrate viability beyond 2013; and (b) demonstrate the existence of firm contracts for the supply of biofuels.
- (2) In relation to the media release by the Minister for Small Business and Tourism, dated 25 July 2003, can details be provided of the 15 ethanol and 16 biodiesel plants or expansions across regional Australia representing possible investment in excess of \$1.1 billion, including for each new plant or expansion: (a) the name of the proponent; (b) whether the project is a new plant or an expansion of an existing production capacity; (c) the nature of the proposed production, for example, ethanol or biodiesel, including proposed feedstock; (d) the volume of the proposed production in million litres (ML); (e) the location of the proposed plant; (f) the potential investment level; (g) the potential job creation; and (h) the nature of the boost to the relevant regional economy.
- (3) Since the announcement, has the Government received advice from proponents connected with any of the 31 projects identified in the Minister's media release advising that expanded production will not be sufficiently supported by the Government's package to allow new plants to be built; if so, can details be provided of the advice received.
- (4) In relation to the report commissioned from the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, jointly with the Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics and the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics, on the Government's 350ML biofuels target: (a) what are the terms of reference; (b) what is its completion date; and (c) what is its budget.

1695 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources—

- (1) What is the current total capacity of Australia's domestic excisable fuel ethanol production.
- (2) What is the current total domestic demand for excisable fuel ethanol.

1697 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Minister for Defence—

- (1) With reference to the discussion and recommendations of the March 1999 Review of Military Compensation by Mr N Tanzer AO, what progress has been made on the development of a premium-based model for the Australian Defence Force (ADF).
- (2) What is the current estimated liability of the Military Compensation Scheme.
- (3) For each of the past 3 years, what total sum has been paid by way of: (a) lump sums for permanent impairment; and (b) incapacity payments to current and discharged personnel.
- (4) For each of the past 3 years: (a) what total sum has been paid under Defence Act Determinations; and (b) to how many recipients.
- (5) How many ADF personnel have died as a result of service-related injuries in each of the past 3 years.
- (6) What claims, by injury group, for compensation by ADF personnel deployed to the Iraq operations during 2003 have been: (a) made; and (b) accepted; under the Military Compensation Scheme.

- (6) What claims, by injury group, for compensation by ADF personnel deployed to the Iraq operations during 2003 have been: (a) made; and (b) accepted; under the Veterans' Entitlements Act 1986.

1698 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Minister for Defence—

- (1) What is the current annual cost of maintaining the 2 Field Hospital (MORT) program of rehabilitation.
- (2) In the 2002-03 financial year: (a) how many Australia Defence Force (ADF) personnel treated at the MORT were successfully returned to service in the ADF; and (b) how many were discharged as medically unfit within classifications A, B and C.
- (3) What plans exist for the replication of the MORT in other states.

1699 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Minister for Defence—

- (1) Did the Chief of the Defence Force (CDF) in a letter to the review of military compensation in 1999 express 'a strong view that the ADF must take a more integrated and holistic approach to occupational health and safety, compensation and rehabilitation that best meets its needs. The current arrangements are less than satisfactory because the shared functions across a number of organisations limit the visibility, sense of ownership and commitment to the whole function within Defence'; if so, what has changed in the attitude of the CDF whereby in the proposed new military compensation scheme, policy responsibility for compensation is further divorced from Defence by transfer to what is effectively the existing Repatriation Commission.
- (2) Under the proposed new military compensation scheme, what responsibility does Defence assume for occupational health and safety (OH&S) policy within the Australian Defence Force, as opposed to the current arrangements where that authority is vested in the Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation Commission.
- (3) Did the CDF also express a preference to the Tanzer Review that the creation of a separate OH&S regulatory authority within Defence had the potential to give a more direct and substantial impetus to that function than was currently possible; if so, is this still the view held.
- (4) Under the proposed new scheme, will funding be allocated to the Department of Defence, or to the new commission based on the Repatriation Commission, or to the Department of Veterans' Affairs.
- (5) Under the proposed new model, how will medical costs be attributed between the Defence Health Services and the scheme with respect to compensable injuries.

1701 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Veterans' Affairs—

- (1) Has an estimate of the liability under the Veterans' Entitlement Act 1986 for compensation claims been done since that done for the Tanzer Review in 1998; if not, why not.
- (2) For the purposes of fiscal planning, has the Department of Finance and Administration ever consulted with the Department of Veterans' Affairs on more accurately identifying the nature of its future liability for all costs including health care and compensation.
- (3) What role does the Repatriation Commission have in monitoring the liability incurred under the Act.

- (4) What is the current estimated full life cost of a totally and permanently incapacitated pension including service pension and allowances to a person aged 55.

1702 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Veterans' Affairs—

- (1) What consideration has been given since the 1999 report into military compensation, to shifting the funding for military compensation from below the line to above the line, together with a premium-based system.
- (2) For fiscal planning purposes, what consideration has the department given to the proper calculation of future liabilities under the Military Compensation Scheme and the Veterans' Entitlements Act 1986.
- (3) What was the last available estimate of each liability.
- (4) Will funding for the proposed new military compensation scheme be below the line or above the line, and will it be a premium-based model.

1703 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Veterans' Affairs—

- (1) For each of the past 7 years, on how many occasions, and to which commemorative events overseas, has there been official attendance by invitation by: (a) Government ministers (can a list of names be provided), (b) Opposition spokesmen, (c) other members of Parliament; and (d) representatives from the veteran community by: (i) number, and (ii) organisation.
- (2) What was the cost of each commemorative ceremony referred to in paragraph (1) above for: (a) ministerial travel and allowances; (b) ministerial spouse travel; (c) ministerial staff travel and allowances; (d) departmental and other officials' travel and allowances; (e) ex-service community travel and allowances; (f) official entertainment; (g) gifts and memorabilia; (h) Australian Defence Force personnel travel and allowances; (i) monument construction; (j) public relations; (k) venue hire; (l) security; and (m) insurance.
- (3) What is the current program of commemorative activity overseas for which funds have been estimated in the budget process over the next 3 years.
- (4) What is the current proposed list of invitees for the opening of the war memorial in London on 11 November 2003, and of those: (a) how many are veterans and war widows; and (b) how were they selected.

1704 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Special Minister of State—

- (1) For the past 7 years, on how many occasions has the Minister for Veterans' Affairs travelled overseas.
- (2) What was the cost of each journey in relation to: (a) travel; and (b) allowances.
- (3) For each journey: (a) how many staff accompanied the Minister; and (b) what was the cost of staff travel.
- (4) (a) On how many occasions was the Minister accompanied by a spouse or partner; and (b) what was the added cost.
- (5) What was the purpose of each journey.
- (6) Has a full acquittal been completed for each journey by ministers and staff.
- (7) What was the total cost of that travel.

Notice given 4 August 2003

Senator Faulkner: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1705-1722)—With reference to each separate agency within the Minister's responsibility:

- (1) How was the agency advised of the Government's revised requirements regarding corporate branding, logos, stationery design etc.
- (2) When was that advice provided.
- (3) Does the agency propose to adopt the revised requirements, or will the agency be seeking an exemption from these requirements; if the latter, from whom will the agency seek the exemption.
- (4) Will the agency be seeking the advice of the Government Communications Unit in the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet in relation to these requirements.
- (5) What is the expected time frame for the implementation of these revised requirements, if appropriate.
- (6) What does this implementation entail.
- (7) What is the expected cost of the implementation of these revised requirements, in terms of: (a) expendables, such as stationery; (b) consultancies; (c) software redesign; (d) capital items, such as signage; and (e) any other expected costs.

1705 Minister representing the Prime Minister

1706 Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services

1707 Minister representing the Treasurer

1708 Minister representing the Minister for Trade

1709 Minister for Defence

1710 Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts

1711 Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs

1712 Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations

1713 Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs

1714 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

1715 Minister representing the Attorney-General

1716 Minister for Finance and Administration

1717 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

1718 Minister for Family and Community Services

1719 Minister representing the Minister for Education, Science and Training

1720 Minister for Health and Ageing

1721 Minister representing the Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources

1722 Minister representing the Minister for Veterans' Affairs

Senator Faulkner: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1724-1741)—In relation to each separate agency within the Minister's responsibility:

- (1) On how many occasions since March 1996 has the agency entered into a consultancy contract in relation to the provision of services related to: (a) corporate branding; (b) logo design; (c) stationery design; and/or (d) related or associated services.

- (2) (a) What was the date of each contract entered into; (b) who was the consultant thereby engaged; and (c) when was each of the contracts completed.
- (3) (a) What was the outcome of each of those consultancies; and (b) can a copy be provided of the design or designs, logo, brand etc provided to the agency as a result of each consultancy referred to in paragraph (2) above, together with advice as to whether these designs etc were adopted and implemented by the agency.
- (4) What was the cost of each of the separate contracts specified in paragraph (2) above.
- (5) What was the cost of implementing the designs, logos etc specified in paragraph (3) above as being adopted by the agency.
- (6) How are these designs, logos etc implemented by the agency.
- (7) In relation to each design, logo etc adopted by the agency, what advice was provided by the consultant and accepted by the agency as to the reason why that design, logo etc was appropriate and recommended.
- (8) If, during the period March 1996 to the present, the agency developed its own: (a) corporate branding; (b) logo design; (c) stationery design; and/or (d) related or associated services; how many staff were employed to develop (a) to (d).
- (9) If, during the period March 1996 to the present, the agency developed its own: (a) corporate branding; (b) logo design; (c) stationery design; and/or (d) related or associated services; what was the cost to the agency to develop (a) to (d).
- (10) If, during the period March 1996 to the present, the agency developed its own: (a) corporate branding; (b) logo design; (c) stationery design; and/or (d) related or associated services; what was the cost of implementing (a) to (d).
- (11) If, during the period March 1996 to the present, the agency developed its own: (a) corporate branding; (b) logo design; (c) stationery design; and/or (d) related or associated services; how did the agency implement (a) to (d).
- (12) (a) What arrangements has the agency made, or will the agency make, to protect the intellectual copyright of the logos, designs etc adopted by the agency; and (b) what is the cost, or the expected cost, of undertaking these arrangements.

1724 Minister representing the Prime Minister

1725 Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services

1726 Minister representing the Treasurer

1727 Minister representing the Minister for Trade

1728 Minister for Defence

1729 Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts

1730 Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs

1731 Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations

1732 Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs

1733 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

1734 Minister representing the Attorney-General

- 1735 Minister for Finance and Administration
- 1736 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
- 1737 Minister for Family and Community Services
- 1738 Minister representing the Minister for Education, Science and Training
- 1739 Minister for Health and Ageing
- 1740 Minister representing the Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources
- 1741 Minister representing the Minister for Veterans' Affairs

Notice given 5 August 2003

- 1743 **Senator Lees:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations—
- (1) How much money was raised by the Government's \$10 Ansett levy on domestic air travel.
 - (2) How much of that money has been allocated to former Ansett employees.
 - (3) How many former Ansett employees still await access to their full entitlements.
 - (4) How much money is required to pay these employees their full entitlements.
 - (5) How much of the money raised by the levy remains unspent.
 - (6) Why does the money remain in the bank rather than being awarded to former Ansett employees.

Notice given 7 August 2003

- 1745 **Senator Murray:** To ask the Minister representing the Prime Minister—
- (1) Can details of all those government departments and agencies affected by the recent decision to standardise stationery be provided.
 - (2) Can details be provided of the costs and timeframe for this to occur and the budgets from which these costs will be drawn.
- 1746 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—
- (1) Did Australia receive intelligence in which Indonesian military officials discussed an operation against Freeport-McMoRan in West Papua prior to an ambush that killed three people on 31 August 2002; if so, what did the Government do with this intelligence to protect the many Australians working at the company.
 - (2) Did this intelligence implicate Indonesian military officials in the operation.

Notice given 8 August 2003

- 1747 **Senator McLucas:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the Sustainable Regions Programme's funding to the Atherton Tablelands region.
- (1) What funds were allocated to the program.
 - (2) What are the outcomes sought by the Commonwealth Government for this funding program.
 - (3) How does the level of funding for the Atherton Tablelands compare with that allocated for other regions.

- (4) When was the funding for the Atherton Tablelands allocated.
- (5) Over what timeframe have the funds been allocated.
- (6) What processes have been put in place to determine that strategic holistic regional objectives are identified and met.
- (7) Will all of the \$18 million allocated which is reported to be allocated to the Atherton Tablelands, be provided; if not: (a) how much will be allocated; and (b) what amounts have been allocated over what years.
- (8) If less than \$18 million is provided, how will this be communicated to the people of the Atherton Tablelands.
- (9) Who determined the management and administrative arrangements for the Atherton Tablelands Sustainable Regions Programme
- (10) What arrangements are in place to determine the allocation of funds to particular projects.
- (11) What proportion of the funds expended by the Commonwealth have been used for administration.
- (12) Who determined the management and administrative arrangements for the Atherton Tablelands' Sustainable Regions Advisory Committee.
- (13) How was the membership of this committee determined and by whom.
- (14) (a) Who are the members of the committee; and (b) on what basis were they appointed.
- (15) (a) To whom does the committee report; (b) how frequently; and (c) in what format.
- (16) Can copies be provided of any committee reports that have been received detailing the funding allocation process or project approvals.
- (17) Can copies be provided of minutes of all committee meetings held to date.
- (18) Are committee members required to declare any interests they may have in any applications being considered; if so: (a) how many occasions has this occurred; (b) for which projects; and (c) by whom.
- (19) In relation to funding issues: (a) what funding criteria were determined; (b) by whom; and (c) how were these criteria applied in determining projects to be funded.
- (20) Can a list be provided of applications for funding received by the committee, including: (a) identification of the purpose for which funding was sought; (b) for what amount; (c) which were successful; (d) which have been rejected and why; and (e) which are still awaiting a decision.
- (21) How many full-time permanent, full-time casual, part-time permanent, part-time casual, and construction jobs will be created by each project approved for funding.
- (22) Is a contribution from the applicant required for the application to be approved.
- (23) What due diligence processes were in place to assess the financial viability of applicants.
- (24) What proportion of successful applicants to date have been private businesses or individuals.
- (25) How many cooperative funding applications from a number of associations or authorities have been received.

- (26) What accountability mechanisms are in place to ensure project objectives are achieved.
- (27) Are successful applicants required to meet key performance indicators; if so: (a) what are these; and (b) how are projects benchmarked against them.
- (28) What impact or evaluation processes have been put in place to measure the success or failure of funded projects.
- (29) What evaluation processes have been put in place to measure the success or failure of the Sustainable Regions Programme in the Atherton Tablelands region.

Notice given 11 August 2003

1748 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Treasurer—

- (1) With regard to the Government's decision to provide domestic ethanol manufacturers with a production subsidy to offset the excise of 38.143 cents per litre applying to ethanol: (a) can the Minister advise: (i) what work was undertaken by Treasury, the Government's Energy Task Force or any other Commonwealth agency to model the effects on livestock feed grains (in terms of price and availability) within Australia as a result of this decision prior to the introduction of this measure in September 2002; and (ii) what work was undertaken by Treasury, the Government's Energy Task Force or any other Commonwealth agency to model the effects on livestock feed grains (in terms of price and availability) within Australia as a result of the decision to extend this measure to 2008; and (b) can a copy be provided of reports by Treasury, the Government's Energy Task Force or any other Commonwealth agency on the effects of these measures on livestock feed grains within Australia; if not, why not.
- (2) What work was or is currently being undertaken Treasury, the Government's Energy Task Force or any other Commonwealth agency to model the effects on livestock feed grains (in terms of price and availability) within Australia as a result of the following promises contained in the Coalition's 2001 Election Statement entitled 'Our Future Action Plan Growing Stronger': (a) setting a target that biofuels contribute 350 million litres to the total annual transport fuel supply by 2010; and (b) introducing a capital subsidy of \$0.16 for each litre of new or expanded biofuel production capacity until the additional 310 million litres target is reached or by the end of 2006-07.

1749 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—

- (1) With regard to the Government's decision to provide domestic ethanol manufacturers with a production subsidy to offset the excise of 38.143 cents per litre applying to ethanol: (a) can the Minister advise: (i) what work was undertaken by Environment Australia, the Government's Energy Task Force or any other Commonwealth agency to model the effects on livestock feed grains (in terms of price and availability) within Australia as a result of this decision prior to the introduction of this measure in September 2002; and (ii) what work was undertaken by Environment Australia, the Government's Energy Task Force or any other Commonwealth agency to model the effects on livestock feed grains (in terms of price and availability) within Australia as a result of the decision to extend this measure to 2008; and (b) can a copy be provided of reports by Environment Australia, the Government's Energy Task Force or any other

Commonwealth agency on the effects of these measures on livestock feed grains within Australia; if not, why not.

- (2) What work was or is currently being undertaken by Environment Australia, the Government's Energy Task Force or any other Commonwealth agency to model the effects on livestock feed grains (in terms of price and availability) within Australia as a result of the following promises contained in the Coalition's 2001 Election Statement entitled 'Our Future Action Plan Growing Stronger': (a) setting a target that biofuels contribute 350 million litres to the total annual transport fuel supply by 2010; and (b) introducing a capital subsidy of \$0.16 for each litre of new or expanded biofuel production capacity until the additional 310 million litres target is reached or by the end of 2006-07.

1750 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—In relation to the Australian Standard Vaccination Schedule:

- (1) Which immunisation schedule will be used to determine whether parents are eligible to access immunisation-dependent family payments – the government-funded schedule or the schedule recommended by the Australian Technical Advisory Group on Immunisation (ATAGI).
- (2) Given that the Australian Medical Association has decided (GP Network News 13 June) that it will encourage general practitioners to recommend to parents that the pneumococcal vaccine be administered in line with ATAGI recommendations and that the retail cost to parents is \$450 per child; what policy response has the Government determined for parents who are unable to pay this.
- (3) Had the Minister received any advice from the department, ATAGI, National Health and Medical Research Council or pharmaceutical companies prior to the May 2003 Budget to the effect that a cost-effective regime of childhood immunisation would be a publicly-funded universal pneumococcal vaccine and a geographically and/or age-targeted Meningococcal C vaccine; if so, why was this advice ignored.
- (4) Has the Minister received any advice from pharmaceutical companies suggesting that the cost of a universal scheme of childhood vaccines would cost around \$60 million a year or less than a third of the retail price to parents; if so, what has been the response to the companies involved.
- (5) Given that the funding for Meningococcal C vaccine of some \$300 million over 4 years was not identified in the 2002-03 Budget nor prior to the announcement on 24 November 2002: (a) what process was undertaken to identify where the funding came from; and (b) did the funding become available through identified savings in the Health portfolio, cuts to anticipated health programs or at the expense of the vaccines subsequently recommended by ATAGI, (namely adult formulation diphtheria, tetanus and Pertussis vaccine 15-17 years, pneumococcal vaccine and varicella) for public funding; if so, which programs and by what amount of money.
- (6) With reference to the answer provided to question no. E03-111 asked during the 2003-04 Budget estimates hearings of the Community Affairs Legislation Committee, why have the submissions provided as part of the public consultation process on ATAGI recommendations in the Childhood Immunisation Handbook been judged 'confidential' and therefore have not been released.

- (7) Which parties are on the list of contributors of submissions received during the public consultation for the draft 8th Edition of the Australian Immunisation Handbook.

Notice given 12 August 2003

1751 **Senator Ludwig:** To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—

- (1) What is the total amount budgeted for the Protective Security Coordination Centre.
- (2) How much of this budget is allocated for staff wages.
- (3) What is the wage scale for staff.
- (4) How many calls does the Protective Security Coordination Centre receive each day.
- (5) How is information received on the hotline forwarded to respective agencies.
- (6) Is there a criteria to determine which agency should receive incoming information; if so, can this criteria be provided.
- (7) Are there any reporting processes in place to determine the feasibility of the program; if so, can these details be provided; if not, why not.
- (8) Is there a counselling service for staff who are showing signs or symptoms of distress relating to calls they receive during working hours; if not, why not.

1752 **Senator Ludwig:** To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 23 asked during the 2003-04 Budget estimates hearings of the Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee:

- (1) Is there an option for an alternate contact person in the event the programmer contracted is unavailable.
- (2) What are the hours of operation.

1753 **Senator Ludwig:** To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—In relation to the Community Legal Services Information System design and development of a new data collection and reporting system:

- (1) What data is collected.
- (2) What is the data used for.
- (3) Who has access to the database.
- (4) Can examples be provided of the records kept or information gathered as a result of information gained by this database.
- (5) Will the report be reviewed; if not, why not; if so: (a) when will the review be held; and (b) when will a report be released.

1754 **Senator Ludwig:** To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—In relation to the department's submission to the Attorney-General on Community Legal Centres and the Regional Law Hotline: Can a copy be provided of the department's submission be provided.

Senator Brown: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1757-1759)—

- (1) Have any analyses been conducted in relation to a national carbon tax or greenhouse gas emissions trading system; if so, can the following information be provided: (a) the dates the analyses were conducted; (b) who did the work; and (c) where copies of these analyses can be obtained.

- (2) (a) What meetings have been held between government and industry to discuss carbon taxes or emissions trading this year; (b) who attended the meetings; (b) when were the meetings held; and (c) what was discussed.

1758 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

1759 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

Senator Brown: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1760-1761)—With reference to the review of the Mandatory Renewable Energy Target Scheme:

- (1) What input, if any, have the following agencies had to the preparation of the panel's report: Environment Australia, Australian Greenhouse Office, Department of Industry, Tourism and resources, Treasury, any other government agencies.
- (2) What advice, analysis or information have the agencies listed in paragraph (1) provided to the review, and can a copy be provided.
- (3) Can a list be provided of groups and individuals with whom the review panel has met, including the dates of the meetings, locations and length.
- (4) Can a list be provided of confidential submissions including reasons as to why they have been made confidential.
- (5) (a) Has the Government of New South Wales made a submission; (b) did the panel request a submission from New South Wales or have any meetings with representatives of the New South Wales Government; if so, can details be provided.

1760 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

1761 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

Senator Brown: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1762-1764)—In relation to the Mandatory Renewable Energy Target (MRET) scheme:

- (1) What analyses of MRET have been conducted by the department or its agencies; please include in the answer: (a) a description of each analysis; (b) when it was carried out; (c) by whom; and (d) its conclusions.
- (2) Has any assessment been undertaken of the economic, environmental and social benefits of different MRET targets in 2010; if so, what were the conclusions.
- (3) What information or analysis has been obtained on levels of renewable energy targets internationally and the benefits derived from them.

1763 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

1764 Minister representing the Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources

Senator Brown: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1765-1766)—

- (1) Why has Australia slipped from providing 5 per cent of the world's photovoltaic (PV) power to less than 1 per cent.
- (2) Is the Minister concerned that Australia's advantage in PV power has declined so precipitately; if so, what are the consequences, environmentally and economically, of the decline.
- (3) Why is PV power going ahead so fast in Japan and Germany.
- (4) What action is being taken to bring Australia's PV power back up to 5 per cent of world production.

1765 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

1766 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

Senator Brown: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1769-1770)—

- (1) (a) How many cameras watch over the Aboriginal Tent Embassy and surrounding area; and (b) how long have these cameras been in place.
 - (2) (a) Were any persons identified as responsible for the fire bombing of the Aboriginal Tent Embassy on 14 June 2003; and (b) did the camera footage show people in the vicinity who may have been responsible.
 - (3) Can the original unedited video of 14 June 2003 (24 hours) be available for viewing by Senator Brown's office.
- 1769 Minister representing the Minister for Regional Services, Territories and Local Government
- 1770 Minister representing the Minister for Regional Services, Territories and Local Government

Notice given 13 August 2003

- 1772 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—With reference to the order of the Senate of 16 October 2002, which requested the Minister to grant a request from the Wadi Wadi Coomaditchie Aboriginal Corporation for an emergency declaration under section 9 of the *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage (Interim Protection) Act 1984* in relation to the development at Sandon Point:
- (1) Was such an emergency declaration made: if so, what was the outcome of the assessment referred to in the order; if not, why not.
 - (2) What other actions, if any, has the Minister taken in relation to Sandon Point.
 - (3) What other actions, if any, has the Minister taken that may have an indirect effect on development or Aboriginal Heritage at Sandon Point.
 - (4) Does the Minister intend to take any action with respect to Sandon Point; if so, what actions or activities is the Minister intending to take; if not, why not.
- 1773 **Senator Lightfoot:** To ask the Chair of the Legal and Constitutional References Committee—With reference to the committee's inquiry into an Australian republic:
- (1) How long is the inquiry expected to take.
 - (2) What is the proposed budget for the inquiry.
 - (3) Will costs be audited.
 - (4) Will all submissions be made public other than those taken in-camera.
- 1774 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—How many Australian Broadcasting Corporation staff and executives accepted redundancy packages between 1 January 2000 and 1 January 2002.
- 1775 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—What was the total amount paid in redundancy payments to employees leaving the Australian Broadcasting Corporation between 1 January 2000 and 1 January 2002.
- 1776 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—How many staff and executives from each division of the Australian Broadcasting Corporation accepted redundancy packages during the period 1 January 2000 to 1 January 2002.

- 1777 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—How many individuals who accepted redundancy packages from the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) during the period 1 January 2000 to 1 January 2002 have subsequently returned to the ABC to perform paid work for the broadcaster, on a full-time, part-time, casual, fee-for-service or consultancy basis.
- 1778 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—What is the total amount in salary, entitlements, consultancy fees or any other form of remuneration the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) has paid since January 2000 to individuals who had accepted a redundancy package from the ABC between 1 January 2000 and 1 January 2002 for work performed by the individuals following their acceptance of redundancy packages.
- 1779 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—What divisions originally employed the individuals who have returned to perform work at the Australian Broadcasting Corporation in any paid capacity subsequent to those individuals accepting a redundancy package during the period 1 January 2000 to 1 January 2002.
- 1780 **Senator Mackay:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—What is the Australian Broadcasting Corporation's policy on the re-employment of staff who have accepted redundancy packages.

Notice given 14 August 2003

- 1781 **Senator Hutchins:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—
- (1) With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 1352 (*Senate Hansard*, 15 May 2003, p. 11332), concerning the number of Australians directly notified of the risk of Hepatitis C exposure from contaminated blood, in which the Minister advised that the department did not have the requested information but had sought this information from the Australian Red Cross Blood Service: What were the figures which the Australian Red Cross provided to the department with regard to the number of Australians who have been notified of the risk to Hepatitis C exposure from contaminated blood.
 - (2) Can the Minister assure Australians that all those exposed to the deadly virus Hepatitis C from contaminated blood transfusions and blood products are now traced and that they have been directly notified.
 - (3) Is the Minister aware that the Queensland branch of the Australian Red Cross Blood Service was recently contacted by a blood donor with Hepatitis C.
 - (4) Given that the individual in paragraph (3) above was infected with Hepatitis C in 1978 and that, in 1995, unaware of their infected status, they made numerous blood donations to the Australian Red Cross: Will the Minister order an immediate investigation into: (a) why this person was not informed by the Red Cross of their infected status; (b) how many hospital patients received their blood; and (c) whether any of these patients were infected as a result.
 - (5) Are there any reports of Hepatitis C infections as a result of blood transfusion during or after 1995.
 - (6) (a) Does the Minister agree that Australia is self-sufficient in the supply of blood and blood products; (b) at what periods in the past has Australia not

been self-sufficient in the supply of blood and blood products; (c) what blood products have been imported into Australia since 1975; (d) what quantity of each blood product has been imported; and (e) what are the names and countries of business registration of the companies that manufactured the imported products.

- (7) (a) Is the Minister aware that the Australian plasma fractionator CSL Ltd. has, in the past, imported foreign-sourced plasma into Australia which was used to make medical products for therapeutic use in Australia; and (b) can a list be provided of the countries from which the formerly government-controlled CSL, and the currently privatized CSL Ltd., bought plasma.
- (8) (a) Is the Minister aware that the practice of accepting blood from prison inmates has occurred in Australia; and (b) on what date was this practice stopped; and (c) what are the names of the prisons where this practice occurred and the time periods in which this practice occurred at each prison.

1782 **Senator Ludwig:** To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—In relation to the working group to examine tenancy database privacy issues:

- (1) How many people will the working group comprise.
- (2) How will working group members be selected.
- (3) From what area or state will working group members be selected.
- (4) When will the selection process for the working group commence.
- (5) Will the working group advertise its objectives and call for contributions; if so, through what medium of advertising will the working group call for contributions; if not, why not.
- (6) Will housing groups or tenancy advocates be able to contribute to the discussion.
- (7) Will the working group investigate claims against tenancy database operators made to respective state and territory residential tenancy tribunals; if not, why not.
- (8) Will the working group hold public forums for contributions; if so, will these forums be held in each state and territory; if not, why not.

1783 **Senator Ludwig:** To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—In relation to departmental employees who decide to do further study and receive financial assistance:

- (1) What guidelines, if any, are in place to ascertain what percentage of fees are paid.
- (2) Is the percentage adjusted according to the type of study undertaken.
- (3) Are employees aware of the availability of financial assistance or encouraged to undertake tertiary studies.
- (4) What processes are in place to inform employees of assistance available should they choose to undertake tertiary studies.
- (5) Are employees encouraged to undertake further studies by supervisors, irrespective of work loads; if so, can examples be provided; if not, why not.

1784 **Senator Ludwig:** To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—In relation to the provision of security assessments for Aviation Security Identity cards:

- (1) To what will the staff level be reduced once the initial reissue has been completed.
- (2) From which areas were the staff seconded.
- (3) Were additional staff employed to cover shortfalls in these areas.
- (4) What was the total cost involved in the reissuing of the cards for the 2003-04 financial year.
- (5) Have any cardholders not been reissued with their cards; if so, can reasons be provided.

1785 **Senator Ludwig:** To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 59 taken during the 2003-04 Budget estimates hearings of the Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee regarding to the agreement with Telstra for the provision of a hotline service:

- (1) How many calls were received for each of the billing dates listed in the answer to this question on notice.
- (2) How many staff were originally employed to work in the centre.
- (3) Have these staff members been relocated to other call centres or retrenched.
- (4) Were these staff members employed under a certified agreement; if so, can details of the agreement be provided.
- (5) Were there any payout costs associated with the downsizing of the workforce; if so, can details of any payout costs be provided.
- (6) Can a comparison of calls to the 1800 service and the general 13 2400 number be provided in the form of a table.

1786 **Senator Ludwig:** To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 60 concerning calls received following the establishment of the hotline to the National Security Information Campaign Taskforce, taken during the 2003-04 Budget estimates hearings of the Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee:

- (1) Can a breakdown be provided of the feedback that was received by:
(a) number of calls; (b) categories; and (c) the exact nature of the calls.
- (2) Can a copy of the feedback received be provided.

1787 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Veterans' Affairs—

- (1) What specific Australian place names are to be engraved on the new war memorial currently being erected at Hyde Park corner in London.
- (2) Is the list available to the public on the departmental website; if not, why not.
- (3) Can a copy of the list be provided in electronic format.

1788 **Senator Ludwig:** To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—

- (1) What is the total budget for the Protective Security Coordination Centre.
- (2) Where is the centre located.
- (3) Is the centre open 24 hours; if not, (a) what hours is it open; and (b) to where are calls diverted when it is not open.
- (4) How many calls does the centre receive each day.
- (5) Can a breakdown be provided of calls received each month since the inception of the centre.

- (6) Are salaries for staff at the centre paid according to qualifications.
- (7) Of the 43 people currently employed within the centre, how many are employed on a full-time, part-time or casual basis.

1789 **Senator Ludwig:** To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 36 taken during the 2003-04 Budget estimates hearings of the Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee:

- (1) What, if any, communications have been received either formally or informally.
- (2) Can all communications relating to this response be provided.
- (3) How much has the department spent on responding to these cases.
- (4) Can details of expenditures from 2001-02 to the present be provided.

1790 **Senator Ludwig:** To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—

- (1) Can copies be provided of letters received from the Office of the Status of Women between 22 November 2002 and 19 June 2003, which refer to the statistics of the number of appointments of females and males for each portfolio body.
- (2) Is any proactive work being undertaken to address any inequities.
- (3) What is the department's process for dealing with inequities which have been addressed.

Senator Brown: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1791-1792)—

- (1) Has the Minister or have his officers discussed the Rio Tinto Foundation for a Sustainable Minerals Industry with Dr Robin Batterham at any time; if so, can the dates on which the discussions took place and a summary of the issues discussed be provided.
- (2) On what date and in what form was the proposal to establish the Rio Tinto Foundation first communicated to the Government or to its Strategic Investment Coordinator.
- (3) (a) On what date was the Advisory Board of the Rio Tinto Foundation established; and (b) when did the Government appoint its representatives.

1791 Minister representing the Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources

1792 Minister representing the Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources

1793 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Science—With reference to a media release of 27 June 2003, in which the Minister stated that Australia will invest \$120 million to develop affordable solutions to deal with greenhouse gas emissions from domestic power generation:

- (1) Can a list be provided of projects that make up the \$120 million, including aims, timelines and agencies undertaking these projects.
- (2) Has the Australian Government committed funding or in-kind support to Futuregen or any other United States carbon sequestration research or demonstration projects; if so, how much has been committed.

Notice given 15 August 2003

1794 **Senator Greig:** To ask the Minister for Family and Community Services—In relation to the 2003-04 Budget measure to abolish the financial supplement loan:

- (1) What is the age and family profile of those individuals who have taken up the option of the financial supplement loan.

- (2) What proportion of those who take up the loan do not repay in full.
- (3) What is the average total loan repayment amount that is not repaid.
- (4) What are the main reasons given for taking up the loan.
- (5) What are the main reasons for the lack of repayment for the loan.
- (6) What other measures has Centrelink or the department considered to recover the loans that are not repaid.
- (7) Has any evaluation been undertaken to assess whether the financial supplement loan has led to more students remaining in study.
- (8) What other options will students have to pay for large sum items, such as text books, should the financial supplement loan be abolished.
- (9) Which groups were consulted prior to the decision to abolish the loan.

1795 **Senator Greig:** To ask the Minister for Justice and Customs—

- (1) Did the Australian Federal Police (AFP) ever receive a complaint about the investigation of theft from the Managing Director of Wylkian Pty Ltd, Mr Harold Upton; if so: (a) what was the period of time that elapsed between the complaint being lodged and the complaint being investigated; (b) what was the nature and outcome of the complaint; (c) what was the amount that Mr Upton alleged was stolen from his business; and (d) who conducted the investigation on behalf of the AFP.
- (2) Is that investigation considered to be open or closed and for what reasons is it considered as such.
- (3) Can the Minister confirm that part of the complaint from Mr Upton included an allegation that certain cheques were stolen from his business; if so: (a) can the Minister confirm whether the investigating officer ascertained whether the cheques were banked and if so, by whom; and (b) can the Minister confirm whether the identity of the person who banked the cheques and or the account holder, were ever ascertained; if not, why not.
- (4) Is the Minister satisfied with the conduct of the AFP in this matter.

1796 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister for Defence—

- (1) Can the Minister confirm that the department is preparing to sell a parcel of 130 hectares of land at Maribyrnong in Victoria.
- (2) Has the land been assessed for rare and endangered species; if so, what were the findings of that assessment.
- (3) Is there any contamination on the site; if so: (a) what is the extent of the contamination; and (b) what is the recommended method of addressing the contamination issues.
- (4) Has the land been offered to the local shire council for purchase; if so, at what price; if not, why not.
- (5) (a) What is the assessed value of the land; (b) who conducted the valuation; and (c) when.

Notice given 18 August 2003

Senator Nettle: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1797-1798)—With reference to the Regional Solutions Programme:

- (1) Can a breakdown be provided of funding in Western Australia for the years 2001 to 2003, including: (a) local government areas receiving funding;

(b) the amount received by each local government area; and (c) brief project descriptions.

- (2) Can a breakdown be provided of funding in Western Australia for the years 2001 to 2003, including: (a) electorates receiving funding; (b) the amount received by each electorate; and (c) brief project descriptions,

1797 Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services

1798 Minister representing the Minister for Regional Services, Territories and Local Government

1799 **Senator Nettle:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—With reference to the 2nd Tier Default Benefit:

- (1) (a) Has the Government had discussions with private health insurance companies about a potential rise in premiums following the removal of the benefit; if so, what was the nature of these discussions; and (b) has the Government had any guarantee from the insurance companies that health insurance premiums will not rise.
- (2) Given that a consequence of the removal of the benefit will be that most private hospitals and private day surgery facilities must negotiate with the private health insurance companies over rebates: What assurances can the Government provide that the large insurance companies will not use their greater negotiating power to force the small private hospitals and private day surgery facilities to accept rebates that are less than satisfactory.
- (3) Does the Government expect that, as contracts run out for many facilities already under contract with private health insurers, many more facilities will be looking to 2nd tier default benefits instead of unsatisfactory arrangements with insurers.
- (4) (a) What does the Government forecast the effect of the removal of the benefit will be on private health facilities that cannot negotiate suitable rebates with health insurance companies; and (b) given that the Australian Medical Association and the Australian Private Hospitals Association have grave fears that hundreds of facilities throughout Australia will have to close: what policies are in place to protect these small businesses.
- (5) (a) How many private hospitals and day surgery facilities does the Government predict will be eligible for the new 'rural and regional default benefit'; (b) what is the level the Government has assumed for its modelling of costs; and (c) if few facilities are eligible for the benefit, what does the Government believe will be the effect on rural and regional health.
- (6) If there is a reduction for customers of private health insurance of choice of private health facilities that are available to them due to a breakdown in negotiations between companies and facilities, will the public health system be prepared and able to cope with the influx from clients who are no longer prepared to buy private health insurance.
- (7) If the number of those holding private health insurance is reduced as a consequence of the removal of the benefit, is the Government prepared to put the 30 per cent rebate that would normally be paid to the health insurance companies into the public health system.

1800 **Senator Nettle:** To ask the Minister for Defence—With reference to the proposed naval munitions storage facility that is part of the 'Twofold Bay Navy Ammunitioning Facility':

- (1) Will nuclear weapons be stored at the facility.

- (2) Will United States navy vessels visit the area as a consequence of the facility.
- (3) Will the munition storage facility be available to all allies as a storage facility, including for the storage of nuclear weapons.
- (4) Does the status of munitions storage facilities vary depending on what is stored.

1801 **Senator Nettle:** To ask the Minister for Defence—With reference to the death in 1989 of Seaman Jason Solomon who was found to have ‘died by misadventure’:

- (1) Has there ever been a Royal Australian Navy board-of-inquiry held into the death of Seaman Jason Solomon.
- (2) Has there ever been a judicial inquiry into the death of Seaman Jason Solomon.
- (3) (a) What evidence exists to substantiate that Seaman Jason Solomon’s death was accidental; and (b) can this evidence be corroborated and verified.

1802 **Senator Nettle:** To ask the Minister for Defence—With reference to the Australian Navy’s involvement in coastal surveillance:

- (1) How much has it cost the Australian people to have the Navy patrol our coastline for the detection and apprehension of refugees and illegal immigrants from July 2001 to date.
- (2) How many people has the Navy caught entering our waters illegally during the period 2001 to date.

1803 **Senator Hutchins:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—

- (1) (a) Were official Australia Post uniforms provided to non-Australia Post employees in the course of the recent 2003 Communications Electrical Plumbing Union New South Wales (Postal and Telecommunications Branch) election for the purposes of election photographs for the ‘Build a Better Union Team’; (b) were any inquiries conducted into the inappropriate provision of those uniforms; (c) what was the outcome of those inquiries; (d) what disciplinary action was taken with respect to any employees who provided the uniforms to non-Australia Post employees; (e) what access to the Australian postal system is afforded to the wearer of an official Australia Post uniform; (f) is the provision of official Australia Post uniforms to individuals who are not employees of Australia Post a threat to the security of our postal systems and, ultimately, the Australian community; and (g) have official Australia Post uniforms been provided to individuals who are not employees of Australia Post on any other occasions.
- (2) (a) Did Australia Post sponsor a three-day Retail Managers’ conference at the Menzies Hotel, Sydney on 16 to 18 June 2003; (b) were members of the Australia Post management, who were candidates in the 2003 Communications Electrical Plumbing Union New South Wales (Postal and Telecommunications Branch) election, permitted to canvass retail members of the union at the conference; (c) was any disciplinary action taken by Australia Post with respect to the candidates who canvassed participants at the conference; (d) what was the nature of the disciplinary action taken; (e) did a senior Australia Post retail manager who attended the conference threaten the future employment of a retail member if that

member did not vote or campaign for the 'Build a Better Union Team'; (f) was any disciplinary action taken by Australia Post with respect to the senior retail manager; (g) what was the nature of the disciplinary action taken; and (h) is it the practice for Australia Post managers to use their position to threaten the ongoing employment of employees for exercising their democratic right to vote in their union election free from external influence.

- (3) Was an officer at the Sydney West Letters Facility threatened in relation to his future tenure as a liaison officer and his ongoing employment with Australia Post if he failed to campaign on behalf of the 'Build a Better Union Team'; if so: (a) were these threats referred to the Security and Investigation Division of Australia Post; (b) did the Security and Investigation Division of Australia Post investigate the threats; if not, why not; and (c) will the Minister direct the Security and Investigation Division to fully investigate the threats.
- (4) (a) Were Australia Post vehicles and associated resources used by any staff at the Regents Park Australia Post Business Centre for the distribution of election material for the 'Build a Better Union Team' during the 2003 Communications Electrical Plumbing Union New South Wales (Postal and Telecommunications Branch) election; (b) did any such material distributed using Australia Post vehicles and associated resources contain defamatory material; (c) was any disciplinary action taken with respect to Australia Post employees who provided access to Australia Post vehicles; (d) what was the nature of the action taken; and (e) could details be provided of any regulations directed at preventing the misuse of Australia Post vehicles and associated resources.
- (5) (a) Did any members of the Communications Electrical Plumbing Union New South Wales (Postal and Telecommunications Branch) receive telephone calls on behalf of the 'Build a Better Union Team' during the 2003 Communications Electrical Plumbing Union New South Wales (Postal and Telecommunications Branch) election in the period 5 June to 22 June 2003; (b) did any members of the Communications Electrical Plumbing Union New South Wales (Postal and Telecommunications Branch) receive text messages on behalf of the 'Build a Better Union Team' during the 2003 Communications Electrical Plumbing Union New South Wales (Postal and Telecommunications Branch) election in the period 5 June to 11 June 2003; (c) did any such text messages originate from the numbers 61429687062 or 61427135121; (d) do any of the members who received these telephone calls and messages have 'private' or 'silent' telephone numbers with Telstra; (e) is it the practice of Telstra to provide privately listed numbers to any persons, organisations or businesses; if so, on what basis; and (f) what organisations or businesses have access to 'private' or 'silent' telephone numbers.

Notice given 19 August 2003

1805 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Veterans' Affairs—

- (1) What was the total amount of funding provided by the department to Victorian councils in the financial years 2001-02 and 2002-03, and budgeted for in the 2003-04 financial year, for the provision of aged care to veterans for the following services: (a) personal care; (b) domestic assistance; (c) home and garden maintenance; and (d) respite care.

- (2) What was the breakdown of departmental funding provided, by council in Victoria, in the financial years 2001-02 and 2002-03 and budgeted for in the 2003-04 financial year, for the provision of aged care to veterans for the following services: (a) personal care; (b) domestic assistance; (c) home and garden maintenance; and (d) respite care.

Notice given 20 August 2003

1806 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—In regard to the Port Hedland Detention Centre:

- (1) Given that a large proportion of inmates has attempted suicide at least once, do guards carry knives at all times to cut down detainees who attempt to hang themselves.
- (2) How many attempted suicides have there been in Refugee/Asylum seeker detention centres in the past 2 years.
- (3) How does this figure compare to the Australian average per head of population.

1807 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—

- (1) In relation to the Minister's press release on 12 February 2003 announcing that private health funds had agreed to phase out gym shoes, tents and golf clubs from the ancillary benefits offered: (a) has the agreement with the Australian Health Insurance Association (AHIA) been secured in writing; if so, can a copy of the agreement be provided; (b) when did the Minister ask the health fund industry to review its products to ensure they funded only items which had a 'direct health benefit'; (c) when did the industry first report back to the Minister on the review; and (d) when did industry first notify the Minister that it intended to exclude some items from ancillary tables.
- (2) Can a copy be provided of: (a) the letter from the private health industry to the Minister referred to on page 133 of the Community Affairs Legislation Committee *Hansard* of 13 February 2003; and (b) the code that industry was stated to be developing on ancillary benefits.
- (3) Has the code referred to in paragraph (2) received relevant adoption or approval and commenced operation; if so, when.
- (4) Has the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission objected to the withdrawal of any benefits for so-called 'lifestyles' ancillaries; if so, how is the industry resolving this objection.
- (5) Can a copy be provided of the schedule for phasing out each ancillary item that was agreed with the AHIA, showing each item that must cease being offered by all health funds and on what dates these cessations must occur.
- (6) Can the Minister confirm that since the agreement with the AHIA was made, all private health insurance funds that offered lifestyle ancillaries have withdrawn them; if not, why not.
- (7) In relation to the Minister's estimate that the cost of so-called 'lifestyle' ancillary benefits is about \$70 million a year, what percentage of this does the Government estimate has been paid for gym shoes, compact discs, tents and golf clubs.
- (8) Why has the Government not prohibited funds by law from offering lifestyle ancillary benefits.

- (9) In relation to the Minister's request to the health funds to examine all ancillaries to make sure they have a 'direct health benefit', what definition or guidance does the Minister give to health funds to comply with this request.
- (10) Are there any products currently offered to Australians by private health insurance funds that the Minister believes do not have a direct health benefit; if so, can a list of these products be provided.
- (11) In relation to the benefits listed in paragraph (10): (a) has the Minister requested each of the funds offering them to review them; and (b) when did the Minister make such requests.

1808 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—

- (1) Are there any plans to shift the Commonwealth's current funding and administrative responsibility for Aged Care Assessment Teams; if so: (a) what are these plans; and (b) what is the timeframe for any proposed changes.
- (2) Can the Minister confirm whether there are any plans to outsource or contract out the function of Aged Care Assessment Teams on a national or regional basis.
- (3) Can the Minister confirm whether there are any plans for the Commonwealth to take full responsibility for funding and administering Aged Care Assessment Teams.

Notice given 21 August 2003

1809 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—

- (1) Is it the practice of the Government to direct family members who receive copies of reports on inquiries relating to the circumstances of the death of a serviceman or servicewoman not to disclose it to anyone other than a lawyer or medical practitioner.
- (2) In what circumstances does the Government authorise copies of such reports referred to in paragraph (1) to be given to family members with such a non-disclosure direction.
- (3) (a) Who decides whether such a non-disclosure direction is to be given in each instance; and (b) is this a decision made by the Minister.
- (4) For each of the past 10 years, how many non-disclosure directions have been made to families who received a copy of an inquiry report into: (a) the death of their loved one; and (b) the mistreatment of their loved one, that has not led to suicide or death.
- (5) Can the Minister confirm that Private Luke Amos, whose mistreatment at Singleton Army Base in 2000 was the subject of an inquiry, was given a copy of the inquiry report on the condition that he would not disclose it publicly.
- (6) Can a copy be provided of the report of the inquiry into the treatment of Private Amos referred to in paragraph (4).
- (7) Did the Minister Assisting the Minister for Defence direct the parents and siblings of Private Jeremy Williams not to disclose the Investigating Officer's report and the Appointing Authority's document relating to the death of Private Williams, except to a lawyer or medical practitioner.
- (8) What was the legal basis and policy rationale for the direction given to Private Williams' family.

1810 **Senator Lightfoot:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—In regard to the Goldfields Land and Sea Council based in Kalgoorlie, which is not a government agency, but was funded by an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission grant of \$3 170 501 for 2002, and given the level of federal funding received by the council gives rise to considerable concerns regarding the apparent lack of fiscal management and public accountability:

- (1) How much Federal funding did the council receive during the 2001-02 financial year.
- (2) With reference to the amount of \$181 166 expended on 'fares and travel allowances' by the council in Kalgoorlie Boulder for the 2001-02 financial year: (a) can a breakdown be provided of these costs for each journey undertaken with specific reference to: (i) the purpose, (ii) the destination, (iii) the total cost, (iv) the individual responsible, and (v) any personal expenses incurred for each trip; (b) can a list be provided for each recipient of: (i) travel allowances paid, and (ii) the capacity in which they were paid; and (c) why did the council exceed its budgeted figure for 'fares and travel allowances' by \$92 242.
- (3) With reference to the amount of \$19 227 expended on 'field expenses' by the council for the 2001-02 financial year: (a) can a breakdown be provided of these costs with specific reference to: (i) each item or service purchased with these monies, and (ii) the individual responsible for making those purchases on each occasion; and (b) why did the council exceed its budgeted figure for 'field expenses' by \$14 161.
- (4) With reference to the amount of \$29 655 expended on 'equipment and furniture' by the council for the 2001-02 financial year: (a) can a breakdown be provided of these costs with specific reference to: (i) each piece of equipment and furniture purchased, (ii) its intended use, and (iii) the name of the individual who will predominantly use each item if it is not a shared office resource; and (b) why did the council exceed its budgeted figure for 'equipment and furniture' by \$14 988.
- (5) With reference to the amount of \$150 133 expended on 'meetings' by the council for the 2001-02 financial year: (a) can a breakdown be provided of these costs with specific reference to: (i) each item, service and/or fee paid for or purchased for each meeting, and (ii) the recipients of all monies expended on meetings for the 2001-02 financial year; and (b) why did the council exceed its budgeted figure for 'meetings' by \$41 670.
- (6) With reference to the amount of \$206 827 expended on 'office expenses' by the council for the 2001-02 financial year: (a) can a breakdown be provided of these costs; and (b) why did the council exceed its budgeted figure for 'office expenses' by \$72 464.
- (7) Can an itemised list be provided of all monies paid by the council, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission or the Federal Government to Mr Brian Wyatt, Chief Executive Officer of the council for the past 3 financial years; including: (a) wages; (b) fees; (c) allowances; (d) reimbursements; (e) account payments; (f) subsidies; and (g) any other form of remuneration paid to Mr Wyatt for those 3 years.

1811 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—

- (1) What is the percentage of bulk-billed general practitioner unreferred attendances (by vocational registry (VR)/non-VR) in each federal electorate for the June 2003 quarter (due for release August 2003).

- (2) For the most recent period collected, what is the average and median Medicare Benefits Schedule rebate received by full-time equivalent general practitioners with VR provider numbers for unreferred attendances in: (a) federal electorates; and (b) across outer-urban, regional and metropolitan areas by each state.
- (3) What is the average and median total payment received by full-time equivalent general practitioners with VR provider numbers for unreferred attendances in: (a) federal electorates; and (b) across outer-urban, regional and metropolitan areas by each state.

1812 **Senator Murray:** To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—Given the findings of the Australian Institute of Criminology Issue Paper Number 250 of May 2003, which included the following observations: (a) when asked if they would ever report on sexual abuse again following the experiences in the criminal justice system, only 44 per cent of children in Queensland, 33 per cent in New South Wales and 64 per cent in Western Australia indicated they would; and (b) in a case study of a cross examination in a Queensland committal, the crying child was repeatedly shouted at and asked more than 30 times to describe the length, width and colour of the penis of the accused:

- (1) Does the Attorney-General intend to coordinate through the Council of Australian Governments far more sensitive and appropriate methods of enabling reported child sexual assault to be effectively pursued in state and Commonwealth courts and jurisdictions.
- (2) Does the Attorney-General accept and recognise that the way in which child sexual assault is dealt with in Australian courts needs to be consistent, fair and ethical; if so, how does the Attorney-General intend to improve highly variable and sometimes grossly offensive and inappropriate treatment of children in these cases.

Notice given 22 August 2003

1813 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Science—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 1358 (Senate *Hansard*, 16 June 2003, p. 11562) relating to the refit of the *Southern Surveyor*:

- (1) (a) What were the: (i) technical problems, and (ii) occupational health and safety incidents which arose; (b) how were these fixed; and (c) at what cost.
- (2) Were any personnel affected; if so: (a) how; and (b) what was done for such personnel.

1814 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister for Defence—

- (1) Is it true that an airstrip for military use was constructed near the Gulf country of northern Carpentaria, Australia, during the 1990s; if so: (a) are the airstrip and associated buildings occupied; and (b) by whom.
- (2) Who funded the construction of the airstrip and associated buildings.

1815 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Treasurer—With reference to the modern scourge of resource-wasting, saturation advertising:

- (1) Is it true that tax deductibility exists for corporations for advertising expenses; if so, what is the cap on these tax deductions.
- (2) Is it appropriate for the Government to subsidise advertising that promotes poor diets or environmentally-detrimental products such as four-wheel drive vehicles.

- 1816 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—
- (1) Can the Minister confirm whether the proposed fish farm development planned for Moreton Bay would need full scientific certainty pursuant to section 3A of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*.
 - (2) Can the Minister confirm that the proposed fish farm is under Commonwealth jurisdiction until full scientific certainty is achieved.
- 1817 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources—
- (1) Is it true that the Government spends \$250 million per annum to subsidise four-wheel drive road vehicles; if not, how much does the Government spend to subsidise these vehicles.
 - (2) Is there a difference in the level of four-wheel drive subsidisation between regional and city tax payers.
- 1818 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—With regard to the Port Hedland Detention Centre:
- (1) Given that the local water quality is evidently poor as guards and locals refuse to drink it and instead drink bottled water: Does the water supplied to the centre meet Australian standards for potable water.
 - (2) What is the calcium content of the water supplied to the inmates.
 - (3) Is the evening meal for inmates chicken and rice with one piece of fruit per person per day.
 - (4) Is the inmates' diet monitored by a nutritionist.
 - (5) Is this nutritionist on site or does he or she just review a menu.
 - (6) If the nutritionist reviews the menu what checks are made that the menu and the meals served are the same.
- 1819 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Prime Minister—With regard to the Prime Minister's recent visit to China to meet the new Chinese leaders: Did the Prime Minister discuss human rights issues pertaining to the abuse and incarceration of Tibetans and/or Falun Dafa practitioners; if not, what attempt has been made to inform the Chinese leadership of Australia's condemnation of human rights abuses.
- 1820 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—With regard to the visa for Father Frank Brennan, a Jesuit Priest, to visit Nauru:
- (1) Was the visa granted to Father Brennan for travel to Nauru; if so, when.
 - (2) Is it true that this visa was subsequently withdrawn; if so: (a) when; and (b) why.

Notice given 25 August 2003

- 1821 **Senator Webber:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—Will the Minister seek to amend copyright legislation to make it easier to prosecute all individuals involved in subscription television service piracy, including both the providers and the users of pirated goods: if so: when is it expected these amendments will come before the Parliament; if not, why not.

1822 **Senator Webber:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—

- (1) Will the Minister release the report by the Forensic Scientific and Investigation Group into the centralisation by Telstra of the handling of complaints.
- (2) (a) How many complaints from Perth have been attributed to lightning strikes in the past 12 months; and (b) when was the most recent lightning related complaint listed.
- (3) How many easy-call facilities and services are not available to customers with pair gains.
- (4) How many pair gains are there in Western Australia.

1823 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—With reference to the sale and leaseback of the logistics facility at Winnellie:

- (1) When was the Winnellie logistics facility sold.
- (2) What was the sale price.
- (3) When was this sale advertised.
- (4) Who managed the sale process; and how much were the managers paid.
- (5) How was the sale for this property conducted.
- (6) Was the property valued prior to sale; if so, what was the result of that valuation.
- (7) Has there been any valuation of the 2.7 hectares of Winnellie land the facility is situated on; if so, what was the result of this valuation.
- (8) How many bids were received.
- (9) Which organisations submitted bids.
- (10) What was the range of bids for the property.
- (11) For what reasons did Defence choose to accept the winning bid.
- (12) (a) Who took the decision to accept the winning bid; and (b) was the decision taken within Defence or by the Minister.
- (13) When was this decision taken.
- (14) What rent will Defence pay for the Winnellie facility in the first, second and subsequent years of the lease.

Notice given 26 August 2003

1824 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister for Defence—

- (1) Has the Minister or have senior advisors to the Minister seen the documentary *Massacre in Mazar*, by Irish director Jamie Doran, revealing war crimes in Afganistan during the recent invasion.
- (2) Is the Minister aware of the mass grave site near the township of Mazar-I-Sharif in Afganistan where thousands of captured prisoners of war and Taliban troops were killed by the Northern Alliance, American and Australian troops.

1825 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—Does the National Health and Medical Research Council intend to conduct a review of the composition of human research ethics committees; if so, when.

1826 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—

- (1) What was the rationale for producing advertisements of government health policy from 1996 to the present in all major newspapers on 21 August 2003.
- (2) Have these advertisements been paid for through Coalition funding for party campaigns; if not, why not.
- (3) What was the total cost of these advertisements.
- (4) Are further advertisements to be placed in print media or in any other form of media.
- (5) Were the advertisements developed by a consultant, ministerial staff and/or the department.
- (6) If a consultant was engaged: (a) who was it; and (b) what was their fee.
- (7) Was advice sought as to whether the advertisements violate any covering existing protocol, code of conduct or legislation from the purchase of these advertisements; if so, whom; if not, why not.
- (8) Can a copy of this advice be provided.
- (9) (a) With reference to the graph of Commonwealth health expenditure published in the advertisement, is the \$2.4 billion private health insurance rebate included; (b) what services or programs comprise the 'other' category in the graph; and (c) how much of this total is for administration costs.

Notice given 1 September 2003

1827 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—

- (1) What funding was provided for each branch of the Cadets (i.e. Army, Navy and Air Force) for the following financial years: (a) 2000-01; (b) 2001-02; and (c) 2002-03.
- (2) What is the proposed level of funding for each branch of the Cadets for the 2003-04 financial year.
- (3) For each branch of the Cadets: (a) how many units were there at the beginning of 2000; (b) how many units are there currently; (c) if there has been an increase in the number of units over that period, where are those units located; and (d) if there has been an increase in the number of units, what criteria were used to determine the new locations.
- (4) For each branch of the Cadets: (a) what was the number of cadets at the beginning of 2000; and (b) what is the current total.
- (5) For each branch of the Cadets: (a) what was the number of officers at the beginning of 2000; and (b) what is the current total.
- (6) What recruiting measures are being undertaken by each branch of the Cadets to encourage young people to join.

1828 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister for Defence—Given that the Minister was reported in the *Sydney Morning Herald* as stating, 'that the Government had refused to release its advice on whether Mr Hicks' detention was legal because it could damage Australia's relations with the United States': How can Australia's relations with the United States be damaged if the Government's advice was that David Hicks' detention was lawful.

1829 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—

- (1) Given that medical records from Australian Correctional Management's staff psychologist Ramesh Nair have documented the deteriorating mental health of Iraqi detainee Hasan Sabbagh, who has been held in detention since 1999: Why has the department failed to act on any of Dr Nair's recommendations.
- (2) Given that over the past three and half years, Hassan Sabbagh has applied four times to the Minister to be released from detention, with no response: How much longer will he have to wait for a response.
- (3) Given that Hassan Sabbagh's original case for protection against repatriation to Iraq has never been heard and yet the department wants to deport him back to Iraq: Is this against the International Refugee Convention.

1830 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—Given that in the 2003-04 financial year the migrant intake is set at between 100 000 and 110 000, including the refugee/humanitarian component, and that, according to Government figures, 43 per cent of the existing Australian population was born overseas, or are the children of overseas-born persons:

- (1) Is the government committed to a continuing migration and humanitarian intake.
- (2) (a) Is the Government committed to implementing its policy as stated; and (b) how does the Government aim to achieve this.
- (3) What responsibility does the Government have to provide effective settlement services for people in Australia.
- (4) In view of the accolades that Migration Resource Centres (MRC) have received for their work; why is the Government considering removing their funding.
- (5) (a) Why are some MRCs singled out for early termination; and (b) how will this produce equitable results for the people served by these centres.
- (6) What alternative, if any, does the Government propose to replace these centres and their services.

1831 **Senator Bartlett:** To ask the Minister for Defence—

- (1) (a) How many divisions or units are there currently in each arm of the Cadets (i.e. Army, Navy and Air Force); and (b) how many were there 5 years ago.
- (2) (a) How many officers or instructors are there currently in each arm of the Cadets; and (b) how many were there 5 years ago.
- (3) Is a list available of the location of units.
- (4) Are instructors or officers being recruited; if so, by what means.
- (5) Are participants being recruited; if so, by what means.
- (6) Does any recruitment target girls and young women.
- (7) (a) Is any arm of the Cadets less well represented at public events than others; and (b) what determines the cadets' participation at public events.

1832 **Senator Faulkner:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—In relation to departmental officers across Australia and in overseas posts considering applications for entry and/or residency visas:

- (1) Are all officers considering visa applications within a class required to consider those applications strictly on the basis of the statutory requirements for that class of visa; if not: (a) what are the exceptions; (b) what is the reason for a differential approach in applying statutory requirements; (c) how is this differential approach explained to departmental officers considering applications; (d) how is the application of this differential approach monitored by the department; and (e) what consistency or probity safeguards apply.
- (2) Are all officers considering visa applications within a class required to consider those applications strictly on the basis of standard requirements for consideration of documentary evidence to substantiate the claims made by the applicant; if not: (a) what are the exceptions; (b) what is the reason for a differential approach in applying documentary requirements; (c) how is this differential approach explained to departmental officers considering applications; (d) how is the application of this differential approach monitored by the department; and (e) what consistency or probity safeguards apply.
- (3) Are all officers considering visa applications within a class required to consider those applications strictly in the order of receipt of the application; if not: (a) what are the exceptions; (b) what is the reason for a differential approach in applying order of consideration requirements; (c) how is this differential approach explained to departmental officers considering applications; (d) how is the application of this differential approach monitored by the department; and (e) what consistency or probity safeguards apply.
- (4) Are all officers considering visa applications within a class required to consider those applications strictly on the basis of the merits of the case before them; if not: (a) what are the exceptions; (b) what is the reason for a differential approach in applying merit requirements; (c) how is this differential approach explained to departmental officers considering applications; (d) how is the application of this differential approach monitored by the department; and (e) what consistency or probity safeguards apply.
- (5) Are all officers considering visa applications within a class required to consider those applications strictly on the basis of the case before them, irrespective of whether the applicant is represented by a Migration Agent, and irrespective of whether the applicant is represented by a particular Migration Agent; if not: (a) what are the exceptions; (b) what is the reason for a differential approach in applying relevance requirements; (c) how is this differential approach explained to departmental officers considering applications; (d) how is the application of this differential approach monitored by the department; and (e) what consistency or probity safeguards apply.
- (6) In relation to each of the application assessment process requirements outlined in parts (1) to (5), are these requirements applied equally when being considered by a departmental officer in Australia or in overseas posts; if not: (a) what are the exceptions; (b) what is the reason for a differential approach in applying these assessment process requirements; (c) how is this differential approach explained to departmental officers considering applications; (d) how is the application of this differential approach monitored by the department; and (e) what consistency or probity safeguards apply.

- (7) In relation to all of the application assessment process requirements outlined in part (6), are each of these requirements applied equally in all departmental offices across the State of New South Wales; if not: (a) what are the exceptions; (b) what is the reason for a differential approach in applying these application assessment process requirements; (c) how is this differential approach explained to departmental officers considering applications; (d) how is the application of this differential approach monitored by the department; and (e) what consistency or probity safeguards apply.

1833 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 1630:

- (1) Can the Minister now offer a satisfactory answer to parts (1) and (2) of that question, in which it was asked whether grey-headed flying-foxes or spectacled flying-foxes 'occur' on any Commonwealth land and not if the Government was aware of any 'permanent colonies'.
- (2) When will the recovery plans for the grey-headed flying-fox and spectacled flying-fox be released for public comment.
- (3) When does the Minister expect the recovery plans for the grey-headed flying-fox and spectacled flying-fox to be finalised and made under section 269A of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*.
- (4) Given that at the time the 2002 guidelines were issued, there was a considerable amount of uncertainty regarding the size of the spectacled and grey-headed flying-fox populations: Has the Commonwealth obtained any additional information on the conservation status of the spectacled and grey-headed flying-foxes to support the proposed policy in relation to these species; if so, can this information (including copies of relevant publications) be provided; if not, why not.
- (5) Has the Commonwealth obtained any information on the total numbers of spectacled and grey-headed flying-foxes that were killed between 1 July 2002 and 30 June 2003; if so, can this information (including copies of relevant publications) be provided; if not, why not.
- (6) Given that the Minister has indicated that the Commonwealth has not received any information on the actual number of spectacled and grey-headed flying-foxes that were killed under state authorisations between July 2002 and June 2003: Why is the Minister proposing to adopt a policy concerning killing members of two threatened species without information on the numbers of these species that were killed in accordance with the policy over the past 12 months.

Notice given 2 September 2003

1834 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—

- (1) When was it decided to establish the Sydney Harbour Federation Trust.
- (2) Who made the decision to establish the Trust.
- (3) Why was the Trust established.
- (4) (a) Who was on the original board of the Trust; (b) has the membership of the board changed since the Trust was established; and (c) who is now on the board.

- (5) On what basis have members of the board been chosen: (a) was there a selection process; (b) who authorised the original appointments and (c) on what basis.
- (6) When was it announced that ex-Defence sites around Sydney Harbour would be transferred to the management of the Trust.
- (7) Who made this announcement.
- (8) Which other parties were consulted about this announcement (for example, the State Government, local councils, State and Commonwealth departments).
- (9) What was the nature of this consultation.
- (10) Who made the final decision to transfer the lands to the Trust.
- (11) Which lands were actually transferred to the Trust, and in relation to each site can a list be provided, including: (a) its size; (b) its previous use; and (c) its proposed use.
- (12) In relation to each site; on what dates did the transfers occur.

1835 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—With reference to the ex-Defence lands managed by the Sydney Harbour Federation Trust:

- (1) Were there any valuations done on any of the sites prior to the transfer from the Department of Defence to the Sydney Harbour Federation Trust.
- (2) What was the valuation for each of the sites managed by the Trust.
- (3) (a) Who undertook these valuations; and (b) when were they undertaken.
- (4) What is the estimated current valuation for each of the sites being managed by the Trust.
- (5) (a) Was there any valuation of the cost of the remediation works that were required at each of the ex-Defence sites being managed by the Trust; and (b) what was the amount of these valuations.
- (6) For each financial year to date: How much has been spent on remediation and environmental works at each of the ex-Defence sites now managed by the Trust.
- (7) When is it expected that all remediation work at the ex-Defence sites will be completed.
- (8) What is the process by which the ex-Defence sites will be transferred to the State of New South Wales following completion of remediation works at these sites.
- (9) (a) Will the sites then become part of the Sydney Harbour National Park, under the management of the New South Wales Government; and (b) when is it expected that this will occur.

1836 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—

- (1) How much funding has the Sydney Harbour Federation Trust received from the Commonwealth Government in each financial year since its establishment.
- (2) Does this include the initial funding of \$96 million that the Trust received as part of the Federation Fund.
- (3) Can a breakdown be provided of how this funding has been spent for each financial year since the Trust was established.

- (4) Can a breakdown be provided of how the \$96 million allocated to the Trust as part of the Federation Fund was spent.
- (5) Can a breakdown be provided of every payment greater than \$1 million made by the Trust since its establishment.
- (6) (a) When is it expected that the work of the Trust will be completed; and (b) will the Trust be closed down once its work is completed.
- (7) What are the forecasts for Commonwealth funding to the Trust for the next 4 financial years.
- (8) Has the New South Wales Government made any financial contributions to the Trust at any time since its establishment; if so, can a list be provided of these contributions (i.e. date, amount, purpose etc.).
- (9) Is it expected that the New South Wales Government will make any financial contributions to the Trust at any time over the next 4 years.
- (10) When the remediation work being undertaken at the ex-Defence sites managed by the Trust is fully completed, and the lands are transferred to the State of New South Wales, will the New South Wales Government have to pay any money to the Commonwealth in respect of the transfer; if not, why not.

1837 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—With reference to the proposed sale of Defence land at Point Cook in Victoria:

- (1) How much land is proposed for sale.
- (2) What was this land previously used for.
- (3) How is the sale process to be managed.
- (4) Who is managing the sale on behalf of the department.
- (5) How much are the sale managers being paid, including all advertising costs.
- (6) Has the sale itself been advertised; if so, when did this occur and can a copy of the advertisement be provided.
- (7) What are the key dates in the sale process.
- (8) To date, have any organisations expressed an interest in the site; if so, can the names of these organisations be provided.
- (9) Have any organisations expressed an interest in a priority sale of the Point Cook site; if so, can the names of these organisations be provided.
- (10) (a) Is it the department's preference to conduct a priority sale or an open market sale; and (b) on what basis was such a decision made.
- (11) Has the site been valued by either the Victorian Valuer-General or the Australian Valuation Office; if so: (a) on what dates did these valuations occur; and (b) what is the estimated value of the site.
- (12) Is the department aware of any heritage or environmental significance attached to the site.
- (13) Was this taken into account prior to the decision being taken to sell the land; if not, why not.
- (14) On what basis was it decided to sell the site.
- (15) (a) Who took the decision to sell the site; and (b) when was the decision taken.
- (16) Are there any restrictions on the future use of the land in the sale documentation; if not, why not; if so, what is the nature of these restrictions.

- (17) Could the land be used for residential and/or commercial development.
- (18) Does the department consider that residential and/or commercial development would be an appropriate use of this site.
- (19) Did the department have any discussions with either the local council or the State Government prior to the decision being taken to sell the land; if not, why not; if so, what was the nature of these discussions.
- (20) Given the environmental and heritage significance of the site, did the department raise the possibility of gifting the land to the local council or the State Government for preservation as parkland; if not, why not.

1838 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—With reference to the Defence Security Authority and the security clearance process prior to the department doing business with individuals and organisations:

- (1) Are individuals and organisations with which the department does business required to obtain a security clearance.
- (2) What is the process for obtaining these clearances, for example, when can the individual or organisation apply, what does it cost, who bears the cost etc.
- (3) How long does it take for security clearance applications submitted by individuals or organisations to be processed.
- (4) What is current backlog of security clearance applications submitted by individuals or organisations seeking to do business with the department.
- (5) (a) Why has this backlog developed; and (b) when is it expected that the backlog will be cleared.
- (6) Are there any appeal or dispute resolution procedures for individuals or organisations who do not receive a security clearance which would enable them to do business with the department; if so, can an outline be provided of the nature of any appeal or dispute resolution procedures; if not, why not.

1839 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—

- (1) Can the Minister confirm that in 2002, Mr Gary Johns of the Institute of Public Affairs had a Fulbright Scholarship to the United States that was partly funded by the Australian Government.
- (2) What did Mr Johns study.
- (3) Was there a contract between Mr Johns and the department.
- (4) What sum of money did Mr Johns receive from the department.
- (5) What did the department receive in return for this money.
- (6) If there was a written report, can a copy be provided.

1840 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

- (1) Did Dr Peter Ellyard visit the Wide Bay Burnett region of Queensland in August 2002 in connection with the Sustainable Regions Programme.
- (2) Was the visit the result of the collaboration of the department and the Wide Bay Burnett Sustainable Region Advisory Committee.
- (3) What was the cost to the Commonwealth of Dr Ellyard's visit to the Wide Bay Burnett region and can this cost be itemised.
- (4) (a) What was the purpose of the visit; and (b) can a copy of the itinerary be provided.

- (5) Did the visit include a public presentation at the Kondari Resort, Urangan, on 8 August 2002; if so: (a) how was the presentation advertised; and (b) how many citizens of the Wide Bay Burnett region (other than members of the committee) attended.
 - (6) On what basis was this visit considered a necessary part of the committee's consideration of funding priorities for the region.
 - (7) Has Dr Ellyard attended meetings in other regions in connection with the Sustainable Regions Programme; if so: (a) what regions has Dr Ellyard visited at the invitation of the department and/or Sustainable Region Advisory committees; and (b) on what dates were those visits.
- 1841 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—What sitting fees, travelling allowances and motor vehicle allowances have been paid to each member of the Wide Bay Burnett Sustainable Regions Advisory Committee since its establishment in April 2002.
- 1842 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to Sustainable Regions Programme funding for the Wide Bay Burnett region of Queensland:
- (1) Why is the Yarraman district included in the Wide Bay Burnett region for the purposes of the Sustainable Regions Programme but was not included in the same region for the purposes of the Wide Bay Burnett Structural Adjustment Package.
 - (2) (a) On what date did the Wide Bay Burnett Sustainable Region Advisory Committee call for expressions of interest from possible candidates for Sustainable Regions Programme funding; and (b) in what form was that call made.
 - (3) How many expressions of interest were received.
 - (4) On what date did the committee report registration statistics to the department.
 - (5) Has the committee: (a) discussed the expressions of interest with each prospective proponent; (b) assessed all expressions of interest against program guidelines; (c) identified eligible projects; (d) worked with prospective proponents of eligible projects on the development of formal funding applications; and (e) made a recommendation to the Minister on funding individual projects; if so, what was the date of the recommendation.
 - (6) With reference to the 29 November 2002 media statement by the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) titled., 'Strong Interest in Regional Funding': (a) on what date was the contents of each expression of interest communicated to the Member; (b) did the committee or the department inform the Member about the contents of each expression of interest; (c) was the Minister or his office consulted about this communication; and (d) was the statement by the Member that projects being considered by the committee 'all appeared to have potential for moving the region towards self-reliance' based on advice from the committee or the department.
 - (7) Has the committee received representations from the Member for Wide Bay on behalf of prospective proponents or the committee.
- 1843 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to Regional Solutions Programme funding for

the 2002-03 financial year for projects that provide assistance to people living in the federal electorate of Wide Bay, for each project:

- (1) What is the name of the project.
- (2) What is the name of the proponent.
- (3) What is the business address of the proponent.
- (4) What amount of funding has been allocated to the project.
- (5) On what date was the funding allocation announced.
- (6) What is the nature of the project.
- (7) What amount of funding has the proponent received and on what dates.

1844 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$100 000 to the Tiaro Shire Council in the 2000-01 financial year under the Regional Solutions Programme, for an economic development and tourism project:

- (1) (a) What total Regional Solutions Programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) Can a detailed description of the project be provided.
- (3) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent.
- (4) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (5) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (6) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the Regional Solutions Programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) if applicable, when was the application varied;
 - (e) what Regional Solutions Programme funding was sought by the proponent, including goods and services tax (if applicable);
 - (f) what is the business address of the proponent;
 - (g) is the proponent a sponsoring organisation administering the grant on behalf of another organisation; if so, can details be provided of this organisation including its name, business address and main activity;
 - (h) what project funding category did the proponent nominate: (i) planning, (ii) project implementation, (iii) community infrastructure, or (iv) resourcing a person to work for the community; if the answer was (iv), did the proponent propose to create a new position; if not, how had the position been funded until the time of application;
 - (i) what particular issue or issues in the local community did the proponent say would be addressed by the project;
 - (j) what expected project benefits did the proponent nominate;
 - (k) how did the proponent advise that the outcomes of the project would be sustained;

- (l) did the proponent advise that the project would be self-sustaining; if so, how;
 - (m) did the project arise from an earlier community planning process; if so, how was the planning conducted and what issues and outcomes were identified;
 - (n) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided;
 - (o) what community involvement in project committees or working groups existed or were proposed by the proponent at the time of application;
 - (p) what experience in developing, budgeting and reporting on projects of this type did the proponent possess at the time of application;
 - (q) did the proponent propose to purchase consultancy services; if so, did the proponent provide quotes with the application;
 - (r) if the proposal involved community infrastructure, did the proponent provide a feasibility study and/or business plan;
 - (s) did the proponent approach other Commonwealth or state funding sources for the project or components of the project within 2 years of the date of application; if so, what sources were approached and what funding was received;
 - (t) what other financial and non-financial contributions to the project were nominated by the proponent and can a breakdown of these proposed contributions be provided including a calculation of the dollar value of the in-kind contributions; and
 - (u) what major project milestones were nominated by the proponent, including the commencement and completion dates.
- (7) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) what benefits has the project realised;
 - (b) what involvement does the community have in project committees or working groups;
 - (c) has the proponent purchased consultancy services with Regional Solutions Programme funding; if so, how much has been spent on consultants;
 - (d) what financial and non-financial contributions to the project has the project received from other sources;
 - (e) have all project milestones nominated by the proponent in the funding application been met; if not, why not; and
 - (f) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
- (8) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent properly acquitted the project by submitting a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made; and
 - (e) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1845 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$20 000 to the Monto Shire Council in the 2000-01 financial year under the Regional Solutions Programme, to employ a project development officer:

- (1) (a) What total Regional Solutions Programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) Can a detailed description of the project be provided.
- (3) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent.
- (4) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (5) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (6) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the Regional Solutions Programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) if applicable, when was the application varied;
 - (e) what Regional Solutions Programme funding was sought by the proponent, including goods and services tax (if applicable);
 - (f) what is the business address of the proponent;
 - (g) is the proponent a sponsoring organisation administering the grant on behalf of another organisation; if so, can details be provided of this organisation including its name, business address and main activity;
 - (h) what project funding category did the proponent nominate: (i) planning, (ii) project implementation, (iii) community infrastructure, or (iv) resourcing a person to work for the community; if the answer was (iv), did the proponent propose to create a new position; if not, how had the position been funded until the time of application;
 - (i) what particular issue or issues in the local community did the proponent say would be addressed by the project;
 - (j) what expected project benefits did the proponent nominate;
 - (k) how did the proponent advise that the outcomes of the project would be sustained;
 - (l) did the proponent advise that the project would be self-sustaining; if so, how;
 - (m) did the project arise from an earlier community planning process; if so, how was the planning conducted and what issues and outcomes were identified;
 - (n) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided;
 - (o) what community involvement in project committees or working groups existed or were proposed by the proponent at the time of application;

- (p) what experience in developing, budgeting and reporting on projects of this type did the proponent possess at the time of application;
 - (q) did the proponent propose to purchase consultancy services; if so, did the proponent provide quotes with the application;
 - (r) if the proposal involved community infrastructure, did the proponent provide a feasibility study and/or business plan;
 - (s) did the proponent approach other Commonwealth or state funding sources for the project or components of the project within 2 years of the date of application; if so, what sources were approached and what funding was received;
 - (t) what other financial and non-financial contributions to the project were nominated by the proponent and can a breakdown of these proposed contributions be provided including a calculation of the dollar value of the in-kind contributions; and
 - (u) what major project milestones were nominated by the proponent, including the commencement and completion dates.
- (7) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) what benefits has the project realised;
 - (b) what involvement does the community have in project committees or working groups;
 - (c) has the proponent purchased consultancy services with Regional Solutions Programme funding; if so, how much has been spent on consultants;
 - (d) what financial and non-financial contributions to the project has the project received from other sources;
 - (e) have all project milestones nominated by the proponent in the funding application been met; if not, why not; and
 - (f) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
- (8) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent properly acquitted the project by submitting a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made; and
 - (e) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1846 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$90 273 to the Hervey Bay City Musicians Inc. in the 2001-02 financial year under the Regional Solutions Programme, for music rehearsal rooms:

- (1) (a) What total Regional Solutions Programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) Can a detailed description of the project be provided.

- (3) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent.
- (4) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (5) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (6) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the Regional Solutions Programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) if applicable, when was the application varied;
 - (e) what Regional Solutions Programme funding was sought by the proponent, including goods and services tax (if applicable);
 - (f) what is the business address of the proponent;
 - (g) is the proponent a sponsoring organisation administering the grant on behalf of another organisation; if so, can details be provided of this organisation including its name, business address and main activity;
 - (h) what project funding category did the proponent nominate:
 - (i) planning, (ii) project implementation, (iii) community infrastructure, or (iv) resourcing a person to work for the community; if the answer was (iv), did the proponent propose to create a new position; if not, how had the position been funded until the time of application;
 - (i) what particular issue or issues in the local community did the proponent say would be addressed by the project;
 - (j) what expected project benefits did the proponent nominate;
 - (k) how did the proponent advise that the outcomes of the project would be sustained;
 - (l) did the proponent advise that the project would be self-sustaining; if so, how;
 - (m) did the project arise from an earlier community planning process; if so, how was the planning conducted and what issues and outcomes were identified;
 - (n) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided;
 - (o) what community involvement in project committees or working groups existed or were proposed by the proponent at the time of application;
 - (p) what experience in developing, budgeting and reporting on projects of this type did the proponent possess at the time of application;
 - (q) did the proponent propose to purchase consultancy services; if so, did the proponent provide quotes with the application;
 - (r) if the proposal involved community infrastructure, did the proponent provide a feasibility study and/or business plan;
 - (s) did the proponent approach other Commonwealth or state funding sources for the project or components of the project within 2 years

- of the date of application; if so, what sources were approached and what funding was received;
- (t) what other financial and non-financial contributions to the project were nominated by the proponent and can a breakdown of these proposed contributions be provided including a calculation of the dollar value of the in-kind contributions; and
 - (u) what major project milestones were nominated by the proponent, including the commencement and completion dates.
- (7) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) what benefits has the project realised;
 - (b) what involvement does the community have in project committees or working groups;
 - (c) has the proponent purchased consultancy services with Regional Solutions Programme funding; if so, how much has been spent on consultants;
 - (d) what financial and non-financial contributions to the project has the project received from other sources;
 - (e) have all project milestones nominated by the proponent in the funding application been met; if not, why not; and
 - (f) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
- (8) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent properly acquitted the project by submitting a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made; and
 - (e) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1847 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$12 200 to the Burnett Inland Economic Development Organisation in the 2001-02 financial year under the Regional Solutions Programme, for the implementation of a regional development strategy:

- (1) (a) What total Regional Solutions Programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) Can a detailed description of the project be provided.
- (3) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent.
- (4) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (5) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (6) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;

- (c) did the funding application comply with the Regional Solutions Programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) if applicable, when was the application varied;
 - (e) what Regional Solutions Programme funding was sought by the proponent, including goods and services tax (if applicable);
 - (f) what is the business address of the proponent;
 - (g) is the proponent a sponsoring organisation administering the grant on behalf of another organisation; if so, can details be provided of this organisation including its name, business address and main activity;
 - (h) what project funding category did the proponent nominate:
 - (i) planning, (ii) project implementation, (iii) community infrastructure, or (iv) resourcing a person to work for the community; if the answer was (iv), did the proponent propose to create a new position; if not, how had the position been funded until the time of application;
 - (i) what particular issue or issues in the local community did the proponent say would be addressed by the project;
 - (j) what expected project benefits did the proponent nominate;
 - (k) how did the proponent advise that the outcomes of the project would be sustained;
 - (l) did the proponent advise that the project would be self-sustaining; if so, how;
 - (m) did the project arise from an earlier community planning process; if so, how was the planning conducted and what issues and outcomes were identified;
 - (n) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided;
 - (o) what community involvement in project committees or working groups existed or were proposed by the proponent at the time of application;
 - (p) what experience in developing, budgeting and reporting on projects of this type did the proponent possess at the time of application;
 - (q) did the proponent propose to purchase consultancy services; if so, did the proponent provide quotes with the application;
 - (r) if the proposal involved community infrastructure, did the proponent provide a feasibility study and/or business plan;
 - (s) did the proponent approach other Commonwealth or state funding sources for the project or components of the project within 2 years of the date of application; if so, what sources were approached and what funding was received;
 - (t) what other financial and non-financial contributions to the project were nominated by the proponent and can a breakdown of these proposed contributions be provided including a calculation of the dollar value of the in-kind contributions; and
 - (u) what major project milestones were nominated by the proponent, including the commencement and completion dates.
- (7) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) what benefits has the project realised;

- (b) what involvement does the community have in project committees or working groups;
 - (c) has the proponent purchased consultancy services with Regional Solutions Programme funding; if so, how much has been spent on consultants;
 - (d) what financial and non-financial contributions to the project has the project received from other sources;
 - (e) have all project milestones nominated by the proponent in the funding application been met; if not, why not; and
 - (f) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
- (8) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent properly acquitted the project by submitting a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made; and
 - (e) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1848 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$5 000 to the Hervey Bay Historical Railway Village in the 2001-02 financial year under the Regional Solutions Programme, to fund a consultant to assist the village:

- (1) (a) What total Regional Solutions Programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) Can a detailed description of the project be provided.
- (3) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent.
- (4) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (5) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (6) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the Regional Solutions Programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) if applicable, when was the application varied;
 - (e) what Regional Solutions Programme funding was sought by the proponent, including goods and services tax (if applicable);
 - (f) what is the business address of the proponent;
 - (g) is the proponent a sponsoring organisation administering the grant on behalf of another organisation; if so, can details be provided of this organisation including its name, business address and main activity;

- (h) what project funding category did the proponent nominate: (i) planning, (ii) project implementation, (iii) community infrastructure, or (iv) resourcing a person to work for the community; if the answer was (iv), did the proponent propose to create a new position; if not, how had the position been funded until the time of application;
 - (i) what particular issue or issues in the local community did the proponent say would be addressed by the project;
 - (j) what expected project benefits did the proponent nominate;
 - (k) how did the proponent advise that the outcomes of the project would be sustained;
 - (l) did the proponent advise that the project would be self-sustaining; if so, how;
 - (m) did the project arise from an earlier community planning process; if so, how was the planning conducted and what issues and outcomes were identified;
 - (n) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided;
 - (o) what community involvement in project committees or working groups existed or were proposed by the proponent at the time of application;
 - (p) what experience in developing, budgeting and reporting on projects of this type did the proponent possess at the time of application;
 - (q) did the proponent propose to purchase consultancy services; if so, did the proponent provide quotes with the application;
 - (r) if the proposal involved community infrastructure, did the proponent provide a feasibility study and/or business plan;
 - (s) did the proponent approach other Commonwealth or state funding sources for the project or components of the project within 2 years of the date of application; if so, what sources were approached and what funding was received;
 - (t) what other financial and non-financial contributions to the project were nominated by the proponent and can a breakdown of these proposed contributions be provided including a calculation of the dollar value of the in-kind contributions; and
 - (u) what major project milestones were nominated by the proponent, including the commencement and completion dates.
- (7) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) what benefits has the project realised;
 - (b) what involvement does the community have in project committees or working groups;
 - (c) has the proponent purchased consultancy services with Regional Solutions Programme funding; if so, how much has been spent on consultants;
 - (d) what financial and non-financial contributions to the project has the project received from other sources;
 - (e) have all project milestones nominated by the proponent in the funding application been met; if not, why not; and
 - (f) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.

- (8) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
 - (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent properly acquitted the project by submitting a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made; and
 - (e) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1849 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$63 635 to the Gin Gin and District Alliance Inc. in the 2001-02 financial year under the Regional Solutions Programme, to employ a co-ordinator to conduct training programs:

- (1) (a) What total Regional Solutions Programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) Can a detailed description of the project be provided.
- (3) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent.
- (4) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (5) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (6) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the Regional Solutions Programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) if applicable, when was the application varied;
 - (e) what Regional Solutions Programme funding was sought by the proponent, including goods and services tax (if applicable);
 - (f) what is the business address of the proponent;
 - (g) is the proponent a sponsoring organisation administering the grant on behalf of another organisation; if so, can details be provided of this organisation including its name, business address and main activity;
 - (h) what project funding category did the proponent nominate: (i) planning, (ii) project implementation, (iii) community infrastructure, or (iv) resourcing a person to work for the community; if the answer was (iv), did the proponent propose to create a new position; if not, how had the position been funded until the time of application;
 - (i) what particular issue or issues in the local community did the proponent say would be addressed by the project;
 - (j) what expected project benefits did the proponent nominate;
 - (k) how did the proponent advise that the outcomes of the project would be sustained;

- (l) did the proponent advise that the project would be self-sustaining; if so, how;
 - (m) did the project arise from an earlier community planning process; if so, how was the planning conducted and what issues and outcomes were identified;
 - (n) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided;
 - (o) what community involvement in project committees or working groups existed or were proposed by the proponent at the time of application;
 - (p) what experience in developing, budgeting and reporting on projects of this type did the proponent possess at the time of application;
 - (q) did the proponent propose to purchase consultancy services; if so, did the proponent provide quotes with the application;
 - (r) if the proposal involved community infrastructure, did the proponent provide a feasibility study and/or business plan;
 - (s) did the proponent approach other Commonwealth or state funding sources for the project or components of the project within 2 years of the date of application; if so, what sources were approached and what funding was received;
 - (t) what other financial and non-financial contributions to the project were nominated by the proponent and can a breakdown of these proposed contributions be provided including a calculation of the dollar value of the in-kind contributions; and
 - (u) what major project milestones were nominated by the proponent, including the commencement and completion dates.
- (7) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) what benefits has the project realised;
 - (b) what involvement does the community have in project committees or working groups;
 - (c) has the proponent purchased consultancy services with Regional Solutions Programme funding; if so, how much has been spent on consultants;
 - (d) what financial and non-financial contributions to the project has the project received from other sources;
 - (e) have all project milestones nominated by the proponent in the funding application been met; if not, why not; and
 - (f) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
- (8) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent properly acquitted the project by submitting a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made; and
 - (e) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1850 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$116 500 to the Maryborough and Hervey Bay Show Society Limited in the 2001-02 financial year under the Regional Solutions Programme, to upgrade showground infrastructure:

- (1) (a) What total Regional Solutions Programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) Can a detailed description of the project be provided.
- (3) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent.
- (4) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (5) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (6) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the Regional Solutions Programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) if applicable, when was the application varied;
 - (e) what Regional Solutions Programme funding was sought by the proponent, including goods and services tax (if applicable);
 - (f) what is the business address of the proponent;
 - (g) is the proponent a sponsoring organisation administering the grant on behalf of another organisation; if so, can details be provided of this organisation including its name, business address and main activity;
 - (h) what project funding category did the proponent nominate: (i) planning, (ii) project implementation, (iii) community infrastructure, or (iv) resourcing a person to work for the community; if the answer was (iv), did the proponent propose to create a new position; if not, how had the position been funded until the time of application;
 - (i) what particular issue or issues in the local community did the proponent say would be addressed by the project;
 - (j) what expected project benefits did the proponent nominate;
 - (k) how did the proponent advise that the outcomes of the project would be sustained;
 - (l) did the proponent advise that the project would be self-sustaining; if so, how;
 - (m) did the project arise from an earlier community planning process; if so, how was the planning conducted and what issues and outcomes were identified;
 - (n) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided;
 - (o) what community involvement in project committees or working groups existed or were proposed by the proponent at the time of application;

- (p) what experience in developing, budgeting and reporting on projects of this type did the proponent possess at the time of application;
 - (q) did the proponent propose to purchase consultancy services; if so, did the proponent provide quotes with the application;
 - (r) if the proposal involved community infrastructure, did the proponent provide a feasibility study and/or business plan;
 - (s) did the proponent approach other Commonwealth or state funding sources for the project or components of the project within 2 years of the date of application; if so, what sources were approached and what funding was received;
 - (t) what other financial and non-financial contributions to the project were nominated by the proponent and can a breakdown of these proposed contributions be provided including a calculation of the dollar value of the in-kind contributions; and
 - (u) what major project milestones were nominated by the proponent, including the commencement and completion dates.
- (7) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) what benefits has the project realised;
 - (b) what involvement does the community have in project committees or working groups;
 - (c) has the proponent purchased consultancy services with Regional Solutions Programme funding; if so, how much has been spent on consultants;
 - (d) what financial and non-financial contributions to the project has the project received from other sources;
 - (e) have all project milestones nominated by the proponent in the funding application been met; if not, why not; and
 - (f) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
- (8) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent properly acquitted the project by submitting a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made; and
 - (e) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1851 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$178 000 to the Theodore Sport & Recreation Association Inc. in the 2001-02 financial year under the Regional Solutions Programme, to provide sport and recreation facilities:

- (1) (a) What total Regional Solutions Programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) Can a detailed description of the project be provided.

- (3) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent.
- (4) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (5) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (6) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the Regional Solutions Programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) if applicable, when was the application varied;
 - (e) what Regional Solutions Programme funding was sought by the proponent, including goods and services tax (if applicable);
 - (f) what is the business address of the proponent;
 - (g) is the proponent a sponsoring organisation administering the grant on behalf of another organisation; if so, can details be provided of this organisation including its name, business address and main activity;
 - (h) what project funding category did the proponent nominate:
 - (i) planning, (ii) project implementation, (iii) community infrastructure, or (iv) resourcing a person to work for the community; if the answer was (iv), did the proponent propose to create a new position; if not, how had the position been funded until the time of application;
 - (i) what particular issue or issues in the local community did the proponent say would be addressed by the project;
 - (j) what expected project benefits did the proponent nominate;
 - (k) how did the proponent advise that the outcomes of the project would be sustained;
 - (l) did the proponent advise that the project would be self-sustaining; if so, how;
 - (m) did the project arise from an earlier community planning process; if so, how was the planning conducted and what issues and outcomes were identified;
 - (n) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided;
 - (o) what community involvement in project committees or working groups existed or were proposed by the proponent at the time of application;
 - (p) what experience in developing, budgeting and reporting on projects of this type did the proponent possess at the time of application;
 - (q) did the proponent propose to purchase consultancy services; if so, did the proponent provide quotes with the application;
 - (r) if the proposal involved community infrastructure, did the proponent provide a feasibility study and/or business plan;
 - (s) did the proponent approach other Commonwealth or state funding sources for the project or components of the project within 2 years

- of the date of application; if so, what sources were approached and what funding was received;
- (t) what other financial and non-financial contributions to the project were nominated by the proponent and can a breakdown of these proposed contributions be provided including a calculation of the dollar value of the in-kind contributions; and
 - (u) what major project milestones were nominated by the proponent, including the commencement and completion dates.
- (7) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) what benefits has the project realised;
 - (b) what involvement does the community have in project committees or working groups;
 - (c) has the proponent purchased consultancy services with Regional Solutions Programme funding; if so, how much has been spent on consultants;
 - (d) what financial and non-financial contributions to the project has the project received from other sources;
 - (e) have all project milestones nominated by the proponent in the funding application been met; if not, why not; and
 - (f) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
- (8) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent properly acquitted the project by submitting a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made; and
 - (e) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1852 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$100 000 to the Eidsvold Shire Council in the 2001-02 financial year under the Regional Solutions Programme, to add value to native hardwood timbers:

- (1) (a) What total Regional Solutions Programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) Can a detailed description of the project be provided.
- (3) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent.
- (4) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (5) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (6) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;

- (c) did the funding application comply with the Regional Solutions Programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) if applicable, when was the application varied;
 - (e) what Regional Solutions Programme funding was sought by the proponent, including goods and services tax (if applicable);
 - (f) what is the business address of the proponent;
 - (g) is the proponent a sponsoring organisation administering the grant on behalf of another organisation; if so, can details be provided of this organisation including its name, business address and main activity;
 - (h) what project funding category did the proponent nominate:
 - (i) planning, (ii) project implementation, (iii) community infrastructure, or (iv) resourcing a person to work for the community; if the answer was (iv), did the proponent propose to create a new position; if not, how had the position been funded until the time of application;
 - (i) what particular issue or issues in the local community did the proponent say would be addressed by the project;
 - (j) what expected project benefits did the proponent nominate;
 - (k) how did the proponent advise that the outcomes of the project would be sustained;
 - (l) did the proponent advise that the project would be self-sustaining; if so, how;
 - (m) did the project arise from an earlier community planning process; if so, how was the planning conducted and what issues and outcomes were identified;
 - (n) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided;
 - (o) what community involvement in project committees or working groups existed or were proposed by the proponent at the time of application;
 - (p) what experience in developing, budgeting and reporting on projects of this type did the proponent possess at the time of application;
 - (q) did the proponent propose to purchase consultancy services; if so, did the proponent provide quotes with the application;
 - (r) if the proposal involved community infrastructure, did the proponent provide a feasibility study and/or business plan;
 - (s) did the proponent approach other Commonwealth or state funding sources for the project or components of the project within 2 years of the date of application; if so, what sources were approached and what funding was received;
 - (t) what other financial and non-financial contributions to the project were nominated by the proponent and can a breakdown of these proposed contributions be provided including a calculation of the dollar value of the in-kind contributions; and
 - (u) what major project milestones were nominated by the proponent, including the commencement and completion dates.
- (7) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) what benefits has the project realised;

- (b) what involvement does the community have in project committees or working groups;
 - (c) has the proponent purchased consultancy services with Regional Solutions Programme funding; if so, how much has been spent on consultants;
 - (d) what financial and non-financial contributions to the project has the project received from other sources;
 - (e) have all project milestones nominated by the proponent in the funding application been met; if not, why not; and
 - (f) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
- (8) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent properly acquitted the project by submitting a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made; and
 - (e) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1853 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$272 727 to the Banana Shire Community Resource Centre Reference Group in the 2001-02 financial year under the Regional Solutions Programme, for a community resource centre:

- (1) (a) What total Regional Solutions Programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) Can a detailed description of the project be provided.
- (3) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent.
- (4) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (5) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (6) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the Regional Solutions Programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) if applicable, when was the application varied;
 - (e) what Regional Solutions Programme funding was sought by the proponent, including goods and services tax (if applicable);
 - (f) what is the business address of the proponent;
 - (g) is the proponent a sponsoring organisation administering the grant on behalf of another organisation; if so, can details be provided of this organisation including its name, business address and main activity;

- (h) what project funding category did the proponent nominate: (i) planning, (ii) project implementation, (iii) community infrastructure, or (iv) resourcing a person to work for the community; if the answer was (iv), did the proponent propose to create a new position; if not, how had the position been funded until the time of application;
 - (i) what particular issue or issues in the local community did the proponent say would be addressed by the project;
 - (j) what expected project benefits did the proponent nominate;
 - (k) how did the proponent advise that the outcomes of the project would be sustained;
 - (l) did the proponent advise that the project would be self-sustaining; if so, how;
 - (m) did the project arise from an earlier community planning process; if so, how was the planning conducted and what issues and outcomes were identified;
 - (n) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided;
 - (o) what community involvement in project committees or working groups existed or were proposed by the proponent at the time of application;
 - (p) what experience in developing, budgeting and reporting on projects of this type did the proponent possess at the time of application;
 - (q) did the proponent propose to purchase consultancy services; if so, did the proponent provide quotes with the application;
 - (r) if the proposal involved community infrastructure, did the proponent provide a feasibility study and/or business plan;
 - (s) did the proponent approach other Commonwealth or state funding sources for the project or components of the project within 2 years of the date of application; if so, what sources were approached and what funding was received;
 - (t) what other financial and non-financial contributions to the project were nominated by the proponent and can a breakdown of these proposed contributions be provided including a calculation of the dollar value of the in-kind contributions; and
 - (u) what major project milestones were nominated by the proponent, including the commencement and completion dates.
- (7) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) what benefits has the project realised;
 - (b) what involvement does the community have in project committees or working groups;
 - (c) has the proponent purchased consultancy services with Regional Solutions Programme funding; if so, how much has been spent on consultants;
 - (d) what financial and non-financial contributions to the project has the project received from other sources;
 - (e) have all project milestones nominated by the proponent in the funding application been met; if not, why not; and
 - (f) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.

- (8) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent properly acquitted the project by submitting a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made; and
 - (e) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1854 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$29 263 to the Monduran Anglers and Stocking Association in the 2001-02 financial year under the Regional Solutions Programme, to develop skills in regional youth:

- (1) (a) What total Regional Solutions Programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) Can a detailed description of the project be provided.
- (3) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent.
- (4) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (5) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (6) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the Regional Solutions Programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) if applicable, when was the application varied;
 - (e) what Regional Solutions Programme funding was sought by the proponent, including goods and services tax (if applicable);
 - (f) what is the business address of the proponent;
 - (g) is the proponent a sponsoring organisation administering the grant on behalf of another organisation; if so, can details be provided of this organisation including its name, business address and main activity;
 - (h) what project funding category did the proponent nominate: (i) planning, (ii) project implementation, (iii) community infrastructure, or (iv) resourcing a person to work for the community; if the answer was (iv), did the proponent propose to create a new position; if not, how had the position been funded until the time of application;
 - (i) what particular issue or issues in the local community did the proponent say would be addressed by the project;
 - (j) what expected project benefits did the proponent nominate;
 - (k) how did the proponent advise that the outcomes of the project would be sustained;

- (l) did the proponent advise that the project would be self-sustaining; if so, how;
 - (m) did the project arise from an earlier community planning process; if so, how was the planning conducted and what issues and outcomes were identified;
 - (n) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided;
 - (o) what community involvement in project committees or working groups existed or were proposed by the proponent at the time of application;
 - (p) what experience in developing, budgeting and reporting on projects of this type did the proponent possess at the time of application;
 - (q) did the proponent propose to purchase consultancy services; if so, did the proponent provide quotes with the application;
 - (r) if the proposal involved community infrastructure, did the proponent provide a feasibility study and/or business plan;
 - (s) did the proponent approach other Commonwealth or state funding sources for the project or components of the project within 2 years of the date of application; if so, what sources were approached and what funding was received;
 - (t) what other financial and non-financial contributions to the project were nominated by the proponent and can a breakdown of these proposed contributions be provided including a calculation of the dollar value of the in-kind contributions; and
 - (u) what major project milestones were nominated by the proponent, including the commencement and completion dates.
- (7) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) what benefits has the project realised;
 - (b) what involvement does the community have in project committees or working groups;
 - (c) has the proponent purchased consultancy services with Regional Solutions Programme funding; if so, how much has been spent on consultants;
 - (d) what financial and non-financial contributions to the project has the project received from other sources;
 - (e) have all project milestones nominated by the proponent in the funding application been met; if not, why not; and
 - (f) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
- (8) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent properly acquitted the project by submitting a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made; and
 - (e) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

Notice given 3 September 2003

1855 **Senator Bartlett:** To ask the Minister for Defence—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 3621 (Senate *Hansard*, 7 August 2001, p. 25811) in which the Government confirmed that Australian F-111 and C-130J aircraft carry depleted uranium as counterbalance weight:

- (1) Do these aircraft still carry depleted uranium (DU); if so, how much.
- (2) Were the F-111 aircraft used in the 'Riverfire' display as part of the Brisbane 'RiverFestival' on the evening of 30 August, carrying DU; if so, were guidelines on the hazards posed by DU exposed to fire issued to Queensland Emergency Services personnel.
- (3) If DU is no longer in use in Australian aircraft as ballast: (a) when did this use cease; (b) when was it disposed of; (c) where was it disposed of; and (d) by whom.
- (4) Were the manuals, as mentioned in the answer, for the C-130J amended.
- (5) How many F-111s carrying DU have crashed; if any: (a) when did they crash; and (b) where.
- (6) If aircraft carrying DU ballast did crash, what clean-up procedures were implemented.
- (7) If DU ballast was lost as a result of an accident, what notices were issued to the public.

1856 **Senator Bartlett:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

- (1) With reference to all vessels sunk in Australian waters between 1936 and 1946, that the Commonwealth is aware of, can the following details be provided: (a) the location, (b) the name of the vessel; (c) the cargo the vessel was carrying at the time; and (d) the flag state of the vessel.
- (2) How does the Commonwealth propose to address the environmental risks posed by these shipwrecks.

Notice given 4 September 2003

1857 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$90 000 for the Subxtreme Manufacturing Facility project under the Structural Adjustment Package for the Wide Bay Burnett Region of Queensland:

- (1) (a) What total Structural Adjustment Package funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee.

- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the funding application referred to the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee;
 - (c) was the application varied; if so, when, and what was the nature of the variation/s;
 - (d) when did the committee make a recommendation to the Minister;
 - (e) what recommendation did the committee make;
 - (f) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (g) did the funding application comply with the structural adjustment package guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (h) what total funding was sought, including goods and services tax;
 - (i) what was the main business of the proponent at the time of application;
 - (j) how did the proponent describe the proposed project;
 - (k) was the proposed project a new project or an extension of an existing business activity;
 - (l) with reference to employment outcomes nominated by the proponent:
 - (i) how many full-time and part time jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (iii) how many construction jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (iv) what employment timing was outlined by the proponent, and
 - (v) what types of jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
 - (m) what project planning and design time did the proponent nominate;
 - (n) if applicable, what construction start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (o) what project commissioning and/or commencement date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (p) what date did the proponent nominate for the project to become fully operational;
 - (q) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (r) what long-term benefits to the Wide Bay Burnett region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;

- (s) what flow-on benefits to other businesses, organisations or individuals in the region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;
 - (t) was the proposal local, national or export focused;
 - (u) did a business plan accompany the application form;
 - (v) what evidence did the proponent provide to support the proposal's feasibility and did this evidence include a feasibility study; if so, who undertook the feasibility study;
 - (w) did the proponent provide details of projected cash flow, revenue and expenses for at least the first 5 years; if so, did the proponent include investment analysis details such as rates of return, liquidity and debt analysis;
 - (x) were copies of the proponent's business plan and financial statements provided;
 - (y) did the proponent provide details of similar projects successfully realised; if so, what projects;
 - (z) did the proponent provide a statement indicating the extent to which Commonwealth funding was needed to realise the project;
 - (aa) (i) what evidence did the proponent provide indicating community support for the application, and (ii) which organisations or individuals provided letters of support;
 - (ab) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, did the proponent identify would be provided or had been sought for the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;
 - (ac) was a statement provided attesting that the proponent's financial contribution to the project would be a new investment;
 - (ad) did the proponent provide evidence that appropriate planning and environmental approvals had been gained or sought;
 - (ae) did the proponent provide a statement describing the likely impact of the project on other businesses in the region; if so, how did the proponent describe the likely impact; and
 - (af) did the proponent provide details of a likely net increase in employment, including, if applicable, employment growth resulting from relocation.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the proponent enter into a grant agreement with the department;
 - (b) with reference to employment outcomes:
 - (i) how many full-time and part time jobs have been generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs have been generated by the project,
 - (iii) how many construction jobs were generated by the project,
 - (iv) over what time period have these jobs been created, and have employment growth and employment numbers been sustained, and
 - (v) what types of jobs have been generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
 - (c) what project planning and design time was required;

- (d) if applicable, what was the construction start date;
 - (e) when did project operations commence;
 - (f) when did the project become fully operational;
 - (g) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so: (i) has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (h) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted, and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (i) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (j) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, when;
 - (k) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, have supported the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;
 - (l) what financial contribution has the proponent made to the project; and
 - (m) has the proponent complied with appropriate planning and environmental laws.
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project; and
 - (f) has an independent audit been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the audit, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1858 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$500 000 for the Cooloola Agriculture Centre project under the Structural Adjustment Package for the Wide Bay Burnett Region of Queensland:

- (1) (a) What total Structural Adjustment Package funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee.

- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the funding application referred to the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee;
 - (c) was the application varied; if so, when, and what was the nature of the variation/s;
 - (d) when did the committee make a recommendation to the Minister;
 - (e) what recommendation did the committee make;
 - (f) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (g) did the funding application comply with the structural adjustment package guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (h) what total funding was sought, including goods and services tax;
 - (i) what was the main business of the proponent at the time of application;
 - (j) how did the proponent describe the proposed project;
 - (k) was the proposed project a new project or an extension of an existing business activity;
 - (l) with reference to employment outcomes nominated by the proponent:
 - (i) how many full-time and part time jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (iii) how many construction jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (iv) what employment timing was outlined by the proponent, and
 - (v) what types of jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
 - (m) what project planning and design time did the proponent nominate;
 - (n) if applicable, what construction start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (o) what project commissioning and/or commencement date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (p) what date did the proponent nominate for the project to become fully operational;
 - (q) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (r) what long-term benefits to the Wide Bay Burnett region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;

- (s) what flow-on benefits to other businesses, organisations or individuals in the region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;
 - (t) was the proposal local, national or export focused;
 - (u) did a business plan accompany the application form;
 - (v) what evidence did the proponent provide to support the proposal's feasibility and did this evidence include a feasibility study; if so, who undertook the feasibility study;
 - (w) did the proponent provide details of projected cash flow, revenue and expenses for at least the first 5 years; if so, did the proponent include investment analysis details such as rates of return, liquidity and debt analysis;
 - (x) were copies of the proponent's business plan and financial statements provided;
 - (y) did the proponent provide details of similar projects successfully realised; if so, what projects;
 - (z) did the proponent provide a statement indicating the extent to which Commonwealth funding was needed to realise the project;
 - (aa) (i) what evidence did the proponent provide indicating community support for the application, and (ii) which organisations or individuals provided letters of support;
 - (ab) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, did the proponent identify would be provided or had been sought for the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;
 - (ac) was a statement provided attesting that the proponent's financial contribution to the project would be a new investment;
 - (ad) did the proponent provide evidence that appropriate planning and environmental approvals had been gained or sought;
 - (ae) did the proponent provide a statement describing the likely impact of the project on other businesses in the region; if so, how did the proponent describe the likely impact;
 - (af) did the proponent provide details of a likely net increase in employment, including, if applicable, employment growth resulting from relocation; and
 - (ag) (i) what exceptional characteristics did the project proposal possess, and (ii) what significant or widespread impact on employment did the application suggest would result from the realisation of the project.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the proponent enter into a grant agreement with the department;
 - (b) with reference to employment outcomes:
 - (i) how many full-time and part time jobs have been generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs have been generated by the project,
 - (iii) how many construction jobs were generated by the project,
 - (iv) over what time period have these jobs been created, and have employment growth and employment numbers been sustained, and

- (v) what types of jobs have been generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
 - (c) what project planning and design time was required;
 - (d) if applicable, what was the construction start date;
 - (e) when did project operations commence;
 - (f) when did the project become fully operational;
 - (g) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so: (i) has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (h) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted, and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (i) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (j) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, when;
 - (k) what long-term benefits for the Wide Bay Burnett region have been generated by the project;
 - (l) what flow-on benefits to other businesses, organisations or individuals in the region have been generated by the project;
 - (m) has the project been local, national or export focused;
 - (n) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, have supported the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;
 - (o) what financial contribution has the proponent made to the project;
 - (p) has the proponent complied with appropriate planning and environmental laws; and
 - (q) what impact has the project had on other businesses in the region.
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project; and
 - (f) has an independent audit been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the audit, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1859 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$160 000 for the Hervey Bay Thrill Seeker “Bungee” project under the Structural Adjustment Package for the Wide Bay Burnett Region of Queensland:

- (1) (a) What total Structural Adjustment Package funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.

- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the funding application referred to the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee;
 - (c) was the application varied; if so, when, and what was the nature of the variation/s;
 - (d) when did the committee make a recommendation to the Minister;
 - (e) what recommendation did the committee make;
 - (f) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (g) did the funding application comply with the structural adjustment package guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (h) what total funding was sought, including goods and services tax;
 - (i) what was the main business of the proponent at the time of application;
 - (j) how did the proponent describe the proposed project;
 - (k) was the proposed project a new project or an extension of an existing business activity;
 - (l) with reference to employment outcomes nominated by the proponent:
 - (i) how many full-time and part time jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (iii) how many construction jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (iv) what employment timing was outlined by the proponent, and
 - (v) what types of jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
 - (m) what project planning and design time did the proponent nominate;
 - (n) if applicable, what construction start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (o) what project commissioning and/or commencement date was nominated by the proponent;

- (p) what date did the proponent nominate for the project to become fully operational;
 - (q) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (r) what long-term benefits to the Wide Bay Burnett region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;
 - (s) what flow-on benefits to other businesses, organisations or individuals in the region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;
 - (t) was the proposal local, national or export focused;
 - (u) did a business plan accompany the application form;
 - (v) what evidence did the proponent provide to support the proposal's feasibility and did this evidence include a feasibility study; if so, who undertook the feasibility study;
 - (w) did the proponent provide details of projected cash flow, revenue and expenses for at least the first 5 years; if so, did the proponent include investment analysis details such as rates of return, liquidity and debt analysis;
 - (x) were copies of the proponent's business plan and financial statements provided;
 - (y) did the proponent provide details of similar projects successfully realised; if so, what projects;
 - (z) did the proponent provide a statement indicating the extent to which Commonwealth funding was needed to realise the project;
 - (aa) (i) what evidence did the proponent provide indicating community support for the application, and (ii) which organisations or individuals provided letters of support;
 - (ab) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, did the proponent identify would be provided or had been sought for the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;
 - (ac) was a statement provided attesting that the proponent's financial contribution to the project would be a new investment;
 - (ad) did the proponent provide evidence that appropriate planning and environmental approvals had been gained or sought;
 - (ae) did the proponent provide a statement describing the likely impact of the project on other businesses in the region; if so, how did the proponent describe the likely impact; and
 - (af) did the proponent provide details of a likely net increase in employment, including, if applicable, employment growth resulting from relocation.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the proponent enter into a grant agreement with the department;
 - (b) with reference to employment outcomes:
 - (i) how many full-time and part time jobs have been generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs have been generated by the project,

- (iii) how many construction jobs were generated by the project,
- (iv) over what time period have these jobs been created, and have employment growth and employment numbers been sustained, and
- (v) what types of jobs have been generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
- (c) what project planning and design time was required;
- (d) if applicable, what was the construction start date;
- (e) when did project operations commence;
- (f) when did the project become fully operational;
- (g) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so: (i) has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
- (h) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted, and (iii) was a steering committee established;
- (i) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
- (j) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, when;
- (k) what long-term benefits for the Wide Bay Burnett region have been generated by the project;
- (l) what flow-on benefits to other businesses, organisations or individuals in the region have been generated by the project;
- (m) has the project been local, national or export focused;
- (n) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, have supported the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;
- (o) what financial contribution has the proponent made to the project;
- (p) has the proponent complied with appropriate planning and environmental laws; and
- (q) what impact has the project had on other businesses in the region.
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
 - (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project; and
 - (f) has an independent audit been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the audit, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1860 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$240 000 for the TSG Pacific Software Engineering Centre project under the Structural Adjustment Package for the Wide Bay Burnett Region of Queensland:

- (1) (a) What total Structural Adjustment Package funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the funding application referred to the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee;
 - (c) was the application varied; if so, when, and what was the nature of the variation/s;
 - (d) when did the committee make a recommendation to the Minister;
 - (e) what recommendation did the committee make;
 - (f) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (g) did the funding application comply with the structural adjustment package guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (h) what total funding was sought, including goods and services tax;
 - (i) what was the main business of the proponent at the time of application;
 - (j) how did the proponent describe the proposed project;
 - (k) was the proposed project a new project or an extension of an existing business activity;
 - (l) with reference to employment outcomes nominated by the proponent:
 - (i) how many full-time and part time jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (iii) how many construction jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (iv) what employment timing was outlined by the proponent, and
 - (v) what types of jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
 - (m) what project planning and design time did the proponent nominate;

- (n) if applicable, what construction start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (o) what project commissioning and/or commencement date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (p) what date did the proponent nominate for the project to become fully operational;
 - (q) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (r) what long-term benefits to the Wide Bay Burnett region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;
 - (s) what flow-on benefits to other businesses, organisations or individuals in the region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;
 - (t) was the proposal local, national or export focused;
 - (u) did a business plan accompany the application form;
 - (v) what evidence did the proponent provide to support the proposal's feasibility and did this evidence include a feasibility study; if so, who undertook the feasibility study;
 - (w) did the proponent provide details of projected cash flow, revenue and expenses for at least the first 5 years; if so, did the proponent include investment analysis details such as rates of return, liquidity and debt analysis;
 - (x) were copies of the proponent's business plan and financial statements provided;
 - (y) did the proponent provide details of similar projects successfully realised; if so, what projects;
 - (z) did the proponent provide a statement indicating the extent to which Commonwealth funding was needed to realise the project;
 - (aa) (i) what evidence did the proponent provide indicating community support for the application, and (ii) which organisations or individuals provided letters of support;
 - (ab) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, did the proponent identify would be provided or had been sought for the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;
 - (ac) was a statement provided attesting that the proponent's financial contribution to the project would be a new investment;
 - (ad) did the proponent provide evidence that appropriate planning and environmental approvals had been gained or sought;
 - (ae) did the proponent provide a statement describing the likely impact of the project on other businesses in the region; if so, how did the proponent describe the likely impact; and
 - (af) did the proponent provide details of a likely net increase in employment, including, if applicable, employment growth resulting from relocation.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the proponent enter into a grant agreement with the department;
 - (b) with reference to employment outcomes:

- (i) how many full-time and part time jobs have been generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs have been generated by the project,
 - (iii) how many construction jobs were generated by the project,
 - (iv) over what time period have these jobs been created, and have employment growth and employment numbers been sustained, and
 - (v) what types of jobs have been generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
 - (c) what project planning and design time was required;
 - (d) if applicable, what was the construction start date;
 - (e) when did project operations commence;
 - (f) when did the project become fully operational;
 - (g) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so: (i) has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (h) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted, and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (i) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (j) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, when;
 - (k) what long-term benefits for the Wide Bay Burnett region have been generated by the project;
 - (l) what flow-on benefits to other businesses, organisations or individuals in the region have been generated by the project;
 - (m) has the project been local, national or export focused;
 - (n) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, have supported the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;
 - (o) what financial contribution has the proponent made to the project;
 - (p) has the proponent complied with appropriate planning and environmental laws; and
 - (q) what impact has the project had on other businesses in the region.
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project; and
 - (f) has an independent audit been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the audit, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1861 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$294 500 for the Farmfresh Expansion Program project under the Structural Adjustment Package for the Wide Bay Burnett Region of Queensland:

- (1) (a) What total Structural Adjustment Package funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the funding application referred to the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee;
 - (c) was the application varied; if so, when, and what was the nature of the variation/s;
 - (d) when did the committee make a recommendation to the Minister;
 - (e) what recommendation did the committee make;
 - (f) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (g) did the funding application comply with the structural adjustment package guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (h) what total funding was sought, including goods and services tax;
 - (i) what was the main business of the proponent at the time of application;
 - (j) how did the proponent describe the proposed project;
 - (k) was the proposed project a new project or an extension of an existing business activity;
 - (l) with reference to employment outcomes nominated by the proponent:
 - (i) how many full-time and part time jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (iii) how many construction jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (iv) what employment timing was outlined by the proponent, and

- (v) what types of jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
 - (m) what project planning and design time did the proponent nominate;
 - (n) if applicable, what construction start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (o) what project commissioning and/or commencement date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (p) what date did the proponent nominate for the project to become fully operational;
 - (q) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (r) what long-term benefits to the Wide Bay Burnett region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;
 - (s) what flow-on benefits to other businesses, organisations or individuals in the region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;
 - (t) was the proposal local, national or export focused;
 - (u) did a business plan accompany the application form;
 - (v) what evidence did the proponent provide to support the proposal's feasibility and did this evidence include a feasibility study; if so, who undertook the feasibility study;
 - (w) did the proponent provide details of projected cash flow, revenue and expenses for at least the first 5 years; if so, did the proponent include investment analysis details such as rates of return, liquidity and debt analysis;
 - (x) were copies of the proponent's business plan and financial statements provided;
 - (y) did the proponent provide details of similar projects successfully realised; if so, what projects;
 - (z) did the proponent provide a statement indicating the extent to which Commonwealth funding was needed to realise the project;
 - (aa) (i) what evidence did the proponent provide indicating community support for the application, and (ii) which organisations or individuals provided letters of support;
 - (ab) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, did the proponent identify would be provided or had been sought for the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;
 - (ac) was a statement provided attesting that the proponent's financial contribution to the project would be a new investment;
 - (ad) did the proponent provide evidence that appropriate planning and environmental approvals had been gained or sought;
 - (ae) did the proponent provide a statement describing the likely impact of the project on other businesses in the region; if so, how did the proponent describe the likely impact; and
 - (af) did the proponent provide details of a likely net increase in employment, including, if applicable, employment growth resulting from relocation.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:

- (a) when did the proponent enter into a grant agreement with the department;
 - (b) with reference to employment outcomes:
 - (i) how many full-time and part time jobs have been generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs have been generated by the project,
 - (iii) how many construction jobs were generated by the project,
 - (iv) over what time period have these jobs been created, and have employment growth and employment numbers been sustained, and
 - (v) what types of jobs have been generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
 - (c) what project planning and design time was required;
 - (d) if applicable, what was the construction start date;
 - (e) when did project operations commence;
 - (f) when did the project become fully operational;
 - (g) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so: (i) has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (h) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted, and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (i) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (j) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, when;
 - (k) what long-term benefits for the Wide Bay Burnett region have been generated by the project;
 - (l) what flow-on benefits to other businesses, organisations or individuals in the region have been generated by the project;
 - (m) has the project been local, national or export focused;
 - (n) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, have supported the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;
 - (o) what financial contribution has the proponent made to the project;
 - (p) has the proponent complied with appropriate planning and environmental laws; and
 - (q) what impact has the project had on other businesses in the region.
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project; and

- (f) has an independent audit been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the audit, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1862 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$330 000 for the Neptunes Reefworld Aquarium Development project under the Structural Adjustment Package for the Wide Bay Burnett Region of Queensland:

- (1) (a) What total Structural Adjustment Package funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the funding application referred to the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee;
 - (c) was the application varied; if so, when, and what was the nature of the variation/s;
 - (d) when did the committee make a recommendation to the Minister;
 - (e) what recommendation did the committee make;
 - (f) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (g) did the funding application comply with the structural adjustment package guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (h) what total funding was sought, including goods and services tax;
 - (i) what was the main business of the proponent at the time of application;
 - (j) how did the proponent describe the proposed project;
 - (k) was the proposed project a new project or an extension of an existing business activity;
 - (l) with reference to employment outcomes nominated by the proponent:
 - (i) how many full-time and part time jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,

- (iii) how many construction jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (iv) what employment timing was outlined by the proponent, and
 - (v) what types of jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
- (m) what project planning and design time did the proponent nominate;
 - (n) if applicable, what construction start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (o) what project commissioning and/or commencement date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (p) what date did the proponent nominate for the project to become fully operational;
 - (q) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (r) what long-term benefits to the Wide Bay Burnett region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;
 - (s) what flow-on benefits to other businesses, organisations or individuals in the region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;
 - (t) was the proposal local, national or export focused;
 - (u) did a business plan accompany the application form;
 - (v) what evidence did the proponent provide to support the proposal's feasibility and did this evidence include a feasibility study; if so, who undertook the feasibility study;
 - (w) did the proponent provide details of projected cash flow, revenue and expenses for at least the first 5 years; if so, did the proponent include investment analysis details such as rates of return, liquidity and debt analysis;
 - (x) were copies of the proponent's business plan and financial statements provided;
 - (y) did the proponent provide details of similar projects successfully realised; if so, what projects;
 - (z) did the proponent provide a statement indicating the extent to which Commonwealth funding was needed to realise the project;
 - (aa) (i) what evidence did the proponent provide indicating community support for the application, and (ii) which organisations or individuals provided letters of support;
 - (ab) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, did the proponent identify would be provided or had been sought for the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;
 - (ac) was a statement provided attesting that the proponent's financial contribution to the project would be a new investment;
 - (ad) did the proponent provide evidence that appropriate planning and environmental approvals had been gained or sought;
 - (ae) did the proponent provide a statement describing the likely impact of the project on other businesses in the region; if so, how did the proponent describe the likely impact; and

- (af) did the proponent provide details of a likely net increase in employment, including, if applicable, employment growth resulting from relocation.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the proponent enter into a grant agreement with the department;
 - (b) with reference to employment outcomes:
 - (i) how many full-time and part time jobs have been generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs have been generated by the project,
 - (iii) how many construction jobs were generated by the project,
 - (iv) over what time period have these jobs been created, and have employment growth and employment numbers been sustained, and
 - (v) what types of jobs have been generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
 - (c) what project planning and design time was required;
 - (d) if applicable, what was the construction start date;
 - (e) when did project operations commence;
 - (f) when did the project become fully operational;
 - (g) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so: (i) has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (h) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted, and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (i) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (j) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, when;
 - (k) what long-term benefits for the Wide Bay Burnett region have been generated by the project;
 - (l) what flow-on benefits to other businesses, organisations or individuals in the region have been generated by the project;
 - (m) has the project been local, national or export focused;
 - (n) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, have supported the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;
 - (o) what financial contribution has the proponent made to the project;
 - (p) has the proponent complied with appropriate planning and environmental laws; and
 - (q) what impact has the project had on other businesses in the region.
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;

- (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
- (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project; and
- (f) has an independent audit been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the audit, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1863 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$150 000 for the B&S Classic Doors Expansion project under the Structural Adjustment Package for the Wide Bay Burnett Region of Queensland:

- (1) (a) What total Structural Adjustment Package funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the funding application referred to the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee;
 - (c) was the application varied; if so, when, and what was the nature of the variation/s;
 - (d) when did the committee make a recommendation to the Minister;
 - (e) what recommendation did the committee make;
 - (f) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (g) did the funding application comply with the structural adjustment package guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (h) what total funding was sought, including goods and services tax;
 - (i) what was the main business of the proponent at the time of application;
 - (j) how did the proponent describe the proposed project;
 - (k) was the proposed project a new project or an extension of an existing business activity;
 - (l) with reference to employment outcomes nominated by the proponent:

- (i) how many full-time and part time jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (iii) how many construction jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (iv) what employment timing was outlined by the proponent, and
 - (v) what types of jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
- (m) what project planning and design time did the proponent nominate;
 - (n) if applicable, what construction start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (o) what project commissioning and/or commencement date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (p) what date did the proponent nominate for the project to become fully operational;
 - (q) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (r) what long-term benefits to the Wide Bay Burnett region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;
 - (s) what flow-on benefits to other businesses, organisations or individuals in the region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;
 - (t) was the proposal local, national or export focused;
 - (u) did a business plan accompany the application form;
 - (v) what evidence did the proponent provide to support the proposal's feasibility and did this evidence include a feasibility study; if so, who undertook the feasibility study;
 - (w) did the proponent provide details of projected cash flow, revenue and expenses for at least the first 5 years; if so, did the proponent include investment analysis details such as rates of return, liquidity and debt analysis;
 - (x) were copies of the proponent's business plan and financial statements provided;
 - (y) did the proponent provide details of similar projects successfully realised; if so, what projects;
 - (z) did the proponent provide a statement indicating the extent to which Commonwealth funding was needed to realise the project;
- (aa) (i) what evidence did the proponent provide indicating community support for the application, and (ii) which organisations or individuals provided letters of support;
 - (ab) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, did the proponent identify would be provided or had been sought for the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;
 - (ac) was a statement provided attesting that the proponent's financial contribution to the project would be a new investment;
 - (ad) did the proponent provide evidence that appropriate planning and environmental approvals had been gained or sought;

- (ae) did the proponent provide a statement describing the likely impact of the project on other businesses in the region; if so, how did the proponent describe the likely impact; and
 - (af) did the proponent provide details of a likely net increase in employment, including, if applicable, employment growth resulting from relocation.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the proponent enter into a grant agreement with the department;
 - (b) with reference to employment outcomes:
 - (i) how many full-time and part time jobs have been generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs have been generated by the project,
 - (iii) how many construction jobs were generated by the project,
 - (iv) over what time period have these jobs been created, and have employment growth and employment numbers been sustained, and
 - (v) what types of jobs have been generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
 - (c) what project planning and design time was required;
 - (d) if applicable, what was the construction start date;
 - (e) when did project operations commence;
 - (f) when did the project become fully operational;
 - (g) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so: (i) has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (h) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted, and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (i) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (j) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, when;
 - (k) what long-term benefits for the Wide Bay Burnett region have been generated by the project;
 - (l) what flow-on benefits to other businesses, organisations or individuals in the region have been generated by the project;
 - (m) has the project been local, national or export focused;
 - (n) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, have supported the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;
 - (o) what financial contribution has the proponent made to the project;
 - (p) has the proponent complied with appropriate planning and environmental laws; and
 - (q) what impact has the project had on other businesses in the region.
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;

- (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
- (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
- (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
- (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project; and
- (f) has an independent audit been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the audit, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1864 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$24 500 for the Expansion of Mikes Industrial Coatings project under the Structural Adjustment Package for the Wide Bay Burnett Region of Queensland:

- (1) (a) What total Structural Adjustment Package funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the funding application referred to the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee;
 - (c) was the application varied; if so, when, and what was the nature of the variation/s;
 - (d) when did the committee make a recommendation to the Minister;
 - (e) what recommendation did the committee make;
 - (f) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (g) did the funding application comply with the structural adjustment package guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (h) what total funding was sought, including goods and services tax;
 - (i) what was the main business of the proponent at the time of application;
 - (j) how did the proponent describe the proposed project;

- (k) was the proposed project a new project or an extension of an existing business activity;
- (l) with reference to employment outcomes nominated by the proponent:
 - (i) how many full-time and part time jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (iii) how many construction jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (iv) what employment timing was outlined by the proponent, and
 - (v) what types of jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
- (m) what project planning and design time did the proponent nominate;
- (n) if applicable, what construction start date was nominated by the proponent;
- (o) what project commissioning and/or commencement date was nominated by the proponent;
- (p) what date did the proponent nominate for the project to become fully operational;
- (q) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
- (r) what long-term benefits to the Wide Bay Burnett region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;
- (s) what flow-on benefits to other businesses, organisations or individuals in the region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;
- (t) was the proposal local, national or export focused;
- (u) did a business plan accompany the application form;
- (v) what evidence did the proponent provide to support the proposal's feasibility and did this evidence include a feasibility study; if so, who undertook the feasibility study;
- (w) did the proponent provide details of projected cash flow, revenue and expenses for at least the first 5 years; if so, did the proponent include investment analysis details such as rates of return, liquidity and debt analysis;
- (x) were copies of the proponent's business plan and financial statements provided;
- (y) did the proponent provide details of similar projects successfully realised; if so, what projects;
- (z) did the proponent provide a statement indicating the extent to which Commonwealth funding was needed to realise the project;
- (aa) (i) what evidence did the proponent provide indicating community support for the application, and (ii) which organisations or individuals provided letters of support;
- (ab) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, did the proponent identify would be provided or had been sought for the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;

- (ac) was a statement provided attesting that the proponent's financial contribution to the project would be a new investment;
 - (ad) did the proponent provide evidence that appropriate planning and environmental approvals had been gained or sought;
 - (ae) did the proponent provide a statement describing the likely impact of the project on other businesses in the region; if so, how did the proponent describe the likely impact; and
 - (af) did the proponent provide details of a likely net increase in employment, including, if applicable, employment growth resulting from relocation.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the proponent enter into a grant agreement with the department;
 - (b) with reference to employment outcomes:
 - (i) how many full-time and part time jobs have been generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs have been generated by the project,
 - (iii) how many construction jobs were generated by the project,
 - (iv) over what time period have these jobs been created, and have employment growth and employment numbers been sustained, and
 - (v) what types of jobs have been generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
 - (c) what project planning and design time was required;
 - (d) if applicable, what was the construction start date;
 - (e) when did project operations commence;
 - (f) when did the project become fully operational;
 - (g) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so: (i) has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (h) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted, and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (i) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (j) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, when;
 - (k) what long-term benefits for the Wide Bay Burnett region have been generated by the project;
 - (l) what flow-on benefits to other businesses, organisations or individuals in the region have been generated by the project;
 - (m) has the project been local, national or export focused;
 - (n) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, have supported the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;
 - (o) what financial contribution has the proponent made to the project;
 - (p) has the proponent complied with appropriate planning and environmental laws; and

- (q) what impact has the project had on other businesses in the region.
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
 - (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project; and
 - (f) has an independent audit been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the audit, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1866 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$135 000 for the Queensland Travel Wholesalers Web Development project under the Structural Adjustment Package for the Wide Bay Burnett Region of Queensland:

- (1) (a) What total Structural Adjustment Package funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the funding application referred to the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee;
 - (c) was the application varied; if so, when, and what was the nature of the variation/s;
 - (d) when did the committee make a recommendation to the Minister;
 - (e) what recommendation did the committee make;
 - (f) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (g) did the funding application comply with the structural adjustment package guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (h) what total funding was sought, including goods and services tax;

- (i) what was the main business of the proponent at the time of application;
- (j) how did the proponent describe the proposed project;
- (k) was the proposed project a new project or an extension of an existing business activity;
- (l) with reference to employment outcomes nominated by the proponent:
 - (i) how many full-time and part time jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (iii) how many construction jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (iv) what employment timing was outlined by the proponent, and
 - (v) what types of jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
- (m) what project planning and design time did the proponent nominate;
- (n) if applicable, what construction start date was nominated by the proponent;
- (o) what project commissioning and/or commencement date was nominated by the proponent;
- (p) what date did the proponent nominate for the project to become fully operational;
- (q) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
- (r) what long-term benefits to the Wide Bay Burnett region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;
- (s) what flow-on benefits to other businesses, organisations or individuals in the region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;
- (t) was the proposal local, national or export focused;
- (u) did a business plan accompany the application form;
- (v) what evidence did the proponent provide to support the proposal's feasibility and did this evidence include a feasibility study; if so, who undertook the feasibility study;
- (w) did the proponent provide details of projected cash flow, revenue and expenses for at least the first 5 years; if so, did the proponent include investment analysis details such as rates of return, liquidity and debt analysis;
- (x) were copies of the proponent's business plan and financial statements provided;
- (y) did the proponent provide details of similar projects successfully realised; if so, what projects;
- (z) did the proponent provide a statement indicating the extent to which Commonwealth funding was needed to realise the project;
- (aa) (i) what evidence did the proponent provide indicating community support for the application, and (ii) which organisations or individuals provided letters of support;

- (ab) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, did the proponent identify would be provided or had been sought for the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;
 - (ac) was a statement provided attesting that the proponent's financial contribution to the project would be a new investment;
 - (ad) did the proponent provide evidence that appropriate planning and environmental approvals had been gained or sought;
 - (ae) did the proponent provide a statement describing the likely impact of the project on other businesses in the region; if so, how did the proponent describe the likely impact; and
 - (af) did the proponent provide details of a likely net increase in employment, including, if applicable, employment growth resulting from relocation.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the proponent enter into a grant agreement with the department;
 - (b) with reference to employment outcomes:
 - (i) how many full-time and part time jobs have been generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs have been generated by the project,
 - (iii) how many construction jobs were generated by the project,
 - (iv) over what time period have these jobs been created, and have employment growth and employment numbers been sustained, and
 - (v) what types of jobs have been generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
 - (c) what project planning and design time was required;
 - (d) if applicable, what was the construction start date;
 - (e) when did project operations commence;
 - (f) when did the project become fully operational;
 - (g) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so: (i) has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (h) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted, and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (i) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (j) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, when;
 - (k) what long-term benefits for the Wide Bay Burnett region have been generated by the project;
 - (l) what flow-on benefits to other businesses, organisations or individuals in the region have been generated by the project;
 - (m) has the project been local, national or export focused;

- (n) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, have supported the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;
 - (o) what financial contribution has the proponent made to the project;
 - (p) has the proponent complied with appropriate planning and environmental laws; and
 - (q) what impact has the project had on other businesses in the region.
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project; and
 - (f) has an independent audit been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the audit, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

Senator Brown: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1867-1868)—Are there any instances or circumstances in which the Government has instructed solicitors acting on its behalf in matters relating to military compensation, to claim legal privilege and to withhold any medical reports generated at their request, which substantiate claimants' statements about injury or illness caused whilst in the service of Australia's armed services; if so, what is the Government's rationale for directing solicitors acting on its behalf to withhold information generated at the Government's own request favourable to the claimant serviceman or woman; if not, what action will the Government take to stop this practice which denies justice to Australia's servicemen and women.

1867 Minister representing the Attorney-General

1868 Minister representing the Minister for Veterans' Affairs

1869 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister for Defence—In relation to the proposal by ES Link and Portsea Camp for use of Commonwealth land at Point Nepean:

- (1) (a) What is the status of this proposal; and (b) have discussions taken place between the Commonwealth or its representatives and ES Link and/or Portsea Camp; if so: (i) when, (ii) who participated, and (iii) what was the subject of the discussions.
- (2) Are there any connections between the Commonwealth Government and ES Link, its directors and shareholders or related entities; if so, can details be provided.
- (3) Under this proposal: (a) would all land remain accessible to the public; (b) what if any new development on the land is required; if so, what area will this involve and what is the purpose; and (c) would the public have access to the beach at all times.

1870 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister for Defence—In relation to the proposed disposal of Commonwealth land at Point Nepean:

- (1) (a) What is the current status of the expressions of interest received in the Commonwealth land at Point Nepean; (b) how many have been ruled out and which remain in contention; and (c) for those which remain in

contention, can details be provided of the company or organisation, together with a summary of the proposal.

- (2) What is the timeline and process for deciding the future of the land.
- (3) (a) What organisations or individuals, other than the Victorian Government, have been asked to advise or comment on the expressions of interest or on the future of the land; (b) when were they asked; and (c) what is their role.
- (4) Will the Minister require the organisation that becomes responsible for the land to have expertise in heritage management and environmental management.

1871 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Education, Science and Training—

- (1) How many and which new non-government schools received funding in 2003.
- (2) How many students are there in each of these new schools.
- (3) What will be the Commonwealth SES funding for these new schools in 2003.
- (4) What will be the Commonwealth capital works funding for these new schools in 2003.
- (5) How many and which non-government schools have closed so far in 2003.
- (6) How many students were in each of these schools.

Notice given 6 September 2003

1865 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$275 000 for the Whitesnake Ventilation Improved Underground project under the Structural Adjustment Package for the Wide Bay Burnett Region of Queensland:

- (1) (a) What total Structural Adjustment Package funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or if the funds were paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;

- (b) when was the funding application referred to the Wide Bay Burnett Region Advisory Committee;
- (c) was the application varied; if so, when, and what was the nature of the variation/s;
- (d) when did the committee make a recommendation to the Minister;
- (e) what recommendation did the committee make;
- (f) when was the application approved by the Minister;
- (g) did the funding application comply with the structural adjustment package guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
- (h) what total funding was sought, including goods and services tax;
- (i) what was the main business of the proponent at the time of application;
- (j) how did the proponent describe the proposed project;
- (k) was the proposed project a new project or an extension of an existing business activity;
- (l) with reference to employment outcomes nominated by the proponent:
 - (i) how many full-time and part time jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (iii) how many construction jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project,
 - (iv) what employment timing was outlined by the proponent, and
 - (v) what types of jobs did the proponent claim would be generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
- (m) what project planning and design time did the proponent nominate;
- (n) if applicable, what construction start date was nominated by the proponent;
- (o) what project commissioning and/or commencement date was nominated by the proponent;
- (p) what date did the proponent nominate for the project to become fully operational;
- (q) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
- (r) what long-term benefits to the Wide Bay Burnett region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;
- (s) what flow-on benefits to other businesses, organisations or individuals in the region did the proponent say would be generated by the project;
- (t) was the proposal local, national or export focused;
- (u) did a business plan accompany the application form;
- (v) what evidence did the proponent provide to support the proposal's feasibility and did this evidence include a feasibility study; if so, who undertook the feasibility study;
- (w) did the proponent provide details of projected cash flow, revenue and expenses for at least the first 5 years; if so, did the proponent

- include investment analysis details such as rates of return, liquidity and debt analysis;
- (x) were copies of the proponent's business plan and financial statements provided;
 - (y) did the proponent provide details of similar projects successfully realised; if so, what projects;
 - (z) did the proponent provide a statement indicating the extent to which Commonwealth funding was needed to realise the project;
 - (aa) (i) what evidence did the proponent provide indicating community support for the application, and (ii) which organisations or individuals provided letters of support;
 - (ab) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, did the proponent identify would be provided or had been sought for the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;
 - (ac) was a statement provided attesting that the proponent's financial contribution to the project would be a new investment;
 - (ad) did the proponent provide evidence that appropriate planning and environmental approvals had been gained or sought;
 - (ae) did the proponent provide a statement describing the likely impact of the project on other businesses in the region; if so, how did the proponent describe the likely impact; and
 - (af) did the proponent provide details of a likely net increase in employment, including, if applicable, employment growth resulting from relocation.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the proponent enter into a grant agreement with the department;
 - (b) with reference to employment outcomes:
 - (i) how many full-time and part time jobs have been generated by the project,
 - (ii) how many direct and indirect jobs have been generated by the project,
 - (iii) how many construction jobs were generated by the project,
 - (iv) over what time period have these jobs been created, and have employment growth and employment numbers been sustained, and
 - (v) what types of jobs have been generated by the project i.e. skilled or unskilled and training opportunities;
 - (c) what project planning and design time was required;
 - (d) if applicable, what was the construction start date;
 - (e) when did project operations commence;
 - (f) when did the project become fully operational;
 - (g) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so: (i) has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (h) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted, and (iii) was a steering committee established;

- (i) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (j) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, when;
 - (k) what long-term benefits for the Wide Bay Burnett region have been generated by the project;
 - (l) what flow-on benefits to other businesses, organisations or individuals in the region have been generated by the project;
 - (m) has the project been local, national or export focused;
 - (n) what sources of funding, other than structural adjustment package funds, have supported the project, including Commonwealth and/or state and/or local government funding;
 - (o) what financial contribution has the proponent made to the project;
 - (p) has the proponent complied with appropriate planning and environmental laws; and
 - (q) what impact has the project had on other businesses in the region.
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project; and
 - (f) has an independent audit been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the audit, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

Notice given 8 September 2003

1888 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$45 000 for the Capricorn Crayfish Value Adding and Marketing project in round one of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 1999-2000 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Central Queensland Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.

- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
- (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;

- (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the Committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;

- (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
- (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1889 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$45 000 for the SILO Information and Reception Centre project in round one of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 1999-2000 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Central Queensland Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;

- (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the Committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;

- (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
 - (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1890 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$25 000 for the Dawson Valley Hardwood Plantation project in round one of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 1999-2000 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Central Queensland Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.

- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
- (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;

- (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the Committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and

- (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1891 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$45 000 for the Trial Herb Processing Plant project in round three of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 1999-2000 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Central Queensland Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;

- (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the Committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;

- (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
 - (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1892 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$49 500 for the Biloela Economic Development Strategy project in round one of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 2001-2002 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Central Queensland Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.

- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
- (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;

- (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the Committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and

- (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1893 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$43 460 for the Cooloola Region Tourism Co-ordination project in round one of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 1999-2000 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Fairfax (Mr Somlyay) or the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee and the Member for Wide Bay and/or Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;

- (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;

- (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
 - (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1894 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$30 193 for the Maryborough CBD Revitalisation project in round one of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 1999-2000 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.

- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
- (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;

- (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;

- (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
- (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1895 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$25 000 for the Cooloola Region Hardwood Value Adding Strategy project in round one of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 1999-2000 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) and/or the Member for Fairfax (Mr Somlyay) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay and/or the Member for Fairfax about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;

- (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;

- (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
 - (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1896 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$23 080 for the South Burnett Wine Industry Development project in round one of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 1999-2000 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.

- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;

- (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;

- (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
- (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1897 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$350 000 for the Promoting International and National Visitation to the Bundaberg Region project in round two of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 1999-2000 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) and/or the Member for Hinkler (Mr Neville) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay and/or the Member for Hinkler about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;

- (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;

- (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
 - (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1898 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$25 000 for the Mary Valley Heritage Railway Development Strategy project in round two of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 1999-2000 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) and/or the Member for Fairfax (Mr Somlyay) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Area Consultative Committee.

- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;

- (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;

- (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
- (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
- (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1899 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$30 000 for the Australian Fishing Museum project in round two of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 1999-2000 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;

- (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;

- (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
 - (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1900 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$25 000 for the Bundeberg CBD revitalisation project in round two of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 1999-2000 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) and/or the Member for Hinkler (Mr Neville) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Area Consultative Committee.

- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;

- (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;

- (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
- (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
- (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1901 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$20 000 for the Eidsvold—Our Future project in round two of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 1999-2000 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;

- (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;

- (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
 - (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1902 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$63 250 for the Marketing Wide Bay Arts and Crafts project in round three of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 1999-2000 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.

- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;

- (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;

- (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
- (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1903 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$22 000 for the Murgon/Wondai/Kilkivan Economic Development project in round four of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 1999-2000 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;

- (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;

- (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
 - (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1904 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$74 250 for the Whistle Stop General Manager project in round four of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 1999-2000 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.

- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
- (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;

- (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and

- (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1905 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$8 800 for the Childers Passport project in round one of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 1999-2000 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) and/or the Member for Hinkler (Mr Neville) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;

- (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;

- (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
 - (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1906 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$199 700 for the Capricorn Crayfish Value Adding and Marketing project in round one of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 2000-2001 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.

- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
- (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;

- (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and

- (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1907 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$38 500 for the Tarong and Beyond E-commerce project in round one of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 1999-2000 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) and/or the Member for Blair (Mr Thompson) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay and/or the Member for Blair about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;

- (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;

- (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
 - (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1908 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$33 000 for the Industry Cluster Tourism project in round two of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 2000-2001 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.

- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
- (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;

- (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and

- (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1909 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$44 000 for the Taming the Wild Scotchman project in round two of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 2000-2001 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;

- (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;

- (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
 - (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1910 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$33 000 for the Hardwood Sawdust Pilot Plant project in round three of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 2000-2001 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.

- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
- (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;

- (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and

- (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1911 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$55 000 for the Gympie Animal Shelter project in round one of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 2001-2002 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Fairfax (Mr Somlyay) or the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) a on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Fairfax and/or the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;

- (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;

- (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
 - (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1912 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$40 700 for the Addressing the Opportunities of Cooloola's Ageing Population project in round three of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 2001-2002 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Fairfax (Mr Somlyay) or the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Fairfax and/or Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.

- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
- (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;

- (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;

- (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
- (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1913 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$44 000 for the Harvey Bay Industry Cluster project in round three of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 2001-2002 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;

- (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;

- (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
 - (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1914 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$110 000 for the Maryborough Urban Renewal project in round three of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 2001-2002 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.

- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
- (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;

- (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and

- (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1915 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$138 104 for the Mary Valley Heritage Railway Corridor Maintenance Business Enhancement project in round three of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 2001-2002 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) and/or the Member for Fairfax (Mr Somlyay) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay and/or Member for Fairfax about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;

- (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;

- (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
 - (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1916 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$13 282 for the Nanango Lee Park Assessment and Management Plan project in round three of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 2001-2002 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) and/or the Member for Blair (Mr Thompson) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay and/or Member for Blair about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.

- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
- (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;

- (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;

- (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
- (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1917 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$17 246 for the Gympie Landcare Revegetation Nursery Development project in round four of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 2001-2002 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Fairfax (Mr Somlyay) or the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Fairfax and/or Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;

- (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;

- (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
 - (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1918 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$32 613 for the Country Music Industry Development project in round one of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 2002-2003 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.

- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;

- (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;

- (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
- (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1919 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$275 000 for the Lake Monduran Development of Recreational Facilities project in round four of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 2001-2002 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.
- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
 - (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;

- (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;
 - (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;

- (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and
 - (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1920 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$65 714 for the Implementation of the South Burnett Regional Tourism Development Strategy project in round one of the Regional Assistance Programme in the 2002-2003 financial year:

- (1) (a) What total programme funds have been paid to the proponent; and (b) if the funds were paid in one sum, on what date was the payment made; or, if paid in instalments, what were the instalment dates and amounts paid on each date.
- (2) (a) What is the name of the proponent; and (b) if the proponent is an organisation or company, does it operate on a commercial or not-for-profit basis.
- (3) What is the proponent's business address.
- (4) Can a description of the project be provided.
- (5) Did the department or the Minister receive representations from the Member for Wide Bay (Mr Truss) on behalf of the proponent and/or the Wide Bay Burnett Area Consultative Committee.
- (6) When did the department or the Minister inform the proponent, the committee and the Member for Wide Bay about the funding approval.
- (7) When did the department or the Minister publicly announce the grant.
- (8) What was the quantum of the grant announced by the department or the Minister.

- (9) In relation to the application for funding:
- (a) when was the funding application lodged with the department;
 - (b) when was the application approved by the Minister;
 - (c) did the funding application comply with the programme guidelines; if not, can details of the non-compliance be provided;
 - (d) what total funding was sought, including, if applicable, the goods and services tax (GST) free amount, the GST-inclusive amount and the specific GST amount;
 - (e) what preferred project start date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (f) what preferred project completion date was nominated by the proponent;
 - (g) what was the project rationale, including identification of need for the project and demonstrated connection to the committee's strategic regional plan;
 - (h) what community consultation did the proponent undertake prior to submitting the application;
 - (i) what previous studies or projects did the proponent nominate as relevant to the project;
 - (j) what project objectives and outcomes did the proponent nominate including employment outcomes and ongoing regional benefit;
 - (k) with reference to employment outcomes, how many direct and indirect full time equivalent positions did the proponent claim would be generated;
 - (l) what additional sources of funding did the proponent nominate would be required to sustain the project at the end of the funding period;
 - (m) did a project plan accompany the application form nominating project milestones; if so, what major milestones were nominated by the proponent;
 - (n) (i) what project linkages were nominated by the proponent, including federal agencies, state agencies, local government, community organisations and the private sector, and (ii) what was the nature of the links;
 - (o) (i) what project management structure was proposed by the proponent, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was proposed, and (iii) if applicable, what was the proposed membership, role and terms of reference for the steering committee;
 - (p) what progress report timing and format did the proponent propose;
 - (q) what monitoring and evaluation process did the proponent propose;
 - (r) what assistance did the proponent advise would be received from other sources (identified by source and type of assistance);
 - (s) did the proponent disclose receipt of other government funding in the 3 years before the application was lodged; if so, what funding had the proponent received;
 - (t) did the proponent propose the purchase of assets with the programme funds;
 - (u) did the proponent hold workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance when the application was lodged;

- (v) was the proponent a Job Network member or involved with a New Apprenticeship Centre or Work for the Dole at the time the application was lodged;
 - (w) was the project endorsed for funding by the committee;
 - (x) was the proponent and/or the committee asked to provide advice on the primary and secondary electorates in which the project activity would be based; if so, why was this question asked and what answer was provided; and
 - (y) did evidence of community support accompany the application or was evidence otherwise provided to the department; if so, what evidence was provided.
- (10) In relation to the progress of the project:
- (a) when did the project start;
 - (b) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (c) what economic or regional benefit has the project provided;
 - (d) (i) were progress payments negotiated on the basis of project activity; if so, has the proponent failed to meet any agreed project milestones, and (ii) have any progress payments been delayed or withheld due to the failure to meet agreed project milestones;
 - (e) were all nominated project linkages, i.e. with government agencies and the private sector, realised; if not, which linkages were not realised;
 - (f) (i) what project management structure was established, (ii) what selection process for the project manager was adopted; and (iii) was a steering committee established;
 - (g) (i) what progress report timing and format was adopted, and (ii) have reporting requirements been met;
 - (h) (i) what monitoring and evaluation process was adopted, and (ii) has the department undertaken monitoring visits; if so, on what dates.
 - (i) has the project received assistance from other sources during the programme funding period; if so, can this assistance be identified by source and type;
 - (j) has the proponent purchased assets with the programme funds; if so, did the proponent receive written permission prior to the purchase;
 - (k) has the proponent maintained workers compensation, public liability, professional indemnity and voluntary worker accident insurance during the funding period;
- (11) In relation to completion of the project funding period (if applicable):
- (a) when did the project and/or funding period conclude;
 - (b) if the project is ongoing, what is its source of funding i.e. self-funding or other sources;
 - (c) has the proponent lodged a final report; if so, on what date;
 - (d) if applicable, has the final payment to the proponent been made;
 - (e) how many direct and indirect full-time equivalent positions have been generated by the project;
 - (f) have any assets purchased with programme funds remained the property of the Commonwealth; and

- (g) has an independent evaluation been undertaken; if so: (i) who undertook the evaluation, (ii) when was it completed, and (iii) what findings did it make.

1921 **Senator Murray:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Education, Science and Training—With reference to the Government's policy in relation to the Mugabe Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front (ZANU-PF) Government, can the Minister advise if there are any students attending Australian universities who are related to current ZANU-PF members of the Government or parliamentarians in Zimbabwe.

1922 **Senator Murray:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

- (1) Does the department know how Australia's national air carriers' seating comfort, i.e. width of seat and legroom, compares with airlines elsewhere in the world for similar types of aircraft.
- (2) Does the Minister recognise that Qantas, seating comfort in economy is extremely poor, and possibly unhealthy, particularly on long flights.
- (3) Does the Minister intend to regulate to require much better economy class seating comfort; if not, why not.

1923 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Regional Services, Territories and Local Government—With reference to the Rural Transaction Centre program:

- (1) When was the independent Rural Transaction Centre Advisory Committee (RTAC) established.
- (2) Who was appointed to the RTAC.
- (3) (a) How were RTAC members selected; and (b) who made the final decision as to their appointment.
- (4) (a) Who is the chair of the RTAC; (b) how was the chair selected; and (c) who made the final decision as to the chair's appointment.
- (5) At the time of the announcement of the original RTAC: (a) what were the terms and conditions under which RTAC members were engaged; (b) for each member, what payments were made including base salary or retainer fees, sitting fees, travel costs, accommodation and other payments; and (c) for each member: (i) what was the tenure of their contracts, and (ii) who determined these contract terms and conditions.
- (6) In relation to the period of service of each member: (a) how many meetings have been held; and (b) how many and which meetings has each member attended.
- (7) Are RTAC members required to disclose to the Minister any financial interests they or their immediate families may hold.
- (8) Can the Minister confirm that no members of the RTAC have, at any time, held a financial interest in GRM International Pty Ltd or its associated companies.
- (9) Since its establishment, have there been changes in the make-up of the RTAC; if so: (a) who has left the RTAC; (b) for what reason or reasons did they leave; (c) when did they leave; (d) who replaced them; (e) when were they replaced; (f) how was their replacement selected; and (g) who made the final decision regarding the replacement's appointment.
- (10) How often and where has the RTAC met since its establishment.

- (11) What records exist of these meetings.
- (12) Who provides secretarial support to the RTAC.
- (13) What has been the cost of the RTAC, by year, since the announcement of the program, including the costs of secretariat support and all other administrative costs.

1924 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Regional Services, Territories and Local Government—With reference to the Rural Transaction Centre program:

- (1) (a) How are applications for preparation of business plans to enable identification of services required by the applicant communities evaluated; and (b) who makes the final decision.
- (2) (a) How are applications for the establishment and operation of Rural Transaction Centres evaluated; and (b) who makes the final decision.
- (3) Have these processes altered since the program was first announced; if so, how.
- (4) (a) What benchmarks are used, and methods of ongoing evaluation employed, in monitoring and reporting on the performance of established Rural Transaction Centres; and (b) are these reports made available to the Minister; if so, how often.
- (5) Can a copy of the funding guidelines used by the Rural Transaction Centre Advisory Committee to assess applications be provided; if not, why not.

1925 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Regional Services, Territories and Local Government—With reference to Media Release M250/2000 of 18 December 2000:

- (1) (a) What process was used to select and appoint GRM International Pty Limited (GRM International); and (b) who made the final decision.
- (2) Which other organisations expressed an interest in undertaking this work.
- (3) What was the original tenure of the contract with GRM International.
- (4) What was the total forecast expenditure by year under the contract.
- (5) How many full-time equivalent officers was GRM International to supply.
- (6) Did the contract specify where these officers were to be located.
- (7) (a) What, if any, changes have been made to the original terms of the contract; (b) why have these changes been made; and (c) who approved these changes.
- (8) What has been the actual expenditure, by year, in relation to the contract.
- (9) How many full-time equivalent officers has GRM International supplied for each year since the contract was awarded.
- (10) (a) Where is each officer supplied by GRM International located; and (b) in which federal electorates are they located.

1926 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the Rural Transaction Centre program:

- (1) When was the independent Rural Transaction Centre Advisory Committee (RTAC) established.
- (2) Who was appointed to the RTAC.
- (3) (a) How were RTAC members selected; and (b) who made the final decision as to their appointment.

- (4) (a) Who is the chair of the RTAC; (b) how was the chair selected; and (c) who made the final decision as to the chair's appointment.
- (5) At the time of the announcement of the original RTAC: (a) what were the terms and conditions under which RTAC members were engaged; (b) for each member, what payments were made including base salary or retainer fees, sitting fees, travel costs, accommodation and other payments; and (c) for each member: (i) what was the tenure of their contracts, and (ii) who determined these contract terms and conditions.
- (6) In relation to the period of service of each member: (a) how many meetings have been held; and (b) how many and which meetings has each member attended.
- (7) Are RTAC members required to disclose to the Minister any financial interests they or their immediate families may hold.
- (8) Can the Minister confirm that no members of the RTAC have, at any time, held a financial interest in GRM International Pty Ltd or its associated companies.
- (9) Since its establishment, have there been changes in the make-up of the RTAC; if so: (a) who has left the RTAC; (b) for what reason or reasons did they leave; (c) when did they leave; (d) who replaced them; (e) when were they replaced; (f) how was their replacement selected; and (g) who made the final decision regarding the replacement's appointment.
- (10) How often and where has the RTAC met since its establishment.
- (11) What records exist of these meetings.
- (12) Who provides secretarial support to the RTAC.
- (13) What has been the cost of the RTAC, by year, since the announcement of the program, including the costs of secretariat support and all other administrative costs.

1927 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the Rural Transaction Centre program:

- (1) (a) How are applications for preparation of business plans to enable identification of services required by the applicant communities evaluated; and (b) who makes the final decision.
- (2) (a) How are applications for the establishment and operation of Rural Transaction Centres evaluated; and (b) who makes the final decision.
- (3) Have these processes altered since the program was first announced; if so, how.
- (4) (a) What benchmarks are used, and methods of ongoing evaluation employed, in monitoring and reporting on the performance of established Rural Transaction Centres; and (b) are these reports made available to the Minister; if so, how often.
- (5) Can a copy of the funding guidelines used by the Rural Transaction Centre Advisory Committee to assess applications be provided; if not, why not.

1928 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to Media Release M250/2000 of 18 December 2000, can the Minister advise:

- (1) (a) What process was used to select and appoint GRM International Pty Limited (GRM International); and (b) who made the final decision.
- (2) Which other organisations expressed an interest in undertaking this work.

- (3) What was the original tenure of the contract with GRM International.
- (4) What was the forecast expenditure, by year, under the contract with GRM International.
- (5) How many full-time equivalent officers was GRM International to supply under the contract.
- (6) Did the contract specify where these officers were to be located.
- (7) (a) What, if any, changes have been made to the original terms of the contract with GRM International; (b) why have these changes been made ; and (c) who approved these changes.
- (8) What has been the expenditure, by year, under the contract with GRM International.
- (9) How many full-time equivalent officers has GRM International supplied for each year since the contract was awarded.
- (10) (a) Where is each officer supplied by GRM International based; and (b) in which federal electorates are they located.

1929 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

- (1) When was the Rural Transaction Centre program announced.
- (2) What was the intended outcome of the program at the time of the original announcement.
- (3) (a) What was the program's forecast duration; and (b) has the forecast been altered; if so, in what way and why.
- (4) What was the initial funding allocation to the program for each year of the program's original intended duration.
- (5) Of the original funding allocation, what quantum was allocated for: (a) the preparation of business plans to enable identification of services required by the applicant communities; and (b) the establishment and operation of Rural Transaction Centres.
- (6) What has been the actual quantum of funding expended for each year of the program for: (a) the preparation of business plans to enable identification of services required by the applicant communities; and (b) the establishment and operation of Rural Transaction Centres.
- (7) At the time the program was announced, what was the forecast number of applications expected, by year, for: (a) the preparation of business plans to enable identification of services required by the applicant communities; and (b) the establishment and operation of Rural Transaction Centres.
- (8) How many applications have been received, by year, for: (a) the preparation of business plans to enable identification of services required by the applicant communities; and (b) the establishment and operation of Rural Transaction Centres.
- (9) How many Rural Transaction Centres have been established for each year since the program's inception.
- (10) What is the location of each established Rural Transaction Centre, and in which federal electorate are they located.
- (11) (a) How many applications, for the preparation of business plans to enable identification of services required by the applicant communities, are pending; and (b) from which town or community groups have these applications been received and in which federal electorates are they located.

- (12) How many applications for the establishment and operation of Rural Transaction Centres are pending and, if successful, in which towns and federal electorates will they be located.

1930 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Regional Services, Territories and Local Government—

- (1) When was the Rural Transaction Centre program announced.
- (2) What was the intended outcome of the program at the time of the original announcement.
- (3) (a) What was the program's forecast duration; and (b) has the forecast been altered; if so, in what way and why.
- (4) What was the initial funding allocation to the program for each year of the program's original intended duration.
- (5) Of the original funding allocation, what quantum was allocated for: (a) the preparation of business plans to enable identification of services required by the applicant communities; and (b) the establishment and operation of Rural Transaction Centres.
- (6) What has been the actual quantum of funding expended for each year of the program for: (a) the preparation of business plans to enable identification of services required by the applicant communities; and (b) the establishment and operation of Rural Transaction Centres.
- (7) At the time the program was announced, what was the forecast number of applications expected, by year, for: (a) the preparation of business plans to enable identification of services required by the applicant communities; and (b) the establishment and operation of Rural Transaction Centres.
- (8) How many applications have been received, by year, for: (a) the preparation of business plans to enable identification of services required by the applicant communities; and (b) the establishment and operation of Rural Transaction Centres.
- (9) How many Rural Transaction Centres have been established for each year since the program's inception.
- (10) What is the location of each established Rural Transaction Centre, and in which federal electorate are they located.
- (11) (a) How many applications, for the preparation of business plans to enable identification of services required by the applicant communities, are pending; and (b) from which town or community groups have these applications been received and in which federal electorates are they located.
- (12) How many applications for the establishment and operation of Rural Transaction Centres are pending and, if successful, in which towns and federal electorates will they be located.

1931 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations—

- (1) For the calendar year 2003 to date: (a) how many staff have been made redundant at the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO); and (b) for each staff member made redundant: (i) what Division did they work for, (ii) what was their position within the organisation, (iii) was the nature of their redundancy voluntary or involuntary, (iv) what was the duration of their employment with CSIRO, and (v) what was the last project they worked on.

- (2) For the remainder of 2003: (a) how many staff will be made redundant at the CSIRO; and (b) for each staff member: (i) what Division do they work for, (ii) what is their position within the organisation, (iii) was the nature of their redundancy voluntary or involuntary, (iv) what is the duration of their employment with CSIRO, and (v) what will be their last project.
- (3) For the calendar year 2002: (a) how many staff were made redundant at the CSIRO; and (b) for each staff member: (i) what Division did they work for, (ii) what was their position within the organisation, (iii) was the nature of their redundancy voluntary or involuntary, (iv) what was the duration of their employment with CSIRO, and (v) what was the last project they worked on.
- (4) What consultation on the matter of redundancies has been undertaken with affected staff, relevant unions and the CSIRO Staff Association during 2003.
- (5) (a) At what level were these staffing cut decisions made; and (b) was the Minister involved.
- (6) What are the costs of redundancy packages for 2003, actual and planned.
- (7) What is the rationale for these redundancies.

1932 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—Does the Government acknowledge that: (a) in 2001 the Australian Bureau of Statistics split the Lismore Statistical Local Area into two statistical local areas known as Part A and Part B; and (b) that the urban centre of Lismore was included in Part A and that the populations of Nimbin, Modanville, Dunoon and Clunes townships were then included in Part B which, by definition, no longer has an urban population centre of more than 10 000; if so, why is it that the Lismore Statistical Local Area Part B has not been given Rural Remote and Metropolitan Area Classification 5 status.

1933 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—

- (1) What representation, if any, has the Government made to the proponents of Basslink and to the Victorian and Tasmanian State Governments on the recommendation of the Joint Advisory Committee (JAC) that an environment review committee be established to monitor developments.
- (2) Why did the Government not make the establishment of such a committee a requirement of its approval of the project.
- (3) Has the Government been advised by proponents of Basslink that a metallic return cable is now to be used in order to reduce the magnetic field; if so, has the Government called for the Integrated Impact Assessment Statement to be amended and resubmitted; (a) if not, why not; and (b) has the Government called for a report on the detail of this new technology.
- (4) What effects will the new technology have on marine organisms including breeding, migration and feeding habits.
- (5) What does the Government understand to be the impact of this technology on shark behaviour in the area.
- (6) Have the proponents of Basslink provided details as to how the cables are to be kept in close proximity in order to reduce the magnetic field; if so, can these details be provided.

- (7) Is it the case that cables will now be installed in separate ducts or trenched through the dune system; if so, what assessment has been made of the impact on dunes.
- (8) What assessment has been made of the means by which cables will be protected and kept together over the very dynamic marine environment, where sand shifts of 4 metres in depth can occur overnight and large rocks are moved about on the sea bed over a distance of up to 5 kilometres.
- (9) Given that, according to Basslink, polypropylene rope proposed to be used to bundle cables during the laying operation will not last the life of the project, what assessment has been made of the life of this rope.
- (10) (a) How many kilometres of the rope will be used; and (b) what effect will it have on fauna, boat propellers and marine life when the rope unravels and drifts away.
- (11) When the rope unravels, how will the cables be kept together.
- (12) What are the effects on Ramsar sites of changes to the coastal processes caused by the proposed rock berm designed to protect cables underwater.
- (13) Is it the case that the Tasmanian Government has applied for a fishing exclusion zone around Basslink; if so, what is the impact of such a zone on the fishing industry.
- (14) Given the advice from Basslink that coaxial cables and underground cables rather than pylon transmission would increase the cost beyond \$500 million and make the project unviable, what does the Government understand to be the viability of the project now that it is estimated to cost \$780 million.
- (15) What information does the Government have about how this additional cost will be funded.
- (16) Is it the case that the Tasmanian Government is underwriting the profits of National Grid International's subsidiary, Basslink Pty Ltd.
- (17) Will the proponents of Basslink be required to establish a bond or financial guarantee that would fund the removal of infrastructure and rehabilitation, where necessary, in the event that the project proves to be unviable or the proponent becomes insolvent.
- (18) What does the Government now understand to be the greenhouse implications of the project, including transmission losses but excluding the proposed but, according to the draft JAC report, unviable Tasmanian windfarms.

1934 **Senator Carr:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Education, Science and Training—

- (1) Can a list be provided of all projects commissioned under the department's Evaluation and Investigation Program (EIP) since 1 July 2000.
- (2) In relation to each project mentioned in paragraph (1), can the following information be provided in tabular form: (a) the title of the project; (b) who commissioned the project; (c) who undertook the study and research for the project; (d) the stated purpose of the project; (e) the value of the project; (f) the date of acquittal of payment for each project; (g) the date the report for the project was provided to the department; (h) the date the report was published; (i) details of whether the report was published electronically or in hard copy; (j) confirmation that all such reports have been provided to the Employment, Workplace Relations and Education Legislation Committee, together with the date of provision; (k) if reports were not

published, why; and (1) if reports were not provided to the Committee, why not.

1935 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Minister for Defence—

- (1) How many instances were there in each of the past 3 years of explosives being stolen from Defence establishments.
- (2) In how many instances in the same years were there incomplete reconciliations of stock holdings.
- (3) In each case, what was stolen and in what quantity.
- (4) (a) What regular process exists for the routine reconciliation of explosive supplies; and (b) what is the reporting and coordination process.
- (5) What quantities of explosives, by type, were purchased in each of the past 2 financial years.
- (6) In how many locations around Australia are explosives stored.
- (7) What accountability for stocks of explosives exists to security agencies at both federal and state levels.

1936 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Minister representing the Prime Minister—

- (1) How many cases of stolen explosives were reported to the Australian Federal Police and state police forces in each of the past 3 years.
- (2) What coordination mechanism exists at the federal level for the exchange of information on explosive imports, local manufacture, sale and distribution of all explosive material.
- (3) What investigations are conducted into reports of missing or stolen explosives in Australia.
- (4) What quantity of explosive material was manufactured within Australia in each of the past 3 years.
- (5) How much explosive material, by type, was imported.
- (6) How much explosive material, by type: (a) was exported; and (b) to which destination, by quantity.

Notice given 9 September 2003

*1937 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—For each of the past 10 years: (a) how much federal funding has been allocated to environment groups in Australia; and (b) how much went to each environment group which was funded, directly or indirectly.

*1939 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

- (1) Why does the Civil Aviation Safety Regulation CASR 91.355, which prohibits self-service of alcoholic beverages on board commercial aircraft, not come into effect earlier than 2005.
- (2) (a) What consultation did the Government conduct with regard to the timing of the introduction of this regulation; and (b) can a copy of the advice given by stakeholders to the Government on the timing be provided.

*1940 **Senator Hutchins:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—

- (1) Can information be provided relating to the average time that it takes for successful onshore parent visa applicants to receive a queue date, from the time they first lodge their applications with the department.
- (2) Can information be provided relating to the average time required for onshore parent visa applicants to be given a health check, from the time they first lodge their applications with the department.

*1941 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—

- (1) How has the Government responded to Alzheimers Australia's call for dementia to be made a national health priority.
- (2) What are the age and demographic trends for dementia in Australia.
- (3) What financial, respite or other government assistance is available to people caring for dementia sufferers at home.

*1942 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to logging in Papua New Guinea:

- (1) For each of the past 5 years, how much Australian aid, direct or indirect, has been made available.
- (2) What was the nature of this aid.
- (3) What demonstrable benefit has come from the aid.
- (4) Is the industry more accountable, socially advantageous or ecologically-sustainable than 5 years ago; if so, how.

*1943 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Small Business and Tourism—

- (1) Given that, according to the Complementary Healthcare Council, sales of complementary medicines are down 20 to 40 per cent and export sales are down by \$200 million, does the Government intend to compensate small retail businesses for this economic loss and the general decline in consumer confidence.
- (2) What response has the Government made to the request from the council for funds to invest in marketing for the industry and positive statements from the Government about complementary medicines.
- (3) What is the progress on the Government's request to major distributors that claims by small business for refunds to consumers on recalled products should be expedited.
- (4) Is the Government monitoring the financial impact of this recall on small business; if so, what is the impact; if not, why not.

Senator Brown: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos *1944-*1945)—With reference to wheat streak mosaic virus:

- (1) Has the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation or any other Australian research organisation, ever imported the virus for research or any other purpose: if so; (a) who licenced and monitored importation of the virus; (b) when was the virus imported; (c) by what means was the virus imported; (d) by what route was the virus imported and transported; (e) in which facilities is, or in which facilities was, the virus stored and used; (f) has the virus been transported to other facilities; (g) has the virus imported under OGTR/GMAC1507 been destroyed; (h) who is or was responsible for containing and managing the virus; (i) has the Office of the Gene Technology Regulation (OGTR) ever inspected, assessed or approved any facilities in which the organisms licenced under GMAC1507

are stored or used; if so, what were the results of those inspections; (j) is there any evidence that the virus may have escaped from storage or research facilities into any other environments; (k) is there any evidence that the virus, licenced by OGTR/GMAC1507 or any other research project using the virus, may be the source of infections recently identified in wheat plants in various research facilities around Australia.

- (2) If the virus was used for research or other purposes in Australia, what evidence shows that this was not the source of the current infection in wheat at various locations, which threatens the Australian wheat industry.

*1944 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

*1945 Minister representing the Minister for Science

Senator Brown: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos *1946-*1947)— With reference to wheat streak mosaic virus was the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, or any other Australian research organisation, aware of the presence of the virus in Australia prior to the 2003 outbreak at research institutions; if so: (a) which research organisations were involved; (b) when was the virus detected; (c) has the virus been researched; if so, is this the reason for the Genetic Manipulation Advisory Committee (GMAC) and Office of the Gene Technology Regulation (OGTR) licenses; (d) was the virus transported; if so, (i) how, (ii) where to, and (iii) when was the virus transported; (e) in which facilities is, or in which facilities was, the virus stored and used; (f) has the WSMV virus been transported to other facilities; (g) has the virus been destroyed; (h) who is or was responsible for containing and managing the virus; (i) has the OGTR ever inspected, assessed or approved any facilities in which the organisms licenced under GMAC1507 (OGTR 5607) are stored or used; if so, what were the results of those inspections; (j) is there any evidence that the virus may have escaped from storage or research facilities into any other environments; and (k) is there any evidence that the virus licenced by OGTR 5607/GMAC1507 or any other research project using the virus may be the source of plant infections recently identified in wheat plants in various research facilities around Australia.

*1946 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

*1947 Minister representing the Minister for Science

Senator Brown: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos *1948-*1949)—In relation to wheat streak mosaic virus:

- (1) Has the Commonwealth Scientific Industrial Research Office (CSIRO) or any other Australian research organisation ever obtained: (a) the agreement of the Genetic Manipulation Advisory Committee (GMAC); and/or (b) a licence from the Office of Gene Technology Regulation (OGTR), for the use of genetically modified viruses and/or plants in a genetic engineering research project entitled 'the use of virus vectors for gene silencing in plants (virus induced gene silencing)'.
- (2) Does the deemed licence issued by the OGTR, identified by the GMAC number 1507 and appearing on the OGTR's public register as GMO Dealing Not Involving Release (DNIR) OGTR 5607, licence the use of various genetically-engineered viruses.
- (3) Does the deemed licence, issued to the CSIRO, include approval for the use of 'GMO5 Wheat Streak Mosaic Virus'.

*1948 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

*1949 Minister representing the Minister for Science

*1950 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—

- (1) Did the Government receive a legal opinion from the Australian Government Solicitor about whether or not it was constitutionally possible for the Commonwealth to deliver a legally binding and enforceable right of veto to the States in relation to the rate of a goods and services tax (GST); if so; can a copy of that opinion be provided.
- (2) Since the passage of the GST legislation, do the state and territory governments have a legally binding and enforceable right of veto over changes to the rate of the GST now and in the future.

*1951 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) Can the Minister confirm that the former Bureau of Resource Sciences engaged in research comparing data on the shark catch and the incidence of seismic testing in south eastern Australian waters, and that this research was due for publication in 2000.
- (2) Why was this research never published.
- (3) When will the study be made available.

*1952 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—

- (1) Have Benaris Energy NV and Woodside Energy Ltd applied to the Commonwealth for permits to undertake seismic testing and survey work in coastal waters around south eastern Australia; if so, where.
- (2) Will the testing include 3D seismic surveys.
- (3) Will the testing include the 12 Apostles Marine National Park.
- (4) What are the impacts of 3D seismic testing on marine animals and are the impacts variable depending on the reproductive cycles of the animals; if so, will the Government prohibit testing during breeding and spawning periods.
- (5) What consultation has the Government conducted with local communities and key stakeholder groups in relation to the proposed Benaris and Woodside seismic surveys; if none, why.
- (6) Does the Government require the application for permits to be publicly advertised; if not, why not.
- (7) Will the Government exercise the precautionary principle in relation to these permit applications.

*1953 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—Is the cost of the advertising campaign in relation to the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme (PBS), targeted to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians, included in the \$27 million program allocated for the PBS advertising campaign targeted to non-Indigenous Australians; if not, what are the additional costs or separate budget allocations for the Indigenous advertising campaign.

*1954 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—

- (1) What is the total cost, including production and placement, of advertising in relation to the Australian Health Care Agreements, placed by the Commonwealth in all newspapers on 21 August 2003.
- (2) What is the total cost, including production and placement, of advertising in relation to the Australian Health Care Agreements, placed by the Commonwealth in all newspapers on 29 August 2003.

*1955 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—

- (1) Why was the decision made to abolish one of the two director positions in the Public Affairs Unit, effective 1 July 2003.
- (2) Who made this decision.
- (3) Was the money used in financial years prior to 2003-04 to fund the second director position reallocated to another position within the Public Affairs Unit; if so, how has this saving been allocated.
- (4) In relation to the additional budgetary allocation, referred to in part (2)(b) of the answer to question on notice no.1601 (Senate *Hansard*, 8 September 2003, p. 14003), why did this amount increase from \$1 251 000 in 2000-01 to \$1 875 000 in 2001-02.

*1956 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—

- (1) In relation to the article in the Melbourne *Herald Sun* of 28 August 2003, can the Minister advise the following: (a) is the treadmill referred to fully owned by the Minister; (b) was the entire purchase price of the treadmill paid by the Minister using her personal income; (c) did the Minister receive any discount on the purchase of the treadmill; if so, on what basis; (d) was there, or is there, any sponsorship arrangement for the full or part costs of the treadmill; (e) was the purchase of the treadmill borne, in full or in part, by a private health insurer.
- (2) In relation to the article in the Melbourne *Herald Sun* of 28 August 2003, can the Minister advise the following: (a) are the weights referred to fully owned by the Minister; (b) was the entire purchase price of the weights paid by the Minister using her personal income; (c) did the Minister receive any discount on the purchase of the weights; if so, on what basis; (d) was there, or is there, any sponsorship arrangement for the full or part costs of the weights; (e) was the purchase of the weights borne, in full or in part, by a private health insurer.

*1957 **Senator Carr:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Education, Science and Training—

- (1) (a) Can a list be provided of new nursing place commencements, by institution, for the out years; and (b) what is the cost of each place.
- (2) (a) Can a list be provided of new medical place commencements, by institution, for the out years; (b) what is the source of the funding; and (c) what is the cost of each place.

*1958 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—

- (1) What is the current status of Defence lands on the Georges River in New South Wales adjoining Holsworthy Army Base, between Alford's Point and Sandy Point.
- (2) Has this land been transferred from the Department of Defence to the Department of Finance and Administration; if so, (a) when and why did this occur; and (b) who authorised the transfer.
- (3) What was the land used for previously.
- (4) What does Defence envisage that the site could be used for in the future.
- (5) What is the size of the site.
- (6) Has the site been valued by either the New South Wales Valuer-General or the Australian Valuation Office; if so, please indicate the dates on which the valuations occurred and the estimated value of the site.

- (7) Is it intended that the site will be sold; if so, when is the sale forecast to occur.
- (8) Is Defence aware of any heritage or environmental significance attached to the site; if so, can details be provided.
- (9) Have any parties (individuals, organisations or governments) expressed an interest in acquiring the site; if so, can details of each expression of interest be provided.
- (10) Has the New South Wales Government expressed an interest in acquiring the site; if so, can details be provided.
- (11) (a) Why has the land not been transferred to the New South Wales Government for protection as parkland; (b) has there been any consultation with the New South Wales Government in this regard; and (c) can details of the nature of each consultation with the New South Wales Government on this issue be provided.
- (12) (a) When did the Commonwealth first acquire the site from New South Wales; and (b) what was the purpose of the acquisition.
- (13) (a) What was the process for acquiring the site from New South Wales; (b) did the Commonwealth pay New South Wales for the acquisition of the land; if so, how much was paid.
- (14) What other Defence land is currently controlled by the Department of Finance and Administration.
- (15) Is it intended that any of these other properties are to be sold; if so: (a) which properties will be sold; (b) what is the size of each property; (c) what is the value of each property; and (d) when are the sales expected to occur.

*1959 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—

- (1) What is the current status of Defence lands at Malabar Headland in New South Wales (the Anzac Rifle Range).
- (2) Has this land been transferred from the Department of Defence to the Department of Finance and Administration; if so, (a) when and why did this occur; and (b) who authorised the transfer.
- (3) What was the land used for previously.
- (4) What does Defence envisage that the site could be used for in the future.
- (5) What is the size of the site.
- (6) Has the site been valued by either the New South Wales Valuer-General or the Australian Valuation Office; if so, please indicate the dates on which the valuations occurred and the estimated value of the site.
- (7) Is it intended that the site will be sold; if so, when is the sale forecast to occur.
- (8) Is Defence aware of any heritage or environmental significance attached to the site; if so, can details be provided.
- (9) Have any parties (individuals, organisations or governments) expressed an interest in acquiring the site; if so, can details of each expression of interest be provided.
- (10) Has the New South Wales Government expressed an interest in acquiring the site; if so, can details of each expression of interest be provided.
- (11) (a) Why has the land not been transferred to the New South Wales Government for protection as a national park; (b) has there been any

consultation with the New South Wales Government in this regard; and (c) can details on the nature of each consultation with the New South Wales Government on this issue be provided.

- (12) (a) When did the Commonwealth first acquire the site from New South Wales; and (b) what was the purpose of the acquisition.
- (13) (a) What was the process for acquiring the site from New South Wales; (b) did the Commonwealth pay New South Wales for the acquisition of the Malabar Headland site; if so, how much was paid.

*1960 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—

- (1) How many security clearance applications are currently waiting to be processed by the Defence Security Authority.
- (2) How many security clearance re-evaluations are currently waiting to be processed by the Defence Security Authority.
- (3) Can a breakdown be provided of how long all security clearances waiting to be processed, including re-evaluations and new applications, have been delayed, for example, x applications are delayed by 1 month, y applications are delayed by 2 months etc.
- (4) What has such a large backlog developed.
- (5) What is the current estimate of the length of time it will take before the backlog is fully cleared.
- (6) What processes or initiatives are being put in place to reduce the backlog.
- (7) What processes or initiatives are being put in place to ensure that such a backlog does not arise again in the future.

*1961 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—

- (1) Can a breakdown be provided of all costs associated with the planned disposal of the Defence land at Point Nepean in Victoria, including all marketing, advertising, tender evaluation, legal and other costs.
- (2) Can this information be provided in respect of both the abandoned proposal to sell the Point Nepean land and the current proposal to lease the site.

*1962 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—With reference to former Defence properties that were sold in the 2002-03 financial year, can details of the sale price and the new owners be provided for the following:

- (1) 749 hectares of vacant land at Leakes Road, Rockbank, Victoria.
- (2) 1.43 hectares at Crows Nest Barracks, Flinders Street, Queenscliff, Victoria.
- (3) 0.89 hectares of vacant land at 150-160 Mine Road, Korumburra, Victoria.
- (4) 208 hectares at the former Royal Australian Navy Armament Depot, Somerton Road, Somerton, Victoria.

*1963 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—Can a breakdown be provided of all costs, including all marketing, advertising, tender evaluation, legal and other costs associated with the disposal of Defence properties during the 2002-03 financial year.

*1964 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—Can a market valuation be provided for each property sold by Defence during the 2002-03 financial year.

*1965 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—Is it true that the area in which the major West Papuan refugee centre in

Papua New Guinea is located is to be logged; if so: (a) what will be the impact on the refugees; and (b) what is Australia doing to ensure the logging is not detrimental to the refugees.

*1966 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—Are any Australian companies involved in logging in Papua New Guinea or West Papua; if so: (a) which companies; and (b) what is the involvement of the Australian Government.

Senator Brown: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos *1967-*1968)—

- (1) Is the person appointed to the position of Chief Scientist required to adhere to the Australian Public Service values, the Australian Public Service code of conduct or an equivalent standard.
- (2) Can a copy of Dr Robin Batterham's deed of appointment to the position of Chief Scientist in 1999 and 2002 be provided.

*1967 Minister representing the Prime Minister

*1968 Minister representing the Minister for Science

*1969 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—

- (1) What is the Rural and Remote Area (RRMA)-by-Rural and Remote Area (RRMA) breakdown for the percentage of total unreferral general practitioner (GP) attendances bulk billed for the 12 months ending: (a) 30 June 2000; (b) 30 June 2001; (c) 30 June 2002; and (d) 30 June 2003.
- (2) What is the RRMA-by-RRMA breakdown of the number of total unreferral GP attendances bulk billed by, federal electoral division, for the 12 months ending: (a) 30 June 2000; (b) 30 June 2001; (c) 30 June 2002; and (d) 30 June 2003.
- (3) What is the RRMA-by-RRMA breakdown for the average patient contribution per service (patient billed services only) for total unreferral GP attendances by, federal electoral division, for the 12 months ending: (a) 30 June 2000; (b) 30 June 2001; (c) 30 June 2002; and (d) 30 June 2003.
- (4) What is the RRMA-by-RRMA breakdown for the number of services for total unreferral GP attendances by, federal electoral division, for 12 months ending: (a) 30 June 2000; (b) 30 June 2001; (c) 30 June 2002; and (d) 30 June 2003.
- (5) For the 12 months to 30 June 2003, what is breakdown by RRMA of the percentage of GPs who bulk billed for unreferral services in the following bands: (a) less than 5%; (b) 5% to 25%; (c) 25% to 50%; (d) 50% to 70%; (e) 70% to 75%; (f) 75% to 80%; (g) 80% to 95%; and (h) greater than 95%. Include only those GPs who provided 1 000 or more unreferral services in the period.

*1970 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—

- (1) What are the breakdowns, by state and territory, of the percentage of total unreferral general practitioner (GP) attendances bulk billed for the quarters ending: (a) 30 June 2000; (b) 30 June 2001; (c) 30 June 2002; and (d) 30 June 2003.
- (2) What are the breakdowns, by state and territory, of the number of total unreferral GP attendances bulk billed for the quarters ending: (a) 30 June 2000; (b) 30 June 2001; (c) 30 June 2002; and (d) 30 June 2003.
- (3) What are the breakdowns, by state and territory, for the average patient contribution per service (patient billed services only) for total unreferral

GP attendances for the quarters ending: (a) 30 June 2000; (b) 30 June 2001; (c) 30 June 2002; and (d) 30 June 2003.

- (4) What are the breakdowns, by state and territory, for the number of services for total unreferral GP attendances for the quarters ending: (a) 30 June 2000; (b) 30 June 2001; (c) 30 June 2002; and (d) 30 June 2003.

*1971 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—

- (1) What are the breakdowns of the percentage of total unreferral attendances bulk billed by, federal electoral division, for the quarters ending: (a) 30 June 2000; (b) 30 June 2001; (c) 30 June 2002 and 30 June 2003.
- (2) What are the breakdowns of the number of total unreferral attendances bulk billed by, federal electoral division, for the quarters ending: (a) 30 June 2000; (b) 30 June 2001; (c) 30 June 2002; and (d) 30 June 2003.
- (3) What are the breakdowns for the average patient contribution per service (patient billed services only) for total unreferral attendances by, federal electoral division, for the quarters ending: (a) 30 June 2000; (b) 30 June 2001; (c) 30 June 2002; and (d) 30 June 2003.
- (4) What are the breakdowns for the number of services for total unreferral attendances by, federal electoral division, for the quarters ending: (a) 30 June 2000; (b) 30 June 2001; (c) 30 June 2002; and (d) 30 June 2003.

*1972 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—

- (1) What are the breakdowns of the percentage of total unreferral general practitioner (GP) attendances bulk billed, by federal electorate division, for the 12 months ending: (a) 30 June 2000; (b) 30 June 2001; (c) 30 June 2002; and (d) 30 June 2003.
- (2) What are the breakdowns of the number of total unreferral GP attendances bulk billed, by federal electorate division, for the 12 months ending: (a) 30 June 2000; (b) 30 June 2001; (c) 30 June 2002; and (d) 30 June 2003.
- (3) What are the breakdowns for the average patient contribution per service (patient billed services only) for total unreferral GP attendances, by federal electorate division, for the 12 months ending: (a) 30 June 2000; (b) 30 June 2001; (c) 30 June 2002; and (d) 30 June 2003.
- (4) What are the breakdowns for the number of services for total unreferral GP attendances, by federal electorate division, for the 12 months ending: (a) 30 June 2000; (b) 30 June 2001; (c) 30 June 2002; and (d) 30 June 2003.

ORDERS OF THE SENATE

Amendments to standing orders and orders of continuing effect

1 Committee meetings during adjournment debate

That standing order 33 be amended to read as follows:

33 Meetings during sitting

- (1) A committee of the Senate and a joint committee of both Houses of the Parliament may meet during sittings of the Senate for the purpose of deliberating in private session, but shall not make a decision at such a meeting unless:
- (a) all members of the committee are present; or

- (b) a member appointed to the committee on the nomination of the Leader of the Government in the Senate and a member appointed to the committee on the nomination of the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate are present, and the decision is agreed to unanimously by the members present.
- (2) **The restrictions on meetings of committees contained in paragraph (1) do not apply after the question for the adjournment of the Senate has been proposed by the President at the time provided on any day.**
- (3) A committee shall not otherwise meet during sittings of the Senate except by order of the Senate.
- (4) Proceedings of a committee at a meeting contrary to this standing order shall be void.

(Agreed to 14 May 2003.)

2 Deadline for receipt of bills

That standing order 111 be amended to read as follows:

111 Initiation

- (5) Where a bill:
 - (a) is first introduced in the Senate by a minister in a period of sittings; or
 - (b) is received from the House of Representatives and was introduced in that House in the same period of sittings; or
 - (c) is received from the House of Representatives after the expiration of two-thirds of the total number of days of sitting of the Senate scheduled for that period of sittings, and a motion is moved for the second reading of the bill, debate on that motion shall be adjourned at the conclusion of the speech of the senator moving the motion and resumption of the debate shall be made an order of the day for the first day of sitting in the next period of sittings without any question being put.
- (6) Paragraph (5) does not apply to a bill introduced in the Senate or received from the House of Representatives within the first two-thirds of the total number of days of sitting of the Senate scheduled for the first period of sittings after a general election of the House of Representatives, but consideration of such a bill shall not be resumed after the second reading is moved in the Senate unless 14 days have elapsed after the first introduction of the bill in either House.
- (7) **Paragraph (5) does not apply to a bill received by the Senate again in the circumstances described in the first paragraph of section 57 of the Constitution.**
- (8) In paragraphs (5) and (6) “period of sittings” means a period during which the Senate adjourns for not more than 20 days.

(Agreed to 14 May 2003.)

3 Departmental and agency contracts—Order for production of documents

That the order be amended to read as follows:

- (1) There be laid on the table, by each minister in the Senate, in respect of each agency administered by that minister, or by a minister in the House of Representatives represented by that minister, by not later than **2 calendar**

months after the last day of the financial and calendar year, a letter of advice that a list of contracts in accordance with paragraph (2) has been placed on the Internet, with access to the list through the department's or agency's home page.

- (2) The list of contracts referred to in paragraph (1) indicate:
 - (a) each contract entered into by the agency which has not been fully performed or which has been entered into during the previous 12 months, and which provides for a consideration to the value of \$100 000 or more;
 - (b) the contractor, the amount of the consideration and the subject matter of each such contract, **the commencement date of the contract, the duration of the contract, the relevant reporting period and the twelve-month period relating to the contract listings;**
 - (c) whether each such contract contains provisions requiring the parties to maintain confidentiality of any of its provisions, or whether there are any other requirements of confidentiality, and a statement of the reasons for the confidentiality; and
 - (d) an estimate of the cost of complying with this order and a statement of the method used to make the estimate.
- (3) If a list under paragraph (1) does not fully comply with the requirements of paragraph (2), the letter under paragraph (1) indicate the extent of, and reasons for, non-compliance, and when full compliance is expected to be achieved. Examples of non-compliance may include:
 - (a) the list is not up to date;
 - (b) not all relevant agencies are included; and
 - (c) contracts all of which are confidential are not included.
- (4) Where no contracts have been entered into by a department or agency, the letter under paragraph (1) is to advise accordingly.
- (5) In respect of contracts identified as containing provisions of the kind referred to in paragraph (2)(c), the Auditor-General be requested to provide to the Senate, within 6 months after each day mentioned in paragraph (1), a report indicating that the Auditor-General has examined a number of such contracts selected by the Auditor-General, and indicating whether any inappropriate use of such provisions was detected in that examination.
- (6) In respect of letters including matter under paragraph (3), the Auditor-General be requested to indicate in a report under paragraph (5) that the Auditor-General has examined a number of contracts, selected by the Auditor-General, which have not been included in a list, and to indicate whether the contracts should be listed.
- (7) The Finance and Public Administration References Committee consider and report on the first **and second** year of operation of this order.
- (8) This order has effect on and after 1 July 2001.
- (9) In this order:

“agency” means an agency within the meaning of the *Financial Management and Accountability Act 1997*; **and**

“previous 12 months” means the period of 12 months ending on **either 31 December or 30 June in any year**, as the case may be.

(Agreed to 20 June 2001; amended 27 September 2001, 18 June and 26 June 2003.)

4 Question on notice—Publication of a reply

That standing order 74(3) be amended to read as follows:

The reply to a question on notice shall be given by delivering it to the Clerk, a copy shall be supplied to the senator who asked the question, **the publication of the reply is then authorised**, and the question and reply shall be printed in Hansard.

(Agreed to 8 September 2003.)

5 Senators breastfeeding infants

That standing order 175 be amended to read as follows:

175 Conduct of visitors

- (1) Visitors may attend, in the galleries provided, a sitting of the Senate.
- (2) A person other than a senator, a clerk at the table or an officer attending on the Senate may not:
 - (a) attend a meeting of the Senate in private session; or
 - (b) enter any part of the Senate chamber reserved for senators while the Senate is sitting.
- (3) **Paragraph (2) does not apply in respect of a senator breastfeeding an infant.**
- (4) The Usher of the Black Rod shall, subject to any direction by the Senate or the President, take into custody any person who enters any part of the chamber reserved for senators while the Senate is sitting, or causes a disturbance in or near the chamber, and a person so taken into custody shall be discharged out of custody in accordance with an order of the Senate.

(Agreed to 13 May 2003.)

6 Times of meeting and routine of business on Tuesday

That standing orders 55 and 57 be amended to read as follows:

55 Times of meetings

- (1) The days and times of meeting of the Senate in each sitting week shall be:

Monday	12.30 pm – 6.30 pm, 7.30 pm – 10.30 pm
Tuesday	12.30 pm – adjournment
Wednesday	9.30 am – 8 pm
Thursday	9.30 am – 8.40 pm.

57 Routine of business

- (1) The routine of business shall be:
 - (b) On Tuesday:
 - (i) **Government business only**
 - (ii) **At 2 pm**, questions
 - (iii) Motions to take note of answers
 - (iv) Petitions
 - (v) Notices of motion
 - (vi) Postponement and rearrangement of business
 - (vii) Formal motions – discovery of formal business
 - (viii) Any proposal to debate a matter of public importance or urgency
 - (ix) Government business

- (x) At 6.50 pm, consideration of government documents for up to 30 minutes under standing order 61
- (xi) At 7.20 pm, adjournment proposed
- (xii) Adjournment.

(Agreed to 14 May 2003.)

Committees

7 Allocation of departments

Departments and agencies are allocated to the legislative and general purpose standing committees as follows:

Community Affairs

Family and Community Services
Health and Ageing

Economics

Treasury
Industry, Tourism and Resources

Employment, Workplace Relations and Education

Employment and Workplace Relations
Education, Science and Training

Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts

Environment and Heritage
Communications, Information Technology and the Arts

Finance and Public Administration

Parliament
Prime Minister and Cabinet
Finance and Administration

Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Foreign Affairs and Trade
Defence (including Veterans' Affairs)

Legal and Constitutional

Attorney-General
Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport

Transport and Regional Services
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry.

(1 May 1996, amended 2 September 1997, 21 October 1997, 11 November 1998, 8 February 2001 and 13 February 2002.)

*8 Economics Legislation Committee—Authorisation to meet

That the Economics Legislation Committee be authorised to hold a public meeting during the sitting of the Senate on Monday, 13 October 2003, from 4 pm, to take evidence for the committee's inquiry into the Late Payment of Commercial Debts (Interest) Bill 2003.

(Agreed to 9 September 2003.)

*9 Electoral Matters—Joint Standing Committee—Authorisation to meet

That the Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters be authorised to hold a public meeting during the sitting of the Senate on Thursday, 18 September 2003, from 9.30 am to 11 am, to take evidence for the committee's inquiry into increasing the minimum representation of the Territories in the House of Representatives.

(Agreed to 9 September 2003.)

10 Estimates hearings

- (1) That estimates hearings by legislation committees for the year 2003 be scheduled as follows:

2002-03 additional estimates:

Monday, 10 February and Tuesday, 11 February and, if required, Friday, 14 February (*Group A*)

Wednesday, 12 February and Thursday, 13 February and, if required, Friday, 14 February (*Group B*).

2003-04 Budget estimates:

Monday, 26 May to Thursday, 29 May and, if required, Friday, 30 May (*Group A*)

Monday, 2 June to Thursday, 5 June and, if required, Friday, 6 June (*Group B*).

- (2) That the committees consider the proposed expenditure in accordance with the allocation of departments to committees agreed to by the Senate.
- (3) That committees meet in the following groups:

Group A:

Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts

Finance and Public Administration

Legal and Constitutional

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport

Group B:

Community Affairs

Economics

Employment, Workplace Relations and Education

Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade.

- (4) That the committees report to the Senate on the following dates:

Wednesday, 19 March 2003 in respect of the 2002-03 additional estimates, and

Thursday, 19 June 2003 in respect of the 2003-04 Budget estimates.

(Agreed to 11 December 2002.)

11 Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade—Joint Standing Committee—Authorisation to meet

That the Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade be authorised to hold private meetings otherwise than in accordance with standing order 33(1) during sittings of the Senate.

(Agreed to 12 November 2002.)

12 Privileges—Standing Committee—Adoption of 94th report recommendation

That the Senate authorise the President, if required, to engage counsel as *amicus curiae* if either the action for defamation against Mr David Armstrong or a similar action against Mr William O'Chee is set down for trial.

(Agreed to 4 September 2000.)

***13 Regulations and Ordinances—Standing Committee—Authorisation to meet**

That the Standing Committee on Regulations and Ordinances be authorised to hold a public meeting during the sitting of the Senate on Wednesday, 10 September 2003, from 3.30pm, to take evidence for the committee's inquiry into the provisions of the Legislative Instruments Bill 2003 and the Legislative Instruments (Transitional Provisions and Consequential Amendments) Bill 2003.

(Agreed to 9 September 2003.)

Legislation

14 Customs Tariff Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2003—Excise Tariff Amendment Bill (No. 1) 2003—Further consideration of the bills

That:

- (1) For the reasons set out in paragraph (3), further consideration of the bills be postponed and be made an order of the day for the next day of sitting after the Government fully complies with the order for the production of documents relating to a proposed excise and production subsidy made on 16 October 2002.
- (2) Senators who have spoken to the motion 'That these bills be now read a second time' may speak again to that motion for up to 20 minutes each when the bill is again called on.
- (3) The reasons referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:
 - (a) the bills remove the excise exemption for fuel ethanol and impose an excise duty rate equivalent to that applying to petroleum and impose an excise duty on imports of fuel ethanol;
 - (b) on 16 October 2002, the Senate ordered the production of documents related to the imposition of fuel ethanol excise and a production subsidy to be tabled on or before 21 October 2002;
 - (c) the Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer (Senator Ian Campbell) advised the Senate on 21 October 2002 that the documents, subject to the order, would be provided as soon as possible;
 - (d) Senator Ian Campbell advised the Senate on 13 December 2002 that the documents would be tabled out of session on 17 December 2002 and further advised the Senate on 5 February 2003 that the documents would be provided as soon as possible;
 - (e) the Senate called on the Government to comply with the order on 11 December 2002, 4 March 2003 and 26 March 2003;
 - (f) it has been revealed that documents relating to the order concern, among other matters, a meeting between the Prime Minister (Mr Howard) and Mr Dick Honan, Chairman of Manildra, on 1 August 2002; and
 - (g) passage of the bills now would be ill-advised in the absence of full information about the Government's consideration of ethanol policy.

(Agreed to 12 August 2003.)

15 Senate consideration—Variation

- (1) That a bill shall not be considered in committee of the whole, unless, prior to the resolution of the question for the second reading, any senator has:
 - (a) circulated in the Senate a proposed amendment or request for amendment of the bill; or
 - (b) required in debate or by notification to the chair that the bill be considered in committee of the whole.
- (2) That this order operate as a sessional order.

(Agreed to 20 June 2002.)

***16 Senate consideration—Variation**

That the provisions of paragraphs (5), (6) and (8) of standing order 111 not apply to the Quarantine Amendment (Health) Bill 2003, allowing it to be considered during this period of sittings.

(Agreed to 9 September 2003.)

Meeting of Senate

17 Meeting of Senate

That the days of meeting of the Senate for 2003 shall be as follows:

Summer sittings:

Tuesday, 4 February to Thursday, 6 February

Autumn sittings:

Monday, 3 March to Thursday, 6 March

Tuesday, 18 March to Thursday, 20 March

Monday, 24 March to Thursday, 27 March

Budget sittings:

Tuesday, 13 May to Thursday, 15 May

Winter sittings:

Monday, 16 June to Thursday, 19 June

Monday, 23 June to Thursday, 26 June

Spring sittings:

Monday, 11 August to Thursday, 14 August

Monday, 18 August to Thursday, 21 August

Monday, 8 September to Thursday, 11 September

Monday, 15 September to Thursday, 18 September

Tuesday, 7 October to Thursday, 9 October

Monday, 13 October to Thursday, 16 October

Monday, 27 October to Thursday, 30 October

Monday, 3 November and Tuesday, 4 November

Monday, 24 November to Thursday, 27 November

Monday, 1 December to Thursday, 4 December.

(Agreed to 12 November 2002.)

18 Adjournment debate on Tuesdays—Temporary order

- (1) On the question for the adjournment of the Senate on Tuesday, a senator who has spoken once subject to the time limit of 10 minutes may speak again for not more than 10 minutes if no other senator who has not already

spoken once wishes to speak, provided that a senator may by leave speak for not more than 20 minutes on one occasion.

- (2) This order shall cease to have effect at the conclusion of the last sitting day in 2003.

(Agreed to 19 November 2002 upon adoption of recommendations in the Procedure Committee's second report of 2002.)

Orders for production of documents

19 Mining—Christmas Island—Order for production of documents

That there be laid on the table, no later than 4 pm on Tuesday, 25 June 2002, the following documents:

- (a) the current mine lease or leases on Christmas Island held by Phosphate Resource Ltd (PRL), including all conditions;
- (b) the Environment Management Plan for the lease or leases;
- (c) any Environment Australia (EA) documents relating to compliance, oversight and enforcement of the lease or leases and conditions;
- (d) all materials relating to breaches of conditions, including claims, investigations and actions;
- (e) any audits of PRL's rehabilitation program;
- (f) any new mining proposals for Christmas Island;
- (g) a current tenure map of all blocks that have been mined;
- (h) any documents relating to the transfer of any lots to or from PRL;
- (i) any documents relating to the current mine rehabilitation budget for EA on Christmas Island;
- (j) any documents relating to the current status of rehabilitation on lease block 138;
- (k) any documents relating to the payment or non-payment of power bills by PRL;
- (l) any documents relating to alternative locations for the proposed detention centre on Christmas Island;
- (m) any documents containing responses of EA to the detention centre proposal; and
- (n) current funds held for purposes of mine rehabilitation on Christmas Island.

(Agreed to 19 June 2002.)

20 Superannuation system—Order for production of document

That there be laid on the table, on the last sitting day of the winter sittings 2002, the revised costings document, including the correct phasing-in arrangements, of the Australian Labor Party's plan for a fairer superannuation system, prepared by Phil Gallagher (Manager, Retirement and Income Modelling Unit, Treasury) which was sent to the Treasurer's office in the week beginning 20 May 2002 and identified in Mr Gallagher's evidence before the Economics Legislation Committee on 4 June 2002.

(Agreed to 24 June 2002.)

21 Finance—Retirement and Income Modelling—Order for production of documents

That there be laid on the table, on the last sitting day of the 2002 winter sittings, the modelling, including information on projected spending for payments to individuals, education, health and aged care spending, prepared for the draft Intergenerational Report in early 2002 before budget changes were factored in, prepared by the Retirement and Income Modelling Unit, Treasury and identified in Treasury's evidence before the Economics Legislation Committee on 6 June 2002.

(Agreed to 25 June 2002.)

22 **Health—Tobacco—Order for production of document**

That the Senate—

- (a) notes the report tabled in the Senate on 6 May 2002 from the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) on the performance of its functions under the *Trade Practices Act 1974* (the Act) with regard to tobacco and related matters, as required by the order of the Senate of 24 September 2001;
- (b) notes that the Senate may require the ACCC to provide it with information in accordance with section 29 of the Act;
- (c) requires the ACCC to report, as soon as possible, on the following issues:
 - (i) whether Australian tobacco companies have engaged in misleading or deceptive conduct in their use of the terms 'mild' and 'light', and
 - (ii) whether there has been any misleading, deceptive or unconscionable conduct in breach of the Act by British American Tobacco and/or Clayton Utz with regard to document destruction for the purpose of withholding information relevant to possible litigation;
- (d) requests the ACCC to engage in consultation with interested parties and stakeholders over the perceived inadequacies in its response to the order of the Senate of 24 September 2001 and requires the ACCC to report on those consultations as soon as possible;
- (e) notes that once the Senate has had the opportunity to consider the ACCC's further reports on the use of the terms 'mild' and 'light', whether there has been misleading, deceptive or unconscionable conduct in relation to document destruction, and the ACCC's consultations, it will consider whether a further report should be sought from the ACCC in response to the order of the Senate of 24 September 2001;
- (f) calls on the Commonwealth Government to pursue the possibility of a Commonwealth/state public liability action against tobacco companies to recover healthcare costs to the Commonwealth and the states caused by the use of tobacco; and
- (g) calls on the Commonwealth to address the issue of who should have access to the more than \$200 million collected in respect of tobacco tax and licence fees by tobacco wholesalers but not passed on to Government (see *Roxborough v. Rothmans*) by introducing legislation to retrospectively recover that amount for the Commonwealth and/or to establish a fund on behalf of Australian consumers and taxpayers, and in either case for the moneys to be used for the purpose of anti-smoking and other public health issues.

(Agreed to 27 June 2002.)

23 **Animal Welfare—Cattle—Order for production of documents**

That there be laid on the table, no later than 4 pm on Wednesday, 21 August 2002, the following documents:

- (a) the Livestock Officer's report on the voyage of the *Maysora*, a Jordanian flagged vessel, travelling from Australia on 28 February 2001 carrying live cattle; and
- (b) the Master's reports from the same voyage.

(Agreed to 20 August 2002.)

24 Superannuation Working Group—Order for production of document

That there be laid on the table, on the next day of sitting, the report presented to the Government by the Superannuation Working Group on 28 March 2002.

(Agreed to 28 August 2002.)

25 Health—Assessment reports by the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission—Order for production of documents—Variation

That the order of the Senate of 25 March 1999, relating to an order for the production of periodic reports by the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission on private health insurance, be amended as follows:

Omit "6 months, commencing with the 6 months ending on 31 December 1999", substitute "12 months ending on or after 30 June 2003".

(Agreed to 18 September 2002.)

26 Transport—Ethanol—Order for production of documents

That there be laid on the table, no later than immediately after motions to take note of answers on Monday, 21 October 2002:

- (a) all documents relating to the meeting between the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (Mr Truss) and the Executive Director of the Australian Institute of Petroleum on 21 August 2002, including but not limited to:
 - (i) papers prepared for the meeting by the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, the Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources, and/or Mr Truss' office,
 - (ii) any agenda or attendance papers,
 - (iii) any notes made by departmental officers and/or ministerial advisers at the meeting, including but not limited to hand-written notes, and
 - (iv) any papers that document the outcome of the meeting, including but not limited to file notes prepared by departmental officers and/or ministerial advisers;
- (b) all records of communications between:
 - Mr JT Honan, Chairman of Manildra and/or other Manildra managers and staff, and
 - the Prime Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Trade, Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources, Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, Assistant Treasurer, and/or departmental officers and ministerial advisers,

concerning the Government's consideration of an ethanol excise and production subsidy, including but not limited to correspondence, telephone records and file notes;

- (c) all records of any meetings between:
 - Mr JT Honan, Chairman of Manildra and/or other Manildra managers and staff, and

- the Prime Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Trade, Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources, Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, Assistant Treasurer, and/or departmental officers and ministerial advisers,
concerning the Government's consideration of an ethanol excise and production subsidy, including but not limited to hand-written file notes;
- (d) all records of communications between:
 - Mr Bob Gordon, Executive Director of the Australian Biofuels Association and/or other Australian Biofuels Association staff, and
 - the Prime Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Trade, Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources, Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, Assistant Treasurer, and/or departmental officers and ministerial advisers,
concerning the Government's consideration of an ethanol excise and production subsidy, including but not limited to correspondence, telephone records and file notes;
- (e) all records of any meetings between:
 - Mr Bob Gordon, Executive Director of the Australian Biofuels Association and/or other Australian Biofuels Association staff, and
 - the Prime Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Trade, Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources, Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, Assistant Treasurer, and/or departmental officers and ministerial advisers,
concerning the Government's consideration of an ethanol excise and production subsidy, including but not limited to hand-written file notes; and
- (f) all analysis by the Treasury, the Department of Finance, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources and Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry concerning the projected budgetary impact of the decision to impose excise on ethanol and grant a 12-month ethanol production subsidy.

(Agreed to 16 October 2002.)

27 Environment—Queensland—Nathan Dam—Order for production of documents

That there be laid on the table, no later than 2 pm on 19 November 2002:

- (a) all documents from 2002 relating to any approaches made by Sudaw Developments Ltd (or its agents) to the Government seeking funding or other support for the Nathan Dam on the Fitzroy River in Queensland;
- (b) any documents or comments provided to Environment Australia in response to the referral, Ref. No. 2002/770—Sudaw Developments Ltd—Water management and use—Dawson River—QLD—Nathan Dam, central Queensland;
- (c) any report or document prepared by Environment Australia in response to referral 2002/770; and
- (d) the report, *Literature review and scoping study of the potential downstream impacts of the proposed Nathan Dam on the Dawson River, Fitzroy River and offshore environments*, prepared by the Australian Centre for Tropical Freshwater Research.

(Agreed to 11 November 2002.)

28 Trade—General Agreement on Trade in Service—Order for production of documents

That there be laid on the table by the Minister representing the Minister for Trade, no later than immediately after motions to take note of answers on Monday, 18 November 2002:

- (a) all requests received by the Australian Government for increased access to Australian services markets by other nations, lodged under negotiations, under the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS);
- (b) any documents analysing the likely impact of any requests made of Australia in negotiations under GATS; and
- (c) any requests lodged by Australia of other countries under negotiations on GATS.

(Agreed to 14 November 2002.)

29 Environment—Oceans policy—Order for production of document

That there be laid on the table at the end of taking note of answers to questions without notice on Tuesday, 19 November 2002, the 'Review of the Implementation of Oceans Policy: Final report' by TFG International, dated 25 October 2002.

(Agreed to 18 November 2002.)

30 Superannuation—Insurance and Superannuation Commission—Order for production of documents

That there be laid on the table, in accordance with their respective ministerial responsibilities, by the Minister representing the Treasurer (Senator Minchin) and the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer (Senator Coonan), by 2 December 2002, the following documents:

- (a) the Treasury files, as described in paragraph 10.1.4 of the report to Messrs Corrs Chambers Westgarth from John Palmer, FCA, entitled 'Review of the role played by the Australian Prudential Regulation Authority and the Insurance and Superannuation Commission in the collapse of the HIH Group of Companies' and provided as a witness statement to the HIH Royal Commission;
- (b) the files of the Insurance and Superannuation Commission in relation to the application of FAI Insurance Limited for an authority to carry on insurance business following the proclamation of the *Insurance Act 1973* containing the application and all correspondence and documentation relating to the consideration of the application and leading to and including the company's eventual authorisation;
- (c) the files of the Insurance and Superannuation Commission in relation to the application of Fire and All Risks Insurance Company Limited for an authority to carry on insurance business following the proclamation of the *Insurance Act 1973* containing the application and all correspondence and documentation relating to the consideration of the application and leading to and including the company's eventual authorisation;
- (d) the files of the Insurance and Superannuation Commission in relation to the application of Car Owners' Mutual Insurance Company Limited for an authority to carry on insurance business following the proclamation of the *Insurance Act 1973* containing the application and all correspondence and documentation relating to the consideration of the application and leading to and including the company's eventual authorisation; and

- (e) the files of the Insurance and Superannuation Commission in relation to the application of Australian and International Insurance Limited for an authority to carry on insurance business following the proclamation of the *Insurance Act 1973* containing the application and all correspondence and documentation relating to the consideration of the application and leading to and including the company's eventual authorisation.

(Agreed to 19 November 2002.)

31 Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—Ministerial responsibility—Order for production of documents

That there be laid on the table, no later than immediately after motions to take note of answers on Thursday, 12 December 2002, all documents relating to the inquiries undertaken by the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet into the possible conflict of interest between the ministerial responsibilities of the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer (Senator Coonan) and the commercial activities of Endispute Pty Ltd (including, but not limited to, a copy of the report of those inquiries furnished to the Prime Minister (Mr Howard) and referred to by him during question time in the House of Representatives on Tuesday, 3 December 2002).

(Agreed to 10 December 2002.)

32 Environment—Tasmania—Logging—Order for production of documents

That there be laid on the table by the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation, no later than noon on Thursday, 12 December 2002, all documents relating to the answers to question on notice no. 404 (Senate *Hansard*, 14 October 2002, p. 5089).

(Agreed to 11 December 2002.)

33 Science and Technology—Genetically-modified food—Order for production of documents

That there be laid on the table by the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs and representing the Prime Minister (Senator Hill), no later than 4 pm on 4 February 2003:

All communications in the period June 2001 to the present between:

- (a) the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade or the Prime Minister's office and Food Standards Australia New Zealand;
- (b) the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade or the Prime Minister's office and the National Farmers Federation;
- (c) the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade or the Prime Minister's office and the Department of Health and Ageing; and
- (d) the Prime Minister's office and the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade,

relating to genetically-modified food in the context of the current free trade agreement negotiations with the United States and of the labelling of genetically modified and genetically engineered food, including communications to or from organisations formed or created under the auspices of any of the above agencies, officers of departments.

(Agreed to 12 December 2002.)

34 Environment—National Radioactive Waste Repository—Order for production of documents

That there be laid on the table, no later than 4 pm on Thursday, 6 February 2003, the submission or submissions made by the Department of Defence to the Environment Impact Assessment for a National Radioactive Waste Repository in South Australia.

(Agreed to 5 February 2003.)

35 Environment—National Radioactive Waste Repository—Order for production of documents

That there be laid on the table, no later than 4 pm on Monday, 3 March 2003, all documents relating to the records and communications between the Department of Defence and the Department of Education, Science and Training concerning the Government's consideration of a National Radioactive Waste Repository in South Australia.

(Agreed to 5 February 2003.)

36 Environment—National Radioactive Waste Repository—Order for production of documents

That there be laid on the table, no later than 4 pm on Thursday, 6 March 2003, the written advice provided by the Department of Defence to the Department of Education, Science and Training concerning the defence-related issues in connection with the National Radioactive Waste Repository in South Australia

(Agreed to 5 March 2003.)

37 Immigration—Illegal migration—Order for production of document

That there be laid on the table, no later than 4 pm on Wednesday, 26 March 2003, the Memorandum of Understanding signed on or around 12 March 2003 between the Australian Government and the Islamic Republic of Iran, which includes measures to combat illegal migration.

(Agreed to 25 March 2003.)

38 Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee—Review of Test and Evaluation in Defence—Report by the Director of Trials—Order for production of document

That the Senate adopt the following recommendations of the Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee in its report on materiel acquisition and management in Defence:

- (a) that the Senate request the Auditor-General to direct that the proposed 2003-04 audit of the Defence Materiel Organisation (DMO) by the Australian National Audit Office include a cultural audit that will assess:
 - (i) DMO's espoused corporate values and standards and staff compliance with these,
 - (ii) management and staff values, behaviours and competencies measured against the capability requirement,
 - (iii) employee attitudes, morale, beliefs, motivation,
 - (iv) employee understanding of, for example, the DMO's customers, industry partners, strategies, business plans, roles and contributions to the overall mission of Defence,
 - (v) communication processes,
 - (vi) the effectiveness of change management programs, employee commitment to them and the extent of the benefits materialising, and
 - (vii) compliance with health and safety regulations;

- (b) that the Senate request the Auditor-General:
- (i) to produce, on an annual basis, a report on progress in major defence projects, detailing cost, time and technical performance data for each project,
 - (ii) to model the report on that ordered by the British House of Commons and produced by the United Kingdom Comptroller and Auditor General, and
 - (iii) to include in the report such analysis of performance and emerging trends as will enable the Parliament to have high visibility of all current and pending major projects; and
- (c) that the Senate under standing order 164, order the production, upon its completion, of the report by the Director of Trials of the Review of Test and Evaluation in Defence, and refer the document to the Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee for examination and report.

(Agreed to 14 May 2003.)

39 Environment—Radioactive waste—National store—Order for production of document

That there be laid on the table by the Minister representing the Minister for Science, no later than 1 pm on 15 May 2003, the document containing the list of potential sites for the location of a national store for intermediate level radioactive waste that has been prepared by the National Store Advisory Committee, referred to in the media release prepared by the Minister for Science, 'SA Ruled Out', dated 9 May 2003.

(Agreed to 14 May 2003.)

40 Industry—Basslink—Order for production of documents

That there be laid on the table, no later than 4 pm on Thursday, 15 May 2003, the letters exchanged between the Victorian and Federal Governments since 1 July 2001 concerning the Basslink project, other than those letters relating to the planning process.

(Agreed to 14 May 2003.)

41 Energy Grants (Credits) Scheme—Draft regulations—Order for production of documents

That there be laid on the table, no later than immediately after motions to take note of answers on Thursday, 19 June 2003:

- (a) draft regulations to be made under the Energy Grants (Credits) Scheme Bill 2003;
- (b) draft regulations to be made under the Energy Grants (Credits) Scheme (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2003; and
- (c) records of any meetings at which members of industry or other groups with a potential to be affected by the passage of these bills were permitted to examine the draft regulations referred to above.

(Agreed to 19 June 2003.)

***42 Education—National report—Order for production of documents**

That there be laid on the table by the Minister representing the Minister for Education, Science and Training (Senator Alston), no later than 3.30 pm on 15 September 2003, the following documents relating to the *National Report on Australia's Higher Education Sector 2001* ('national report') and the associated supporting research reports to it:

- (a) a copy of the drafts of chapters 4 and 7 of the national report as they were written at:
 - (i) April 2002,
 - (ii) September 2002,
 - (iii) 1 December 2002,
 - (iv) 31 December 2002, and
 - (v) April 2003;
- (b) a copy of the four following reports:
 - (i) P Aungles et al, *HECS and educational opportunities*,
 - (ii) R Fleming and T Karmel, *University participation of persons from non-English speaking backgrounds: Impact of migration patterns*,
 - (iii) M McLachlan and T Karmel, *HECS: The impact of changes*, and
 - (iv) Y Martin and T Karmel, *Expansion in higher education: Effects on access and students quality over the 1990s as at April 2002*;
- (c) any communication between the Secretary of the Department of Education, Science and Training and the head of the Education Information and Analysis Group, the Higher Education Group and/or the Research, Analysis and Evaluation Group, on the methodological quality of the research underpinning the reports mentioned in paragraphs (a) and (b) above;
- (d) briefing advices or notes prepared for the Minister for Education, Science and Training and/or the Secretary of the Department of Education, Science and Training between April 2002 and July 2003, regarding the reports mentioned in paragraphs (a) and (b) above;
- (e) any minutes of meetings held to consider the research, editing, formatting and indexing of the reports mentioned in paragraphs (a) and (b) above;
- (f) any correspondence, including e-mails, directing the change in status of the reports from being 'forthcoming' to becoming 'advice to the Minister';
- (g) records of any communications between Bill Burmeister and any Department of Education, Science and Training officer, or external consultant, on the national report and all four reports mentioned at paragraph (b), from the period when Mr Burmeister was appointed head of the Higher Education Group, until July 2003;
- (h) copies of any other Evaluations and Investigations Programme (EIP) reports (either prepared internally, or commissioned by the EIP group) related to higher education, that were reclassified after April 2002, as 'advice to the Minister';
- (i) a copy of the invoices and receipts relating to payment to Ray Adams and Associates, for editing work on the national report; and
- (j) a copy of the invoices and receipts relating to the Department of Education, Science and Training in-house printing service JS McMillan, regarding work on the national report.

(Agreed to 9 September 2003.)

Orders for production of documents still current from previous parliaments

Date of order	Subject	Addressed to
---------------	---------	--------------

Date of order	Subject	Addressed to
25.10.1995	Administrative decision-making—Effect of international instruments	Minister representing the Attorney-General
13.05.1998	Waterfront reform	Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Development (Senator Alston); Minister representing the Minister for Workplace Relations and Small Business (Senator Alston); and Minister representing the Prime Minister (Senator Hill)
07.03.2000	Environment—Queensland—Tree clearing	Minister for the Environment and Heritage (Senator Hill)
03.04.2000	Aged care—Riverside Nursing Home	Minister representing the Minister for Aged Care
27.06.2000	Tax reform—Petrol pricing	Assistant Treasurer (Senator Kemp)
09.11.2000	Environment—Tasmania	Minister representing the Minister for Sport and Tourism (Senator Minchin)
04.12.2000	Taxation—Opinion polls	Leader of the Government in the Senate (Senator Hill)
05.03.2001	Taxation	Minister representing the Treasurer (Senator Kemp)
23.05.2001	HIH Insurance	Minister representing the Treasurer (Senator Kemp)
24.05.2001	Workplace relations	Minister representing the Minister for Employment, Workplace Relations and Small Business
09.08.2001	Foreign Affairs—Japanese fishing boats	Minister representing the Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Trade
21.08.2001	Transport—Black Spot Project	Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services
23.08.2001	Environment—Great Barrier Reef—Water quality control	Leader of the Government in the Senate (Senator Hill)
19.09.2001	Transport—Ansett Australia	Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services
20.09.2001	Transport—Ansett Australia	Minister representing the Prime Minister

CONTINGENT NOTICES OF MOTION

Auditor-General's reports—Consideration

- 1 Leader of the Opposition in the Senate (Senator Faulkner)

Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Bartlett)**Senator Brown****Senator Harradine****Senator Harris****Senator Lees****Senator Nettle**

To move (contingent on the President presenting a report of the Auditor-General on any day or notifying the Senate that such a report had been presented under standing order 166)—That so much of the standing orders be suspended as would prevent the senator moving a motion to take note of the report and any senator speaking to it for not more than 10 minutes, with the total time for the debate not to exceed 60 minutes.

Conduct of business

- 2 **Leader of the Government in the Senate (Senator Hill):** To move (contingent on the Senate on any day concluding its consideration of any item of business and prior to the Senate proceeding to the consideration of another item of business)—That so much of the standing orders be suspended as would prevent a minister moving a motion to provide for the consideration of any matter.

- 3 **Leader of the Opposition in the Senate (Senator Faulkner)**

Leader of the National Party of Australia in the Senate (Senator Boswell)**Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Bartlett)****Senator Brown****Senator Harradine****Senator Harris****Senator Lees****Senator Nettle**

To move (contingent on the Senate on any day concluding its consideration of any item of business and prior to the Senate proceeding to the consideration of another item of business)—That so much of the standing orders be suspended as would prevent the senator moving a motion relating to the conduct of the business of the Senate or to provide for the consideration of any other matter.

Government documents

- 4 **Leader of the Opposition in the Senate (Senator Faulkner)**

Leader of the National Party of Australia in the Senate (Senator Boswell)**Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Bartlett)****Senator Brown****Senator Harradine****Senator Harris****Senator Lees****Senator Nettle**

To move (contingent on the Senate proceeding to the consideration of government documents)—That so much of the standing orders relating to the consideration of government documents be suspended as would prevent the senator moving a motion relating to the order in which the documents are called on by the President.

Limitation of time

Leader of the Opposition in the Senate (Senator Faulkner)
Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Bartlett)
Senator Brown
Senator Harradine
Senator Harris
Senator Lees
Senator Nettle

- 5 To move (contingent on a minister moving a motion that a bill be considered an urgent bill)—That so much of standing order 142 be suspended as would prevent debate taking place on the motion.
- 6 To move (contingent on a minister moving a motion to specify time to be allotted to the consideration of a bill, or any stage of a bill)—That so much of standing order 142 be suspended as would prevent the motion being debated without limitation of time and each senator speaking for the time allotted by standing orders.
- 7 To move (contingent on the chair declaring that the time allotted for the consideration of a bill, or any stage of a bill, has expired)—That so much of standing order 142 be suspended as would prevent further consideration of the bill, or the stage of the bill, without limitation of time or for a specified period.

Matters of urgency

- 8 **Leader of the Government in the Senate (Senator Hill):** To move (contingent on the moving of a motion to debate a matter of urgency under standing order 75)—That so much of the standing orders be suspended as would prevent a minister moving an amendment to the motion.
- 9 **Leader of the Opposition in the Senate (Senator Faulkner)**
Leader of the National Party of Australia in the Senate (Senator Boswell)
Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Bartlett)
Senator Brown
Senator Harradine
Senator Harris
Senator Lees
Senator Nettle
To move (contingent on the moving of a motion to debate a matter of urgency under standing order 75)—That so much of the standing orders be suspended as would prevent the senator moving an amendment to the motion.

Order of business

- 10 **Leader of the Opposition in the Senate (Senator Faulkner)**
Leader of the National Party of Australia in the Senate (Senator Boswell)
Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Bartlett)
Senator Brown
Senator Harradine
Senator Harris
Senator Lees

Senator Nettle

To move (contingent on the President proceeding to the placing of business on any day)—That so much of the standing orders be suspended as would prevent the senator moving a motion relating to the order of business on the *Notice Paper*.

Statements**11 Leader of the Opposition in the Senate (Senator Faulkner)**

Leader of the National Party of Australia in the Senate (Senator Boswell)

Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Bartlett)

Senator Brown

Senator Harradine

Senator Harris

Senator Lees

Senator Nettle

To move (contingent on any senator being refused leave to make a statement to the Senate)—That so much of the standing orders be suspended as would prevent that senator making that statement.

Questions without notice**12 Leader of the Opposition in the Senate (Senator Faulkner)**

Leader of the National Party of Australia in the Senate (Senator Boswell)

Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Bartlett)

Senator Brown

Senator Harradine

Senator Harris

Senator Lees

Senator Nettle

To move (contingent on a minister at question time on any day asking that further questions be placed on notice)—That so much of the standing orders be suspended as would prevent the senator moving a motion that, at question time on any day, questions may be put to ministers until 28 questions, including supplementary questions, have been asked and answered.

Tabling of documents**13 Leader of the Opposition in the Senate (Senator Faulkner)**

Leader of the National Party of Australia in the Senate (Senator Boswell)

Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Bartlett)

Senator Brown


Senator Harradine

Senator Harris

Senator Lees

Senator Nettle

To move (contingent on any senator being refused leave to table a document in the Senate)—That so much of the standing orders be suspended as would prevent the senator moving that the document be tabled.



TEMPORARY CHAIRS OF COMMITTEES

Senators Bolkus, Brandis, Chapman, Cherry, Cook, Ferguson, Hutchins, Kirk, Knowles, Lightfoot, Sandy Macdonald, Marshall, McLucas and Watson

CATEGORIES OF COMMITTEES

Standing Committees

Appropriations and Staffing
House
Library
Privileges
Procedure
Publications
Selection of Bills
Senators' Interests

Legislative Scrutiny Standing Committees

Regulations and Ordinances
Scrutiny of Bills

Legislative and General Purpose Standing Committees

Community Affairs Legislation
Community Affairs References
Economics Legislation
Economics References
Employment, Workplace Relations and Education Legislation
Employment, Workplace Relations and Education References
Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts Legislation
Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts References
Finance and Public Administration Legislation
Finance and Public Administration References
Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation
Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References
Legal and Constitutional Legislation
Legal and Constitutional References
Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation
Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References

Select Committees

A Certain Maritime Incident
Medicare
Ministerial Discretion in Migration Matters
Superannuation
Superannuation and Financial Services

Joint Statutory Committees

ASIO, ASIS and DSD

Australian Crime Commission (*replaced the Parliamentary Joint Committee on the National Crime Authority with effect from 1 January 2003*)

Broadcasting of Parliamentary Proceedings

Corporations and Financial Services

National Crime Authority

Native Title and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Fund

Public Accounts and Audit

Public Works

Joint Committees

Electoral Matters

Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Migration

National Capital and External Territories

Treaties

N.B. Details appear in the following section, with committees listed in alphabetical order.

COMMITTEES

A Certain Maritime Incident—Select Committee

(*appointed 13 February 2002; terms of appointment varied 13 March 2002; final report tabled 23 October 2002*)

Members

Senator Cook (*Chair*), Senator Brandis (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Bartlett, Collins, Faulkner, Ferguson, Mason and Murphy

Report presented

Report (*tabled 23 October 2002*)

Erratum (*presented to the Deputy President on 25 October 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 11 November 2002*)

Appropriations and Staffing—Standing Committee*Members*

The President (*Chairman*), the Leader of the Government in the Senate, the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate and Senators Allison, Bolkus, Boswell, Ferris, Heffernan and Ray

Reports presented

36th report—Estimates for the Department of the Senate 2002-03 (*certified by the President on 22 May 2002, pursuant to standing order 166(2); tabled 18 June 2002*)

Annual report for 2001-02 (*tabled 29 August 2002*)

37th report—Administration of parliamentary security (*tabled 18 November 2002*)

38th report—Estimates for the Department of the Senate 2003-04 (*tabled 23 June 2003*)

39th report—Review of aspects of parliamentary administration (*tabled 23 June 2003*)

ASIO, ASIS and DSD—Joint Statutory Committee

Members

Mr Jull (*Chair*), Senators Ferguson, Sandy Macdonald and Ray and Mr Beazley, Mr McArthur and Mr McLeay

Current inquiry

Intelligence information received by Australia's intelligence services in relation to weapons of mass destruction (*referred 17 June 2003; reporting date: 2 December 2003*)

Reports presented

Australian Security Intelligence Organisation Legislation Amendment (Terrorism) Bill 2002—Interim report (*presented to the Deputy President on 3 May 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 14 May 2002*)

Australian Security Intelligence Organisation Legislation Amendment (Terrorism) Bill 2002—Advisory report (*tabled 18 June 2002*)

Annual report for 2001-02 (*tabled 2 December 2002*)

Australian Crime Commission—Joint Statutory Committee

(*replaced the Parliamentary Joint Committee on the National Crime Authority with effect from 1 January 2003*)

Members

Mr Baird (*Chair*), Mr Sercombe (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Denman, Ferris, Greig, Hutchins and McGauran and Mr Dutton, Mr Kerr and Mr CP Thompson

Current inquiries

Recent trends in practices and methods of cybercrime (*adopted 6 March 2003*)

The Australian Crime Commission's response to the emerging trend of trafficking in women for sexual servitude (*adopted 26 June 2003*)

Broadcasting of Parliamentary Proceedings—Joint Statutory Committee

Members

The President (*Vice Chairman*), the Speaker (*Chairman*), Senators Ferris and Stephens and Mr Forrest, Mrs Gash, Mr Lindsay, Ms JS McFarlane and Mr Price

Community Affairs Legislation Committee

Portfolios

Family and Community Services; Health and Ageing

Members

Senator Humphries (*Chair*), Senator Greig (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Denman, Heffernan, Hutchins and Knowles

Substitute member

Senator Tchen to replace Senator Knowles from 22 August to 19 December 2003, inclusive

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Bishop, Boswell, Buckland, Carr, Chapman, Collins, Coonan, Crossin, Eggleston, Evans, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Forshaw, Harradine, Harris, Hogg, Lees, Lightfoot, Ludwig, McGauran, Mackay, McLucas, Moore, Murphy, Nettle, Payne, Tierney, Watson and Webber

Senator Allison for matters relating to the Health and Ageing portfolio

Reports presented

Matters not disposed of at the end of the 39th Parliament (*tabled 14 February 2002*)

Annual reports (No. 1 of 2002) (*tabled 13 March 2002*)

Additional estimates 2001-02, March 2002 (*tabled 13 March 2002*)

Budget estimates 2002-03, June 2002 (*tabled 19 June 2002*)

Provisions of the Research Involving Embryos and Prohibition of Human Cloning Bill 2002 (*presented to the President on 24 October 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 11 November 2002*)

Family and Community Services Legislation Amendment (Special Benefit Activity Test) Bill 2002 (*tabled 2 December 2002*)

Additional estimates 2002-03, March 2003 (*tabled 19 March 2003*)

Annual reports (No. 1 of 2003), March 2003 (*tabled 20 March 2003*)

Health Legislation Amendment (Private Health Insurance Reform) Bill 2003 (*tabled 16 June 2003*)

Budget estimates 2003-04, June 2003 (*tabled 19 June 2003*)

Community Affairs References Committee*Members*

Senator Hutchins (*Chair*), Senator Knowles (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Humphries, Lees, McLucas and Moore

Substitute members

Senator Murray to replace Senator Lees for the committee's inquiry into children in institutional care

Senator Tchen to replace Senator Knowles from 22 August to 19 December 2003, inclusive

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Bishop, Carr, Chapman, Coonan, Crossin, Denman, Eggleston, Evans, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Forshaw, Harradine, Harris, Lightfoot, Ludwig, Mackay, Mason, McGauran, Murphy, Nettle, Payne, Tierney, Watson and Webber

Senator Greig for matters relating to the Family and Community Services portfolio

Senator Allison for matters relating to the Health and Ageing portfolio

Senator Knowles from 22 August to 19 December 2003, inclusive

Current inquiries

Operation of the social security breaches and penalties system (*referred 16 October 2002*)

Poverty and financial hardship (*referred 21 October 2002; reporting date: 27 November 2003*)

Children in institutional care (*referred 4 March 2003; reporting date: 3 December 2003*)

Hepatitis C in Australia (*referred 19 August 2003; reporting date: the first sitting day of the 2004 winter session*)

Reports presented

Matters not disposed of at the end of the 39th Parliament (*tabled 14 February 2002*)
 The patient profession: Time for action—Report on the inquiry into nursing (*tabled 26 June 2002*)
 Participation requirements and penalties in the social security system [Family and Community Services Legislation Amendment (Australians Working Together and other 2001 Budget Measures) Bill 2002 and related issues] (*tabled 25 September 2002*)

Corporations and Financial Services—Joint Statutory Committee

(formerly the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Corporations and Securities; name amended 11 March 2002 pursuant to Schedule 1, item 5 of the Financial Services Reform Act 2001)

Members

Senator Chapman (*Chair*), Senator Wong (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Brandis, Conroy and Murray and Mr Byrne, Mr Ciobo, Mr Griffin, Mr Hunt and Mr McArthur

Current inquiries

Banking and financial services in rural, regional and remote areas of Australia (*adopted 26 June 2002*)

Australia's insolvency laws (*adopted 14 November 2002*)

Reports presented

Regulations and ASIC policy statements made under the *Financial Services Reform Act 2001* (*tabled 23 October 2003*)

Review of the *Managed Investments Act 1998* (*tabled 12 December 2002*)

Review of the Australian Securities and Investment Commission (*tabled 26 March 2003*)

Corporations Amendment Regulations 2003 (No. 1), Statutory Rules 2003 No. 31 (*tabled 24 June 2003*)

Regulation 7.1.29 in Corporations Amendment Regulations 2003 (No. 3), Statutory Rules 2003 No. 85 (*tabled 26 June 2003*)

Inquiry into the disclosure of commissions on risk products (*tabled 12 August 2003*)

Economics Legislation Committee

Portfolios

Treasury; Industry, Tourism and Resources

Members

Senator Brandis (*Chair*), Senator Stephens (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Chapman, Murray, Watson and Webber

Substitute members

Senator Allison to replace Senator Murray for matters relating to the Resources portfolio

Senator Ridgeway to replace Senator Murray for the committee's inquiry into the provisions of the ACIS Administration Amendment Bill 2003 and the Customs Tariff Amendment (ACIS) Bill 2003

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Boswell, Buckland, George Campbell, Carr, Cherry, Conroy, Cook, Coonan, Eggleston, Evans, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Forshaw, Harradine, Harris,

Kirk, Knowles, Lees, Lightfoot, Ludwig, Lundy, Mackay, Marshall, Mason, McGauran, Murphy, Payne, Ridgeway, Sherry, Stott Despoja, Tchen and Tierney

Current inquiries

Late Payment of Commercial Debts (Interest) Bill 2003 (*referred 19 March 2003; reporting date: 16 October 2003*)

Provisions of the ACIS Administration Amendment Bill 2003 and the Customs Tariff Amendment (ACIS) Bill 2003 (*referred 13 August 2003; reporting date: 15 September 2003*)

Provisions of the Taxation Laws Amendment Bill (No. 7) 2003 (*referred 13 August 2003; reporting date: 10 September 2003*)

Reports presented

Commonwealth Inscribed Stock Amendment Bill 2001 (*presented to the Deputy President on 6 December 2001, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 12 February 2002*)

Additional estimates 2001-02, March 2002 (*tabled 19 March 2002*)

Taxation Laws Amendment (Superannuation) Bill (No. 1) 2002 and Income Tax (Superannuation Payments Withholding Tax) Bill 2002 (*tabled 20 March 2002*)

Annual reports (No. 1 of 2002) (*tabled 21 March 2002*)

Budget estimates 2002-03, June 2002 (*tabled 19 June 2002*)

New Business Tax System (Consolidation) Bill (No. 1) 2002 (*tabled 26 June 2002*)

Taxation Laws Amendment Bill (No. 4) 2002 (*tabled 26 June 2002*)

Diesel Fuel Rebate Scheme Amendment Bill 2002 (*tabled 26 June 2002*)

Space Activities Amendment Bill 2002 (*tabled 27 August 2002*)

Annual reports (No. 2 of 2002) (*tabled 18 September 2002*)

New Business Tax System (Consolidation, Value Shifting, Demergers and Other Measures) Bill 2002 (*presented to the Deputy President on 18 October 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 21 October 2002*)

Excise Tariff Amendment Bill (No. 1) 2002 and Customs Tariff Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2002 (*tabled 22 October 2002*)

New Business Tax System (Consolidation and Other Measures) Bill (No. 1) 2002 (*tabled 18 November 2002*)

Inspector-General of Taxation Bill 2002 (*tabled 3 December 2002*)

Trade Practices Amendment (Liability for Recreational Services) Bill 2002 (*tabled 10 December 2002*)

Financial Sector Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2002 (*tabled 11 December 2002*)

Additional estimates 2002-03, March 2003 (*tabled 19 March 2003*)

Corporations Amendment (Repayment of Directors' Bonuses) Bill 2002 (*tabled 19 March 2003*)

Annual reports (No. 1 of 2003), March 2003 (*tabled 20 March 2003*)

Additional estimates 2002-03, March 2003 (*tabled 20 March 2003*)

Energy Grants (Credits) Scheme Bill 2003 and Energy Grants (Credits) Scheme (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2003 (*tabled 24 March 2003*)

Corporations (Fees) Amendment Bill 2002, Corporations Legislation Amendment Bill 2002 and Corporations (Review Fees) Bill 2002 (*tabled 26 March 2003*)

Terrorism Insurance Bill 2003 (*tabled 14 May 2003*)

Designs Bill 2002 and Designs (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2002 (*presented to the President on 28 May 2003, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 16 June 2003*)

Taxation Laws Amendment Bill (No. 4) 2003 (*tabled 19 June 2003*)
 Taxation Laws Amendment Bill (No. 8) 2003 (*tabled 19 June 2003*)
 Budget estimates 2003-04, June 2003 (*tabled 23 June 2003*)
 New Business Tax System (Taxation of Financial Arrangements) Bill (No. 1) 2003 (*tabled 13 August 2003*)
 Provisions of the Trade Practices Amendment (Personal Injuries and Death) Bill 2003 (*tabled 20 August 2003*)
 Provisions of the Taxation Laws Amendment Bill (No. 5) 2003 (*tabled 21 August 2003*)
 Provisions of the Financial Services Reform Amendment Bill 2003 (*tabled 21 August 2003*)

Economics References Committee

Members

Senator Stephens (*Chair*), Senator Brandis (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Chapman, Hogg, Ridgeway and Webber

Substitute member

Senator Allison to replace Senator Ridgeway for matters relating to the Resources portfolio

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Barnett, Boswell, Buckland, George Campbell, Carr, Cherry, Conroy, Coonan, Eggleston, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Forshaw, Harradine, Harris, Kirk, Knowles, Lees, Lightfoot, Ludwig, Mackay, Mason, McGauran, Murphy, Murray, Payne, Sherry, Stott Despoja, Tchen, Tierney and Watson

Current inquiries

The structure and distributive effects of the Australian taxation system (*referred 12 December 2002; reporting date: last sitting day in June 2004*)

Whether the *Trade Practices Act 1974* adequately protects small business (*referred 25 June 2003; reporting date: 4 December 2003*)

Reports presented

Inquiry into mass marketed tax effective schemes and investor protection (*presented to the President on 11 February 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 12 February 2002*)

Inquiry into the framework for the market supervision of Australia's stock exchanges (*presented to the President on 11 February 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 12 February 2002*)

A review of public liability and professional indemnity insurance (*tabled 22 October 2002*)

Electoral Matters—Joint Standing Committee

(*appointed 14 February 2002*)

Members

Mr Georgiou (*Chair*), Mr Danby (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Bartlett, Brandis, Mason, Murray and Ray and Mr Forrest, Mr Melham and Ms Panopoulos

Current inquiry

Increasing the minimum representation for the Territories in the House of Representatives (*referred 8 July 2003*)

Reports presented

The integrity of the electoral roll: Review of ANAO report no. 42 of 2001-02 (*tabled 11 November 2002*)

The 2001 Federal Election: Report of the inquiry into the conduct of the 2001 Federal Election, and matters related thereto (*tabled 23 June 2003*)

Employment, Workplace Relations and Education Legislation Committee

(formerly the *Employment, Workplace Relations, Small Business and Education Legislation Committee*; name amended 11 March 2002—see standing order 25)

Portfolios

Employment and Workplace Relations; Education, Science and Training

Members

Senator Tierney (*Chair*), Senator George Campbell (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Barnett, Carr, Johnston and Stott Despoja

Substitute members

Senator Murray to replace Senator Stott Despoja for matters relating to the Workplace Relations portfolio

Senator Allison to replace Senator Stott Despoja for matters relating to the Training portfolio and the Schools portfolio

Senator Cherry to replace Senator Stott Despoja for matters relating to the Employment portfolio

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Bartlett, Boswell, Buckland, Chapman, Cherry, Collins, Coonan, Crossin, Eggleston, Evans, Faulkner, Ferguson, Forshaw, Harradine, Harris, Humphries, Hutchins, Knowles, Lees, Lightfoot, Ludwig, Marshall, Mackay, Mason, McGauran, Murphy, Nettle, Payne, Santoro, Sherry, Stephens, Watson and Webber

Current inquiry

Workplace Relations Amendment (Compliance with Court and Tribunal Orders) Bill 2003 and the provisions of the Workplace Relations Amendment (Codifying Contempt Offences) Bill 2003 (*referred 20 August 2003; reporting date: 13 October 2003*)

Reports presented

Annual reports (No. 1 of 2002) (*tabled 13 March 2002*)

Additional estimates 2001-02, March 2002 (*tabled 13 March 2002*)

Workplace Relations Amendment (Fair Dismissal) Bill 2002, Workplace Relations Amendment (Prohibition of Compulsory Union Fees) Bill 2002, Workplace Relations Amendment (Secret Ballots for Protected Action) Bill 2002, Workplace Relations Amendment (Genuine Bargaining) Bill 2002 and Workplace Relations Amendment (Fair Termination) Bill 2002 (*tabled 15 May 2002*)

Budget estimates 2002-03, June 2002 (*tabled 27 June 2002*)

Higher Education Funding Amendment Bill 2002 (*tabled 22 August 2002*)

Research Agencies Legislation Amendment Bill 2002 (*tabled 29 August 2002*)

Workplace Relations Amendment (Paid Maternity Leave) Bill 2002 (*tabled 18 September 2002*)

Annual reports (No. 2 of 2002) (*tabled 18 September 2002*)

Workplace Relations Amendment (Improved Protection for Victorian Workers) Bill 2002 (*presented to the President on 15 November 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 18 November 2002*)

Additional estimates 2002-03, March 2003 (*tabled 19 March 2003*)
 Annual reports (No. 1 of 2003), March 2003 (*tabled 20 March 2003*)
 Workplace Relations Amendment (Termination of Employment) Bill 2002 (*tabled 26 March 2003*)
 Workplace Relations Amendment (Protecting the Low Paid) Bill 2003—Interim report (*presented to the Deputy President on 2 May 2003, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 13 May 2003*)
 Budget estimates 2003-04, June 2003 (*tabled 19 June 2003*)
 Workplace Relations Amendment (Protecting the Low Paid) Bill 2003 (*tabled 19 June 2003*)

* Annual reports (No. 2 of 2003), September 2003 (*tabled 9 September 2003*)

Employment, Workplace Relations and Education References Committee

(formerly the *Employment, Workplace Relations, Small Business and Education References Committee*; name amended 11 March 2002—see standing order 25)

Members

Senator George Campbell (*Chair*), Senator Tierney (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Barnett, Carr, Crossin and Stott Despoja

Substitute members

Senator Murray to replace Senator Stott Despoja for matters relating to the Workplace Relations portfolio

Senator Allison to replace Senator Stott Despoja for matters relating to the Training portfolio and the Schools portfolio

Senator Cherry to replace Senator Stott Despoja for matters relating to the Employment portfolio

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Bartlett, Boswell, Buckland, Chapman, Cherry, Collins, Coonan, Denman, Eggleston, Evans, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Forshaw, Harradine, Harris, Humphries, Hutchins, Johnston, Knowles, Lees, Lightfoot, Ludwig, Mackay, Mason, McGauran, McLucas, Moore, Murphy, Nettle, Payne, Santoro, Sherry, Stephens, Watson and Webber

Current inquiries

The refusal of the Government to respond to the order of the Senate of 21 August 2002 for the production of documents relating to financial information concerning higher education institutions (*referred 18 September 2002; reporting date: 15 October 2003*)

Labour market skills requirements (*referred 23 October 2002; reporting date: 28 October 2003*)

Proposed budget changes to higher education (*referred 26 June 2003; reporting date: 30 October 2003*)

Reports presented

Education of gifted and talented children (*presented to the President on 2 October 2001, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 12 February 2002*)

Universities in crisis: Report into the capacity of public university to meet Australia's higher education needs—Addendum (*presented to the President on 8 November 2001, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 12 February 2002*)

Education of students with disabilities (*tabled 10 December 2002*)

Small business employment (*tabled 6 February 2003*)

Education of students with disabilities—Corrigendum (*tabled 5 March 2003*)

Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts Legislation Committee

Portfolios

Environment and Heritage; Communications, Information Technology and the Arts

Members

Senator Eggleston (*Chair*), Senator Mackay (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Bartlett, Lundy, Santoro and Tchen

Substitute members

Senator Greig to replace Senator Bartlett for matters relating to the Information Technology portfolio

Senator Ridgeway to replace Senator Bartlett for matters relating to the Arts portfolio

Senator Wong to replace Senator Mackay for the committee's inquiry into the Plastic Bag Levy (Assessment and Collection) Bill 2002 [No. 2] and the Plastic Bag (Minimisation of Usage) Education Fund Bill 2002 [No. 2]

Senator Cherry to replace Senator Bartlett for matters relating to the Communications portfolio

Senator Allison to replace Senator Bartlett for the committee's inquiry into the provisions of the Fuel Quality Standards Amendment Bill 2003

Senator O'Brien to replace Senator Mackay for the committee's inquiry into the provisions of the Fuel Quality Standards Amendment Bill 2003

Senator Humphries to replace Senator Tchen for the committee's inquiry into the Communications Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2003 on 5 September 2003

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Bolkus, Boswell, Brown, George Campbell, Carr, Chapman, Conroy, Coonan, Evans, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Harradine, Harris, Humphries, Knowles, Lees, Lightfoot, McLucas, Mason, McGauran, Moore, Murphy, Nettle, Ray, Watson and Wong

Current inquiries

Plastic Bag Levy (Assessment and Collection) Bill 2002 [No. 2] and the Plastic Bag (Minimisation of Usage) Education Fund Bill 2002 [No. 2] (*referred 5 March 2003; reporting date: 7 October 2003*)

Provisions of the Telstra (Transition to Full Private Ownership) Bill 2003 (*referred 13 August 2003; reporting date: 30 October 2003*)

Communications Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2003 (*referred 20 August 2003; reporting date: 15 September 2003*)

Provisions of the Fuel Quality Standards Amendment Bill 2003 (*referred 20 August 2003; reporting date: 28 October 2003*)

Reports presented

Additional estimates 2001-02, March 2002 (*tabled 13 March 2002*)

Annual reports (No. 1 of 2002) (*tabled 21 March 2002*)

Broadcasting Services Amendment (Media Ownership) Bill 2002 (*presented to the President on 18 June 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 19 June 2002*)

Budget estimates 2002-03, June 2002 (*tabled 19 June 2002*)

New Zealand/Australia committee exchange program: Report of visit to New Zealand, 15 to 17 April 2002 (*tabled 27 August 2002*)

Annual reports (No. 2 of 2002) (*tabled 18 September 2002*)

Telecommunications Competition Bill 2002 (*presented to the Deputy President on 22 November 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 2 December 2002*)

Renewable Energy (Electricity) Amendment Bill 2002—Interim report (*presented to the Deputy President on 28 November 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 2 December 2002*)

Renewable Energy (Electricity) Amendment Bill 2002 (*tabled 2 December 2002*)

Additional estimates 2002-03, March 2003 (*tabled 19 March 2003*)

Annual reports (No. 1 of 2003), March 2003 (*tabled 20 March 2003*)

Budget estimates 2003-04, June 2003 (*tabled 19 June 2003*)

Provisions of the Postal Services Legislation Amendment Bill 2003 (*tabled 19 August 2003*)

* Annual reports (No. 2 of 2003), September 2003 (*tabled 9 September 2003*)

Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts References Committee

Members

Senator Cherry (*Chair*), Senator Tierney (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Lundy, Mackay, Tchen and Wong

Substitute members

Senator Crossin to replace Senator Mackay for the committee's inquiry into environmental performance at the Ranger, Jabiluka, Beverley and Honeymoon uranium operations

Senator Buckland to replace Senator Lundy for the committee's inquiry into environmental performance at the Ranger, Jabiluka, Beverley and Honeymoon uranium operations

Senator Scullion to replace Senator Tierney for the committee's inquiry into environmental performance at the Ranger, Jabiluka, Beverley and Honeymoon uranium operations

Senator Moore to replace Senator Wong for the committee's inquiries into the Australian telecommunications network and the role of libraries as providers of public information in the online environment

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Allison, Bolkus, Boswell, Brown, Buckland, George Campbell, Carr, Chapman, Conroy, Coonan, Eggleston, Evans, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Harradine, Harris, Humphries, Knowles, Lees, Mason, McGauran, Moore, Murphy, Nettle, Payne and Watson

Senator Greig for matters relating to the Information Technology portfolio

Senator Ridgeway for matters relating to the Arts portfolio

Senator Nettle for the committee's inquiry into environmental performance at the Ranger, Jabiluka, Beverley and Honeymoon uranium operations

Senator Wong for the committee's inquiry into the Australian telecommunications network

Current inquiries

Environmental performance at the Ranger, Jabiluka, Beverley and Honeymoon uranium operations (*referred 20 June 2002; reporting date: 16 September 2003*)

The role of libraries as providers of public information in the online environment (*referred 25 June 2002; reporting date: 16 September 2003*)

Australian telecommunications network (*referred 25 June 2002; reporting date: 2 December 2003*)

Competition in broadband services (*referred 26 June 2003; reporting date: last sitting day in March 2004*)

Regulation, control and management of invasive species (*referred 26 June 2003; reporting date: last sitting day in March 2004*)

Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Amendment (Invasive Species) Bill 2002 (*referred 26 March 2003; order varied 26 June 2003; reporting date: 25 November 2003*)

Reports presented

Matters not disposed of at the end of the 39th Parliament (*tabled 14 February 2002*)

New Zealand/Australia committee exchange program: Report of visit to New Zealand, 15 to 17 April 2002 (*tabled 27 August 2002*)

The value of water: Inquiry into Australia's urban water management (*tabled 5 December 2002*)

Finance and Public Administration Legislation Committee

Portfolios

Parliament; Prime Minister and Cabinet; Finance and Administration

Members

Senator Mason (*Chair*), Senator Murray (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Brandis, Faulkner, Forshaw and Heffernan

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Carr, Chapman, Conroy, Coonan, Eggleston, Evans, Ferguson, Ferris, Harradine, Harris, Knowles, Lees, McGauran, Mackay, Marshall, Murphy, Payne, Ray, Ridgeway, Sherry, Tchen, Tierney and Watson

Current inquiry

Portfolio Budget Statements (*referred 21 November 1996; readopted 2 December 1998 and 21 March 2002*)

Reports presented

Additional estimates 2001-02, March 2002 (*tabled 13 March 2002*)

Matters not disposed of at the end of the 39th Parliament (*tabled 21 March 2002*)

Annual reports (No. 1 of 2002) (*tabled 21 March 2002*)

Budget estimates 2002-03, June 2002 (*tabled 19 June 2002*)

Charter of Political Honesty Bill 2000 [2002], Electoral Amendment (Political Honesty) Bill 2000 [2002], Government Advertising (Objectivity, Fairness and Accountability) Bill 2000 and Auditor of Parliamentary Allowances and Entitlements Bill 2000 [No. 2] (*tabled 29 August 2002*)

Annual reports (No. 2 of 2002) (*tabled 18 September 2002*)

Members of Parliament (Life Gold Pass) Bill 2002 (*tabled 19 September 2002*)

Public Interest Disclosure Bill 2001 [2002] (*tabled 26 September 2002*)

Additional estimates 2002-03, March 2003 (*tabled 19 March 2003*)

Annual reports (No. 1 of 2003), March 2003 (*tabled 20 March 2003*)

Budget estimates 2003-04, June 2003 (*tabled 19 June 2003*)

* Annual reports (No. 2 of 2003), September 2003 (*tabled 9 September 2003*)

Finance and Public Administration References Committee*Members*

Senator Forshaw (*Chair*), Senator Watson (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Heffernan, Moore, Ridgeway and Wong

Substitute members

Senator Murray to replace Senator Ridgeway for the committee's inquiry into recruitment and training in the Australian Public Service

Senator Bartlett to replace Senator Ridgeway for the committee's inquiry into administrative review within the area of veteran and military compensation and income support

Senator Bishop to replace Senator Wong for the committee's inquiry into administrative review within the area of veteran and military compensation and income support

Senator Murray to replace Senator Ridgeway for the committee's inquiry into staff employed under the *Members of Parliament (Staff) Act 1984*

Senator Webber to replace Senator Wong for the committee's inquiry into staff employed under the *Members of Parliament (Staff) Act 1984*

Senator Brandis to replace Senator Heffernan for the committee's inquiry into staff employed under the *Members of Parliament (Staff) Act 1984* on 2 September and 3 September 2003

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Brandis, Carr, Chapman, Conroy, Coonan, Crossin, Eggleston, Evans, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Harradine, Harris, Knowles, Lees, Lundy, Mackay, Mason, McGauran, Murphy, Murray, Payne, Sherry, Tchen and Tierney

Senator Marshall for the committee's inquiry into funding under the Dairy Regional Assistance Program

Current inquiries

Tabling of indexed lists of files of departments and agencies (*referred 21 August 1996 pursuant to the order of 30 May 1996; readopted 1 December 1998 and 21 March 2002*)

Recruitment and training in the Australian Public Service (*referred 21 March 2002; reporting date: 18 September 2003*)

Staff employed under the *Members of Parliament (Staff) Act 1984* (*referred 19 March 2003; reporting date: 8 October 2003*)

Second year of operation of the Senate order for the production of lists of departmental and agency contracts (*ordered 18 June 2003*)

Administrative review within the area of veteran and military compensation and income support (*referred 19 June 2003*)

Reports presented

Matters not disposed of at the end of the 39th Parliament (*tabled 21 March 2002*)

Departmental and agency contracts: Report on the first year of operation of the Senate order for the production of lists of departmental and agency contracts (*tabled 12 December 2002*)

A funding matter under the Dairy Regional Assistance Program (*tabled 26 June 2003*)

Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade—Joint Standing Committee

(*appointed 14 February 2002*)

Members

Senator Ferguson (*Chair*), Mr Brereton (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Bolkus, Cook, Eggleston, Evans, Harradine, Hutchins, Johnston, Sandy Macdonald, O'Brien, Payne and Stott Despoja and Mr Baird, Mr Baldwin, Mr Beazley, Mr Bevis, Mr Byrne, Mr Edwards, Mr LDT Ferguson, Mrs Gash, Mr Hawker, Mr Jull, Mr Lindsay, Mrs Moylan, Mr Nairn, Mr Price, Mr Prosser, Mr Scott, Mr Snowdon, Mr Somlyay and Mr CP Thompson

Current inquiries

Watching brief on the war on terrorism (*adopted 15 May 2002*)

United Nations – Australia's role in the UN (*adopted 15 May 2002*)

World Trade Organisation – Australia's role in the WTO (*adopted 15 May 2002*)

Trade and investment relations with the countries of Central Europe (*adopted 12 August 2002*)

Relations with Indonesia (*adopted 22 August 2002*)

Australia's maritime strategy (*adopted 27 August 2002*)

Review of those aspects of the 2000-01 annual report of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission relating to conditions at immigration detention centres and the treatment of detainees (*adopted 27 June 2002*)

Human rights and good governance education in the Asia-Pacific region (*referred 3 September 2002*)

Review of the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) annual report for 2001-02 (*adopted 16 October 2002*)

Review of the Australian Trade Commission (Austrade) annual report for 2001-02 (*adopted 16 October 2002*)

Review of the Department of Defence annual report for 2001-02 (*adopted 16 October 2002*)

Review of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade annual report for 2001-02 (*adopted 16 October 2002*)

Review of Australia-Indonesia Institute annual report for 2001-02 (*adopted 2 December 2002*)

Reports presented

Review of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Defence annual reports 2000-01 (*tabled 23 September 2002*)

Enterprising Australia: Planning, preparing and profiting from trade and investment—A short report on the proceedings of the inquiry (*tabled 16 October 2002*)

Parliament's watching brief on the war on terrorism—Visit to Australian forces deployed to the international coalition against terrorism (*tabled 21 October 2002*)

Parliament's watching brief on the war on terrorism—Review of Australia's preparedness to manage the consequences of a terrorist attack (*statement made, by way of a report, 2 December 2002*)

Review of Australia's relations with the United Nations (*statement made, by way of a report, 9 December 2002*)

Scrutiny of the World Trade Organisation (*statement made, by way of a report, 9 December 2002*)

Report of the 2003 New Zealand Parliamentary Committee Exchange, 6-11 April 2003 (*tabled 23 June 2003*)

Foreign Affairs and Trade; Defence (including Veterans' Affairs)

Members

Senator Sandy Macdonald (*Chair*), Senator Cook (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Evans, Ferguson, Payne and Ridgeway

Substitute members

Senator Bartlett to replace Senator Ridgeway for the committee's inquiry into off-setting arrangements between the Veterans' Entitlements Act and the Military Compensation Scheme

Senator Allison to replace Senator Ridgeway for the committee's inquiry into the provisions of the Non-Proliferation Legislation Amendment Bill 2003

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Bishop, Boswell, Brandis, Carr, Chapman, Coonan, Eggleston, Faulkner, Ferris, Forshaw, Harradine, Harris, Hogg, Hutchins, Johnston, Knowles, Lees, Lightfoot, Mackay, Marshall, Mason, McGauran, Murphy, Nettle, Santoro, Stott Despoja, Tchen, Tierney and Watson

Senator Bartlett for matters relating to the Defence and Veterans' Affairs portfolio

Current inquiries

Provisions of the Non-Proliferation Legislation Amendment Bill 2003 (*referred 20 August 2003; reporting date: 11 September 2003*)

Aspects of the Veterans' Entitlements Act 1986 and the Military Compensation Scheme (*adopted 6 March 2003*)

Reports presented

Annual reports (No. 1 of 2002) (*tabled 21 March 2002*)

Additional estimates 2001-02, March 2002 (*tabled 21 March 2002*)

Budget estimates 2002-03, June 2002 (*tabled 26 June 2002*)

Annual reports (No. 2 of 2002) (*tabled 18 September 2002*)

Additional estimates 2002-03, March 2003 (*tabled 19 March 2003*)

Annual reports (No. 1 of 2003), March 2003 (*tabled 20 March 2003*)

Budget estimates 2003-04, June 2003 (*tabled 19 June 2003*)

Export Market Development Grants Amendment Bill 2003 (*tabled 24 June 2003*)

* Annual reports (No. 2 of 2003), September 2003 (*tabled 9 September 2003*)

Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee

Members

Senator Cook (*Chair*), Senator Sandy Macdonald (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Hogg, Johnston, Marshall and Ridgeway

Substitute members

Senator Stott Despoja to replace Senator Ridgeway for the committee's inquiry into the performance of government agencies in the assessment and dissemination of security threats in South East Asia in the period 11 September 2001 to 12 October 2002

Senator Bartlett to replace Senator Ridgeway for the committee's inquiry into current health preparation arrangements for the deployment of Australian Defence Forces overseas

Senator Bishop to replace Senator Marshall for the committee's inquiry into current health preparation arrangements for the deployment of Australian Defence Forces overseas

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Boswell, Brandis, Brown, Carr, Chapman, Collins, Coonan, Denman, Eggleston, Evans, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Forshaw, Harradine, Harris, Hutchins, Knowles, Lees, Lightfoot, Mackay, Mason, McGauran, Murphy, Nettle, Payne, Santoro, Stott Despoja, Tchen, Tierney and Watson

Senator Kirk for the committee's inquiry into the performance of government agencies in the assessment and dissemination of security threats in South East Asia in the period 11 September 2001 to 12 October 2002

Senator Bartlett for matters relating to the Defence and Veterans' Affairs portfolio

Current inquiries

An examination of the Government's foreign and trade policy strategy (*referred 10 December 2002; reporting date: 16 September 2003*)

Issues involved in the negotiation of the General Agreement on Trade in Services in the Doha Development Round (*referred 12 December 2002; reporting date: 27 November 2003*)

The performance of government agencies in the assessment and dissemination of security threats in South East Asia in the period 11 September 2001 to 12 October 2002 (*referred 24 March 2003; reporting date: 4 November 2003*)

Report by the Director of Trials of the Review of Test and Evaluation in Defence (*referred 14 May 2003 contingent upon the presentation of the document in the Senate*)

Current health preparation arrangements for the deployment of Australian Defence Forces overseas (*referred 19 June 2003*)

Reports presented

Recruitment and retention of ADF personnel (*presented to the Temporary Chair of Committees, Senator Chapman, on 4 October 2001, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 12 February 2002*)

Materiel acquisition and management in Defence (*tabled 27 March 2003*)

A Pacific engaged: Australia's relations with Papua New Guinea and the island states of the south-west Pacific (*tabled 12 August 2003*)

House—Standing Committee

Members

The President (*Chair*), the Deputy President, Senators Carr, Colbeck, Collins, Lightfoot and Stephens

Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee

Portfolios

Attorney-General; Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs

Members

Senator Payne (*Chair*), Senator Bolkus (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Greig, Ludwig, Mason and Scullion

Substitute member

Senator Ridgeway to replace Senator Greig for matters relating to the Indigenous Affairs portfolio

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Brandis, Brown, Carr, Chapman, Eggleston, Evans, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Harradine, Harris, Humphries, Kirk, Knowles, Lees, Lightfoot,

Mackay, McGauran, McLucas, Murphy, Nettle, Ray, Sherry, Stephens, Stott Despoja, Tchen, Tierney and Watson

Senator Bartlett for matters relating to the Immigration and Multicultural Affairs portfolio

Current inquiries

Provisions of the Age Discrimination Bill 2003 (*referred 13 August 2003; reporting date: 18 September 2003*)

Provisions of the Migration Legislation Amendment (Identification and Authentication) Bill 2003 (*referred 20 August 2003; reporting date: 11 September 2003*)

Reports presented

Matter not disposed of at the end of the 39th Parliament (*tabled 11 March 2002*)

Annual reports (No. 1 of 2002) (*tabled 21 March 2002*)

Additional estimates 2001-02, March 2002 (*tabled 21 March 2002*)

Proceeds of Crime Bill 2002 and the Proceeds of Crime (Consequential Amendments and Transitional Provisions) Bill 2002—Interim report (*presented to the Temporary Chair of Committees, Senator Chapman, on 10 April 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 14 May 2002*)

Criminal Code Amendment (Espionage and Related Offences) Bill 2002—Interim report (*presented to the Deputy President on 26 April 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 14 May 2002*)

Proceeds of Crime Bill 2002 and the Proceeds of Crime (Consequential Amendments and Transitional Provisions) Bill 2002 (*presented to the Deputy President on 26 April 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 14 May 2002*)

Security Legislation Amendment (Terrorism) Bill 2002 [No. 2], Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism Bill 2002, Criminal Code Amendment (Suppression of Terrorist Bombings) Bill 2002, Border Security Legislation Amendment Bill 2002 and Telecommunications Interception Legislation Amendment Bill 2002—Interim report (*presented to the Deputy President on 3 May 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 14 May 2002*)

Australian Security Intelligence Organisation Legislation Amendment (Terrorism) Bill 2002—Interim report (*presented to the Deputy President on 3 May 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 14 May 2002*)

Security Legislation Amendment (Terrorism) Bill 2002 [No. 2], Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism Bill 2002, Criminal Code Amendment (Suppression of Terrorist Bombings) Bill 2002, Border Security Legislation Amendment Bill 2002 and Telecommunications Interception Legislation Amendment Bill 2002 (*presented to the Temporary Chair of Committees, Senator Knowles, on 8 May 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 14 May 2002*)

Criminal Code Amendment (Espionage and Related Offences) Bill 2002 (*presented to the Deputy President on 10 May 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 14 May 2002*)

Family Law Amendment (Child Protection Convention) Bill 2002 (*tabled 15 May 2002*)

Proceeds of Crime Bill 2002 and the Proceeds of Crime (Consequential Amendments and Transitional Provisions) Bill 2002—Erratum (*tabled 16 May 2002*)

Migration Legislation Amendment (Procedural Fairness) Bill 2002—Interim report (*presented to the Temporary Chair of Committees, Senator Cook, on 22 May 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 18 June 2002*)

Migration Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 1) 2002—Interim report (*presented to the Temporary Chair of Committees, Senator Cook, on 22 May 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 18 June 2002*)

Migration Legislation Amendment (Procedural Fairness) Bill 2002 (*presented to the Deputy President on 5 June 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 18 June 2002*)

Migration Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 1) 2002 (*presented to the Deputy President on 5 June 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 18 June 2002*)

Australian Protective Service Amendment Bill 2002 (*presented to the Deputy President on 13 June 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 18 June 2002*)

Australian Security Intelligence Organisation Legislation Amendment (Terrorism) Bill 2002 (*tabled 18 June 2002*)

Budget estimates 2002-03, June 2002 (*tabled 25 June 2002*)

Government amendments to the Proceeds of Crime Bill 2002 and the Proceeds of Crime (Consequential Amendments and Transitional Provisions) Bill 2002 (*presented to the President on 28 June 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 19 August 2002*)

Annual reports (No. 2 of 2002) (*tabled 18 September 2002*)

Statutory powers and functions of the Australian Law Reform Commission—Interim report (*tabled 12 December 2002*)

Statutory powers and functions of the Australian Law Reform Commission—Final report (*tabled 20 March 2003*)

Additional estimates 2002-03, March 2003 (*tabled 20 March 2003*)

Customs Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2002—Interim report (*tabled 25 March 2003*)

Customs Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2002 (*presented to the Temporary Chair of Committees, Senator Brandis, on 4 April 2003, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 13 May 2003*)

Annual reports (No. 1 of 2003) (*tabled 15 May 2003*)

Human Rights Commission Legislation Bill 2003 (*presented to the Temporary Chair of Committees, Senator Brandis, on 29 May 2003, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 16 June 2003*)

Human Rights Commission Legislation Bill 2003—Erratum (*presented to the Temporary Chair of Committees, Senator Collins, on 2 June 2003, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 16 June 2003*)

Budget estimates 2003-04, June 2003 (*tabled 19 June 2003*)

Provisions of the Migration Legislation Amendment (Sponsorship Measures) Bill 2003 (*tabled 12 August 2003*)

Provisions of the Family Law Amendment Bill 2003 (*tabled 13 August 2003*)

Australian Protective Service Amendment Bill 2003 (*tabled 18 August 2003*)

* Annual reports (No. 2 of 2003), September 2003 (*tabled 9 September 2003*)

Document presented

Security Legislation Amendment (Terrorism) Bill 2002 [No. 2], Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism Bill 2002, Criminal Code Amendment (Suppression of Terrorist Bombings) Bill 2002, Border Security Legislation Amendment Bill 2002 and Telecommunications Interception Legislation Amendment Bill 2002—Additional information (*tabled 27 March 2003*)

Legal and Constitutional References Committee

Members

Senator Bolkus (*Chair*), Senator Payne (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Greig, Kirk, Scullion and Stephens

Substitute members

Senator Ridgeway to replace Senator Greig for matters relating to the Indigenous Affairs portfolio

Senator Crossin to replace Senator Stephens for the committee's inquiry into progress towards national reconciliation

Senator Stott Despoja to replace Senator Greig for the committee's inquiry into the establishment of an Australian republic with an Australian Head of State

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Brandis, Brown, Carr, Chapman, Crossin, Eggleston, Evans, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Harradine, Harris, Humphries, Knowles, Lees, Lightfoot, Ludwig, Mackay, Mason, McGauran, Murphy, Nettle, Sherry, Stott Despoja, Tchen, Tierney and Watson

Senator Bartlett for matters relating to the Immigration and Multicultural Affairs portfolio

Current inquiries

Progress towards national reconciliation (*referred 27 August 2002; reporting date: 16 September 2003*)

The capacity of current legal aid and access to justice arrangements to meet the community need for legal assistance (*referred 17 June 2003; reporting date: 3 March 2004*)

Establishment of an Australian republic with an Australian Head of State (*referred 26 June 2003*)

* State Elections (One Vote, One Value) Bill 2001 [2002] (*referred 9 September 2003; reporting date: 30 October 2003*)

Reports presented

Matters not disposed of at the end of the 39th Parliament (*tabled 11 March 2002*)

Human Rights (Mandatory Sentencing for Property Offences) Bill 2000 (*tabled 12 March 2002*)

Inquiry into s. 46 and s. 50 of the *Trade Practices Act 1974* (*tabled 14 May 2002*)

Outsourcing of the Australian Customs Service's Information Technology (*tabled 16 May 2002*)

Migration zone excision: An examination of the Migration Legislation Amendment (Further Border Protection Measures) Bill 2002 and related matters (*tabled 21 October 2002*)

Australian Security Intelligence Organisation Legislation Amendment (Terrorism) Bill 2002 and related matters (*tabled 3 December 2002*)

Documents presented

Sexuality discrimination—Additional information (*tabled 27 March 2003*)

Library—Standing Committee*Members*

The President (*Chair*), Senators Kirk, Ludwig, Scullion, Tchen, Tierney and Wong

Medicare—Select Committee

(appointed 15 May 2003; terms of appointment varied: 26 June and 21 August 2003)

Members

Senator McLucas (*Chair*), Senator Barnett (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Allison, Forshaw, Humphries, Knowles, Lees and Stephens

Current inquiry

Health Legislation Amendment (Medicare and Private Health Insurance) Bill 2003 (referred 19 June 2003; reporting date: 30 October 2003)

Migration—Joint Standing Committee

(appointed 14 February 2002)

Members

Ms Gambaro (*Chair*), Senators Bartlett, Eggleston, Kirk and Tchen and Mr LDT Ferguson, Mrs Gash, Mrs Irwin, Mr Ripoll and Mr Randall

Current inquiry

Review of skilled migration (referred 18 June 2002)

Report presented

2003 Review of Migration Regulation 4.31B (presented to the Deputy President on 29 April 2003, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 13 May 2003)

Ministerial Discretion in Migration Matters—Select Committee

(appointed 19 June 2003)

Members

Senator Ludwig (*Chair*), Senator Santoro (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Bartlett, Humphries, Johnston, Sherry and Wong

National Capital and External Territories—Joint Standing Committee

(appointed 14 February 2002)

Members

Senator Lightfoot (*Chair*), Senator Crossin (*Deputy Chair*), The Deputy President and Chairman of Committees, the Deputy Speaker, Senators Lundy, Scullion and Stott Despoja and Ms Ellis, Mr Johnson, Mr Neville, Mr Snowdon and Mr CP Thompson

Reports presented

Norfolk Island electoral matters (tabled 26 August 2002)

Striking the right balance: Draft amendment 39, National Capital Plan (tabled 21 October 2002)

National Crime Authority—Joint Statutory Committee

(replaced by the Parliamentary Joint Committee on the Australian Crime Commission with effect from 1 January 2003)

Reports presented

Australian Crime Commission Establishment Bill 2002 (tabled 11 November 2002)

Examination of the annual report for 2000-01 of the National Crime Authority (*tabled 11 December 2002*)

Native Title and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Fund—Joint Statutory Committee

Members

Senator Johnston (*Chair*), Senator McLucas (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Crossin, Lees and Scullion and Mrs Hull, Mrs Ley, Mr McMullan, Mr Secker and Mr Snowdon

Reports presented

Examination of annual reports in fulfilment of the committee's duties pursuant to s.206(c) of the *Native Title Act 1993*—

2000-01 (*tabled 12 December 2002*)

2001-02 (*tabled 25 June 2003*)

Privileges—Standing Committee

Members

Senator Ray (*Chair*), Senators Evans, Johnston, Humphries, McGauran[†], Payne and Sherry

[†]Senator McGauran to be discharged from 22 December 2003 with Senator Knowles to be appointed in his place

Reports presented

102nd report—Counsel to the Senate (*tabled 26 June 2002*)

103rd report—Possible improper influence and penalty on a senator (*tabled 26 June 2002*)

104th report—Possible false or misleading evidence before the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Native Title and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Fund (*tabled 26 June 2002*)

105th report—Execution of search warrants in senators' offices – Senator Harris (*tabled 26 June 2002*)

106th report—Possible improper interference with a witness before the Senate Select Committee on a Certain Maritime Incident (*tabled 27 August 2002*)

107th report—Parliamentary privilege precedents, procedures and practices in the Australian Senate 1996-2002 (*tabled 27 August 2002*)

108th report—Person referred to in the Senate (Mr John Hyde Page) (*tabled 15 October 2002*)

109th report—Person referred to in the Senate (Mr Tony Kevin) (*tabled 22 October 2002*)

110th report—Persons referred to in the Senate (Dr Geoffrey Vaughan, Dr Peter Jonson, Professor Brian Anderson) (*tabled 10 December 2002*)

111th report—Persons referred to in the Senate (Mr Bob Moses, on behalf of board and management of National Stem Cell Centre) (*tabled 5 February 2003*)

112th report—Possible unauthorised disclosure of report of Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts Legislation Committee (*tabled 6 February 2003*)

113th report—Australian Press Council and Committee of Privileges: Exchange of correspondence (*tabled 25 June 2003*)

114th report—Execution of search warrants in senators' officers – Senator Harris: Matters arising from the 105th report of the Committee of Privileges (*tabled 20 August 2003*)

Document presented

Advices to the Senate Committee of Privileges from the Clerk of the Senate and Senior Counsel—March 1988 to April 2002 (*tabled 27 August 2002*)

Procedure—Standing Committee

Members

The Deputy President (*Chair*), the President, the Leader of the Government in the Senate, the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate and Senators Allison, Ian Campbell, Eggleston, Ferguson, Ludwig and Ray

Current inquiry

Recommendations in the Procedure Committee's first report of 2002 relating to standing order 74(5) (*referred 28 August 2002*)

Reports presented

First report of 2002—Adjournment debate; Unanswered questions on notice (*tabled 19 June 2002*)

Second report of 2002—Chairs and quorums in committees; Adjournment debate on Tuesdays (*tabled 18 November 2002*)

First report of 2003—Times of meeting on Tuesday; Senators breastfeeding infants; Deadline for receipt of bills; Presentation of the budget; Committee meetings during adjournment debate; Formal motions (*presented to the Temporary Chair of Committees, Senator Sandy Macdonald, on 17 April 2003, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 13 May 2003*)

Second report of 2003—Publication of questions on notice and answers: protection by parliamentary privilege (*tabled 21 August 2003*)

Public Accounts and Audit—Joint Statutory Committee

Members

Mr Charles (*Chairman*), Ms Plibersek (*Vice Chairman*), Senators Conroy, Lundy, Humphries, Murray, Scullion and Watson and Mr Ciobo, Mr Cobb, Mr Georgiou, Ms Grierson, Mr Griffin, Ms CF King, Mr PE King and Mr Somlyay

Current inquiry

Management and integrity of electronic information in the Commonwealth (*referred 23 October 2002*)

Reports presented

Report 388—Review of the accrual budget documentation (*tabled 19 June 2002*)

Report 389—Review of Auditor-General's reports 2000-01: Fourth quarter (*tabled 27 June 2002*)

Report 390—Review of Auditor-General's reports 2001-02: First, second and third quarters (*tabled 29 August 2002*)

Report 391—Review of independent auditing by registered company auditors (*tabled 18 September 2002*)

Report 392—Annual report 2001-02 (*tabled 14 November 2002*)

Report 390—Review of Auditor-General's reports 2001-02: First, second and third quarters—Erratum (*tabled 14 November 2002*)

Report 393—Review of Auditor-General's reports 2001-02: Fourth quarter (*tabled 3 March 2003*)

Report 394—Review of Australia's quarantine function (*tabled 5 March 2003*)

Report 395—Inquiry into the draft Financial Framework Legislation Amendment Bill (*tabled 20 August 2003*)

Documents presented

Executive minute responses to reports nos 373, 382, 383 and 385 (*tabled 14 November 2002*)

Executive minute responses to reports nos 374, 385, 388 and 389 (*tabled 24 June 2003*)

Public Works—Joint Statutory Committee

Members

Mrs Moylan (*Chairman*), Mr BPJ O'Connor (*Deputy Chairman*), Senators Colbeck, Ferguson and Forshaw and Mr Jenkins, Mr Lindsay, Mr Lloyd and Mr Ripoll

Reports presented

Sixty-fifth annual report, March 2002 (*tabled 15 May 2002*)

Common use infrastructure on Christmas Island (First report of 2002) (*tabled 27 August 2002*)

RAAF Base Williamtown redevelopment stage 1 and facilities for the airborne early warning and control aircraft (Second report of 2002) (*tabled 18 September 2002*)

Sixty-sixth annual report, March 2003 (*tabled 19 March 2003*)

Proposed fit-out of new leased premises for the Bureau of Meteorology, 700 Collins Street, Docklands, Victoria (*tabled 26 March 2003*)

Development of off-base housing for Defence at Adamstown, Newcastle, NSW (*tabled 14 May 2003*)

Fit-out of new leased premises for the Australian Customs Service at Sydney International Terminal, Sydney, NSW (*tabled 19 June 2003*)

Provision of facilities for the Australian Capital Territory Multi User Depot, HMAS Harman, ACT (*tabled 25 June 2003*)

Redevelopment of the Australian Institute of Sport, Bruce, Australian Capital Territory (Fifth report of 2003) (*tabled 20 August 2003*)

Provision of facilities for the collocation and re-equipping of the 1st Aviation Regiment at Robertson Barracks, Darwin, NT (Sixth report of 2003) (*tabled 20 August 2003*)

RAAF Base Tindal perimeter security fence, Katherine, Northern Territory (Seventh report of 2003) (*tabled 20 August 2003*)

Publications—Standing Committee

Members

Senator Colbeck (*Chair*), Senators Hutchins, Johnston, Kirk, Marshall, Moore and Scullion

Reports presented

1st report (*tabled 21 March 2002*)

2nd report (*tabled 29 August 2002*)

3rd report (*tabled 26 September 2002*)

- 4th report (tabled 23 October 2002)
 5th report (tabled 14 November 2002)
 6th report (tabled 12 December 2002)
 7th report (tabled 27 March 2003)
 8th report (tabled 15 May 2003)
 9th report (tabled 26 June 2003)
 10th report (tabled 21 August 2003)
-

Regulations and Ordinances—Legislative Scrutiny Standing Committee

Members

Senator Tchen (*Chairman*), Senators Bartlett, Marshall, Mason, Moore and Santoro

Current inquiry

Provisions of the Legislative Instruments Bill 2003 and the Legislative Instruments (Transitional Provisions and Consequential Amendments) Bill 2003 (*referred 13 August 2003; reporting date: 3 October 2003*)

Report presented

110th report—Annual report 2000-01 (*tabled 21 March 2002*)

Documents presented

Ministerial correspondence relating to the scrutiny of delegated legislation, March – June 2002 (*tabled 26 June 2002*)

Delegated legislation monitor—Regulations and disallowable instruments tabled in the Senate in 2002, dated February 2003 (*tabled 6 March 2003*)

Ministerial correspondence relating to the scrutiny of delegated legislation, June 2002 to February 2003 (*tabled 6 March 2003*)

Ministerial correspondence relating to the scrutiny of delegated legislation, March to June 2003 (*tabled 20 August 2003*)

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

Portfolios

Transport and Regional Services; Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Members

Senator Heffernan (*Chair*), Senator Buckland (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Cherry, Colbeck, Ferris and O'Brien

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Boswell, Brown, Carr, Chapman, Coonan, Eggleston, Evans, Faulkner, Ferguson, Harradine, Harris, Hutchins, Knowles, Lightfoot, Mason, Sandy Macdonald, Mackay, McGauran, McLucas, Murphy, Payne, Ray, Santoro, Stephens, Tchen, Tierney and Watson

Senator Greig for matters relating to the Fisheries portfolio

Senator Lees for matters relating to air safety

Senator Allison for matters relating to the Transport portfolio

Current inquiries

Administration of the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (*adopted 22 October 1999; readopted 13 March 2002; reporting date: last sitting day in 2003*)

Import risk assessment on New Zealand apples (*referred 2 November 2000; readopted 13 March 2002; reporting date: last sitting day in 2003*)

Administration of AusSAR in relation to the search for the *Margaret J* (referred 25 June 2001; readopted 13 March 2002; reporting date: last sitting day in 2003)

Provisions of the Aviation Transport Security Bill 2003 and the Aviation Transport Security (Consequential Amendments and Transitional Provisions) Bill 2003 (referred upon the introduction of the bill in the House of Representatives pursuant to the Selection of Bills Committee report no. 4, 26 March 2003; bill introduced 27 March 2003; reporting date: 16 September 2003)

The application and expenditure of funds by Australian Wool Innovation Ltd (adopted 26 May 2003)

Reports presented

Matters not disposed of at the end of the 39th Parliament (tabled 13 March 2002)

Annual reports (No. 1 of 2002) (tabled 21 March 2002)

Additional estimates 2001-02, March 2002 (tabled 21 March 2002)

Airports Amendment Bill 2002 (tabled 16 May 2002)

Administration by the Department of Transport and Regional Services of Australian Motor Vehicle Standards under the *Motor Vehicle Standards Act 1989* and Regulations (tabled 18 June 2002)

Budget estimates 2002-03, June 2002 (tabled 19 June 2002)

The introduction of quota management controls on Australian beef exports to the United States by the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (tabled 26 June 2002)

Administration of the Civil Aviation Safety Authority—Interim report (tabled 27 June 2002)

Proposed importation of fresh apple fruit from New Zealand—Interim report (tabled 27 June 2002)

Administration of AusSAR in relation to the search for the *Margaret J*—Interim report (tabled 27 June 2002)

Annual reports (No. 2 of 2002) (tabled 18 September 2002)

The Australian meat industry consultative structure and quota allocation—Interim report: Allocation of the US beef quota (tabled 24 September 2002)

Egg Industry Service Provision Bill 2002 and Egg Industry Service Provision (Transitional and Consequential Provisions) Bill 2002 (tabled 23 October 2002)

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 1) 2002 (tabled 12 November 2002)

The Australian meat industry consultative structure and quota allocation—Second report: Existing government advisory structures in the Australian meat industry (tabled 12 December 2002)

Transport Safety Investigation Bill 2002 (tabled 5 February 2003)

Additional estimates 2002-03, March 2003 (tabled 19 March 2003)

Annual reports (No. 1 of 2003), March 2003 (tabled 20 March 2003)

Dairy Industry Service Reform Bill 2003 and Primary Industries (Excise) Levies Amendment (Dairy) Bill 2003 (tabled 27 March 2003)

Wheat Marketing Amendment Bill 2002 (tabled 18 June 2003)

Budget estimates 2003-04, June 2003 (tabled 19 June 2003)

Civil Aviation Amendment Bill 2003 (tabled 24 June 2003)

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee

Members

Senator Ridgeway (*Chair*), Senator Heffernan (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Buckland, McGauran, O'Brien and Stephens

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Boswell, Brown, Carr, Chapman, Colbeck, Coonan, Crossin, Eggleston, Evans, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Harradine, Harris, Hutchins, Knowles, Lees, Lightfoot, Mackay, Mason, Sandy Macdonald, Murphy, Payne, Santoro, Tchen, Tierney and Watson

Senator Greig for matters relating to the Fisheries portfolio

Senator Allison for matters relating to the Transport portfolio

Current inquiries

Forestry plantations (*referred 27 June 2002; reporting date: 8 October 2003*)

Rural water resource usage (*referred 21 October 2002; reporting date: last sitting day in 2003*)

Scrutiny of Bills—Legislative Scrutiny Standing Committee

Members

Senator Crossin (*Chairman*), Senator Mason (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Barnett, Johnston, McLucas and Murray

Alert Digests presented

No. 1 of 2002 (presented to the President on 21 February 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); *tabled 11 March 2002*)

No. 2 of 2002 (*tabled 13 March 2002*)

No. 3 of 2002 (*tabled 20 March 2002*)

No. 4 of 2002 (*tabled 15 May 2002*)

No. 5 of 2002 (*tabled 19 June 2002*)

No. 6 of 2002 (*tabled 26 June 2002*)

No. 7 of 2002 (*tabled 21 August 2002*)

No. 8 of 2002 (*tabled 28 August 2002*)

No. 9 of 2002 (*tabled 18 September 2002*)

No. 10 of 2002 (*tabled 25 September 2002*)

No. 11 of 2002 (*tabled 16 October 2002*)

No. 12 of 2002 (*tabled 23 October 2002*)

No. 13 of 2002 (*tabled 13 November 2002*)

No. 14 of 2002 (*tabled 19 November 2002*)

No. 15 of 2002 (*tabled 4 December 2002*)

No. 16 of 2002 (*tabled 11 December 2002*)

No. 1 of 2003 (*tabled 5 February 2003*)

No. 2 of 2003 (*tabled 5 March 2003*)

No. 3 of 2003 (*tabled 19 March 2003*)

No. 4 of 2003 (*tabled 26 March 2003*)

No. 5 of 2003 (*tabled 14 June 2003*)

No. 6 of 2003 (*tabled 18 June 2003*)

No. 7 of 2003 (*tabled 25 June 2003*)

No. 8 of 2003 (*tabled 13 August 2003*)

No. 9 of 2003 (*tabled 20 August 2003*)

Reports presented

- No. 1 of 2002 (*presented to the President on 21 February 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 11 March 2002*)
 No. 2 of 2002 (*tabled 13 March 2002*)
 No. 3 of 2002 (*tabled 20 March 2002*)
 Matters not disposed of at the end of the 39th Parliament (*tabled 21 March 2002*)
 No. 4 of 2002 (*tabled 15 May 2002*)
 No. 5 of 2002 (*tabled 19 June 2002*)
 No. 6 of 2002: Application of absolute and strict liability offences in Commonwealth Legislation (*tabled 26 June 2002*)
 No. 7 of 2002 (*tabled 26 June 2002*)
 Work of the committee during the 39th Parliament, November 1998-October 2001 (*tabled 27 June 2002*)
 No. 8 of 2002 (*tabled 21 August 2002*)
 No. 9 of 2002 (*tabled 28 August 2002*)
 No. 10 of 2002 (*tabled 18 September 2002*)
 No. 11 of 2002 (*tabled 25 September 2002*)
 No. 12 of 2002 (*tabled 16 October 2002*)
 No. 13 of 2002 (*tabled 23 October 2002*)
 No. 14 of 2002 (*tabled 13 November 2002*)
 No. 15 of 2002 (*tabled 4 December 2002*)
 No. 16 of 2002 (*tabled 11 December 2002*)
 No. 1 of 2003 (*tabled 5 February 2003*)
 No. 2 of 2003 (*tabled 5 March 2003*)
 No. 3 of 2003 (*tabled 26 March 2003*)
 No. 4 of 2003 (*tabled 14 May 2003*)
 No. 5 of 2003 (*tabled 18 June 2003*)
 No. 6 of 2003 (*tabled 25 June 2003*)
 No. 7 of 2003 (*tabled 13 August 2003*)
 No. 8 of 2003 (*tabled 20 August 2003*)
-

Selection of Bills—Standing Committee

Members

The Government Whip (*Chair*), the Opposition Whip, the Australian Democrats Whip, the National Party of Australia Whip and Senators Buckland, Ian Campbell, Eggleston and Ludwig

Reports presented

- Report no. 1 of 2002 (*presented 13 March 2002*)
 Report no. 2 of 2002 (*presented 20 March 2002*)
 Report no. 3 of 2002 (*presented 15 May 2002*)
 Report no. 4 of 2002 (*presented 19 June 2002*)
 Report no. 5 of 2002 (*presented 26 June 2002*)
 Report no. 6 of 2002 (*presented 21 August 2002*)
 Report no. 7 of 2002 (*presented 28 August 2002*)
 Report no. 8 of 2002 (*presented 18 September 2002*)
 Report no. 9 of 2002 (*presented 25 September 2002*)
 Report no. 10 of 2002 (*presented 16 October 2002*)

Report no. 11 of 2002 (*presented 23 October 2002*)
 Report no. 12 of 2002 (*presented 13 November 2002*)
 Report no. 13 of 2002 (*presented 4 December 2002*)
 Report no. 14 of 2002 (*presented 11 December 2002*)
 Report no. 1 of 2003 (*presented 5 February 2003*)
 Report no. 2 of 2003 (*presented 5 March 2003*)
 Report no. 3 of 2003 (*presented 19 March 2003*)
 Report no. 4 of 2003 (*presented 26 March 2003*)
 Report no. 5 of 2003 (*presented 14 May 2003*)
 Report no. 6 of 2003 (*presented 18 June 2003*)
 Report no. 7 of 2003 (*presented 25 June 2003*)
 Report no. 8 of 2003 (*presented 13 August 2003*)
 Report no. 9 of 2003 (*presented 20 August 2003*)

Senators' Interests—Standing Committee

Members

Senator Denman (*Chair*), Senator Lightfoot (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Allison, Forshaw, Humphries, McGauran, Webber and Wong

Notifications of alterations of interests

Register of senators' interests incorporating declarations of interests and notifications of alterations of interests lodged between 26 June 2001 and 6 December 2001 (*presented to the President on 21 December 2001, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 12 February 2002*)

Register of senators' interests incorporating declarations of interests and notifications of alterations of interests lodged between 7 December 2001 and 24 June 2002 (*tabled 26 June 2002*)

Register of senators' interests incorporating current statements of interests, including new statements of interests, and notifications of alterations of interests lodged between 25 June 2002 and 5 December 2002 [2 vols] (*tabled 10 December 2002*)

Register of senators' interests incorporating statements of interests and notifications of alterations of interests lodged between 6 December 2002 and 19 June 2003 (*tabled 24 June 2003*)

Reports presented

Report 1/2002: Annual report 2001 (*presented to the President on 28 March 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 14 May 2002*)

Report 2/2002: Proposed changes to resolutions relating to declarations of senators' interests and gifts to the Senate and the Parliament (*tabled 26 June 2002*)

Report 1/2003: Annual report 2002 (*tabled 27 March 2003*)

Superannuation—Select Committee

(*appointed 14 March 2002*)

Members

Senator Watson (*Chair*), Senator Sherry (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Buckland, Chapman, Cherry, Lightfoot and Wong

Current inquiry

Draft Superannuation Industry (Supervision) Amendment Regulations 2003 and draft Retirement Savings Accounts Amendment Regulations 2003 (*referred 17 June 2003; reporting date: 10 September 2003*)

Reports presented

Taxation Laws Amendment (Superannuation) Bill (No. 2) 2002 and Superannuation Guarantee Charge Amendment Bill 2002 (*tabled 25 June 2002*)

Taxation treatment of overseas superannuation transfers (*presented to the President on 25 July 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 19 August 2002*)

Superannuation (Government Co-contribution for Low Income Earners) Bill 2002 and Superannuation Legislation Amendment Bill 2002 (*tabled 26 September 2002*)

Superannuation Legislation Amendment (Choice of Superannuation Funds) Bill 2002 (*tabled 12 November 2002*)

Superannuation and standards of living in retirement: The adequacy of the tax arrangements for superannuation and related policy (*tabled 12 December 2002*)

Superannuation Industry (Supervision) Amendment Bill 2002 and Superannuation (Financial Assistance Funding) Levy Amendment Bill 2002 (*tabled 19 March 2003*)

Planning for retirement (*presented to the President on 29 July 2003, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 11 August 2003*)

Superannuation and Financial Services—Select Committee

(*appointed 22 September 1999 with effect on and from 11 October 1999; re-appointed as the Superannuation—Select Committee, see above*)

Report presented

Early access to superannuation benefits (*presented to the Temporary Chair of Committees, Senator Hogg, on 31 January 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 12 February 2002*)

Documents presented

Early access to superannuation benefits—Discussion paper (*presented to the Temporary Chair of Committees, Senator Hogg, on 31 January 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 12 February 2002*)

Investing superannuation funds in rural and regional Australia—Issues paper (*presented to the Deputy President on 7 February 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 12 February 2002*)

Treaties—Joint Standing Committee

(*appointed 14 February 2002*)

Members

Ms JI Bishop (*Chair*), Mr Wilkie (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Bartlett, Kirk, Marshall, Mason, Santoro, Stephens and Tchen and Mr Adams, Mr Bartlett, Mr Ciobo, Mr Evans, Mr Hunt, Mr PE King and Mr Scott

Current inquiry

Proposed agreement relating to US nationals and the International Criminal Court (*referred 2 December 2002*)

Reports presented

Report 44—Four nuclear safeguards treaties tabled in August 2001 (*tabled 15 May 2002*)

Report 45—The Statute of the International Criminal Court (*tabled 15 May 2002*)

- Report 46—Treaties tabled 12 March 2002 (*tabled 24 June 2002*)
Statement on the 46th report, dated 26 June 2002 (*tabled 26 June 2002*)
Report 47—Treaties tabled on 18 and 25 June 2002 (*tabled 26 August 2002*)
Report 48—Treaties tabled in August and September 2002 (*tabled 21 October 2002*)
Report 49—The Timor Sea Treaty (*tabled 12 November 2002*)
Report 50—Treaties tabled 15 October 2002 (*tabled 10 December 2002*)
Report 51—Treaties tabled on 12 November and 3 December 2002 (*tabled 19 March 2003*)
Report 52—Treaties tabled in March 2003 (*tabled 26 June 2003*)
Report 53—Treaties tabled in May and June 2003 (*tabled 20 August 2003*)

SENATE APPOINTMENTS TO STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

Advisory Council on Australian Archives

Senator Faulkner—(*appointed 27 June 2002 for a period of 3 years*).

Council of the National Library of Australia

Senator Tierney (*appointed 14 February 2002 for a period of 3 years*).

Parliamentary Retiring Allowances Trust

Senators Cook and Watson (*appointed 13 May 1998 and 10 February 1994, respectively*).

HARRY EVANS
Clerk of the Senate

MINISTERIAL REPRESENTATION

Minister	Representing
Senator the Honourable Robert Hill <i>Minister for Defence</i> <i>Leader of the Government in the Senate</i>	Prime Minister Minister for Trade Minister for Foreign Affairs Minister for the Environment and Heritage Minister for Veterans' Affairs
Senator the Honourable Richard Alston <i>Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts</i> <i>Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate</i>	Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations Minister for Education, Science and Training Minister for Science Minister for Employment Services
Senator the Honourable Nicholas Minchin (<u>Nick</u>) <i>Minister for Finance and Administration</i>	Treasurer Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources
Senator the Honourable Amanda Vanstone <i>Minister for Family and Community Services</i> <i>Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for the Status of Women</i>	Minister for Children and Youth Affairs
Senator the Honourable Kay Patterson <i>Minister for Health and Ageing</i>	Minister for Ageing
Senator the Honourable Christopher Ellison (<u>Chris</u>) <i>Minister for Justice and Customs</i>	Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs Attorney-General Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs
Senator the Honourable Ian Macdonald <i>Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation</i>	Minister for Transport and Regional Services Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Minister for Regional Services, Territories and Local Government
Senator the Honourable Charles Kemp (<u>Rod</u>) <i>Minister for the Arts and Sport</i>	
Senator the Honourable Eric Abetz <i>Special Minister of State</i>	Minister for Small Business and Tourism
Senator the Honourable Helen Coonan <i>Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer</i>	
Parliamentary Secretaries	
Senator the Honourable Ian Campbell <i>Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer</i> <i>Manager of Government Business in the Senate</i>	
Senator the Honourable Judith Troeth <i>Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry</i>	
Senator the Honourable Ronald Boswell (<u>Ron</u>) <i>Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Transport and Regional Services</i>	

In those instances where Senators prefer to be known by other than their first name, the preferred name is underlined.

A GUIDE TO THE DAILY NOTICE PAPER

The *Notice Paper* is issued each sitting day and contains details of current business before the Senate. Its structure is based on four main types of business, as follows:

Matters of privilege take precedence over all other business and are listed at the beginning of the *Notice Paper* when they arise. They consist of notices of motion which the President has determined warrant such precedence and any orders relating to uncompleted debates on such motions.

Business of the Senate has precedence over government and general business for the day on which it is listed. It includes disallowance motions, orders of the day for the presentation of committee reports, motions to refer matters to standing committees, motions for leave of absence for a senator and motions concerning the qualification of a senator.

Government business is business initiated by a minister. It takes precedence over general business except for a period of 2½ hours each week set aside on Thursdays for general business.

General business is all other business initiated by senators who are not ministers. It takes precedence over government business only as described above.

Within each of these categories, business consists of notices of motion and orders of the day:

Notices of motion are statements of intention that senators intend to move particular motions on the days indicated. They are entered on the *Notice Paper* in the order given and may be given jointly by two or more senators. Notices of motion are usually considered before orders of the day.

Orders of the day are items of business which the Senate has ordered to be considered on particular days, usually arising from adjourned debates on matters (including legislation) or requirements to present committee reports.

On days other than Thursdays, the *Notice Paper* records in full current items of business of the Senate and government business, but includes only new items of general business from the previous sitting day. On Thursdays, business relating to the consideration of government documents, committee reports and government responses to committee reports is also published.

Other sections in the *Notice Paper* are as follows:

Orders of the day relating to committee reports and government responses follows government business and lists orders of the day for adjourned debates on motions to consider or adopt committee reports and government responses which have been presented during the week. These orders may be considered for one hour on Thursdays at the conclusion of general business. New items appear in the following day's *Notice Paper*. The section is printed in full on Thursdays.

Orders of the day relating to government documents appears in general business and lists orders of the day for adjourned debates on motions to take note of government documents. Such orders arise from consideration of the government documents presented on a particular day and include consideration of any documents not reached on the day. They are also listed for consideration for one hour on Thursdays during the consideration of general business. New items appear in the following day's *Notice Paper*. The section is printed in full on Thursdays.

Business for future consideration lists any notice of motion or order of the day to be considered on a specific day in the future; for example, a committee report ordered to be presented on a specific date, or a notice of motion given for a day other than the next day of sitting.

Bills referred to committees lists all bills or provisions of bills currently being considered by committees.

Questions on notice includes the text of new questions on notice and lists the numbers of unanswered questions.

Orders of the Senate includes orders of short-term duration such as orders for production of documents and those relating to days of sitting for a period of sittings.

Contingent notices of motion are statements of intention by senators that, contingent on a specified occurrence, they may move a motion, usually to suspend standing orders. They are grouped by subject.

Temporary chairs of committees: is a daily list of all senators appointed to take the chair in the absence of the President or Deputy President.

Categories of committees: is a daily list, categorised by type, of Senate and joint committees. Details of each committee appear in the committee section.

Committees: a daily list of Senate and joint committees, including membership, current inquiries and reports presented on or since the previous sitting day.

Senate appointments to statutory authorities lists the statutory authorities on which the Senate is represented and details of representation.

Ministerial representation lists Senate ministers and the portfolios they represent.

A GUIDE TO THE FULL NOTICE PAPER

On the first day of each period of sittings a full *Notice Paper* is printed listing all outstanding business before the Senate, including the full text of all unresolved notices of motion and unanswered questions on notice. This edition is a complete reference to unresolved business from earlier in the session and is useful to keep. All business before the Senate is published daily in the full electronic version of the *Notice Paper*, available on ParlInfo and on the parliament's Internet site.

Inquiries concerning the *Notice Paper* or business listed in it may be directed to the Senate Table Office on (02) 6277 3015.

