

2002-03

THE PARLIAMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

THE SENATE

NOTICE PAPER

No. 101

TUESDAY, 7 OCTOBER 2003

The Senate meets at 12.30 pm

Contents

Business of the Senate	
Notices of Motion.....	2
Orders of the Day	2
Government Business	
Notice 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.....	6
Orders of the Day	16
Business for Future Consideration.....	26
Bills Referred to Committees	37
Bills Discharged, Laid Aside or Negatived.....	39
Questions on Notice	40
Orders of the Senate	349
Contingent Notices of Motion.....	370
Temporary Chairs of Committees	374
Categories of Committees.....	374
Committees	375
Senate Appointments to Statutory Authorities	403
Ministerial Representation	405
A Guide to the Daily Notice Paper	406
A Guide to the Full Notice Paper	407

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

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

Notices 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.

Nine 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.*

Orders 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.*)

- 2 **Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee**

Report to be presented on the Australian Protective Service Amendment Bill 2003. (*Referred pursuant to Selection of Bills Committee report.*)

- 3 **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.*)

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Notice of Motion

Notice given 17 September 2003

- 1 **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 following bills, allowing them to be considered during this period of sittings:

Crimes (Overseas) Amendment Bill 2003

Energy Grants (Cleaner Fuels) Scheme Bill 2003 and the Energy Grants (Cleaner Fuels) Scheme (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2003

Family Assistance Legislation Amendment (Extension of Time Limits) Bill 2003

International Tax Agreements Amendment Bill 2003

Taxation Laws Amendment Bill (No. 8) 2003

Taxation Laws Amendment (Superannuation Contributions Splitting) Bill 2003.

Orders of the Day

- 1 **Superannuation (Surcharge Rate Reduction) Amendment Bill 2003**
Superannuation (Government Co-contribution for Low Income Earners) Bill 2003
Superannuation (Government Co-contribution for Low Income Earners) (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2003
In committee—Superannuation (Government Co-contribution for Low Income Earners) Bill 2003 (18 September 2003)—(*Superannuation (Surcharge Rate Reduction) Amendment Bill 2003 restored pursuant to resolution of 10 September 2003*).
- 2 **Sex Discrimination Amendment (Pregnancy and Work) Bill 2002**
Consideration in committee of the whole of message no. 388 from the House of Representatives (11 September 2003).
- 3 **Communications Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3) 2003**—(*Minister for Defence, Senator Hill*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Buckland, 21 August*
- 4 **Family and Community Services (Closure of Student Financial Supplement Scheme) Bill 2003**
Student Assistance Amendment Bill 2003—(*Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts, Senator Alston*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Crossin, 15 September 2003*).
- 5 **Taxation Laws Amendment Bill (No. 7) 2003**—(*Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer (Senator Coonan), in continuation, 11 September 2003*).
- 6 **Australian Protective Service Amendment Bill 2003**—(*Senate bill*)—(*Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (26 June 2003).
- 7 **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*). 2003).
- 8 **Trade Practices Amendment (Personal Injuries and Death) Bill 2003**—(*Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation, Senator Ian Macdonald*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (25 June 2003).
- 9 **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*).

- 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 **Financial Sector Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2002**—(*Minister for Health and Ageing, Senator Patterson*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*2 December 2002*).
- 12 **Australian Human Rights Commission Legislation Bill 2003**—(*Special Minister of State, Senator Abetz*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Mackay, 11 August 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 **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*).
- 15 **Migration Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 1) 2002**—(*Minister for Justice and Customs, Senator Ellison*)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Buckland, 5 February 2003*).
- 16 **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*).
- 17 **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*).
- 18 **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*).
- 19 **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*).
- 20 **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).

21 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*).

22 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 Committee Reports and Government Responses

***1 Finance and Public Administration References Committee—Report— Recruitment and training in the Australian Public Service**

Adjourned debate on the motion of the chair of the committee (Senator Forshaw)—That the Senate take note of the report (*adjourned, Senator Moore, 18 September 2003*).

***2 Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee—Report— Aspects of the Veterans’ Entitlements Act 1986 and the Military Compensation Scheme**

Adjourned debate on the motion of the chair of the committee (Senator Sandy Macdonald)—That the Senate take note of the report (*Senator Bishop, in continuation, 18 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 foetuses;
- (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 spend 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 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 8 September 2003

569 **Senator Brown:** To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes the current impasse in negotiations between Papua New Guinea and Australia regarding Australian aid to Papua New Guinea;
- (b) recognises the importance of ensuring that Australia's aid to Papua New Guinea is appropriately allocated and administered, and that it is subject to proper accountability mechanisms;
- (c) notes that there is widespread concern in Papua New Guinea regarding evidence that 80 per cent of Australian aid is ultimately paid to Australian consulting companies, construction companies and individuals earning the aid the name 'Boomerang aid'; and
- (d) calls on the Australian Government:
 - (i) to ensure that there is a review of Australia's aid to Papua New Guinea, incorporating an assessment of Australian policies regarding the allocation of such aid, as well as any issues associated with its administration by Papua New Guinea, and
 - (ii) to ensure a bilateral relationship with Papua New Guinea founded upon respect for Papua New Guinea's interests and the democratic rights of its people, and to guard against any form of undue pressure in its dealings with Papua New Guinea.

Notice of motion altered on 10 September 2003 pursuant to standing order 77.

Notice given 10 September 2003

575 **Leader of the Opposition in the Senate (Senator Faulkner):** To move—That the Senate notes with grave concern:

- (a) the leaking of an Office of National Assessment (ONA) document dated December 2002 and classified top-secret AUSTEO;

- (b) that material from the ONA classified report was published in an article by Mr Andrew Bolt in the *Herald Sun* of 23 June 2003;
- (c) the failure to ensure immediate and thorough investigation of the circumstances surrounding this unprecedented leak; and
- (d) the failure of the Prime Minister (Mr Howard) and other ministers to fully explain their involvement in this matter.

Notice given 16 September 2003

601 Senator Hutchins: To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes:
 - (i) the British Health Secretary's recent decision to provide compensation to all Britons who contracted Hepatitis C as a result of receiving contaminated blood products from the National Health Service, and
 - (ii) that individuals are expected to receive between £20 000 and £45 000;
- (b) commends the decision of the British Labour Government to provide payments to people who contracted Hepatitis C through no fault of their own;
- (c) notes that many Australians who have contracted Hepatitis C in the same manner are yet to be compensated; and
- (d) encourages the Australian Government to take similar action and compensate Australians who have had the misfortune of suffering the health problems associated with Hepatitis C.

602 Senator Nettle: To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes that:
 - (i) like anti-personnel landmines, anti-vehicle mines kill and maim long after conflicts have ended,
 - (ii) like anti-personnel landmines, anti-vehicle mines are indiscriminate and kill both civilians and military personnel in violation of the Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol 1) of 8 June 1977,
 - (iii) anti-vehicle mines can increase the cost and slow the delivery of humanitarian aid,
 - (iv) there is no publicly available evidence that the Australian Defence Forces have gained any direct military advantage from the use of anti-vehicle mines since the Korean War,
 - (v) the only Australian soldier killed in the 2001 to 2002 deployment to Afghanistan, SAS Sergeant Andrew Russell, was the victim of an anti-vehicle mine, and
 - (vi) of the four Australian peace-keepers killed since 1966 by weapons, two have been killed by landmines while driving in vehicles; and
- (b) calls on the Federal Government to:
 - (i) recognise anti-vehicle mines that can be set off by contact with a person as anti-personnel landmines, and therefore banned under the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and their Destruction (Mine Ban Treaty),

- (ii) support a ban on anti-vehicle mines with anti-handling devices, which can be set off if a mine is disturbed, and
- (iii) work with like-minded countries towards a global ban on the production, stockpiling, transfer and use of anti-vehicle mines.

604 **Senator Brown:** To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes reports in the British press that the United States of America and Britain have decided to delay indefinitely the publication of a full report into Iraq's weapons of mass destruction (WMD) because the efforts of the Iraq survey group, an Anglo-American team of 1 400 scientists, have so far failed in its task to locate WMDs; and
- (b) calls on the Prime Minister (Mr Howard) to apologise to the Australian people for misleading them on the reasons for going to war with Iraq.

Notice given 17 September 2003

607 **Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Bartlett) and Senator Stott Despoja:** To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes:
 - (i) its previous motion calling on the Australian Government to support a moratorium on the production, transfer and use of cluster munitions and to guarantee that Australian forces will not use, or be involved in the use of, these cruel and indiscriminate weapons,
 - (ii) that the effect of such explosive remnants of war on communities is similar to that of anti-personnel landmines, in that they kill and injure indiscriminately and have significant negative impacts on social and economic reconstruction post-conflict,
 - (iii) that the recent conflict in Iraq has highlighted the negative impacts of explosive remnants of war, especially those that result from the use of cluster munitions with high failure rates, with UNICEF reporting on 17 July 2003 that more than 1 000 Iraqi children had been injured by explosive remnants of war, and
 - (iv) that Landmine Action, in its report, *Explosive remnants of war: A global survey*, found that at least 82 countries are affected by explosive remnants of war and that casualties were reported in 59 countries between January 2001 and June 2002; and
- (b) calls on the Australian Government to support a Protocol to the 'Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects' to cover explosive remnants of war and containing the following elements:
 - (i) that the parties to any conflict promptly clean up, or arrange for clearance of, all unexploded ordnance, bearing full responsibility for the munitions that they have generated where that can be determined,
 - (ii) include in agreements to terminate hostilities, peace negotiations and other relevant military technical agreements, provisions allocating responsibility, standards and procedures for signing off land as cleared of unexploded ordnance,
 - (iii) parties to the conflict are to inform demining and/or unexploded ordnance clearance agencies of where munitions strikes have

- occurred and to provide technical data on all munitions used, to enable the unexploded munitions to be rendered safe or destroyed,
- (iv) parties to the conflict are to provide appropriate information, including pictures and warnings to civilians, about the dangers of unexploded ordnance, both during and after the conflict,
 - (v) a prohibition on the use of weapons with large amounts of submunitions in or near concentrations of civilians,
 - (vi) that all munitions have high quality fuses and detonation systems to ensure explosion on impact or self-destruction within seconds of impact, or that render munitions safe if they fail to detonate,
 - (vii) a moratorium on the manufacture, transfer and use of munitions with submunitions until such munitions can be demonstrated to have failure rates that are no higher than other munitions that do not cause large amounts of unexploded ordnance (which typically generate less than 1 per cent live duds), and
 - (viii) the compilation of a list of banned submunitions that have already been demonstrated to generate large humanitarian problems in places where they have been used and based on experience in the field, this list to include the BLU 26 (US), RBL 755 (UK), BLU 97 (US), Multiple Launch Rocket System M77 submunition (US), BL755 (UK), Mk 118 'Rockeye' (US), M42 and M46 Dual Purpose Improved Conventional Munition (DPICM) submunitions (US) and the Mk 6/7 'Rockeye' (US).

Notice given 18 September 2003

*612 **Senator Brown:** To move—That the Senate—

- (a) notes:
 - (i) the claims by the Prime Minister (Mr Howard) about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program, in the lead up to the war with that country, have proven false, and
 - (ii) that the Prime Minister failed to adequately inform the Australian public on intelligence agency warnings that a war with Iraq would increase the likelihood of terrorist activity; and
- (b) censures the Prime Minister for misleading the country in his determination to join the President of the United States of America, Mr G.W. Bush, in the war on Iraq.

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*).
- 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*).
- 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*).

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*).

67 Regional Australia

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator O'Brien—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 (*Senator Colbeck, in continuation, 11 September 2003*).

***68 Financial Management and Accountability (Anti-Restrictive Software Practices) Amendment Bill 2003—(Senate bill)—(Senator Greig)**

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*Senator Greig, in continuation, 18 September 2003*).

***69 Health—Medicare—Bulk billing**

That the Senate—

- (a) notes, with grave concern, the crisis in Australia's health system, including:
 - (i) bulk billing rates falling by more than 12 per cent since 1996,
 - (ii) 10 million fewer services being bulk-billed each year by general practitioners than in 1996,
 - (iii) the 59 per cent rise since 1996 in the average amount patients are required to pay to see a general practitioner (GP),
 - (iv) the largely unaddressed GP workforce shortage, which government policies have exacerbated,
 - (v) the unaddressed shortages in nurses, dentists, radiographers and other vitally-needed health professionals,
 - (vi) emergency departments in public hospitals being strained by the increasing numbers of patients who could have been attended to by a GP, and
 - (vii) frail aged people being accommodated in acute hospital beds because there is nowhere else for them to go; and
- (b) calls on the Government to respond to community concerns about its health policies, as evidenced by tens of thousands of petitions, by:
 - (i) addressing the health crisis in co-operation with the states,
 - (ii) strengthening Medicare by taking steps to ensure universal access to bulk-billing, and
 - (iii) ensuring that enough GPs, nurses, dentists, radiographers and other vitally-needed health professionals are trained and retained in the health system—(*Senator Barnett, in continuation, 18 September 2003*).

BUSINESS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION

Next day of sitting (8 October 2003)

Business of the Senate—Notice of Motion

Notice given 15 September 2003

- 1 **Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Bartlett):** To move—That the Fisheries Management Amendment Regulations 2003 (No. 3), as contained in Statutory Rules 2003 No. 112 and made under the *Fisheries Management Act 1991*, be disallowed.

Twelve 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 **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.

3 **Legal and Constitutional References Committee**

Report to be presented on progress towards national reconciliation.

General Business—Notices of Motion

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 17 September 2003

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

(a) notes:

- (i) the collapse of the World Trade Organization talks in Cancun, Mexico,
 - (ii) that agricultural subsidies are a crucial issue for Australian farmers, and
 - (iii) that agricultural subsidies can only be discussed in multilateral trade negotiations; and
- (b) calls on the Government to publicly explain to Australian farmers that agricultural subsidies in the United States of America (US) cannot be on the table in the US-Australia free trade agreement.

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

(a) notes:

- (i) that Australia is one of the most open markets for foreign television programming, 68.7 per cent of new airtime hours being of foreign origin,

- (ii) that United States of America (US) films take 83 per cent of annual Australian box office takings, and
 - (iii) the experience of New Zealand which now has one of the lowest percentages of local content, at 24 per cent, as a result of excessive liberalisation of its cultural industries; and
- (b) calls on the Government to:
- (i) ensure that any free trade agreement (FTA) between Australia and the US classifies Australian cultural products as technologically neutral, assuring that these will not fall under the category of 'e-commerce', and
 - (ii) protect and strengthen existing support mechanisms for Australian cultural industries by:
 - (A) removing the regulations restrict the number of foreign cast and crew per production from any FTA negotiations, and
 - (B) removing local content quota regulations, and the Government's ability to increase the quota in the future, from any FTA negotiations.

On 9 October 2003

Business of the Senate—Notice of Motion

Notice given 15 September 2003

- 1 **Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Bartlett):** To move—That clause 4(3) of the Housing Assistance (Form of Agreement) Determination 2003, made under section 5 of the *Housing Assistance Act 1996*, be disallowed.

Twelve sitting days remain for resolving.**

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

On 13 October 2003

Business of the Senate—Orders 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.*)
- 2 **Employment, Workplace Relations and Education Legislation Committee**
Report to be presented on the Workplace Relations Amendment (Improved Remedies for Unprotected Action) Bill 2002. (*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*).

- 3 **Workplace Relations Amendment (Improved Remedies for Unprotected Action) Bill 2002**—*(Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell)*

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Mackay, 11 September 2003*).

On 14 October 2003

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

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

Report to be presented on environmental regulation of the Ranger, Jabiluka, Beverley and Honeymoon uranium operations.

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—Orders 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.

- 2 **Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee**

Report to be presented on an examination of the Government's foreign and trade policy strategy.

On 16 October 2003

Business of the Senate—Orders 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.*)

- 2 **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.

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 Economics Legislation Committee

Report to be presented on the provisions of the Energy Grants (Cleaner Fuels) Scheme Bill 2003 and the Energy Grants (Cleaner Fuels) Scheme (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2003. (*Referred pursuant to Selection of Bills Committee report.*)

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*).

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*).

Seven sitting days after today (27 October 2003)

Business of the Senate—Notice of Motion

Notice given 16 September 2003

1 Senator Allison: To move—That the Civil Aviation Amendment Regulations 2003 (No. 5), as contained in Statutory Rules 2003 No. 201 and made under the *Civil Aviation Act 1988*, 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 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.*)

Government Business—Order of the Day

- 1 **Fuel Quality Standards Amendment Bill 2003**—(*Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*adjourned, Senator Crossin, 16 September 2003*).

On 30 October 2003

Business of the Senate—Orders of the Day

- 1 **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.*)

- 2 **Medicare—Select Committee**

Report to be presented.

- 3 **Medicare—Select Committee**

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

- 4 **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 the 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—Orders of the Day

- 1 **Ministerial Discretion in Migration Matters—Select Committee**

Report to be presented.

2 Economics Legislation Committee

Report to be presented on the provisions of the International Tax Agreements Amendment Bill 2003. (*Referred pursuant to Selection of Bills Committee report.*)

3 Economics Legislation Committee

Report to be presented on the provisions of the Taxation Laws Amendment (Superannuation Contributions Splitting) Bill 2003. (*Referred pursuant to Selection of Bills Committee report.*)

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 7 November 2003

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

1 Employment, Workplace Relations and Education References Committee

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

On the first day in the next period of sittings (24 November 2003)

Government Business—Orders of the Day

1 International Tax Agreements Amendment Bill 2003—(*Minister for Forestry and Conservation, Senator Ian Macdonald*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*17 September 2003*).

2 Family Assistance Legislation Amendment (Extension of Time Limits) Bill 2003—(*Minister for Forestry and Conservation, Senator Ian Macdonald*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*17 September 2003*).

***3 Crimes (Overseas) Amendment Bill 2003**—(*Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*18 September 2003*).

***4 Taxation Laws Amendment Bill (No. 8) 2003**—(*Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*18 September 2003*).

***5 Taxation Laws Amendment (Superannuation Contributions Splitting) Bill 2003**—(*Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*18 September 2003*).

***6 Energy Grants (Cleaner Fuels) Scheme Bill 2003**

Energy Grants (Cleaner Fuels) Scheme (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2003—(*Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell*)

Second reading—Adjourned debate (*18 September 2003*).

Twelve sitting days after today (25 November 2003)

Business of the Senate—Notice of Motion

Notice given 16 September 2003

- 1 **Chairman of the Standing Committee on Regulations and Ordinances (Senator Tchen):** To move—That the Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Amendment Regulations 2003 (No. 1), as contained in Statutory Rules 2003 No. 115 and made under the *Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act 1977*, 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.*

Thirteen sitting days after today (26 November 2003)

Business of the Senate—Notice of Motion

Notice given 17 September 2003

- 1 **Chairman of the Standing Committee on Regulations and Ordinances (Senator Tchen):** To move—That the Medical Indemnity Subsidy Scheme 2003, made under subsection 43(1) of the *Medical Indemnity Act 2002*, be disallowed.

Fourteen sitting days remain for resolving.**

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

Fourteen sitting days after today (27 November 2003)

Business of the Senate—Notice of Motion

Notice given 18 September 2003

- *1 **Chairman of the Standing Committee on Regulations and Ordinances (Senator Tchen):** To move—That the Criminal Code Amendment Regulations 2003 (No. 9), as contained in Statutory Rules 2003 No. 184 and made under the *Criminal Code Act 1995*, be disallowed.

Fifteen sitting days remain for resolving.**

- *2 **Chairman of the Standing Committee on Regulations and Ordinances (Senator Tchen):** To move—That Determination No. 4 of 2003—Reporting Standards for Superannuation Entities, made under paragraph 13(1)(a) of the *Financial Sector (Collection of Data) Act 2001*, be disallowed.

Fifteen sitting days remain for resolving.**

- *3 **Chairman of the Standing Committee on Regulations and Ordinances (Senator Tchen):** To move—That the Electoral and Referendum Amendment Regulations 2003 (No. 1), as contained in Statutory Rules 2003 No. 188 and made under the *Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918*, be disallowed.

Fifteen sitting days remain for resolving.**

- *4 **Chairman of the Standing Committee on Regulations and Ordinances (Senator Tchen):** To move—That the Fishing Levy Amendment Regulations

2003 (No. 1), as contained in Statutory Rules 2003 No. 134 and made under the *Fisheries Management Act 1991* and the *Fishing Levy Act 1991*, be disallowed.

Fifteen sitting days remain for resolving.**

- *5 **Chairman of the Standing Committee on Regulations and Ordinances (Senator Tchen):** To move—That the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Amendment Regulations 2003 (No. 2), as contained in Statutory Rules 2003 No. 200 and made under the *Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Act 1975*, be disallowed.

Fifteen sitting days remain for resolving.**

- *6 **Chairman of the Standing Committee on Regulations and Ordinances (Senator Tchen):** To move—That the Marriage Amendment Regulations 2003 (No. 2), as contained in Statutory Rules 2003 No. 198 and made under the *Marriage Act 1961*, be disallowed.

Fifteen sitting days remain for resolving.**

- *7 **Chairman of the Standing Committee on Regulations and Ordinances (Senator Tchen):** To move—That the Migration Amendment Regulations 2003 (No. 5), as contained in Statutory Rules 2003 No. 154 and made under the *Migration Act 1958*, be disallowed.

Fifteen sitting days remain for resolving.**

- *8 **Chairman of the Standing Committee on Regulations and Ordinances (Senator Tchen):** To move—That the Retirement Savings Accounts Amendment Regulations 2003 (No. 2), as contained in Statutory Rules 2003 No. 195 and made under the *Retirement Savings Accounts Act 1997*, be disallowed.

Fifteen sitting days remain for resolving.**

- *9 **Chairman of the Standing Committee on Regulations and Ordinances (Senator Tchen):** To move—That the Superannuation Industry (Supervision) Amendment Regulations 2003 (No. 4), as contained in Statutory Rules 2003 No. 196 and made under the *Superannuation Industry (Supervision) Act 1993*, 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 and Determination will be deemed to have been disallowed.*

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.

3 **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.*)

General Business—Order of the Day

- 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*).

By the first sitting day of the 2004 winter sittings

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†

Australian Protective Service Amendment Bill 2003‡

Referred to the Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee (*referred 10 September 2003; reporting date: 7 October 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 varied 16 September 2003; reporting date: last sitting day in March 2004*).

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*).

Workplace Relations Amendment (Improved Remedies for Unprotected Action) Bill 2002‡

Referred to the Employment, Workplace Relations and Education Legislation Committee (*referred 17 September 2003; reporting date: 13 October 2003*).

Provisions of bills currently referred†

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, 9 September and 16 September 2003; reporting date: 7 October 2003*).

Energy Grants (Cleaner Fuels) Scheme Bill 2003‡

Energy Grants (Cleaner Fuels) Scheme (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2003‡

Referred to the Economics Legislation Committee (*referred 17 September 2003; reporting date: 16 October 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*).

International Tax Agreements Amendment Bill 2003‡

Referred to the Economics Legislation Committee (*referred 17 September 2003; reporting date: 3 November 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 varied 16 September 2003; reporting date: 16 October 2003*).

Taxation Laws Amendment (Superannuation Contributions Splitting) Bill 2003‡

Referred to the Economics Legislation Committee (*referred 17 September 2003; reporting date: 3 November 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.

Restored to *Notice Paper* pursuant to resolution of 10 September 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 1871 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 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 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.

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 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

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; (e) on what date or dates did staff engage in the task; (f) what was the cost of engaging in the task; (g) to whom did the staff deliver this information in Australia; and (h) 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.

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 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 this 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; (d) optometrical; (e) aids and appliances; (f) dentistry; (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 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 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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 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 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 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 Hamed 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

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.

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.

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 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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 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

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

- 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.

- 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.

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.

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Notice given 25 August 2003

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

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.

Notice given 2 September 2003

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.

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 Subaxtreme 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.

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.

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 Minister for Veterans' Affairs
- 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 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 Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—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 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 Education, Science and Training—

- (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, Dunoos 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 Science

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 for Health and Ageing

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 Special Minister of State—

- (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 Special Minister of State—

- (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 Minister for Science

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.

Notice given 10 September 2003

1973 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—

- (1) For each of the following financial years; 2000-01, 2001-02, and 2002-03: (a) how many suspected illegal fishing vessels in the Heard and McDonald Island (HIMI) region have been reported to Australian authorities; and (b) in each case: (i) what was the source of the report, and (ii) on what date was the report received.
- (2) For each of the following financial years; 2000-01, 2002-02, and 2002-03: (a) how many suspected illegal fishing vessels in the HIMI region were reported to Australian authorities but not subsequently intercepted; and (b) in each case where a suspected illegal fishing vessel was identified but not intercepted, why was it not intercepted.

- 1974 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—
With reference to the answer to paragraph (3)(a) of question on notice no. 565 (Senate *Hansard*, 11 November 2002, p. 6016):
- (1) Was the alleged broadcasting of bogus Emergency Position Indicating Rescue Beacon signals by the *Volga* to assist the illegal fishing vessel the *Lena* to evade hot pursuit by the Australian Fisheries Management Authority contracted *Southern Supporter* subject to investigation by Australian authorities; if so, what was the outcome of the investigation and do current charges against the crew of the *Volga* relate to this alleged activity; if no investigation has been undertaken, why not.
 - (2) Was the alleged broadcasting of bogus Emergency Position Indicating Rescue Beacon signals by the *Florence* during the *Southern Supporter's* hot pursuit of the illegal fishing vessel the *Lena*, and the *Florence's* alleged re-fuelling of the *Lena*, subject to investigation by Australian authorities; if so, what was the outcome of this investigation and what legal action, if any, has been initiated against the crew of the *Florence*; if no investigation has been undertaken, why not.
- 1975 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—
With reference to the answer to paragraph (3)(b) of question on notice no. 731 (Senate *Hansard*, 9 December 2002, p. 7520): Has the Australian Government yet made direct representations to the Bolivian Government on Australia's concerns about illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing and flag of convenience fishing; if so, when and in what form were these representations made; if not, why not.
- 1976 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—
- (1) What companies have been issued with a licence to fish in the Heard and McDonald Island Fishery.
 - (2) In relation to each company: (a) what is its registered address; and (b) when was the licence issued and, if applicable, renewed.
 - (3) (a) What total allowable catch, by species, is each licence holder allocated; and (b) in relation to each licence holder, have catch limits been varied; if so, when and what is the nature of the variation.
- 1977 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—
With reference to the report of the Twenty-First Meeting of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, held in Hobart from October to November 2002 and, in particular, the report on illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing:
- (1) Has Russia complied with Australia's request for the provision of vehicle monitoring system (VMS) data for the Russian-flagged vessel the *Volga*, recorded prior to its apprehension; if so, when did Russia provide the data; if not, has Australia made further representations in this matter.
 - (2) Is the Minister aware that, during the meeting, France identified the vessel the *Viarsa* as a suspected illegal toothfish vessel.
 - (3) (a) What information did Australia seek from France on the alleged activities of the *Viarsa* and other vessels identified as alleged illegal fishing vessels; (b) what investigation did Australia undertake upon receipt of that information; and (c) what outcome can be attributed to that investigation.
 - (4) (a) What assistance has Australia provided Uruguay in the implementation of a 'smart track' VMS; and (b) what progress has Uruguay made on its implementation.

- 1978 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—
- (1) Did the Minister authorise the release of the details about Operation 'Rushcutter' contained in his ministerial media statement AFFA03/86MJ, issued on 12 May, including detailed vessel specifications of the *Aurora Australis*, patrol duration incorporating departure and return dates, a detailed description of crew numbers, training and operational capacity, the area of operation and the operational command structure; if not, who authorised the release of this information.
 - (2) Did the Minister authorise the release of information about the sidearms carried by officers and larger calibre weapons available aboard the *Aurora Australis* during Operation 'Rushcutter', as reported in the Hobart *Mercury* on 13 May 2003; if not, who authorised the release of this information.
 - (3) With reference to the Minister's media statement '\$12 million Budget boost to fight illegal fishing in Southern Ocean' issued on 13 May 2003, can details be provided of the Government's new program of armed enforcement patrols, including the proposed patrol frequency and enhanced enforcement capacity.
- 1979 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—
- (1) For each of the following financial years; 2001-02 and 2002-03: what was the estimated illegal catch of Patagonian toothfish and other fish species taken from the Heard and McDonald Islands region.
 - (2) For each of the following financial years; 2001-02 and 2002-03: what assessment has the Government made of incidental mortality, including marine species and sea birds, resulting from this illegal fishing activity.
- 1980 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—
- (1) What charges were laid against the master and crew of the vessel the *Aliza Glacial*, arising from its apprehension in October 1997, for alleged illegal fishing activity in Australian waters near the Heard and McDonald Islands.
 - (2) When did the master and crew depart Australia.
 - (3) Did the departure of the master and crew stall the prosecution for alleged illegal fishing activity; if so: (a) what conditions were placed on their departure; (b) what has the Government done to secure the return of the accused to Australia; (c) what is the current location of the accused; (d) what is the status of the outstanding charges; and (d) what future action is proposed by the Government in this matter.
- 1981 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—
With reference to the 'stern warning' to illegal Southern Ocean fishers and the nations that support illegal fishing activity issued by the Minister on 9 February 2003, in media statement AFFA03/017M:
- (1) In what form and over what period was the warning communicated to illegal fishers.
 - (2) Was the warning delivered in languages other than English; if so, in which languages; if not, why not.
 - (3) Was the warning delivered to governments believed to support illegal fishers; if so: (a) when did the Minister do so; (b) what governments received the warning; and (c) what message did the Minister deliver on behalf of the Commonwealth.

- (4) Did the Minister's reference to nations that support illegal fishing include countries that provide markets for illegal catches of Patagonian toothfish.
- (5) What outcomes can be attributed to the warning.

1982 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—
With reference to the answer to paragraph (3)(a) of question on notice no. 490 (Senate *Hansard*, 17 September 2002, p. 4320), concerning negotiations with key flag states of illegal or suspected illegal fishing vessels and countries that tolerate illegal, unreported and unregulated and flag of convenience fishing:

- (1) (a) What bilateral negotiations has the Government undertaken on the elimination of illegal fishing with Russia, Belize, Togo, Mauritius and the Seychelles in the past 12 months; (b) have these negotiations included ministerial-level communications; and (c) what outcomes, by country, can be attributed to Australia's negotiations.
- (2) (a) What other countries, suspected to be flag states of illegal fishing vessels or tolerant of illegal fishing, has the Government engaged in bilateral negotiations in the past 12 months; (b) have these negotiations included ministerial-level communications; and (c) what outcomes, by country, can be attributed to Australia's negotiations.

1983 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—
With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 730 (Senate *Hansard*, 10 December 2003, p. 7659):

- (1) Has Australia finalised an agreement with France on combating illegal fishing in Australia's sub-Antarctic exclusive economic zones; if so when was the agreement finalised and what are the details of the agreement; if not: (a) why not; (b) what negotiations have been undertaken since the Minister advised in his answer that a proposed draft text was agreed; (c) were negotiations progressed during the Minister's meeting with the French Minister for Overseas Territories in Paris in June 2003; (d) have negotiations included consideration of joint use of French facilities or French patrols of Australian waters; (e) what future negotiations are planned; and (f) when does the Minister expect the agreement will be finalised and active.
- (2) Has a cooperative arrangement to combat illegal fishing been negotiated with South Africa; if so, when was the arrangement finalised and what are the details of the arrangement; if not: (a) what negotiations have been undertaken since the Minister wrote to his South African counterpart in September 2002 initiating formal discussions; (b) what future negotiations are planned; and (c) when does the Minister expect a cooperative arrangement will be finalised.

1984 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—
With reference to the high-level policy group formed to oversee the protection of the Heard and McDonald Island Fishery:

- (1) When has the group met since its inaugural meeting on 6 August 2002.
- (2) What senior departmental officials from: (a) the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade; (b) the Department of Environment and Heritage; (c) the Department of Defence; (d) the Attorney General's Department; (e) the Department of Treasury; (f) the Australian Customs Service (Coastwatch); (g) the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet; (h) the Australian Federal Police; and (i) the Department of Finance and Administration, comprise its membership.

- (3) Who chairs the group.
- (4) Has the membership of the group, or its terms of reference, altered since its inaugural meeting; if so, can details of membership changes or amendments to the group's terms of reference be provided.
- (5) Is the group required to consult with non-departmental stakeholders; if so, can details of such consultation be provided; if not, why not.

1985 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—
With reference to the Australian Fisheries Management Authority charter vessel *Southern Supporter*:

- (1) When was the current Standing Deed of Offer signed.
- (2) (a) What are the terms of the Standing Deed of Offer; and (b) what is the value of the contract between the Commonwealth and P&O Maritime Services Pty Ltd.
- (3) What assessment has been made of the performance of the *Southern Supporter* in combating illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing in the Heard and McDonald Island (HIMI) region.
- (4) (a) How many operations involving apprehension, boarding and/or searching suspected illegal fishing vessels were undertaken by the *Southern Supporter* in the HIMI region in 2002-03; and (b) for each operation: (i) what was the name of the vessel involved, (ii) what fishing equipment and/or catch was seized, and (iii) what legal action, if any, resulted.
- (5) What are consequences for the role of the *Southern Supporter*, arising from the end of the civilian charter vessel program in June 2003, announced by the Minister on 13 May 2003.

1986 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—

- (1) What specific outcomes beneficial to Australian fisheries management can be attributed to the Minister's attendance at the fisheries roundtable organised by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation, held in Paris in June 2003.
- (2) Can an English-language communiqué of the roundtable be provided.
- (3) Which French Ministers did the Minister meet to discuss illegal fishing in the Southern Ocean around Australia's Heard and McDonald Islands and France's Kerguelen Island.
- (4) What new measures did the French Ministers propose to facilitate surveillance and apprehension of boats illegally fishing in Australian and French waters in the Southern Ocean.
- (5) What new measures did the Minister propose to the French Ministers.
- (6) When did the Minister depart Australia for the roundtable visit.
- (7) When did the Minister return to Australia.
- (8) Who accompanied the Minister on this trip.
- (9) Can the details of the Minister's official itinerary be provided.
- (10) (a) What was the total cost of the Minister's visit to Paris, including departmental officers and ministerial staff; and (b) which department or departments met these costs.

1987 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—
With reference to the Minister's meeting with the French Minister for Overseas Territories in Paris on 3 June 2003:

- (1) Did the Minister discuss aerial surveillance of the French Kerguelen Island and Australia's adjacent Heard and McDonald Islands as a means to combat illegal fishing during the meeting.
- (2) Was agreement reached on aerial surveillance; if so, what are the details of the agreement; if not, what future negotiations are planned and when does the Minister expect agreement will be reached.

1988 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—With reference to the Minister's address to the National Press Club on 19 August 2003 concerning illegal toothfish fishing in Australian waters:

- (1) What action has the Government taken to investigate and prosecute the 20 to 30 alleged regular illegal fishing operators known to the Government.
- (2) (a) Is the Minister aware of allegations that the operator of the so-called 'Alphabet Boats' is a well known Hong Kong-based company with a wholly-owned Jakarta-based subsidiary that services the illegal fleet; (b) what action has the Government taken to investigate these allegations; (c) what representations has the Government made to the Hong Kong SAR Government, the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Indonesian Government, in relation to this company's alleged involvement in the operation of the 'Alphabet Boats'.

1989 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—With reference to Australia's 2001-02 report on its activities in the Convention on Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) area in accordance with Article XX of the Convention:

- (1) Has Australia initiated any dispute resolution process involving any party to the Convention, including fellow members of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, for alleged failure to undertake efforts consistent with Article XXI of the Convention.
- (2) (a) What action has Australia taken in respect to the 2002 failure by the Uruguayan Government to withdraw validated *Dissostichus* catch documents (DCDs), decline to validate further DCDs and stop shipments of catch from the Uruguayan-flagged vessels *Dorita* and *Arvisa I* that are subject to an illegal fishing investigation; (b) has the Uruguayan Government responded to Australia's concerns; if so, what was the nature of the Uruguayan response and did the response include the outcome of an investigation of the vessels' activities inside CCAMLR waters.
- (3) What reply did the Government receive from Uruguay, the Netherlands Antilles and the Netherlands to its protest over the temporary re-flagging of the *Arvisa I* to the Netherlands Antilles.
- (4) What response did the Government receive from each of the following countries: (a) Japan; (b) Hong Kong; (c) China; (d) Mozambique; and (e) Kenya, to Australian requests that the alleged illegal toothfish catch from the *Dorita* and *Arvisa I* be denied access to their markets.
- (5) (a) What, if any, legal action has been taken against the master and crew of the *Arvisa I* following its apprehension by the French in July 2002; and (b) did the Government provide French authorities with evidence it had gathered in January 2002, including a report of alleged illegal fishing activity, statutory statements from the captain and master of the Australian vessel *Aurora Australis* and photographic and auditory evidence; if not, why not.

- (6) (a) Has the Government continued to send officers to monitor landings by Australian boats unloading toothfish in Mauritius; and (b) if not, has Mauritius implemented a monitoring and validation system for the unloading of toothfish consistent with the requirements of CCAMLR; if so, when did the Mauritius implement such a system.

1990 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation—

- (1) When were Australian authorities first made aware of alleged, actual or intended illegal fishing activity by the vessel the *Viarsa* in Australian waters near the Heard and McDonald Islands (HIMI).
- (2) What was the source of the information.
- (3) When did Australian authorities authorise the Australian Fisheries Management Authority-contracted vessel the *Southern Supporter* to intercept the *Viarsa*.
- (4) Where and when did the *Southern Supporter* first locate the *Viarsa*.
- (5) (a) What action, pursuant to what international or domestic law, did the *Southern Supporter* order the *Viarsa* to undertake; (b) when was this order made; and (c) what was the *Viarsa's* response.
- (6) (a) Were the *Viarsa's* identifiers displayed at the time it was located by the *Southern Supporter*; if so, were these identifiers later removed and when.
- (7) When and how did the *Viarsa* first identify itself to the *Southern Supporter*.
- (8) Was authorisation from a Minister or departmental officer required before the *Southern Supporter* commenced its hot pursuit of the *Viarsa*; if so: (a) when was this authorisation requested; (b) when was it provided; and (c) who provided it.
- (9) When did the 'hot pursuit' of the *Viarsa* by the *Southern Supporter* commence.
- (10) Why did the Minister not announce the commencement of the pursuit until 12 August 2003.
- (11) With reference to the Minister's statement on 13 May 2003 concerning armed enforcement in HIMI, was the *Southern Supporter* armed; if not, what capacity did the *Southern Supporter* have to apprehend the *Viarsa* without additional enforcement assistance.
- (12) Was the Department of Defence asked to provide logistical or enforcement assistance in the interception of the *Viarsa*; if so: (a) when was the request made; (b) what was the department's response; and (c) what assistance was provided.
- (13) (a) When did the Australian Government first make direct representations to the Uruguayan Government urging it to exercise its flag state responsibilities and require the *Viarsa* to accompany the *Southern Supporter* to the nearest Australian port; (b) what form did those representations take; (c) what was the Uruguayan Government's initial response and when was that response received; (d) did the Uruguayan Government consent to Australia's request that the *Viarsa* be ordered to accompany the *Southern Supporter*; (e) did the Uruguayan Government order the *Viarsa* to accompany the *Southern Supporter* to an Australian port; if so, when was that order made and what is the source of that information.
- (14) (a) What subsequent representations did the Government make to the Uruguayan Government prior to the vessel's apprehension; (b) what was

the Uruguayan Government's response to these representations; (c) when did the Minister make direct contact with the Uruguayan Minister for Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries; (d) what assistance did the Minister seek; (e) how did the Uruguayan Minister respond to the Minister's request for assistance; and (f) what assistance has the Uruguayan Embassy in Canberra provided in the *Viarsa* matter.

- (15) Did the Uruguayan Government order the *Viarsa* to return to Montevideo; if so, when was that order made and what is the source of the information.
- (16) (a) When was the Minister and/or his department informed that a Uruguayan Government official was aboard the *Viarsa*; (b) what was the source of this information; (c) what is the name of the Uruguayan Government official and what position does the official hold; (d) what representations has the Government made to the Uruguayan Government in this matter; (e) what was the Uruguayan Government's response; (f) when did the Uruguayan official board the *Viarsa*.
- (17) (a) What representations has the Government received from the Uruguayan Government since the vessel's apprehension; and (b) how has Australia responded to those representations.
- (18) When did the Government first alert the secretariat of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) of the alleged illegal fishing activity by the *Viarsa*.
- (19) (a) What assistance did the Government, through its secretariat, ask members of CCAMLR to provide in relation to the *Viarsa*; (b) when was that assistance sought; and (c) what assistance, by country, was provided.
- (20) (a) When did the Government first make direct representations to the South African Government seeking assistance in the apprehension of the *Viarsa*; (b) what request did the Government make; (c) what response did the South African Government provide and when was it received; (d) when was the Government informed that the *SA Agulhas* would be directed to intercept the *Viarsa*; and (e) when did the *SA Agulhas* join the "hot pursuit" of the *Viarsa*.
- (21) (a) When did the Government initiate commercial negotiations on the hire of the tug boat *John Ross* to assist in the apprehension of the *Viarsa*; (b) when did the tug commence pursuit of the *Viarsa*; (c) what was the composition of the crew aboard the tug; (d) did the tug operate under Australian command; (e) what was the total cost of the tug hire; (f) was the cost of hiring the tug reduced as a result of Australia's cooperative relationship with the South African Government on illegal fishing matters; and (g) what total cost is payable to South African interests for assistance in the *Viarsa* matter.
- (22) (a) When did the Government first make direct representations to the United Kingdom Government seeking assistance in the apprehension of the *Viarsa*; (b) what request did the Government make; (c) what response did the United Kingdom Government provide and when was it received; (d) what assistance did the United Kingdom Government provide; and (e) what total cost is payable to United Kingdom interests for assistance in the *Viarsa* matter.
- (23) When and where was the apprehension of the *Viarsa* effected.
- (24) (a) What was the number and composition of the crew aboard the *Viarsa* upon its apprehension; (b) has the Government made representations to other governments on the presence of their nationals aboard the *Viarsa*; if

so, what representations has the Government made and what was the response.

- (25) What fish and equipment was allegedly found aboard the vessel.
- (26) (a) What progress has been made in the investigation into the *Viarsa's* conduct in Australian waters; and (b) where is the vessel and its crew currently located.
- (27) What arrangements has the government made for the disposal of fish allegedly found aboard the vessel.
- (28) How has the Government recognised the performance of the Australian officers involved in the pursuit and apprehension of the *Viarsa*.
- (29) What was the cost of the operation to apprehend the *Viarsa*.
- (30) What total cost has the Government incurred in the *Viarsa* matter, including the cost of pre-pursuit and post-apprehension operations.
- (31) Will the cost of the *Viarsa* operation be met from the \$12 million budget allocation for Southern Ocean fisheries enforcement in the 2003-04 financial year, announced by the Minister on 13 May 2003; if so, how will the operational plan for the 2003-04 financial year be amended to account for the *Viarsa* operation.
- (32) What provision has the Government made for Southern Ocean fisheries enforcement beyond 2003-04.

1991 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Minister for Justice and Customs—With reference to the unauthorised entry to the Charles Ulm building occupied by the Australian Customs Service at Sydney airport on 27 August 2003:

- (1) Was the closed circuit television (CCTV) fully operational; if so, (a) was it turned on; (b) did it record on film; and (c) were staff observing screens at the time.
- (2) Were any other CCTV cameras outside the building working on the night in question, either attached to the building or any other building, which might have captured images of the intruders as they entered or left; if so, was any footage obtained of the intruders and any transport used.
- (3) Does the Australian Customs Service (Customs) provide its own security guards at the entry to the building or is the function contracted out; if the latter (a) who is the contractor; (b) what is the term of the contract; and (c) what penalties are contained in the contract for breaches.
- (4) At the time of the unauthorised entry, how many security personnel were in attendance.
- (5) What system of entry is in place at the building ie. photographic identification only or swipe card technology.
- (6) What identification checking process is in place at other Customs establishments at the airport.
- (7) On the night in question, precisely what check was made of any identification presented.
- (8) What security checking process is in place between Customs and all contractors, including Electronic Data Services (EDS).
- (9) Are police checks required; if so, are they conducted with both state and federal police agencies.
- (10) Were those who gained illegal entry dressed in any clothing identifiable as EDS uniform, or with EDS logo or badges.

- (11) How many EDS staff have access to the building.
- (12) What was the turnover of EDS staff engaged at Customs in Sydney, who had access to this building, during 2002-03.
- (13) Are identity passes for access to the building prepared by Customs or by EDS.
- (14) In this particular instance, were those seeking entry required to have a photographic pass; if so, what check was made of the validity of the passes.
- (15) Has it now been concluded that any ID passes used by the intruders were forged.
- (16) What new procedures have been put in place with respect to identification provision and checking within Customs and with EDS.
- (17) On the night in question, how many Customs and EDS staff were on duty in; (a) the building; and (b) on the key floor containing the mainframe infrastructure.
- (18) Is access within the building restricted between floors, or is total access possible.
- (19) Have all Customs and EDS staff on duty at the time been interviewed; if so, how many reported unidentified strangers on site.
- (20) Was the presence of unidentified strangers reported by any Customs or EDS staff either at the time or on a subsequent occasion.
- (21) What instructions exist within Customs and EDS for the identification of strangers on site.
- (22) What have police investigations revealed of the identity of the intruders, their ethnic origin, and any likely connection with either terrorist or known criminal associations.
- (23) Did the intruders engage in any conversations with other staff; if so, how many.
- (24) Were the intruders challenged by any other member of staff at any time.
- (25) Do the systems operating in the building contain records of; (a) passenger entry and exit; (b) cargo entry and exit; (c) planned passenger interceptions either personal or luggage; (d) detail of investigations of illegal imports; (e) records of interview; (f) inspection programs of air freight containers; (g) intelligence from overseas agencies; and (h) communications between all those employed in the building and all outside agencies.
- (26) Is the inter agency intelligence system, ASNET, connected to any systems within the building.
- (27) Is detail of the Customs activity at Port Botany and any other Customs site within Australia accessible from the building.
- (28) With respect to the servers stolen; (a) what brand and type were they; (b) what was their storage capacity; and (c) was their function solely one of internal and external communication, if so, was encryption used.
- (29) Was any of the information contained on the stolen servers backed up to another server; if not, why not.
- (30) Did the investigations conducted by the Defence Signals Directorate (DSD) reveal whether any systems had been accessed by the intruders; if so, which ones.
- (31) Did DSD find whether any data and information had been down loaded onto either compact discs, floppy discs, or the two servers in question.

- (32) If systems were accessed, were legitimate passwords used and how were they obtained.
- (33) (a) Since 27 August 2003, what specific new security arrangements have been put in place at the building; and (b) what new arrangements have been required of EDS.
- (34) What is the current status of the review of IT Security Policy in Customs, referred to in the *Australian National Audit Office report* No. 35, 2002-03.
- (35) When was a site security plan last prepared for the building.
- (36) Has a protective security risk review and a work area risk review been conducted of the building, as required in the *Protective Security Manual*; if so, when.

1992 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—

- (1) How many children in Australia were diagnosed formally with autistic disorder in each of the years 1983 to 2002 by: (a) age group; and (b) state and territory.
- (2) How many children in Australia were diagnosed formally with Asperger's syndrome in each of the years 1983 to 2002 by: (a) age group; and (b) state and territory.
- (3) How many children in Australia were diagnosed formally with pervasive developmental disorders and/or autism spectrum disorders in each of the years 1983 to 2002 by: (a) age group; and (b) state and territory.
- (4) (a) Can an explanation be provided for the disparity in Australian Institute of Health and Welfare data from 1998 that shows adult rates of autism spectrum disorder to be significantly lower than those for children, given that this is a life-long condition; and (b) to what extent can the disparity be attributed to better diagnosis.
- (5) Does the Government agree with recent comments by Professor Fiona Stanley that there is an epidemic of autism; if so, what is the extent of the epidemic.
- (6) With reference to the December 2002 report of the Employment, Workplace Relations and Education References Committee, 'Education of students with disabilities', which cites the incidents of autism as 27 to 93 per population of 10 000, to what extent does the Government regard autism spectrum disorder as a health problem.
- (7) What are the assumptions that underlie the fact that in Australian Bureau of Statistics statistics, children with autism are grouped with those with intellectual disability.
- (8) Is the Government aware that a survey of paediatricians in Victoria in 2002 identified autism as one of the more difficult areas of practice.
- (9) What measures has the Government adopted for ensuring that children with autism spectrum disorders receive effective, evidence-based treatment for their condition.
- (10) Is the Government aware that the Medical Journal of Australia editorial, 2003, said in relation to autism spectrum disorder: 'The early intervention that has been subjected to the most rigorous assessment is behavioural intervention. There is now definite evidence that behavioural intervention improves cognitive, communication, adaptive and social skills in young children with autism. Most young children with autism in Australia do not receive intensive behavioural intervention programs – partly because such

programs are not recommended by many health professionals and partly because of their prohibitive cost for families’.

- (11) What efforts have been made by the Commonwealth to see that: (a) health professionals are adequately informed in the diagnoses and treatment of children with autism spectrum disorder; (b) affordable, evidence-based early intervention from specialist behavioural psychologists is available for all children with autism spectrum disorders; and (c) all children with autism spectrum disorders can readily access appropriate early intervention and treatment such as speech therapy, occupational therapy and physiotherapy.
- (12) With reference to the establishment by the United Kingdom Government of specialist research institutes for autism spectrum disorders, has the Government considered doing so in Australia; if not, why not.
- (13) (a) What research is currently underway; and (b) what is planned in the future looking into the cause, diagnosis and/or treatment of autism spectrum disorders in Australia.

1993 **Senator Lees:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—With reference to the tendering process currently underway for Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement (South Australia) services:

- (1) Given that the timeline provided by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Service (ATSIS) to the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement (ALRM) has already been compromised by a delay in calling for tenders, will the deadline be extended to 3 months from the date tenders are called, or will the September deadline for tenders stand.
- (2) Will ALRM be offered a further grant for the remainder of 2003-04 financial year.
- (3) (a) Has ALRM been informed in writing by ATSIS officials that the tendering timetable also states that the new contracts would be awarded in late November 2003 and a contract would come into effect in January 2004.
- (4) Can the Minister explain why that timetable has not been kept, and what timetable will now apply to the tendering of Aboriginal legal services in South Australia.
- (5) Is the Minister aware of correspondence from the Chief Executive Officer of ALRM, dated 22 August 2003, which expresses great concerns about that timetable.
- (6) (a) Is the Minister concerned about a tendering process in May 2003, during which ATSIS officials told ALRM that ‘this is a timetable that may be achieved. It must be understood that any of the above projected dates could change; and the part or all of the process described might not eventuate’; (b) given that the livelihood of staff and the legal outcomes for clients are likely to be affected by the tendering process and any changes it produces, how does the Minister intend to ensure that a more appropriate, clear and reasonable description will be forthcoming from ATSIC and/or ATSIS in its tendering process of this service in the future.
- (7) What provision does the Minister intend to make regarding ALRM’s accrued liabilities, including staff entitlements to long-service and other leave which amount to at least \$412 000, for which ATSIS and ATSIC have been unable to make proper provision in the past.
- (8) (a) Is the Minister aware that ALRM has expressed concerns to ATSIS (letter dated 4 July 2003) that its accrued and unprovided for liabilities have

the potential to severely jeopardise its ability to take part in the tendering process; and (b) will the Minister take to ensure that ALRM is not severely jeopardised; if so, what will that action be.

- (9) (a) Given the amount of grant funding provided by ATSSIS to ALRM for the period 1 July to 31 December 2003 and the amount of those accrued liabilities, is the Minister aware that ALRM has warned ATSSIS that it may have to cease trading at the end of October 2003 in order to meet these accrued liabilities; and (b) is the Minister prepared to allow this process to force ALRM to cease trading as a result of these unmet liabilities.
- (10) Given that ALRM has warned ATSSIS that it would require at least 8 weeks prior to that time to arrange for proper transfer of all client matters and legal files of some 7 000 matters to alternative legal providers: (a) Has ATSSIS advised the Minister of this correspondence; and (b) has ATSSIS or the Minister proposed any solutions as to how these issues of transition will be dealt with.
- (11) Does the Minister agree with ALRM that the process of tendering should be deferred at least until the end of the 2003-04 financial year, in order that it may be undertaken in a measured and prudent manner, thus avoiding risk of harm to clients and ALRM's employees; if not: (a) why not; and (b) how will this timeline pressure, without disadvantaging ALRM staff and clients, be addressed.
- (12) Given that ATSSIS and ATSSIC have described themselves to the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement Inc. as a 'supplementary funder of legal services': (a) can an explanation of this relationship be provided; and (b) what, if any, consultation has the Minister had with the State Government of South Australia about its view that this is an area of Commonwealth responsibility.
- (13) How does the Minister intend to ensure that the tendering process, in future, will provide adequate funding to ALRM.
- (14) What steps are being considered to secure funding from other sources for ALRM in South Australia.
- (15) Given that the staff and management of ALRM have chosen to maintain existing staffing levels, as far as possible, and to maintain service delivery, and that since 1992, other than slight safety net increases from 1998, staff wages have not increased: Will the Minister now ensure sufficient funding for wage parity between equivalent legal officers and para-legal officers at the Legal Services Commission of South Australia and those employed by ALRM.
- (16) Did the strategic National State Directions Strategy of the ATSSIS Law and Justice Branch state that the Office of Evaluation and Audit within ATSSIC has estimated that the gap between the funding of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Services (ATSILS) and the funding required to make them commensurate with mainstream legal services, is in the order of \$22 million.
- (17) Does the Minister agree with ATSSIS that 'these funds are not likely to be made available; if they are not likely to be made available, why.
- (18) What is the Minister's response to the recommendations of ALRM (through review processes, workshops and meetings with ATSSIC and through direct submissions to ATSSIC since May 2001), for the creation of a National Professional Indemnity Insurance Scheme for ATSILS throughout Australia

in the interests of prudent financial management, in the provision of Aboriginal Legal Services nationwide.

- (19) (a) Does the Minister agree that under the 'Enterprise Bargaining Agreement' covering employees of ATSIC, now transferred to ATSI, the equivalent wages and conditions for employees are to be maintained.
- (20) Given that, as an ATSI funded organisation, ALRM is not able to provide an enterprise bargaining agreement or wage increases to its staff because ATSIC and/or ATSI does not provide the necessary funding increase to allow for such wage increases: how will the Minister ensure provision is made to rectify this inequity.
- (21) (a) Is the Minister satisfied with ATSIC's response to requests for further funding to cover the cost of an enterprise bargaining agreement, that in comparison to other under-funded ATSI throughout Australia, ALRM is in no worse or better position than any other; and (b) does this mean that the funding provided to ATSI across the country similarly impairs the enterprise bargaining processes these organisations.
- (22) (a) Has the Minister initiated any studies to be undertaken of the effectiveness of the contestability policy of ATSIC and/or ATSI in relation to Aboriginal Legal Services; if so: (i) what studies were initiated, (ii) when were they undertaken, and (iii) what do these they show.
- (23) Given that the Indigenous people of South Australia are among the most disadvantaged, distressed, over-imprisoned and stressed communities in this State: what consideration has been given to the question of whether managed competition, through quasi internal markets, is a suitable response to the provision of legal services to Indigenous people.
- (24) Has the Minister recognised the particular expertise and experience of the existing staff of ALRM to provide specialised legal assistance to the Indigenous client group.
- (25) Has the Minister appraised whether the private legal profession of South Australia is in a position to provide such specialist services at a cost equivalent to that provided by ALRM: if so, what is the Minister's appraisal and in regard to this, will the Minister consider the view of the office of Evaluation and Audit within ATSIC, that ALRM provides approximately \$9.2 million worth of legal services per annum, at an aggregate cost of \$3.4 million.
- (26) (a) Does the Minister favour the implementation of the Royal Commission in Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, recommendation no. 195, 'that, subject to appropriate provision to ensure accountability to government for funds received, payments by Government to Aboriginal organisations and communities be made on the basis of triennial or quarterly funding'; (b) does the Minister recognise the advantages for Aboriginal organisations of triennial rather than annual funding cycles; and (c) what is the Minister's intention in his oversight of ATSI with respect to the provision of triennial funding, and the implementation of the Royal Commission's recommendation no. 195, particularly as it applies to ATSI.
- (27) Given that the 1998 amendments of the *Native Title Act 1993* provided for detailed and specific laws governing the transfer of business between Native Title representative bodies, in the circumstance that one representative body was deregistered and another one was to take its place for a particular area [see section 203FC of the Act, which allows the Commonwealth Minister to issue directions by written instrument] and in

the event that the existing ATSILS do not win a contract for the provision of legal services, and in relation to the ATSIL's contestability policy of the Commonwealth: What consideration has been given to the passing of similar legislation to that quoted above, in relation to the ongoing files held by solicitors employed or retained by the existing ATSILS.

- (28) Does the Minister recognise the primary obligation and duty of solicitors employed or retained by existing ATSILS to their clients and their need to safeguard the interest of their clients in the event that ATSILS, which employ or retain them, do not obtain a contract for the provision of services.
- (29) What provision has the Minister, through ATSIIS, made for this scenario, having regard to the existing obligations of solicitors to their clients.
- (30) What specific consideration has the Minister given to the question of allowing for the incorporation, or creation by statute, of specific corporations to carry out ATSILS functions in the states and territories.
- (31) What consideration has been given, and what negotiations have occurred, for cooperation with the states on the question of creation by statute of such bodies within the states and territories.
- (32) Have any studies or research been initiated on the desirability of incorporated legal practices being established by state, Commonwealth or territory law to provide for the efficient running of community controlled ATSILS.
- (33) What consideration has been given to the incorporation of not-for-profit legal practices in the current Standing Committee of Attorneys-General project on incorporated legal practices.

Senator Lees: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 1994-1995)—With regard to the current action to recover legal costs from Mr Darryl Sumner:

- (1) Given the attitude of the nineteen other parties, all of whom have waived their right to costs in this matter, as well as the desirability of achieving closure on the longstanding and acrimonious Hindmarsh Island dispute: will the Minister demonstrate a practical approach to reconciliation by waiving Mr Sumner's debt; if not, why does the Commonwealth of Australia continue to pursue Mr Sumner.
- (2) Why did the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs not support Mr Sumner's submission for the waiver of costs in this case.
- (3) Has the Minister provided Mr Sumner a copy of his letter on this matter to the Hon Peter Slipper of 13 May 2003; if so, when; if not, does the Minister intend to do so.
- (4) Can the Minister for Finance and Administration table a copy of the letter of 13 May 2003 to the Hon Peter Slipper regarding the waiver request.
- (5) Has the Minister informed Mr Sumner of the reason or reasons why he did not support the waiver.
- (6) Does the Minister consider, given the circumstances and the process of reconciliation, that pursuing Mr Sumner to the point of bankruptcy will achieve little other than acrimony between the Minister, the Ngarrindjerri people and Mr Sumner.
- (7) Given its potential damage to these relationships and the reconciliation process: will the Minister explain the reasons for the pursuit of Mr Sumner.

- (8) In the interests of furthering the process of reconciliation in Australia, will the Ministers reconsider the decision not to assist Mr Sumner, by ensuring his costs debt is waived in this case.
- 1994 Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs
- 1995 Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs
- 1996 **Senator Webber:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—Is the Government committed to continuing the funding of the Community Midwifery Program in Western Australia beyond the 2003-04 financial year, under the National Women's Health Program; if so, when can a decision be expected; if not, why not.
- 1997 **Senator Hutchins:** To ask the Minister representing the Treasurer—
- (1) Are any officials, employees, advisors or contracted staff of the department entitled to any monetary loans, discount or otherwise, from the Treasury, the Reserve Bank or any other Commonwealth agency; if so, can the details and nature of such monetary loans including interest rates and fees be provided.
 - (2) Do any current or former officials, employees, advisors or contracted staff of the department currently have, or have they ever had, any monetary loan arrangements, discount or otherwise, with the Treasury, the Reserve Bank or any other Commonwealth agency; if so, can the details and nature of such monetary loans be provided, including interest rates and fees.
- 1998 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—
- (1) Does the Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service (AQIS) receive advice from Livecorp on all withdrawals of accreditation and accreditation downgrades under the Live Export Accreditation Program (LEAP).
 - (2) Can details of all such accreditation withdrawals be provided for each of the following financial years; 2000-01, 2001-02 and 2002-03, including for each withdrawal: (a) the name of the company; (b) reason for withdrawal; and (c) consequential action by AQIS.
 - (3) Can details of all such accreditation downgrades be provided for each of the following financial years: 2000-01, 2001-02 and 2002-03, including for each downgrade: (a) the name of the company; (b) change in accreditation level; (d) reason for downgrade; and (d) consequential action by AQIS.
- 1999 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—Which countries have banned, suspended or varied conditions of export for Australian live animals since 1996; and in each case, can details of the ban, suspension or variation, including date of action and basis of action, be provided.
- 2000 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—
- (1) What action has been taken to investigate claims of serious animal cruelty involving Australian export cattle slaughtered at the abattoir in Bassatin, Egypt.
 - (2) When did the Minister, his office and his department become aware of claims of animal cruelty at the abattoir involving Australian export cattle.

- (3) (a) What action has been taken to improve animal welfare practices at the abattoir; (b) what improved animal welfare practices have resulted from this action; and (c) what is the source of information about these improved practices.

2001 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to allegations of misreporting of live export mortality numbers aboard a journey of the *Al-Khaleej* in 2001, aired on *60 Minutes* on 27 July 2003:

- (1) (a) When did the Minister, his office and his department first become aware of allegations of misreporting of mortality numbers relating to this shipment; and (b) in each case, what was the source of this information.
- (2) (a) When did the Minister, his office and his department first become aware that Livecorp has instigated an independent investigation of the allegations; and (b) in each case, what was the source of the information.
- (3) (a) When did the Livecorp investigation commence and what are its terms of reference; and (b) what was the source of this information.
- (4) If applicable: (a) when did the Livecorp investigation conclude; (b) when did the Minister receive the report; (c) what is the outcome of the investigation; (d) can a copy of the investigation report be provided; and (e) what consequential action has Livecorp and/or the Minister taken.
- (5) When did the Minister direct the Australian Quarantine Inspection Service (AQIS) Compliance Unit to undertake an inquiry into the allegations concerning the *Al-Khaleej*.
- (6) (a) What terms of reference did the Minister establish for the inquiry; and (b) when were these terms of reference established.
- (7) When did the inquiry commence.
- (8) If applicable: (a) when did the inquiry conclude; (b) what findings and recommendations did it make; and (c) what consequential action has the Minister taken.
- (9) If the inquiry has concluded, can a copy of the report be provided; if not, why not.
- (10) If the inquiry has not concluded, when does the Minister expect it will conclude and will a copy of the inquiry report be made available; if not, why not.
- (11) In respect to the journey of the *Al-Khaleef* subject to inquiry: (a) can the following information be provided: (i) date of departure, (ii) export licence holder, (iii) loading port/s, (iii) destination port/s, (iv) voyage length, (v) number and type of animals exported, (vi) reported mortality number, (vii) reported mortality rate, and (viii) reported explanation for mortality; (b) what is the source of this information; and (c) when was the mortality data reported to the Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA) and/or AQIS.
- (12) What mortality number and rate was initially reported to: (a) Saudi authorities; (b) the export licence holder; and (c) Livecorp, and, in each case, when were these reports made and when did the department become aware of the report figures.
- (13) What, if any, revised mortality data was reported to: (a) Saudi authorities; (b) the export licence holder and (c) Livecorp and in each case, when were

these reports made and on what date did the department become aware of the report figures.

- (14) What was the actual mortality number and rate aboard the *Al-Khaleej*; and, if different from the reported mortality data, what is the explanation for the difference.

2002 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the suspension of Australian livestock exports to Saudi Arabia in August 2003:

- (1) (a) When did the Minister, his office and his department become aware that the health of sheep aboard the *MV Cormo Express* was subject to a dispute with the Saudi authorities; (b) what was the source of this information.
- (2) (a) When did Saudi authorities first inspect the livestock aboard the *MV Cormo Express*; and (b) what is the source of this information.
- (3) When did the Saudi authorities advise the exporter that they were not satisfied with the condition of the livestock aboard the vessel.
- (4) (a) What number of animals, and what percentage of the shipment, did the Saudi authorities allege were afflicted with scabby mouth; and (b) were other health problems identified by the authorities; if so, can details be provided of the problems and number afflicted.
- (5) Did the department investigate the claim, reported in the *Arab News* of 26 August 2003, that the livestock were affected by stomatitis; if so, what was the result of that investigation.
- (6) (a) What number of animals, and what percentage of the shipment, did the Australian Quarantine Inspection Service (AQIS)-approved veterinarian aboard the vessel allege were afflicted with scabby mouth; and (b) were other health problems identified by the veterinarian; if so, can details of the problems and number afflicted be provided.
- (7) In respect to the journey of the *MV Cormo Express*, can the following information be provided: (a) name and registered address of export licence holder; (b) when the exporter lodged with AQIS and Livecorp a notice of intention to export livestock to Saudi Arabia pursuant to the Australian Meat and Live-stock Industry (Live Sheep and Goat Exports to Saudi Arabia) Order 2002 (the Order); (c) when the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry issued a certificate of origin for the livestock pursuant to the Order; (d) the date AQIS issued a health certificate for the livestock pursuant to the Order; (e) date of departure; (f) loading port/s; (g) destination port/s; (h) voyage length; (i) number and type of animals exported; (j) reported mortality number; (k) reported mortality rate; (l) source of mortality data; and (m) date of mortality data reporting.
- (8) (a) When did the department and Australian Embassy officials meet with Saudi Agriculture Ministry officials to discuss the rejection of the shipment; (b) what representations did officials make to the Saudi Agriculture Ministry; and (c) what was the nature of the response.
- (9) What role did the Australian Government play in securing an alternative buyer for the livestock aboard the *MV Cormo Express*.
- (10) (a) When did the *MV Cormo Express* depart the Port of Jeddah; (b) when did it arrive at an alternative port; (c) when were the livestock subject to an additional veterinary investigation; and (d) when were the livestock discharged from the vessel.

- (11) What mortality occurred between the arrival of the *MV Cormo Express* at the Port of Jeddah and the eventual discharge of the livestock.
- (12) When did the Minister discuss the initial rejection of the livestock with his Saudi counterpart.
- (13) When did the Minister call in the Saudi Charge d'Affaires to express concern about the Saudi rejection.
- (14) What has been the total cost of the Government's response to the Saudi rejection.
- (15) (a) When were live exports with Saudi Arabia suspended; and (b) when was this suspension communicated to Saudi authorities.
- (16) Were any Australian live export vessels en route to Saudi Arabia when the Minister suspended the trade; if so: (a) what vessels were affected; (b) how many animals were on board each vessel; and (c) were these vessels re-directed.
- (17) What conditions have been placed on the resumption of trade with Saudi Arabia.

2003 **Senator Hutchins:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—With reference to the assertion made on page 14 of the Report of the Export Advisory Group on Hepatitis C and Plasma that “There have been no reports of HCV in recipients of blood products made from pools of plasma that included anti-HCV positive units dispatched from the Central Coast Blood Bank to Commonwealth Serum Laboratories”: Was there a process for identifying or notifying all patients who may have received or used recalled product manufactured from hepatitis C contaminated plasma; if so, were such patients tested for HCV.

2004 **Senator Hutchins:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—With reference to the Therapeutic Goods Administration's (TGA) recall in 1992 of unused product manufactured from hepatitis C positive plasma arising from the 'Gosford incident' as reported on page 14 of the Report of the Export Advisory Group on Hepatitis C and Plasma in 1990:

- (1) What was the stated reason for the recall.
- (2) Which blood products and batch numbers were recalled.
- (3) Was any of the plasma product Prothrombinex (Factor IX) recalled.
- (4) What was the 'class' and 'level' of the recall as per the procedures described in the TGA's Uniform Recall Procedure for Therapeutic Goods.
- (5) What was the 'strategy' for the recall as per the procedures described within the TGA's Uniform Recall Procedure for Therapeutic Goods.
- (6) What quantity was manufactured of each of the batches that were recalled.
- (7) What quantity was distributed.
- (8) What quantity was used by patients.
- (9) What quantity was retrieved.
- (10) (a) Which blood transfusion services were notified of the recall; and (b) how were they notified.
- (11) (a) Which hospitals were notified of the recall; and (b) how were they notified.
- (12) (a) Which clinicians were notified of the recall; and (b) how were they notified.

- (13) (a) Which patients were notified of the recall; and (b) how were they notified.
- (14) (a) Which hospitals notified patients who were treated as out-patients; and (b) how were they notified.
- (15) (a) Which hospitals notified patients who were treated as 'on home therapy'; and (b) how were they notified.
- (16) Were 'at risk' batch numbers disclosed to all patients who may have used the suspect products.
- (17) What process was implemented to Hepatitis C (HCV) test all patients who may have used the at-risk batches.
- (18) What measures have been taken by medical authorities to deal with the consequences of the tests for HCV.

2005 **Senator Hutchins:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—With reference to the *Report of the Expert Advisory Group on Hepatitis C and Plasma in 1990* (the 'Barraclough report') and the report's findings in relation to the so-called 'Gosford Incident' (Part 4.2 of the report):

- (1) How much unlabelled hepatitis C positive plasma from this episode was sent to the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories (CSL) and used for manufacture into plasma products.
- (2) (a) Which plasma product, or products, were manufactured from hepatitis C positive plasma from this episode; and (b) how much of each product was manufactured and distributed.
- (3) Was any quantity of the plasma product Prothrombinex (Factor IX) manufactured from hepatitis C positive plasma from the 'Gosford incident'; if so: (a) would the contaminated Prothrombinex (Factor IX) have been heat-treated; (b) at what temperature would the contaminated Prothrombinex (Factor IX) have been heat-treated; and (c) would this temperature have been adequate to ensure the heat treatment completely removed any traces of the Hepatitis C virus from the plasma product Prothrombinex (Factor IX).
- (4) (a) When, exactly, was CSL informed of this problem in 1992; (b) who informed CSL of the problem; and (c) how was CSL informed of the problem.

Notice given 11 September 2003

2006 **Senator Nettle:** To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—

- (1) What is the likely cost to the Australian Government of providing security during the impending visit by the President of the United States of America.
- (2) In the lead up to the 2000 Sydney Olympics, the Federal Attorney-General (Mr Williams), in the press release, 'Carriage of Firearms at Sydney 2000 Games', dated 20 July 2000, stated 'that Australia has a longstanding policy regarding carriage of firearms by foreign security personnel... foreign security officials have no operational role in Australia... I will take the opportunity to stress again the firm Australian position on non-carriage of firearms': Will permission be given to members of President Bush's security force to carry their own weapons or acquire firearms once they are in Australia; if so, can an explanation be provided as to why a different standard is applied to United States security forces, as opposed to the strict 'no weapons' policy applied to the security forces of other countries.

2007 **Senator Cook:** To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—In relation to payments made to individual mining companies under the Diesel Fuel Rebate Scheme for the financial years 2000-01 to 2002-03:

What was (a) the name of each company; (b) the type of mineral mined; and (c) the amount of rebate received.

What proportion of rebate was paid primarily for exploration purposes as opposed to actual mining operations.

Senator Brown: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 2008-2009)—What is the process through which the Chief Scientist is selected and appointed, and who makes the appointment.

2008 Minister representing the Minister for Science

2009 Minister representing the Minister for Science

2010 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Treasurer—

(1) How much money has been collected since 18 September 2002 in excise or customs tariffs on ethanol.

(2) (a) How much money has been paid, or is owed, to domestic producers of ethanol in subsidies since 18 September 2002; and (b) how much will be paid if current arrangements remain.

2011 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—

(1) Since August 2001, when the then Minister, Senator Hill announced the \$500 000 Natural Heritage Trust funding for the Flora for Fauna promotional campaign: (a) how much additional Federal Government funding has Nursery & Garden Industry Australia (NGIA) obtained; and (b) how much more is due.

(2) Did NGIA, or anybody acting on their behalf, promise to include a statement similar to the following with their list of recommended plants: 'For reasons of ecological integrity, remember to plant only native species which occur in your local area. Information on local species can usually be obtained from your local Australian Plants Society branch, catchment management committee or local council'; if so, is the Minister aware that, since NGIA received government funding, it has not included a supporting statement to this effect.

(3) What action is being taken to ensure that NGIA uses the funds in accordance with its declared aim of enhancing biodiversity and conservation, and not as a marketing tool for increasing nursery industry profits from a limited choice of convenient, mass-produced, industry selected plants.

2012 **Senator Stott Despoja:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Education, Science and Training—(a) How did the department calculate the figure of \$5.1 million, the amount of additional revenue that will be received over the next 4 years on an ongoing basis, as a result of the enactment of the Education Services for Overseas Students (Registration Charges) Amendment Bill 2003; and (b) can details of the costings used to calculate this figure be provided.

2013 **Senator Ludwig:** To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—

(1) Has the Attorney-General directed the department to investigate or report on the increasing number of self represented litigants; if so, what were the

findings; if not, why not, and will the department consider such an investigation.

- (2) Can statistics concerning the number of legal aid lawyers who have withdrawn from and/or been added to the preferred supplier scheme since 1995 be provided.
- (3) Does the department monitor the number of applications rejected by State Legal Aid offices; if so, can these figures be provided; if not, why not.
- (4) (a) Are any unspent monies returned to the Commonwealth by the states; if so, can details be provided for following financial years: (i) 1995-96, (ii) 1996-97, (iii) 1997-98, (iv) 1998-99, (v) 1999-2000, (vi) 2000-01, (vii) 2001-02, and (viii) 2002-03; and (b) how often does this occur.
- (5) Are these monies redistributed to other states to assist with funding shortfalls.
- (6) Are statistics recorded on the number of requests for legal aid assistance on a state-by-state basis; if so, can figures be provided for the following financial years: (a) 1995-96; (b) 1996-97; (c) 1997-98; (d) 1998-99; (e) 1999-2000; (f) 2000-01; (g) 2001-02; and (h) 2002-03; if not, why not.
- (7) Has the department investigated the impact of changes to legal aid funding arrangements on clients of legal aid; if not, why not; if so, can details be provided.
- (8) Can information be provided on the number of Legal Aid cases in which practitioners have been unable to represent a client to the conclusion of their case because of caps and staged funding.
- (9) What studies is the Attorney-General or the department aware of regarding the time required to prepare for different types of matters within the court system.
- (10) How does the department monitor the success of self represented litigants in the court system, e.g. ability to present evidence at trial.
- (11) What instances is the Attorney-General or the department aware of in which court appeals by self-represented litigants have been allowed.

2014 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—

- (1) (a) How many dolphins are in captivity in the Solomon Islands; and (b) what is their state of health.
- (2) What measures is the Australian Government taking to have the remaining dolphins returned to the wild.

2015 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 1227 (*Senate Hansard*, 10 September 2003, p. 14263): (a) What representation has the Government made to the Indonesian Government about the shooting of Elyse Rumbiak Bonai, her daughters and others; and (b) what information has Indonesia supplied.

2016 **Senator Bolkus:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—Can the Minister table the country briefs which were current in respect of the following countries in March 1996: Republic of Korea, China, Greece, Cyprus, the United States of America, Japan, Vietnam and Indonesia.

2017 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—

- (1) Was the Minister informed that the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) National Measurement Laboratory has ceased work on international standards for ultrasound measurement and safety.
- (2) Will this work be completed; if so, how.
- (3) Was the Minister informed that the CSIRO National Measurement Laboratory has ceased work on the important area of medical metrology; if so, is the Minister concerned about this move given the development of new devices and apparent lack of standards for such devices.
- (4) Was the Minister informed that the CSIRO has ceased its work on foetal risks from diagnostic ultrasound when the CSIRO studies suggest there are risks associated with new technology being developed with higher acoustic output; and (b) is the Minister concerned that, despite the fact every pregnant woman who presents to a doctor will have an ultrasound, very little work is now being done on the safety standards of this technology; if so, what action is proposed to address this issue.

2018 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Science—

- (1) Why has the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) National Measurement Laboratory ceased work on international standards for ultrasound measurement and safety.
- (2) Why has the CSIRO National Measurement Laboratory ceased work on the important area of medical metrology, given the development of new devices and apparent lack of standards for these devices.
- (3) Why has the CSIRO ceased its work on foetal risks from diagnostic ultrasound when new techniques are being developed with higher acoustic output.
- (4) Who will provide rationale scientific expert witness if and when the legal claims reach the level of class actions by entrepreneur lawyers.
- (5) Who will conduct research into bacterial drug resistance, previously carried out by microbiologist, Dr Ruth Hall.
- (6) Can details be provided on other programs in public health that will be affected by staff redundancies at the CSIRO.

2019 **Senator Bartlett:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—

- (1) What specific abilities are there for members of Parliament to sponsor temporary entrants or visitors to Australia.
- (2) Under what circumstances may a visitor visa be refused when a member of Parliament has sponsored the applicant.
- (3) (a) How many members of Parliament (state and federal) have sponsored visitor or temporary visa applicants; (b) how many applicants have been (i) approved, and (ii) rejected.

2020 **Senator Faulkner:** To ask the Minister for Justice and Customs—With reference to the answer to question no. 130 taken on notice by the department during the May 2003 Budget estimates hearings of the Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee:

- (1) In relation to an answer by Commissioner Keelty, of the Australian Federal Police (AFP), during the estimates hearings (Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee *Hansard*, 27 May 2003, p. 307) about a 'report

made available' to Federal Agent Leigh Dixon's 'reporting group' concerning the 13 June 2001 inter-agency people smuggling meeting in the Australian Embassy in Jakarta: Was a report, either oral or written, received by Federal Agent Leigh Dixon's reporting group; if so: (a) when did this occur; (b) who was made aware of this report; (c) was the report oral or written.

- (2) (a) If the report was oral, were any notes and/or minutes taken by anyone involved in the discussion or discussions he had; and (b) if the report was a written, can a copy be provided by the AFP.
- (3) In relation to the meeting held on 1 August 2002 with Federal Agent Dixon and other AFP members to discuss Marian Wilkinson's questions about the 13 June 2001 meeting: (a) which AFP members were present; (b) who initiated this meeting; (c) where was it held; and (d) were notes or minutes taken; if so, can a copy of these notes and/or minutes be provided; (e) who prepared and cleared the meeting summary; (f) for whom was this summary brief prepared; and (g) apart from Commissioner Keelty, who else saw the summary of this meeting, and can a copy be provided.

2021 **Senator Faulkner:** To ask the Minister for Justice and Customs—With reference to the answer to question no. 131 taken on notice by the department during the May 2003 Budget estimates hearings of the Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee:

- (1) Who briefed the Minister on 19 August 2002 and 26 September 2002 about Marian Wilkinson's questions.
- (2) Who initiated the briefing.
- (3) Was the briefing oral or in writing.
- (4) If it was an oral briefing: (a) who briefed the Minister; (b) who else was present; (c) were minutes and/or notes taken; if so, can a copy of minutes and/or notes be provided; and (d) what action, if any, did the Minister take after he was provided with the two briefings in August and September 2002.
- (5) If it was a written briefing: (a) who prepared the brief; (b) who cleared the brief; (c) apart from the Minister, who else saw the brief; and (d) what action, if any, did the Minister take after he was provided with the two briefings in August and September 2002.

2022 **Senator Faulkner:** To ask the Minister for Justice and Customs—With reference to the answer to question no. 132 taken on notice by the department during the May 2003 Budget estimates hearings of the Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee:

- (1) During his visit to Indonesia on 17 September 2001, did Commissioner Keelty of the Australian Federal Police discuss with the Indonesian National Police (INP) the cancellation of the protocol.
- (2) What reason or reasons did the INP give for the cancellation of the protocol.

2023 **Senator Faulkner:** To ask the Minister for Justice and Customs—With reference to the answer to question no. 135 taken on notice by the department during the May 2003 Budget estimates hearings of the Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee:

- (1) (a) What information was provided to the Australian Federal Police (AFP) as a result of the telephone interview with a SIEVX survivor on 22 October 2001; and (b) what did the AFP do with the information they received.
- (2) Can the AFP confirm whether the interview on 23 October 2001 with two SIEVX survivors conducted by the Indonesian National Police (INP) and observed by two AFP members is the same interview that is outlined in *Dark Victory*, by David Marr and Marian Wilkinson, 2003, p.237-238 and an SBS Radio report *The Five Mysteries of SIEVX*, SBS Radio/Arabic Program, by Ghassan Nakhoul, 28 August 2002; (b) which AFP members were present at the interview on 23 October 2001; (c) for how long was the interview conducted; (d) what did the AFP do with the information obtained from the interview; (e) was a transcript made; and (f) was it the INP or the AFP which provided the 20 odd photographs to the survivors; if the AFP: (i) which agency supplied the photographs, (ii) how were they taken, and (iii) what did they depict.

2024 **Senator Faulkner:** To ask the Minister for Justice and Customs—With reference to the answer to a question taken on notice by the department during the May 2003 Budget estimates hearings of the Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee: Is the Australian Federal Police aware of tracking devices having been placed on people smuggling vessels in the period 1 July 2001 to 30 June 2002.

2025 **Senator Faulkner:** To ask the Minister for Justice and Customs—With reference to the answer to question no. 127 taken on notice by the department during the May 2003 Budget estimates hearings of the Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee: What did Federal Agent Dixon's 'gathering of information relevant to people smuggling activities' in Indonesia involve.

Notice given 15 September 2003

2026 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—Can a list be provided of all work performed on the HMAS *Kanimbla* between 1 January 2002 and 30 June 2002, including: (a) a description of the work; (b) the contractor who performed the work; (c) the amount paid to each of the contractors; and (d) the dates that each payment was made.

2027 **Senator Forshaw:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—

- (1) How many allocated aged care places were available as at 30 June 2003 in each state and territory for: (a) high care residential; (b) low care residential; (c) and community aged care packages.
- (2) How many operational places were available as at 30 June 2003 in each state and territory for: (a) high care residential; (b) low care residential; and (c) community aged care packages.

2028 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—In regard to the provision of two-way satellite broadband access for rural areas in Australia: (a) What advantages or disadvantages does the satellite option have for remote communities compared with other options; (b) does the satellite option offer Australians in remote or rural areas services similar to those available in metropolitan areas; and (c) are any proposals being considered by the Government.

2029 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Prime Minister—With reference to statements made by the Prime Minister at a press conference with Australian journalists at the Makati Shangri-la Hotel, Manila, on 14 July 2003:

- (1) What are the terms of the agreement reached between the Prime Minister and the President of the Philippines on the establishment of a standing forum to resolve agricultural trade disputes between Australia and the Philippines.
- (2) (a) Which country initiated the standing forum proposal; and (b) how was the proposal initiated.
- (3) Were officers of the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry present during the Prime Minister's negotiations on the standing forum; if so, which officers.
- (4) Did the Prime Minister consult with: (a) the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry; (b) the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry; (c) the Minister for Trade; (d) the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade; (e) the National Farmers' Federation; or (f) any Australian commodity or industry group, before he agreed to establish a standing forum to resolve agricultural trade disputes with the Philippines; if so, when did he engage in such consultation.
- (5) If the forum was not first discussed by representatives of the two countries during the Prime Minister's meeting with the President of the Philippines on 14 July 2003: (a) when was the proposal first discussed; (b) who was involved; (c) what other negotiations occurred prior to 14 July 2003; (d) when did those negotiations take place; and (e) who was involved.
- (6) With regard to negotiations about the standing forum since the Prime Minister's meeting with the President of the Philippines on 14 July 2003: (a) if negotiations have taken place; (i) what form have they taken, (ii) where were these held, (iii) when did they take place, (iv) which officials from which departments have been involved, (v) what has been the total cost of these negotiations, (vi) what proportion of the costs has Australia met, (vii) what outcomes can be attributed to the negotiations, (viii) what future negotiations are planned, (ix) when are negotiations anticipated to conclude; and (b) if no negotiations have taken place: (i) why not, (ii) when will they commence, (iii) what form will they take, (iv) which officials from which departments will be involved, (v) what will the negotiations cost, (vi) what proportion of these costs will Australia meet, and (vii) when will the negotiations conclude.
- (7) Has the forum been established; if so: (a) when; (b) what was its establishment cost and what will be its ongoing operations cost; (c) can a breakdown of these costs be provided; (d) what is its membership; (e) how are matters brought before the forum; (f) what matters can be brought before the forum; (g) how are disputes resolved in the forum; (h) what matters have been discussed by the forum; (i) when have those discussions occurred; (j) what has been the outcome of those discussions; if the forum has not been established: (a) why not; and (b) when will the forum be established.
- (8) Is the standing forum consistent with Australia's World Trade Organisation (WTO) obligations.
- (9) Have other countries made any representations to the Government in connection with the standing forum proposal; if so, (a) what countries have made representations; (b) what was their nature; (c) when were they made; and (d) what response has the Government provided.
- (10) Has the Government considered establishing standing for a with other countries as a means to settle trade disputes.

- (11) What implications does the standing forum proposal have for the settlement of current trade disputes with the Philippines concerning the proposed importation of bananas and pineapples.
- (12) (a) What are the details of the proposal put by the President of the Philippines to the Prime Minister in relation to the importation of pineapples; (b) does the proposal involve a change to the conditions of entry for pineapples; (c) what consideration has the Government given to the proposal; and (d) what is the timeframe for the conclusion of that consideration.
- (13) (a) Did the Prime Minister raise the Philippines' recent WTO challenge against Australian quarantine in only a 'very, very cursory way' during his meeting with the President of the Philippines; if so, why; and (b) did the Prime Minister adopt this course of action pursuant to departmental advice; if so, which departments provided this advice.
- (14) (a) What other agricultural trade matters were discussed at the meeting between the Prime Minister and the President of the Philippines on 14 July 2003; and (b) what agreements were reached.

2030 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the Minister's trip to South America in mid-2003:

- (1) When did the Minister: (a) depart Australia; and (b) return to Australia.
- (2) Who travelled with the Minister.
- (3) Who met the cost of the participants' travel and other expenses associated with the trip.
- (4) If costs were met by the department, can an itemised list of costs be provided; if not, why not.
- (5) Can the Minister's detailed itinerary be provided; if not, why not.

2031 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Special Minister of State—With reference to the visit by the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry to South America in mid-2003:

- (1) What travel costs and other associated expenses, if any, were met by the department in respect of the Minister and his staff.
- (2) What were these costs per expenditure item for: (a) the Minister; and (b) the Minister's staff.
- (3) What other costs, if any, were met by the department in relation to the trip.

2032 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the trip to the United States of America by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry in mid-2003:

- (1) When did the Parliamentary Secretary: (a) depart Australia; and (b) return to Australia.
- (2) Who travelled with the Parliamentary Secretary.
- (3) Who met the cost of the participants' travel and other expenses associated with the trip.
- (4) If costs were met by the department, can an itemised list of costs be provided; if not, why not.

- (5) Can the Parliamentary Secretary's detailed itinerary be provided; if not, why not.

2033 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Special Minister of State—With reference to the trip to the United States of America by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry in mid-2003:

- (1) What travel costs and other associated expenses, if any, were met by the department in respect of the Parliamentary Secretary and her staff.
- (2) What were these costs per expenditure item for: (a) the Parliamentary Secretary; and (b) the Parliamentary Secretary's staff.
- (3) What other costs, if any, were met by the department in relation to the trip.

Senator O'Brien: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 2034-2064)—

- (1) For each of the following financial years: (a) 1996-97; (b) 1997-98; (c) 1998-99; (d) 1999-2000; (e) 2000-01; (f) 2001-02; (g) 2002-03; and (h) 2003-04, has the department or any agency for which the Minister is responsible, including boards, councils, committees and advisory bodies, made payments to the Institute of Public Affairs (IPA) for research projects, consultancies, conferences, publications and/or other purposes; if so, (i) how much each payment, (ii) when was each payment made, and (iii) what services were provided.
- (2) In relation to each research project or consultancy: (a) when was the IPA engaged; (b) for what time period; (c) what were the terms of reference; (d) what role did the Minister and/or his office have in the engagement of the IPA; (e) was the contract subject to a tender process; if so, was it an open tender or a select tender; if not, why not.

2034 Minister representing the Prime Minister

2035 Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services

2036 Minister representing the Treasurer

2037 Minister representing the Minister for Trade

2038 Minister for Defence

2039 Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts

2040 Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs

2041 Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations

2042 Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs

2043 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

2044 Minister representing the Attorney-General

2045 Minister for Finance and Administration

2046 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

2047 Minister for Family and Community Services

2048 Minister representing the Minister for Education, Science and Training

2049 Minister for Health and Ageing

2050 Minister representing the Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources

2051 Minister for Justice and Customs

2052 Minister for Fisheries, Forestry and Conservation

2053 Minister for the Arts and Sport

- 2054 Minister representing the Minister for Small Business and Tourism
- 2055 Minister representing the Minister for Science
- 2056 Minister representing the Minister for Regional Services, Territories and Local Government
- 2057 Minister representing the Minister for Children and Youth Affairs
- 2058 Minister representing the Minister for Employment Services
- 2059 Special Minister of State
- 2060 Minister representing the Minister for Veterans' Affairs
- 2061 Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer
- 2062 Minister representing the Minister for Ageing
- 2063 Minister representing the Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs
- 2064 Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for the Status of Women
- 2065 **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. 1474 (Senate *Hansard*, 19 August 2003, p. 14019) concerning a Dairy Regional Assistance Program grant of \$20 900 to the Eurobodalla Shire Council for the production of a Eurobodalla coast gourmet trails brochure:
- (1) What variations to the application were made on: (a) 2 July 2001; and (b) 17 August 2001.
 - (2) (a) When was the project milestone constituting a brochure launch scheduled; (b) when was the launch cancelled due to a 'lack of availability of invitees'; (c) why did the proponent fail to reschedule the launch; and (d) why did the department not delay or withhold progress payments until this project milestone was reached.
 - (3) When were monitoring visits undertaken.
 - (4) (a) How has the Minister attributed the generation of four full-time equivalent positions to this project; (b) what is the nature of these positions; and (c) where are they located.
 - (5) Can the Minister explain how the project was completed on 20 May 2003 when, according to his advice, it is not due to commence until 1 October 2003.
 - (6) Can the Minister explain how a final audit was completed on 19 July 2002 when, according to his advice, the project itself was not completed until 20 May 2003.
- 2066 **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. 1473 (Senate *Hansard*, 19 August 2003, p. 14010) concerning a Dairy Regional Assistance Program grant of \$34 914 to the Sapphire Coast Producers' Association Inc. for the alternative starter kits project:
- (1) What variation to the application was made on 22 November 2000.
 - (2) Can the Minister explain why the proponent was not informed about the funding approval until 5 July 2001 when, according to the Minister's advice, his department informed the Area Consultative Committee and the Member for Eden-Monaro (Mr Nairn) on 10 April 2001 and announced the grant on 11 April 2001.
 - (3) Why have no monitoring visits been undertaken by the department.

- (4) (a) What project milestones has the proponent failed to report; and (b) what progress payments has the department withheld as a consequence of this failure.
- (5) With reference to the project's projected employment generation of 10 to 40 jobs within two years and a further 5 to 10 jobs through the construction of a multi-purpose processing facility: (a) does the drought constitute a satisfactory explanation for the project's failure to generate any employment outcomes since August 2001; and (b) why is the project not completed.

2067 **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. 1472 (Senate *Hansard*, 19 August 2003, p. 14004) concerning a Dairy Regional Assistance Program (RAP) grant of \$39 974 to the South East New South Wales Area Consultative Committee for the strategic response to dairy RAP project:

- (1) Can the Minister explain why he advised that 'ownership of assets purchased with Dairy RAP funds vests with the funding recipient' when the Minister's program information guide states that 'any assets purchased with Dairy RAP funds will remain the property of the department upon completion or termination of the project, unless the Commonwealth determines otherwise'.
- (2) If the Minister has determined that assets purchased with this grant should be vested in the proponent, can the Minister: (a) explain why; (b) advise what assets were purchased and the value of these assets; and (c) advise on what date this decision was made.

2068 **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. 1471 (Senate *Hansard*, 19 August 2003, p. 13996) concerning a Dairy Regional Assistance Program (RAP) grant of \$660 645 to the Bega Cooperative Society for the Bega Cheese shredding and mozzarella line project:

- (1) (a) What project milestones has the proponent failed to meet; and (b) what progress payments have been withheld as a result.
- (2) Why is the project incomplete 30 months after commencement when the application advised that the project would be completed within 4 months of commencement.
- (3) (a) In what months has the proponent failed to provide monthly progress reports; (b) when has the department made 'repeated requests' for the provision of these reports; and (c) what explanation has the department received for the failure to provide these reports.
- (4) What is the nature of the '22 positions' generated by the project, i.e. are these jobs permanent, full-time, seasonal, direct or indirect.
- (5) (a) Why did the Minister advise that 'ownership of assets purchased with Dairy RAP funds vests with the funding recipient' when the Minister's program information guide states that 'any assets purchased with Dairy RAP funds will remain the property of the department upon completion or termination of the project, unless the Commonwealth determines otherwise'; and (b) if the Minister has determined that assets purchased with this grant should be vested in the proponent, can the Minister: (i) explain why, (ii) advise what assets were purchased and the value of these assets, and (iii) advise on what date this decision was made.

2069 **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. 1475 (Senate *Hansard*, 19 August 2003, p. 14025) concerning a Dairy Regional Assistance Program grant of \$770 000 to the Bega Cooperative Society for the Bega Cheese – cheese plant upgrade project:

- (1) Did the failure of the Bega Cooperative Society to meet project milestones for the Bega Cheese shredding and mozzarella line project have any impact on the decision to approve funding for the cheese plant upgrade project; if so, what impact; if not, why not.
- (2) (a) What project milestones has the proponent failed to meet for the shredding and mozzarella line project; and (b) what progress payments have been withheld as a result.
- (3) Why is the project incomplete 14 months after commencement when the application advised that the project would be completed within 6 months of commencement.
- (4) (a) In what months has the proponent failed to provide monthly progress reports; (b) when has the department made 'repeated requests' for the provision of these reports; and (c) what explanation has the department received for the failure to provide these reports.
- (5) What is the nature of the '24 positions' generated by the project, i.e. are these jobs permanent, full-time, seasonal, direct or indirect.

Senator Faulkner: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 2070-2087)—

- (1) For the financial years 2001-02 and 2002-03, have there been any laptop computers lost or stolen from the possession of any officer of the department and/or any agency within the portfolio, if so: (a) how many have been lost; (b) how many have been stolen; (c) what is the total value of these computers; (d) what is the average replacement value per computer; and (e) have these computers been recovered or replaced.
- (2) Have the police been requested to investigate any of these incidents, if so: (a) how many were the subject of police investigation; (b) how many police investigations have been concluded; (c) in how many cases has legal action commenced; and (d) in how many cases has action been concluded and with what result.
- (3) How many of these lost or stolen items had, on their hard disc drives or in the form of floppy disc, CD-ROM or any other storage device, departmental documents, content or information other than operating software.
- (4) How many of the documents referred to in paragraph (3) were classified for security or any other purpose; if any, what was the security classification involved.
- (5) (a) How many of the documents referred to in paragraph (3) have been recovered; and (b) how many documents referred to in paragraph (4) have been recovered.
- (6) What departmental disciplinary or other actions have been taken in regard to the items referred to paragraph (1), or in relation to the documents referred to in paragraphs (3) and (4).

2070 Minister representing the Prime Minister

2071 Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services

2072 Minister representing the Treasurer

- 2073 Minister representing the Minister for Trade
- 2074 Minister for Defence
- 2075 Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts
- 2076 Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs
- 2077 Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations
- 2078 Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs
- 2079 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage
- 2080 Minister representing the Attorney-General
- 2081 Minister for Finance and Administration
- 2082 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
- 2083 Minister for Family and Community Services
- 2084 Minister representing the Minister for Education, Science and Training
- 2085 Minister for Health and Ageing
- 2086 Minister representing the Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources
- 2087 Minister representing the Minister for Veterans' Affairs

Senator Faulkner: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 2088-2105)—

- (1) For the financial years 2001-02 and 2002-03, have there been any desktop computers, or any other item of computer hardware, other than laptop computers, lost or stolen from the possession of any officer of the department and/or any agency within the portfolio, if so: (a) what and how many have been lost; (b) what and how many have been stolen; (c) what is the total value of these items; (d) what is the nominal replacement value per item; and (e) have these computers been recovered or replaced.
- (2) Have the police been requested to investigate any of these incidents, if so: (a) how many were the subject of police investigation; (b) how many police investigations have been concluded; (c) in how many cases has legal action commenced; and (d) in how many cases has action concluded and with what result.
- (3) How many of these lost or stolen items had, on their hard disc drives or in the form of floppy disc, CD-ROM or any other storage device, departmental documents, content or information other than operating software.
- (4) How many of the documents referred to in paragraph (3) were classified for security or any other purpose; if any, what was the security classification involved.
- (5) (a) How many of the documents referred to in paragraph (3) have been recovered; and (b) how many documents referred to in paragraph (4) have been recovered.
- (6) What departmental disciplinary or other actions have been taken in regard to the items referred to paragraph 1, or in relation to the documents referred to in paragraphs (3) and (4).

- 2088 Minister representing the Prime Minister
- 2089 Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services
- 2090 Minister representing the Treasurer
- 2091 Minister representing the Minister for Trade

- 2092 Minister for Defence
- 2093 Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts
- 2094 Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs
- 2095 Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations
- 2096 Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs
- 2097 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage
- 2098 Minister representing the Attorney-General
- 2099 Minister for Finance and Administration
- 2100 Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
- 2101 Minister for Family and Community Services
- 2102 Minister representing the Minister for Education, Science and Training
- 2103 Minister for Health and Ageing
- 2104 Minister representing the Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources
- 2105 Minister representing the Minister for Veterans' Affairs
- 2106 **Senator Marshall:** To ask the Minister for Justice and Customs—With reference to a raid conducted by the Australian Federal Police (AFP) at a family home in Melbourne in the early hours of 3 June 2003, as reported in the *Age* of 4 June 2003:
- (1) Were personal items, such as high school text and exercise books, other books, photos, political placards, banners, flags and posters, framed pictures, newspaper clippings, calendars, videos, and clothing badges and pins confiscated from the home.
 - (2) (a) How many of each of these items were seized and was what the subject nature of each item; and (b) why were these items seized.
 - (3) (a) Was the AFP requested to return any or all of these items to the family, by the family or their legal representatives; (b) can details of any such requests be provided; (c) on how many occasions have such requests been made to the AFP; and (d) can details the AFP's response to any such requests be provided; if not, why not.
 - (4) When will these items be returned to the family; if not, why not.
 - (5) (a) What assistance or remedy can the Government provide to the student, or students, whose education has been disadvantaged by the seizure and non-return of schoolbooks; and (b) will the Government offer such assistance or remedy; if not, why not.
- 2107 **Senator Webber:** To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—
- (1) Is the proposed visit by HRH Prince Harry of a completely private nature.
 - (2) Does the visit include visiting Bondi Beach, attending the Rugby World Cup and attending a farm-stay program.
 - (3) Will the Prince undertake any official duties during his stay in Australia.
 - (4) Are reports claiming that the personal security costs associated with the visit have been estimated to be in excess of \$1.4 million, accurate.
 - (5) Does the Minister believe it is appropriate to use taxpayer's money to cover the costs of a purely private visit by a member of the British Royal Family.

- 2108 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Education, Science and Training—What progress has been made on developing a national framework for combating abuse in schools, as first raised by the Minister at the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs meeting in July 2002.
- 2109 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Education, Science and Training—
- (1) Is the Government aware that British Nuclear Fuels Limited is currently exhuming waste and debris contaminated with plutonium buried at its repository at Drigg, Cumbria and repackaging it, with a view to disposal in concrete at its Sellafield site.
 - (2) Will the Government now consider exhuming the plutonium contaminated debris currently buried in earth trenches at Maralinga for proper re-burial in concrete; if not, why not.

Notice given 16 September 2003

- 2110 **Senator Webber:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs—
- (1) Given the department's concerns with the maladministration of the Northern Suburbs Migrant Resource Centre in Perth, Western Australia, why was an administrator not put in charge of the organisation.
 - (2) Why did the department not ask the South Metropolitan Migrant Resource Centre in Perth to move its operations to another location that better suited the needs of the migrant community of Perth.
 - (3) What consultations were undertaken with local stake-holders prior to the decision to merge the two Western Australian Migrant Resource Centres (MRCs).
 - (4) Has the department explored how the needs of migrants in the outer metropolitan suburbs of Perth can be met with minimal travel time and expense.
 - (5) Why is the Minister phasing out MRCs, given their capacity to provide services that are culturally and linguistically appropriate than equivalent Commonwealth services.
 - (6) Why does the department persist in the practice of placing non-voting members on the management committees of MRCs, when the Commonwealth provides greater funding to other mainstream organisations, without requiring participation in management committees.
- 2111 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—
- (1) Has the Private Forest Reserves program in Tasmania succeeded.
 - (2) Will the program receive Commonwealth funding beyond the 2003-04 financial year.
 - (3) What is the cost difference between the purchase of private properties for conservation reasons and covenanting the same properties.
- 2112 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—With regard to the e-Defence project (Project Joint 2054) in the Defence Capability Plan:
- (1) Can a description of all the phases of this project be provided.

- (2) (a) What was the original timeline for the completion of the project, including the dates for completing each of the phases in the project.
- (3) What was the original budget for this project, including the budget for each of the phases.
- (4) (a) What is the current schedule for completing this project, including the dates for each of the phases.
- (5) What is the current budget for the project, including the budget for each of the phases.
- (6) What has been the cost of this project to date, including the cost for each phase completed.
- (7) What are the reasons for the delays being experienced with Phase 1 of this project.

2113 **Senator Evans:** To ask the Minister for Defence—

- (1) (a) What is the current status of the Defence property at the Stockton Rifle Range in New South Wales; (b) what was the land used for previously; and (c) for what purpose does Defence envisage that the site could be used in the future.
- (2) What is the size of the site.
- (3) Has the site been valued by either the New South Wales Valuer-General or the Australian Valuation Office; if so: (a) when did the valuations take place; and (b) what was the estimated value.
- (4) Is it intended that the site will be sold; if so, when.
- (5) Is Defence aware of any heritage and/or environmental significance attached to the site; if so, can details be provided.
- (6) Have any parties, i.e. individuals, organisations or governments, expressed an interest in acquiring the site; if so, can details be provided.
- (7) Has the Port Stephens Council expressed an interest in acquiring the site; if so, what was the nature of each expression of interest from the Council.
- (8) (a) Why has the land not been transferred to the Port Stephens Council; and (b) has there been any consultation between Defence and the Council in this regard; if so, what was the nature of each consultation with the Council on this issue.
- (9) (a) When did the Commonwealth first acquire the site; and (b) what was the purpose of the acquisition.
- (10) (a) What was the process for acquiring the site; and (b) did the Commonwealth ever pay any party for the acquisition; if so, how much was paid.

2115 **Senator Carr:** To ask the Minister representing the Treasurer—With regard to issues of management, restructuring and Occupational Health and Safety (OH&S) at the Note Printing Australia Ltd plant at Craigieburn, Victoria:

- (1) (a) Did the company employ an independent investigator, Co Solve, to investigate employee allegations of bullying, intimidation and harassment; and (b) did that investigation find that a senior staff member and a consultant, driving a change program within the organisation, have a case to answer.
- (2) Can a copy of that report be provided.

- (3) How much money has the company paid to the change program consultant, Caroline Shabaz and her associates, during the past 3 years.
- (4) Is Caroline Shabaz now suing Note Printing Australia Ltd; if so: (a) what are the grounds for her claim; and (b) what amount of money is she seeking.
- (5) Has anyone else commenced legal action against Note Printing Australia Ltd over these matters.
- (6) (a) What has been the total cost to the company, over the past 3 years, in hiring consultants in the areas of: (i) change management, (ii) OH&S, and (iii) organisational restructuring; and (b) in relation to each consultancy: (i) who was the consultant, (ii) what was the duration of their contract, and (iii) what was the total remuneration and expenses paid to them.
- (7) Can full details be provided of the process that was used for the employment of each of these consultants.
- (8) (a) What evaluation of the effectiveness of each of these consultancies has been made by the company; and (b) can a copy of each of these evaluations be provided.
- (9) Have any of these consultants subsequently been appointed to management positions within the company; if so: (a) how many and who; (b) were public service guidelines followed in all such appointments; and (c) were the positions advertised.
- (10) (a) Is it correct that the company has had 3 human resources managers in the past 2 years; and (b) were any of these internal appointments or promotions; if so, what appointment guidelines were followed in each case: (i) what were the selection criteria, (ii) what qualifications were identified for the position, and (iii) was the position advertised.
- (11) What are the total legal costs to date incurred by the company in relation to issues arising from proposed restructuring and the consequent allegations.
- (12) Does Note Printing Australia Ltd have a current business plan and a plan for restructuring; if so, can copies of these be provided.
- (13) Has any analysis of the possible sale of Note Printing Australia Ltd been undertaken; if not, has the company's board ever considered this matter.

Notice given 17 September 2003

2116 **Senator Ridgeway:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—

- (1) Has the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Service (ATSIS) notified certain Indigenous organisations that funding will be provided on a cyclical basis or will cease completely; if so, how many organisations have had their funding withdrawn or altered since the changeover from the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) to ATSIS.
- (2) Which organisations, by name, category and location, have: (a) received ATSIC funding in the 2002-03 financial year; and (b) had their funding altered in the changeover to ATSIS.
- (3) (a) How many of these organisations have been notified; and (b) how long will these changes be in place.
- (4) What reasons for the changes have been provided to the relevant organisations.

- (5) Where funding has or will cease, can organisations appeal to the Minister against the ATSSIS decision.
- (6) Where funding has or will cease, what Government policy objectives will be achieved.
- (7) Has ATSSIS made any costs savings as a result of the changeover from ATSSIC.
- (8) (a) What plans does the Government have for any surplus funds; and
(b) what programs will be funded using this surplus.
- (9) (a) What ATSSIC assets, if any, have been transferred to ATSSIS and;
(b) what is the legal basis for assets transfers.

2117 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—

- (1) Given the Minister's response to a question without notice by Senator Allison on 11 September 2003, that the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) has never found foetal risks from diagnostic ultrasound equipment, can the Minister explain the findings of animal studies carried out at the CSIRO, which clearly show that such risks exist.
- (2) Given the Minister's claims that the CSIRO's National Measurement Laboratory (NML) will continue to maintain a standard for ultrasound equipment power after it becomes part of the National Measurement Institute in July 2004, can the Minister explain how this is possible when:
(a) the work carried out at the NML was on standards for therapeutic ultrasounds, not diagnostic ultrasounds; and
(b) the only scientist researching ultrasound standards at the NML, Dr Adrian Richards, has been made redundant.

Notice given 18 September 2003

*2118 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Science—

- (1) With regard to the proposed low level and short-lived intermediate level radioactive waste repository:
 - (a) who will be responsible for the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository;
 - (b) will the Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation (ANSTO) be responsible for the transportation of radioactive waste from the nuclear reactor at Lucas Heights to the repository;
 - (c) will ANSTO be responsible for the transportation of radioactive waste from sites occupied by other Commonwealth agencies, state agencies or any private person to the repository;
 - (d) will the Commonwealth regulate the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository; if so, what legislation will the Commonwealth use;
 - (e) have any Indigenous groups consented to the construction and operation of the repository at the site known as Site 40a; if so, which groups;
 - (f) have any Indigenous groups stated that Site 40a has no particular Indigenous heritage values; if so, which groups;
 - (g) how many truckloads of radioactive waste are expected to be transported to the repository each year.

- (2) With regard to the proposed long-lived intermediate level radioactive waste repository:
 - (a) will the Minister table a copy of the list of sites that are being considered for the construction of this repository by no later than 8 October 2003;
 - (b) will the Commonwealth require access to a port in order to receive intermediate-level radioactive waste for the proposed repository; if so: (a) which port or ports is the Commonwealth considering using;
 - (c) will the Minister table, by no later than 8 October 2003, a copy of the radiological consequence analysis, prepared by Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency, in relation to Lucas Heights.

*2119 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the discovery of live sea lice in a shipment of imported salmon on 3 September 2003:

- (1) What was the exporting country.
- (2) When did the shipment depart.
- (3) If not exported from the country of origin, what was the exporting country.
- (4) What was the port of departure.
- (5) When did the shipment arrive in Australia.
- (6) Was Sydney the port of arrival
- (7) What salmonid species did the shipment contain.
- (8) When did the Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service (AQIS) issue the permit to import quarantine material.
- (9) When was the official certificate issued by an AQIS-recognised Competent Authority in the exporting country.
- (10) What was the form, presentation and weight of the salmon
- (11) What was the intended end use of the salmon, including, if applicable, commercial processing, processing for retail sale and/or direct retail sale.
- (12) When and where did AQIS first inspect the salmon.
- (13) When was the salmon seized.
- (14) Was the salmon ordered to be frozen, if so: (i) when was that order made, and (ii) on what date was the salmon frozen.
- (15) In relation to the sea lice analysis: (a) when did this commence and conclude; (b) where was this done; and (c) who conducted the analysis.
- (16) When was the Minister and/or his office and/or his department informed about the analysis findings; (a) what are the analysis findings, including: (i) details of the sea lice species, (ii) whether the species are usually found in Australian waters, and (iii) whether the sea lice present a quarantine risk.
- (17) (a) When did AQIS consult with Food Standards Australia New Zealand and state and territory food agencies about the salmon; (b) what state and territory food agencies were consulted; and (c) what was the nature of those consultations.
- (18) In relation to the outcome of the sea lice discovery and analysis: (a) If the salmon was released for sale: (i) when, (ii) what conditions, if any, were placed on its end use, and (iii) what was its end use; (b) if the salmon was ordered to be re-exported: (i) when was that order made, (ii) when was the salmon exported, (iii) how was the exported salmon labelled; and (iv) to

what country was it exported; (c) if the salmon was ordered to be destroyed:
(i) when was that order made, (ii) when and how was it destroyed.

- *2120 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—Can details be provided of all breaches of import conditions applying to the commercial importation of uncanned salmonid product since new quarantine conditions came into effect on 1 June 2000, including, for each breach: (a) the date of importation; (b) the nature of the breach, including: (i) failure to provide an Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service (AQIS) permit, (ii) failure to provide a completed official certificate issued by an AQIS-recognised competent authority, (iii) failure to remove the head and gills, and (iv) any other reasons; (c) the salmonid species; (d) the country of export; (e) if not exported from the country of origin, the country that exported the salmonid product; (f) the product presentation and form; and (g) action taken in response to the breach including, if applicable: (i) the suspension or revocation of the import permit, and (ii) the disposal or re-export of the salmonid product.
- *2121 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the Plant Breeders' Rights Advisory Committee:
- (1) When in 2003 did the department seek applications for eight part-time vacancies.
 - (2) In what newspapers and other media did the department place advertisements seeking applications.
 - (3) How many applications did the department receive from applicants nominating qualifications in respect of the following positions designated in section 64 of the *Plant Breeders' Rights Act 1994*: (a) representatives of breeders, and likely breeders' of new plant varieties; (b) a representative of users, and likely users, of new plant varieties; (c) a representative of consumers, and likely consumers, of new plant varieties or of the products of new plant varieties; (d) a representative of conservation interests in relation to new plant varieties and the potential impacts of new plant varieties; (e) a representative of indigenous Australian interests in relation to new plant varieties and the source, use and impacts of new plant varieties; and (f) others with appropriate experience or qualifications.
 - (4) How many people did the department interview in relation each designated position.
 - (5) Can details be provided of each industry, consumer, conservation, indigenous and/or other organisation consulted prior to the appointment of the current committee members.
 - (6) When did the Minister appoint the current members.
 - (7) (a) What is the name and business address of each member; (b) what interests do they represent pursuant to section 64 of the *Plant Breeders' Rights Act 1994*.
 - (8) Which organisations provided letters of support for each member.
 - (9) Since its appointment, when has the current committee met.
 - (10) What are the names and terms of appointment for all members of the committee since its formation in 1994.
- *2122 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the Government's revised corporate branding requirements:

- (1) For each of the following Research and Development Corporations (RDCs): What advice has the Minister or his department provided concerning branding requirements: (a) Cotton; (b) Fisheries; (c) Forest and Wood Products; (d) Grains; (e) Grape and Wine; (f) Land & Water Australia; (g) Rural Industries; (h) Sugar; and (i) Tobacco.
- (2) For each RDC in paragraph (1), when did the Minister provide this advice.
- (3) For each RDC in paragraph (1), what assessment has the Minister or his department made about the costs associated with new corporate branding requirements.
- (4) For each RDC in paragraph (1), when did consultation with RDCs on revised branding commence; if consultation did not commence prior to the provision of instructions about new branding requirements, why not.
- (5) For each RDC in paragraph (1), when did the Minister commence consultation with related commodity groups on revised branding requirements; if consultation did not commence prior to the provision of instructions about new branding requirements, why not.
- (6) For each RDC in paragraph (1): (a) what response has the Minister or his department received in relation to the revised branding requirements; (b) when was this response received; and (c) did this response include cost estimates; if so, can details be provided.
- (7) Is the Minister or his department aware of concerns held by the Chair of the Grains RDC and the Deputy President of the Grains Council of Australia, reported in the *Weekly Times* of 17 September 2003, concerning the appropriateness of branding an RDC as a government agency; if so, what action has the Minister or his department taken in response to those concerns.
- (8) For each RDC in paragraph (1), can details be provided of new branding requirements, including but not necessarily limited to name and logo.
- (9) What impact will the new branding requirements have with respect to the following industry-owned companies in receipt of levies and matching Commonwealth payments: (a) Meat and Livestock Australia Limited; (b) Horticulture Australia Limited; (c) Australian Wool Innovation Limited; (d) Australian Pork Limited; (e) Dairy Australia Limited; and (f) Australian Egg Corporation Limited.

*2123 **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. 1688 (Senate *Hansard*, 8 September 2003, p. 14043) concerning Area Consultative Committees (ACC):

- (1) Why have the ACC Handbook and the Governance Manual not been publicly released.
- (2) Can copies of the ACC Handbook and the Governance Manual be provided; if not, why not.

*2124 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the meetings between the Australian Ambassador to Indonesia and representatives of Australian-owned mining operations in Indonesia on 30 January 2002:

- (1) What issues were raised.
- (2) What actions did the Ambassador agree to undertake.

- (3) What specific actions did the Ambassador or other embassy staff take following this meeting, and when.
 - (4) When representatives of Aurora Gold informed the meeting of the shooting and injury by security force personnel of a so-called 'illegal miner': (a) did any representatives of other companies raise any concerns about security forces resorting to violence; if so, what concerns were raised and who raised them; or (b) did other representatives offer support to Aurora Gold representatives; or (c) did they say nothing.
- *2125 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the meetings between the Ambassador to Indonesia and representatives of Australian-owned mining operations in Indonesia on 8 February 2001:
- (1) What issues were raised.
 - (2) What actions did the Ambassador agree to undertake.
 - (3) What specific actions did the Ambassador or other embassy staff take following this meeting, and when.
- *2126 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the meetings between the Ambassador to Indonesia and representatives of Australian-owned mining operations in Indonesia on 10 May 2001:
- (1) What issues were raised.
 - (2) What actions did the Ambassador agree to undertake.
 - (3) What specific actions did the Ambassador or other embassy staff take following this meeting, and when.
- *2127 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the meetings between the Ambassador to Indonesia and/or other embassy staff, and representatives of Australian-owned mining operations in Indonesia on 10 August 2000:
- (1) What issues were raised.
 - (2) What actions did the Ambassador or embassy staff agree to undertake.
 - (3) What specific actions did the Ambassador or other embassy staff take following this meeting, and when.
- *2128 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to dealings from 1999 onwards with representatives of Aurora Gold concerning its Mt Muro mine in Kalimantan, Indonesia:
- (1) In the light of demonstrations that occurred in the forecourt of the Australian Embassy in March 2000, and the persistent claims of non-government organisations: Were Australian embassy officials aware of the widespread speculation over the past decade that major resource projects in Indonesia, including those owned by Australian companies, made payments to the Indonesian military and paramilitary police for the security forces located near their projects.
 - (2) Did Australian Embassy officials inquire as to whether Aurora Gold had ever been approached by the security forces, whether police or military, to make donations or pay for any costs associated with operating near the mine; if not, why not.

- (3) Did Australian Embassy officials ask representatives of Aurora Gold if any such payments had been made; if so, what was the response; if not, why not.
 - (3) If any such payments were made: (a) when did these occur; and (b) what advice, if any, did Embassy officials offer to company representatives.
- *2129 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the meeting on 30 January 2002 with representatives of Aurora Gold and other mining companies:
- (1) What undertakings did the Ambassador give about making further representations to Indonesian officials about dealing with small-scale miners at Mt Muro, or other Australian-owned mining operations.
 - (2) What explanation did Aurora Gold representatives provide to the Ambassador about the shooting injury of a small scale miner at the Mt Muro mine on 19 January 2002.
 - (3) Did Aurora Gold representatives express any concern about the actions of the security forces.
 - (4) Did the Ambassador raise any concerns in the meeting about the actions of the security forces with Aurora Gold representatives; if so, what were those concerns; if not, why was the Ambassador not concerned.
- *2130 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the 27 August 2001 shooting injury of a teenage boy considered an ‘illegal miner’ at the Mt Muro mine in Kalimantan, Indonesia in May 2001: Why is the Minister not prepared to table a copy of the 5 March 2002 written briefing provided to the Ambassador by Aurora Gold.
- *2131 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the briefing from the President of Aurora Gold to the Ambassador to Indonesia, Mr Richard Smith, on the killing of two people by Indonesian security forces at the Mt Muro mine in Kalimantan, Indonesia in May 2001:
- (1) Why did an Australian embassy official request the briefing, as referred to in the answer to question on notice no. 707 (Senate *Hansard*, 5 February 2003, p 8641):
 - (2) What prompted the request.
 - (3) What explanation did Aurora Gold provide to the Ambassador for the killings.
 - (4) Did the Ambassador accept the explanation.
 - (5) Why did the Ambassador consider it acceptable for Aurora Gold not to notify him soon after the killings by security forces at Mt Muro mine.
 - (6) Why did the Ambassador decide that the nationality of those killed by the security forces at the Mt Muro mine meant that no representations should be made to Indonesian officials to ensure appropriate investigations and, where appropriate, prosecutions, should be undertaken against the perpetrators.
- *2132 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the visit by the Ambassador to Indonesia, Mr Richard Smith, to the Mt Muro mining lease area in Indonesia in May 2001, which was then held by the Australian company, Aurora Gold, and his meeting with Indonesian security officials:

- (1) In the light of a peaceful demonstration held on the forecourt of the Australian Embassy in Jakarta in March 2000 by women and children, Dayak people from the Mt Muro mining lease area and women's groups, at which Australian embassy officials addressed demonstrators but denied the group access to the embassy: What steps did the Ambassador take to investigate the grievances which led the group to demonstrate at the Australian Embassy regarding Aurora Gold's operations.
- (2) Did the Ambassador accept that allegations made by local villagers of human rights abuses by Indonesian security forces dating back as far as the early 1990s were legitimate; if not, why not.
- (3) Did the Ambassador meet with: (a) local landowner groups, to discuss their relationship with the mine; and (b) local landowner groups and non-government organisations, to discuss allegations of forced resettlement by the mining company and human rights abuses by Indonesian security forces, including a claim that villagers in the mining concession area were bulldozed and burned to the ground.
- (4) What was the basis for the Ambassador thinking that any security forces operations against those deemed by the company to be 'illegal' miners would be undertaken in a 'peaceful manner', as suggested in the answer to question on notice no. 706 (Senate *Hansard*, 5 February 2003, p. 8641).
- (5) Did the Ambassador accept that there was a possibility that Indonesian security forces could use violence against those deemed by the company to be 'illegal' miners; if not, why not.
- (6) Does the Ambassador accept that the violence against the 'illegal' miners was reasonably foreseeable; if not, why not.
- (7) Does the Ambassador believe that the deaths and injuries that occurred as a result of action in three separate incidents in May 2001, August 2001 and January 2002 were 'lawful' and 'peaceful' means of protecting mining interests; if so, why.

*2133 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister for Finance and Administration—With reference to the public relations consultancy contract entered into in 2003 with Michels Warren in relation to the proposed nuclear waste dump:

- (1) What was the specific purpose of the consultancy.
- (2) Was the consultancy subject to a tender process; if not, why not.
- (3) (a) When did this consultancy commence; and (b) what is the duration of the consultancy.
- (4) What is the budgeted cost for the consultancy for each of the following financial years: (a) 2002-03; and (b) 2003-04.
- (5) What were the key tasks the consultants were hired to perform.

*2134 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Science—With reference to work by the department on the proposed nuclear waste dump in South Australia:

- (1) Did departmental officers develop a list of 'experts' that were used to make public comments in support of the proposed nuclear waste dump; if so, when was this list first developed.
- (2) What was the proposed nature of the relationship with the 'experts'.
- (3) Were members of the media and/or 'media commentators' proposed to be included as part of the expert panel; if so, why.

- (4) What tasks were each of the 'experts' required to perform.
 - (5) Were formal contracts entered in to with each of the 'experts'.
 - (6) Were any payments made to any of the 'experts'; if so: (a) to whom; (b) what amount; (c) what were the payments for; and (d) when were the payments made.
 - (7) Was it a requirement that these 'experts', including members of the media and/or 'media commentators', be required to disclose these payments when making any public comments.
 - (8) Did departmental officers consider the need to undertake media training of the 'experts' selected to support the proposed nuclear waste dump.
 - (9) How was the expert panel formed.
 - (10) Were any of the 'experts' provided with media training by consultants to the department; if so: (a) who received training; and (b) what was the cost.
- *2135 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Science—With reference to the hiring by the department of public relations consultants to work on the proposed nuclear waste dump in South Australia: Were specialist consultants hired by Hill and Knowlton on behalf of the department to undertake 'Indigenous community relations' work; if so: (a) which consultants were hired; (b) what were their tasks; and (c) what was the cost of their work.
- *2136 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Science—With reference to the work done by consultants Hill and Knowlton for the department on the proposed nuclear waste dump in South Australia:
- (1) What was the total amount paid for their work under the contract.
 - (2) Was a final report submitted on completion of the work by Hill and Knowlton.
 - (3) Did departmental officers and the consultants convene regular meetings and/or phone link-ups to review progress on the contract; if so, when.
 - (4) Did departmental officers discuss with the company the possibility of organising a speaking tour to South Australia by Canadian consultant, Patrick Moore; if so: (a) was Mr Moore approached; and (b) did he indicate his willingness to assist.
- *2137 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Science—With reference to the public relations brief sent by the department to prospective public relations consultants regarding the proposed nuclear waste dump in South Australia, which referred to the public consultation phase of the Environmental Impact Statement and stated that a 'separate short term communications strategy is underway to manage this issue':
- (1) Who undertook the communications strategy.
 - (2) When was this strategy prepared.
 - (3) (a) When did implementation of this strategy commence; and (b) what was the cost.
 - (4) Which agency or consultant was tasked to implement the strategy.
 - (5) (a) What was the objective of the strategy; and (b) what were the key tasks identified to be performed.
 - (6) What were the criteria against which the strategy would be evaluated.
 - (7) Is this the strategy referred to as 'Communications strategy - announcement of low level radioactive waste site in SA'.

- *2138 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Science—With reference to the hiring by the department of public relations consultants to work on the proposed nuclear waste dump in South Australia in late 2002:
- (1) How many companies were: (a) sent a copy of the public relations brief; and (b) requested to submit a proposal.
 - (2) How many attended a question and answer session after receiving the brief.
 - (3) How many developed a written proposal.
 - (4) How many presented a proposed strategy to the evaluation panel.
 - (5) How many consultants were shortlisted to give a presentation before the Ministerial Committee on Government Communications.
 - (6) Who are the members of this ministerial committee.
- *2139 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Science—With reference to market research work undertaken in relation to the proposed nuclear waste dump in South Australia in the 2002-03 financial year: (a) What market research was undertaken; (b) who undertook the work; (c) what was the cost of the research; and (d) when was the research report completed and supplied to the department.
- *2140 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Science—With reference to the public relations consultancy work undertaken by Michels Warren in relation to the proposed nuclear waste dump in South Australia prior to December 2002: (a) When did this consultancy work commence and conclude; (b) what was the cost involved in each financial year that it ran; (c) what was the objective of the consultancy; (d) what were the key tasks the consultants were required to perform; and (e) what was the nature of the ‘issues monitoring’ work undertaken by the company.

Notice given 19 September 2003

- *2141 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the meetings between the Ambassador to Indonesia and representatives of Australian-owned mining operations in Indonesia on 27 September 2001:
- (1) What issues were raised.
 - (2) What actions did the Ambassador agree to undertake.
 - (3) What specific actions did the Ambassador or other embassy staff take following this meeting, and when.
- *2142 **Senator Webber:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Health and Ageing—
- (1) Given the recent awarding of medical places to the Notre Dame University in Western Australia, has the Minister been contacted by any organisations expressing concern that the university’s philosophy may prevent them from training students in the full range of reproductive health treatments; if so, how many groups or organisations have contacted the Minister.
 - (2) Will the university have control over the curriculum taught at the medical school, and therefore be able to restrict the curriculum and the selection of staff and students on the basis of conformity with the university’s Catholic philosophy.

- (3) Will students be able to graduate without having a full medical education in the areas of birth control, infertility, sterilisation, stem cell research and preventative medicine relating to sexual activity and health.
- (4) Will graduates who lack these skills be limited in their capacity to provide health services to the public.

*2143 **Senator Webber:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Health and Ageing—

- (1) Given the recent awarding of medical places to the Notre Dame University in Western Australia, has the Minister been contacted by any organisations expressing concern that the university's philosophy may prevent them from training students in the full range of reproductive health treatments; if so, how many groups or organisations have contacted the Minister.
- (2) Will the university have control over the curriculum taught at the medical school, and therefore be able to restrict the curriculum and the selection of staff and students on the basis of conformity with the university's Catholic philosophy.
- (3) Will students be able to graduate without having a full medical education in the areas of birth control, infertility, sterilisation, stem cell research and preventative medicine relating to sexual activity and health.
- (4) Will graduates who lack these skills be limited in their capacity to provide health services to the public.

*2145 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the meeting on 20 June 2002 referred to in the answer to question on notice no. 717 (Senate *Hansard*, 5 February 2003, p. 8646) between delegations from Australian mining companies and Australian embassy officials in Indonesia with senior officials from the Department of Forestry:

- (1) Which companies were represented.
- (2) Who represented each company.
- (3) In relation to what specific projects did they make representations.

*2146 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 719 (Senate *Hansard*, 5 February 2003, p. 8647) relating to meetings hosted by the former Ambassador to Indonesia with journalists: What were the dates in 2002 on which each of the meetings with Don Greenlees and Rowan Callick were held.

*2147 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 717 (Senate *Hansard*, 5 February 2003, p. 8646) that Australian embassy officials in Indonesia met to discuss 'the uncertainty surrounding the conservation value of some areas that had been designated as "protected forest":

- (1) To which specific mining projects did this 'uncertainty' relate.
- (2) What specifically is the 'uncertainty' for each of the protected forests affecting individual mining projects.
- (3) What information has been sought or provided to the embassy affecting each of the mining projects which challenges the conservation or other natural values of these areas.
- (4) With reference to the Indonesian Forestry Law 41 of 1999, which prohibits open cut mining in 'hutan lindun' i.e. protected forest areas: (a) Are Australian officials aware that the legislation states that the aim of such

protected forest is not conservation in terms of biodiversity or similar (which is instead dealt with by 'hutan konservasi' i.e. Conservation Forest), but specifically the protection of livelihoods, prevention of floods and erosion through water catchment protection; and (b) why did Australian embassy officials consider it was relevant to raise concerns around the 'conservation value' of areas designated as 'hutan lindung'.

- (5) Do Australian Embassy officials consider that lobbying Indonesian government officials on seven occasions within a year regarding mining in protected forests, given Australia's role as neighbour and donor to Indonesia, amounts to applying pressure on this issue.
- (6) Are Australian government officials aware that members of the Indonesian government have stated to the media at various times and in a parliamentary committee meeting on 7 May 2003 that they feel pressured by foreign governments to remove laws which protect forests and other conservation areas from mining.
- (7) Given the very small percentage of Indonesian land area designated as 'hutan lindung', and Indonesia's extensive and serious problems associated with forest and other natural vegetation loss, including erosion and flooding: why does the Australian Government consider it is more important to lobby on behalf of Australian companies than to support the Indonesian government environment protection laws.
- (8) Are Australian government officials aware that members of the Indonesian government have stated to the media at various times that they fear costly international arbitration will be brought against the Indonesian government by mining companies, if they do not allow lease holders to mine in protected areas.
- (9) Have Australian government officials ever discussed with Indonesian officials the possibility of international arbitration over this issue; if so: (a) who raised the issue; and (b) what advice was given by Australian government officials.
- (10) Are Australian government officials aware that Australian companies own mining leases over other types of protected areas in Indonesia, including national parks.
- (11) Have Australian government officials ever discussed with Indonesian officials the issue of Australian-owned mining leases over other types of protected areas in Indonesia, including national parks; if so: (a) who raised the issue; and (b) advice was given by Australian government officials.

*2148 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Trade—With reference to the answer to paragraph (2)(b) of question on notice no. 720 (Senate *Hansard*, 5 February 2003, p. 8647) relating to meetings organised by Austrade on behalf of Esmeralda Exploration, which is involved in the Aurul SA joint venture in Romania:

- (1) On how many occasions did Austrade assist with arranging meetings with Romanian government officials.
- (2) When were each of these meetings.
- (3) Who were each of these meetings with.
- (4) What was the purpose of each of these meetings.

*2149 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Trade—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 720 (Senate *Hansard*, 5 February

2003, p. 8647) relating to meetings organised by Austrade on behalf of Esmeralda Exploration, which is involved in the Aurul SA joint venture in Romania:

- (1) When did Austrade first become aware of what was referred to in the Hungarian media as the 'Kiraly affair'.
- (2) What is the Austrade understanding of what caused the controversy over the charging of Kiraly.
- (3) Did Austrade or other embassy officials in Romania or Hungary make representations to Romanian or Hungarian Government officials in relation to the 'Kiraly affair'.

*2150 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—Following the collapse in January 2001 of the tailings dam at the Aurul mine in Romania operated by the Perth-based Esmeralda Exploration:

- (1) When did the company first contact the Minister or his staff.
- (2) What was the nature of the representation made by the company.
- (3) What assistance, if any, did the company seek.
- (4) What assistance, if any, was provided.
- (5) On how many occasions subsequently did Esmeralda Exploration representatives contact the Minister or his staff.
- (6) When did each of these contacts occur.

*2151 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—

- (1) Is Mr Luo Gan, the head of the G10 Office in Beijing, due to visit Australia; if so, when and why.
- (2) What is Mr Luo's record on human rights, including in relation to repression of adherents to Falon Gong.

Notice given 22 September 2003

*2152 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the meetings between the Australian Ambassador to Indonesia and representatives of Australian-owned mining operations in Indonesia on 22 July 2002:

- (1) What issues were raised.
- (2) What actions did the Ambassador agree to undertake.
- (3) What specific actions did the Ambassador or other embassy staff undertake following this meeting, and when.

*2153 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the visit by Australian embassy officials to the Freeport mine in the Indonesian province of Papua on 4 May and 5 May 2001:

- (1) Which embassy officials visited the mine.
- (2) What was the purpose of the visit.
- (3) Which mining company representatives did embassy officials meet.
- (4) (a) Who else did the embassy officials meet during their visit; and (b) who did they represent.
- (5) Prior to the visit, were embassy officials aware of human rights abuses by security forces around the mine.

- (6) Did embassy officials meet representatives of the security forces during the visit; if so, what was the purpose of the meetings.
- (7) In relation in the answer to question on notice no. 721 (*Senate Hansard*, 5 February 2003, p. 8648), what specific ‘concerns about the security environment in the area surrounding the mine’ did company representatives raise.
- (8) Did they seek any assistance from embassy officials; if so, what requests were made.
- (9) What assistance, if any, was subsequently provided.
- (10) Did embassy officials raise concerns with mining company representatives about human rights abuses in the area surrounding the mine; if so, what response was received.
- (11) Did embassy officials raise concerns about human rights abuses in the area surrounding the mine in any meetings with Indonesian security officials; if so, what response was received.
- (12) Did mining company representatives inform embassy officials at any time during the visit that the company was paying millions of dollars directly to the Indonesian security forces around the mine; if so, who informed the embassy officials.
- (13) Did embassy officials ask mining company representatives if the company was making payments to the local security forces; if not, why not.
- (14) Why did embassy officials decide not to organise meetings with representatives of key local indigenous landowner group LEMASA (Amungme people’s representatives) and LEMASKO (Komoro people’s representatives), other landowner groups or other non-government organisations.

*2154 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the visit by Australian embassy officials to the Freeport mine in the Indonesian province of Papua on 19 June to 21 June 2001:

- (1) Which embassy officials visited the mine.
- (2) What was the specific purpose of the visit, especially given the earlier visit in May 2001.
- (3) Which mining company representatives did embassy officials meet.
- (4) (a) Who else did the embassy officials meet during their visit; and (b) who did they represent.
- (5) Prior to the visit, were embassy officials aware of human rights abuses by security forces around the mine.
- (6) Did embassy officials meet representatives of the security forces during the visit; if so, what was the purpose of the meetings.
- (7) In relation in the answer to question on notice no. 721 (*Senate Hansard*, 5 February 2003, p. 8648), what specific ‘concerns about the security environment in the area surrounding the mine’ did company representatives raise.
- (8) Did they seek any assistance from embassy officials; if so what requests were made.
- (9) What assistance, if any, was subsequently provided.

- (10) Did embassy officials raise concerns with mining company representatives about human rights abuses in the area surrounding the mine; if so, what response was received.
- (11) Did embassy officials raise concerns about human rights abuses in the area surrounding the mine in any meetings with Indonesian security officials; if so, what response was received.
- (12) Did mining company representatives inform embassy officials at any time during the visit that the company was paying millions of dollars directly to the Indonesian security forces around the mine; if so, who informed the embassy officials.
- (13) Did embassy officials ask mining company representatives if the company was making payments to the local security forces; if not, why not.
- (14) Why did embassy officials decide not to organise meetings with representatives of local landowner groups or other non-government organisations.

*2155 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the visit by Australian embassy officials to the Freeport mine in the Indonesian province of Papua on 5 December to 7 December 2001:

- (1) Which embassy officials visited the mine.
- (2) What was the specific purpose of the visit, especially given the earlier visits in May 2001 and June 2001.
- (3) Which mining company representatives did embassy officials meet.
- (4) (a) Who else did the embassy officials meet during their visit; and (b) who did they represent.
- (5) Prior to the visit, were embassy officials aware of human rights abuses by security forces around the mine.
- (6) Did embassy officials meet representatives of the security forces during the visit; if so, what was the purpose of the meetings.
- (7) In relation in the answer to question on notice no. 721 (*Senate Hansard*, 5 February 2003, p. 8648), what specific ‘concerns about the security environment in the area surrounding the mine’ did company representatives raise.
- (8) Did they seek any assistance from embassy officials; if so, what requests were made.
- (9) What assistance, if any, was subsequently provided.
- (10) Did embassy officials raise concerns with mining company representatives about human rights abuses in the area surrounding the mine; if so, what response was received.
- (11) Did embassy officials raise concerns about human rights abuses in the area surrounding the mine in any meetings with Indonesian security officials.
- (12) Did mining company representatives inform embassy officials at any time during the visit that the company was paying millions of dollars directly to the Indonesian security forces around the mine; if so, who informed the embassy officials.
- (13) Did embassy officials ask mining company representatives if the company was making payments to the local security forces; if not, why not.

- (14) Why did embassy officials decide not to organise meetings with representatives of local landowner groups or other non-government organisations.

*2156 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the visit by Australian embassy officials to the Freeport mine in the Indonesian province of Papua between 4 September to 6 September 2002:

- (1) Which embassy officials visited the mine.
- (2) What was the specific purpose of the visit, especially given the earlier visits in May 2001, June 2001 and December 2001.
- (3) Which mining company representatives did embassy officials meet.
- (4) (a) Who else did the embassy officials meet during their visit; and (b) who did they represent.
- (5) Prior to the visit, were embassy officials aware of human rights abuses by security forces around the mine.
- (6) Did embassy officials meet representatives of the security forces during the visit; if so, what was the purpose of the meetings.
- (7) In relation in the answer to question on notice no. 721 (Senate *Hansard*, 5 February 2003, p. 8648), what specific 'concerns about the security environment in the area surrounding the mine' did company representatives raise.
- (8) Did they seek any assistance from embassy officials; if so, what requests were made.
- (9) What assistance, if any, was subsequently provided.
- (10) Did embassy officials raise concerns with mining company representatives about human rights abuses in the area surrounding the mine; if so, what response was received.
- (11) Did embassy officials raise concerns about human rights abuses in the area surrounding the mine in any meetings with Indonesian security officials; if so, what response was received.
- (12) Did mining company representatives inform embassy officials at any time during the visit that the company was paying millions of dollars directly to the Indonesian security forces around the mine; if so, who informed the embassy officials.
- (13) Did embassy officials ask mining company representatives if the company was making payments to the local security forces; if not, why not.
- (14) Why did embassy officials decide not to organise meetings with representatives of local landowner groups or other non-government organisations.

*2157 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the four visits by Australian embassy officials to the Freeport mine in the Indonesian province of Papua during 2001 and 2002:

- (1) Does the Minister acknowledge that the failure to organise meetings with more diverse interest groups, beyond the mining company, resulted in a failure to gain a broad understanding of issues affecting the mine; if not, why not.
- (2) Is it official policy not to meet with representatives of non-government organisations on visits to mines in Indonesia; if so, why.

- (3) Were embassy officials aware of the collapse of the Lake Wanagon mine waste dump in 2001, which resulted in the deaths of four workers, the destruction of property and livestock of villagers and the release of acidic, heavy metal laced mine waste in the valley below.
- (4) Did embassy officials at any time discuss with mining company representatives the collapse of the waste dump.
- (5) (a) Did embassy officials inspect the waste dump; and (b) did embassy officials inquire of measures made to prevent a reoccurrence of this disaster; if not, why not.
- (6) Did embassy officials at any time discuss with mining company representatives the adverse findings by a Jakarta court that company advertising in relation to the collapse of the waste dump was misleading.
- (7) Did embassy officials inspect any of the hundreds of square kilometers of forest covered in mine waste (tailings) by the mine's disposal of mine waste into the Ajkwa and Kamora rivers; if not, why not.
- (8) (a) Are embassy officials aware that it appears from satellite photos published by Indonesian non-government organisations that tailings disposed of by the mine have contaminated the World Heritage-listed Lorenz National Park via the Mawati and Otokwa Rivers; and (b) has the matter ever been discussed with mining company representatives, and with what result.
- (9) Did embassy officials raise the issue or seek assurances about the safety of tailings released via the Ajkwa and Kamora rivers into the Arafura Sea directly north of Australia; if not, why not.

*2158 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the public disclosure, in March 2003, by Freeport McMoRan, the owner of the Freeport mine in Papua, Indonesia, part-owned by Australian-listed company Rio Tinto and with whom Rio Tinto has a 40 per cent joint venture agreement, that it has paid millions of dollars to the military forces guarding its mine:

- (1) Does the Minister consider these payments appropriate.
- (2) When did Australian officials first become aware that the owners of the Freeport mine, were making payments to the military.
- (3) Have representatives of Rio Tinto made representations to the Minister or Australian officials about this matter: (a) if so, when; and (b) if not, have the Minister, the Australian Ambassador to Indonesia or Australian officials raised the issue with the company; if so, when; if not, why not.
- (4) What explanation, if any, did the company provide for the payments.
- (5) When did these payments commence.
- (6) (a) What explanation, if any, has the company provided for keeping these payments secret for years; and (b) why did the Indonesian military keep the payments secret, and indeed continue to deny the extent of the payments even after Freeport revealed their existence.
- (7) Has the Minister or government officials raised the matter with Indonesian government officials; if so, with whom and when.
- (8) Has the Minister and/or the department sought or received legal advice about whether the payment of Indonesian military forces by private interests is legal under Indonesian law.

- (9) Has the Minister and/or the department sought or received legal advice that direct payments to the Indonesian military by mining companies are not in keeping with Indonesian Law No.3 2002, regarding National Defence, (and its predecessor, Law No.20 1982) which in Chapter 7, section 25(1) sets out that the military is to be paid for only from the national budget.
- (10) Has the Minister and/or the department sought or received legal advice about whether payments by Australian companies to Indonesian military or police forces is consistent with Australian law; if so, when was legal advice on this matter last sought.
- (11) Will the Minister and the department ask all Australian resource extraction companies operating in Indonesia to disclose payments both ongoing and past, made to Indonesian security forces, including military and police; if not, why not.

*2159 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—

- (1) Did Australian embassy officials visit the Freeport mine after the visit on 4 September to 6 September 2002; if so, when and what was the purpose of the visit.
- (2) Did the mining company seek any assistance from embassy officials; if so, what requests were made.
- (3) What assistance, if any, was subsequently provided.

*2160 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the visit by Australian embassy officials to the Mt Muro mine operated by Aurora Gold in Indonesian between 25 November and 26 November 1999:

- (1) Which embassy officials visited the mine.
- (2) Which mining company representatives did embassy officials meet.
- (3) (a) Who else did the embassy officials meet during their visit; and (b) who did they represent.
- (4) Prior to the visit, were embassy officials aware of human rights abuses by security forces around the mine.
- (6) Did embassy officials meet representatives of the security forces during the visit; if so, what was the purpose of the meetings.
- (7) In relation in the answer to question on notice no. 721 (*Senate Hansard*, 5 February 2003, p. 8648), what specific 'registered concerns about the security of company staff from incursions from illegal miners' did company representatives raise.
- (8) Did they seek any assistance from embassy officials; if so what requests were made.
- (9) What assistance, if any, was subsequently provided.
- (10) Did embassy officials raise concerns with mining company representatives about human rights abuses in the area surrounding the mine.
- (11) Did embassy officials raise concerns about human rights abuses in the area surrounding the mine in any meetings with Indonesian security officials; if so, what response was received.
- (12) What advice, if any, did the embassy officials offer Aurora Gold representatives.

- (13) Why did embassy officials decide not to organise meetings with representatives of local landowner groups or other non-government organisations.

*2161 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the visit by Australian embassy officials to the BHP Billiton owned PT Arutrim Indonesia-Senakin mine in South Kalimantan on 6 March 2000:

- (1) Which embassy officials visited the mine.
- (2) What was the specific purpose of the visit.
- (3) Which mining company representatives did embassy officials meet.
- (4) (a) Who else did the embassy officials meet; and (b) who did they represent.
- (5) Did embassy officials meet representatives of the security forces during the visit; if so, what was the purpose of the meetings.
- (6) In relation in the answer to question on notice no. 721 (*Senate Hansard*, 5 February 2003, p. 8648), what specific ‘concerns about the security of company staff from incursions by illegal miners’ did company representatives raise.
- (7) Did they seek any assistance from embassy officials; if so what requests were made.
- (8) What assistance, if any, was subsequently provided.
- (9) Did mining company representatives inform embassy officials at any time whether they had been asked to make payments to the Indonesian security forces around the mine; if so, who informed the embassy officials.
- (10) Did embassy officials ask mining company representatives if the company was making payments to the local security forces; if not, why not.

*2162 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the visit by Australian embassy officials to the BHP Billiton owned PT Arutrim Indonesia-Senakin mine in South Kalimantan on 24 May 2001:

- (1) Which embassy officials visited the mine.
- (2) What was the specific purpose of the visit, especially given the earlier visit in March 2000.
- (3) Which mining company representatives did embassy officials meet.
- (4) (a) Who else did the embassy officials meet; and (b) who did they represent.
- (5) Did embassy officials meet representatives of the security forces during the visit; if so, what was the purpose of the meetings.
- (6) In relation in the answer to question on notice no. 721 (*Senate Hansard*, 5 February 2003, p. 8648), what specific ‘concerns about the security of company staff from incursions by illegal miners’ did company representatives raise.
- (7) Did they seek any assistance from embassy officials; if so what requests were made.
- (8) What assistance, if any, was subsequently provided.

- (9) Did mining company representatives inform embassy officials at any time whether they had been asked to make payments to the Indonesian security forces around the mine; if so, who informed the embassy officials.
- (10) Did embassy officials ask mining company representatives if the company was making payments to the local security forces; if not, why not.

*2163 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—

- (1) Is the department aware of whether any of the following companies have been approached by Indonesian security forces, including military and police operating near their respective mining operations, to contribute financially to the security forces' local costs or make other payments: (a) Newcrest Indonesia; (b) BHP Billiton Indonesia; (c) Rio Tinto Indonesia; (d) Normandy Asia/ Horas Nauli; (e) Placer Dome; (f) Westralian Atan Minerals; and (g) Barisan Tropical Mining.
- (2) Is the department aware or whether any of the following companies have made payments to the Indonesian security forces, including military and police operating near their respective mining operations: (a) Newcrest Indonesia; (b) BHP Billiton Indonesia; (c) Rio Tinto Indonesia; (d) Normandy Asia/Horas Nauli; and (e) Placer Dome.

*2164 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the visit by Australian embassy officials to the Kaltim Prima coal mine owned by Rio Tinto on 22 May 2001:

- (1) Which embassy officials visited the mine.
- (2) Which mining company representatives did embassy officials meet.
- (3) Who else did the embassy officials meet during their visit and who did they represent.
- (4) In relation in the answer to question on notice no. 721 (*Senate Hansard*, 5 February 2003, p. 8648), what specific 'registered concerns about the increasing strike activity on the mine site' did company representatives raise.
- (5) In relation to the answer to question on notice no. 721: (a) what specific instances were company representatives referring to when they, 'registered their concerns about recent instances of violent behaviour by striking workers at the mine site'; and (b) what occurred in each instance.
- (6) Did the company representatives seek any assistance from embassy officials in relation to the strike activity; if, so what.
- (7) What assistance, if any, was subsequently provided.
- (8) Did embassy officials meet representatives of the security forces on the visit; if so, what was the purpose of the meetings.
- (9) Did embassy officials raise concerns about strike activity with the security forces; if so, what action did embassy officials request.
- (10) (a) What action, if any, did Indonesian security forces take; and (b) when did these actions occur.
- (11) Were embassy officials advised of whether the mining company had been approached to make payments to the security forces.
- (12) (a) Were embassy officials advised of whether the mining company had made payments to the security forces; and (b) did embassy officials ask

mining company representatives whether any payments had ever been made to the security forces.

- (13) Did embassy officials meet with any representatives of the workers who went on strike; if so, what specific issues were raised with the officials; if not, why not.
- (14) Does the Minister acknowledge that it would have been useful to at least hear the grievances of the striking workers; if not, why not.

*2165 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—In relation to the quarterly meetings between the Australian Ambassador to Indonesia, Mr Richard Smith, and/or other embassy staff, and representatives of Australian-owned mining operations in Indonesia:

- (1) Has the issue of mine waste disposal at sea (submarine tailings disposal, also known as DSTP), ever been raised at these meetings; if so, by whom was it raised.
- (2) (a) Has the Ambassador or any other Australian government official ever been requested to make any representations to Indonesian government officials regarding DSTP; and (b) have any representations regarding DSTP ever been made by Australian government officials to Indonesian government officials.
- (3) Has the issue of mine closure ever been raised at these meetings; if so, by whom was it raised.
- (4) (a) Has the Ambassador or any other Australian government official ever been requested to make any representations to Indonesian government officials regarding mine closure; and (b) have any representations regarding mine closure ever been made by Australian government officials to Indonesian government officials.
- (5) Has the Ambassador or any Australian government official ever visited an Australian-owned mine which has closed or is in the process of closing.
- (6) Is the Ambassador satisfied that all operating and planned Australian-owned mines have plans for prompt and proper mine closure, developed in consultation with local communities and government officials, including progressive rehabilitation of completed areas while mining progresses.
- (7) In the absence of detailed Indonesian regulations or government policy regarding mine closure, is the Ambassador satisfied that all Australian-owned mine closure plans are in keeping with best Australian mining practice.
- (8) Does the Ambassador consider that Australian-owned mines should plan for closure rehabilitation, which includes ensuring mine pits are never simply allowed to remain and fill with water which may become polluted with acid and heavy metals.

*2166 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the quarterly meetings between the Australian Ambassador to Indonesia, Mr Richard Smith and/or other embassy staff, and representatives of Australian-owned mining operations in Indonesia:

- (1) Have any meetings occurred since the meeting held on 22 July 2002; if so, for each meeting: (a) which companies attended; (b) who represented the individual companies; and (c) can a list be provided of the issues raised.

- (2) What actions, if any, did the Ambassador or embassy staff agree to undertake from each of these meetings.

*2167 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the answer to the supplementary estimates question no. RDG04, provided to the Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee on 11 February 2003, containing a table of Sustainable Regions Program direct funding and other contributions:

- (1) Can an updated table be provided which includes: (a) all projects approved for funding and the approved level of funding; (b) funding already provided and the amount outstanding; and (c) the financial years in which expenditure of outstanding funds is likely to occur.
- (2) In relation to the Regional Partnerships Program: (a) how many projects have been approved for funding in the 2003-04 financial year; (b) what is the total level of funding for these projects; and (c) how much has been committed for expenditure in the following financial years: (i) 2003-04, (ii) 2004-05, (iii) 2005-06, and (iv) 2006-07.
- (3) In relation to projects approved prior to 1 July 2003 under the Regional Solutions Program, the Rural Transaction Centres, the Regional Assistance Program, the Dairy Regional Assistance Program, the Wide Bay Burnett Structural Adjustment Package, the Namoi Valley Package, the Weipa Electricity Generation Compensation Package and the South West Forests of Western Australia Structural Adjustment Package: (a) how much has been committed for expenditure in the 2003-04 financial year; (b) how much of the funds committed for expenditure in the 2003-04 financial year has been expended to date; and (c) how much has been committed for expenditure in the following financial years: (i) 2004-05, (ii) 2005-06, and (iii) 2006-07.

Notice given 23 September 2003

*2168 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) Can a schedule be provided of all partnerships or programs commenced within the past 3 financial years, between the department and biotechnology companies or their agents, including but not limited to AVCARE, Agrifood Awareness Australia Limited, Monsanto Australia Ltd (Monsanto) and Bayer Crop Science Australia (Bayer) or its predecessor, Aventis, including the following details for each:
 - (a) the stated aim;
 - (b) the proposed duration;
 - (c) the forecast financial or in-kind contribution to be provided by the department;
 - (d) the forecast financial or in-kind contribution to be provided by the department's partners;
 - (e) the actual financial or in-kind contribution made to date by the department;
 - (f) the actual financial or in-kind contribution made to date by the department's partners; and
 - (g) for those programs that have been completed, a summary of actual outcomes as compared with the stated aim.

- (2) Can a copy of the commercial agreements entered into between the department and its partners in relation to these programs be provided; if not, why not.

*2169 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) Can a schedule be provided of all partnerships, programs or funding arrangements entered into each of the past 3 financial years between the department and the Australia Oilseeds Federation (AOF), including the following details for each:
- (a) the stated aim of each partnership or program or for the funding provided by the department;
 - (b) the proposed duration of each partnership or program or for the funding provided by the department;
 - (c) the forecast financial or in-kind contribution to be provided by the department;
 - (d) the forecast financial or in-kind contribution to be provided by AOF;
 - (e) the actual financial or in-kind contribution made to date by the department;
 - (f) the actual financial or in-kind contribution made to date by AOF; and
 - (g) for those programs or funding arrangements that have been completed, a summary of actual outcomes as compared with the stated aim of each program, partnership or funding arrangement.
- (2) Can a copy of the commercial agreements entered into between the department and AOF in relation to these programs or funding arrangements be provided; if not, why not.

*2170 **Senator Harris:** To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—Does the Prime Minister have portfolio responsibility for the Office of the Commissioner of Taxation.

Notice given 24 September 2003

*2171 **Senator Lees:** To ask the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—

- (1) Will the Minister act on unanimous advice from a range of health and social welfare agencies, including the Royal Australasian College of Physicians (RACP), Paediatrics and Child Health Division; the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists, Faculty of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry; and the Professional Alliance for the Health of Asylum Seekers and their Children that 'prolonged detention is causing harm to the mental health and development of children and adolescents' and that the Minister should 'undertake an independent, expert review' into the mental health of children held in detention in Australia's immigration detention centres.
- (2) Will the Minister take any further action to examine and evaluate the performance of Australasian Correctional Management (ACM), with regard to the mental health and welfare of children in detention; if so, what action will the Minister take; if not, under what conditions would the Minister be prepared to conduct such an evaluation of ACM's performance.
- (3) With reference to the Minister's response to the May 2003 *Four Corners* program on the former Woomera Detention Centre, that 'there is no

contractual requirement for ACM to provide staffing numbers to DIMIA' for the achievement of contracted outcomes by ACM: Given this lack of detailed accountability by ACM and the consistent reporting by social welfare and medical practitioners about the institutional barriers to the mental health and wellbeing of detainees: What steps is the Minister currently taking to ensure that ACM is now upholding Australian immigration detention standards.

Notice given 25 September 2003

*2172 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) Has Basslink Pty Ltd prepared a code of conduct for commercial and recreational fishing activities, as is required for approval of the Basslink project; if so; (a) has the code been approved; and (b) can a copy of the code be provided.
- (2) With which fishing groups and individuals did the proponents consult when developing the code.
- (3) If consultations did not include Gippsland fisher's such as those from Yarram, McLaughlin's Beach and Lakes Entrance, why were these groups not consulted.

Notice given 29 September 2003

*2173 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the changes in seed cleaning arrangements detailed in Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service (AQIS) Public Quarantine Alert PQA0266, Cleaning of contaminated seed consignments in rural areas:

- (1) What steps have been taken to consult with representations of the seed industry, including, but not limited to, importers, growers and peak bodies, in developing these changes.
- (2) What steps have been taken to communicate with representatives of the seed industry, including, but not limited to, importers, growers and peak bodies, to ensure they were aware of these changes.
- (3) What work has been conducted or commissioned by the department or other Commonwealth agencies to determine: (a) potential and actual changes in costs experienced by seed importers, breeders and end users as a result of these changes, and what are the results of this work; (b) potential and actual time delays experienced by seed importers, breeders and end users as a result of these changes, and what are the results of this work; (c) potential and actual extra costs borne by the Commonwealth as a result of these changes, and what are the results of this work; and (d) potential and actual closure of or job losses at AQIS-approved seed cleaning facilities in rural areas as a result of these changes, and what are the results of this work.

*2174 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) For each of the past 5 financial years, what has been the quantity (in metric tonnes) of seed processed through the Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service (AQIS) approved seed cleaning facilities in rural areas.

- (2) For each of the past 5 financial years, what has been the level of full-time equivalent employment at each of the AQIS-approved seed cleaning facilities in rural areas.
- (3) For each of the past 5 financial years, how many AQIS-approved seed cleaning facilities have operated in rural areas, and where were they located.
- (4) Are AQIS-approved seed cleaning facilities in rural areas operated under license to AQIS or under some other accreditation process.
- (5) For each of the past 5 financial years, have any AQIS-approved seed cleaning facilities in rural areas applied for their AQIS licenses or accreditation to be renewed but been refused; if so, for each facility, can the following information be provided: (a) a brief description of the reasons why an AQIS license or accreditation was not renewed; (b) the date of application, and the date the applicant was advised of the outcome; and (c) details of all assistance provided by the Commonwealth to the proprietor and staff of the unsuccessful applicant.

*2175 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) When was the Plant Breeders' Rights (PBR) Office established.
- (2) For each year since its establishment, or for each of the past 5 financial years, whichever is the lesser period, what has been: (a) the posted staffing contingent in full-time equivalents; (b) the actual staffing contingent in full-time equivalents; (c) the projected Commonwealth expenditure for operating the office; (d) the actual Commonwealth expenditure for operating the office; (e) the projected number of customer transactions to be undertaken; and (f) the actual number of customer transactions undertaken.

Notice given 1 October 2003

*1872 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the Structural Adjustment Package for the Wide Bay Burnett Region of Queensland:

- (1) When did the Minister announce the package.
- (2) What funding was committed to the package.
- (3) What grant monies have been paid under the package.
- (4) When were program guidelines and applications forms made publicly available.
- (5) When did the application period commence.
- (6) When did the application period close.

*1873 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$247 500 for the Kaygee's 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 long-term benefits for the 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.

*1874 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$450 000 for the Chrome Engineering 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 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.

*1875 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$100 000 for the Gin Gin Bakery 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 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.

*1876 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$115 000 for the Cadastral Survey Data Management 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 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.

*1877 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$93 500 for the Fraser Coast Packhouse 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 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.

*1878 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$550 000 for the Hervey Bay Organic Processing Plant 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 and/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 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;
 - (q) what impact has the project had on other businesses in the region; and
 - (r) has the project had a significant and/or widespread impact on employment 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.

*1879 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$70 000 for the MacLennon Nominees Production of Citrus for Coles Supermarkets 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 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.

*1880 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$250 000 for the Abbotsleigh Citrus Stage Two 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 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.

*1881 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the grant of \$250 000 for the Kingaroy and South Burnett Community Private Hospital 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 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.

*1882 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) When did Australia first accepted imports of snow peas and sugar snap peas.
- (2) For each of the past 5 financial years, from which countries and in what quantity has Australia imported snow peas and sugar snap peas.
- (3) In relation to each country from which Australia currently accepts imports of snow peas and sugar snap peas, what chemical residues are currently tested on these imports.
- (4) In relation to each country from which Australia imports snow peas and sugar snap peas: (a) which nations test for chemical residues; (b) which agencies or companies perform these chemical residue tests; (c) what quantity of snow peas and sugar snap peas make up each sample taken for the chemical residue test; and (d) what is the rate at which samples are taken and tested for chemical residues, for example, is one sample taken for

each tonne of snow peas and sugar snap peas, or for each half tonne, or for each container load.

- (5) Where chemical residue testing on snow peas and sugar snap peas bound for Australia is conducted in different nations or by agencies other than Australian Government agencies, what audit processes are undertaken by the Commonwealth to ensure the veracity of the testing conducted in these nations or by agencies other than Australian Government agencies.
- (6) Can details be provided of any instances in the past 5 financial years where chemical residue testing of snow peas and sugar snap peas bound for Australia has been found by the Commonwealth to be inadequate.
- (7) What penalties or sanctions have been applied to the supplying nation, shipping operator, trader or agency in cases where chemical residue testing of snow peas and sugar snap peas bound for Australia has been found by the Commonwealth to be inadequate.
- (8) In relation to each country from which Australia has imported snow peas and sugar snap peas: On how many occasions have snow peas and sugar snap peas bound for import to Australia been rejected on the basis that chemical residue testing has detected unacceptable levels of chemical residues, and, in each case: (a) which chemical was involved; (b) what was the concentration of the chemical; and (c) what is the concentration of each chemical approved by Food Standards Australia and New Zealand.

*1883 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) When did the Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA) or its predecessor, the National Registration Authority, receive an application for the use of glufosinate ammonium as a broad acre herbicide in Australia.
- (2) Who was the applicant.
- (3) When was the final decision made by APVMA regarding the use of glufosinate ammonium as a broad acre herbicide in Australia and can a copy of the approval notice or permit be provided, including all details of conditions of use; if not, why not.
- (4) To date, how much has the current application for the use of glufosinate ammonium as a broad acre herbicide in Australia cost the APVMA to process.
- (5) What is the expected total cost to the APVMA of processing the application.
- (6) To date, what is the quantum of fees and charges which have been levied upon the applicant in relation to the application.
- (7) What is the expected total of fees and charges that will be levied upon the applicant in relation to the application.

*1884 **Senator O'Brien:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

- (1) When did the Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA) or its predecessor, the National Registration Authority, receive an application for the use of the herbicide known as Roundup as a broad acre herbicide in Australia.
- (2) Who was the applicant.

- (3) When is a final decision expected from the APVMA for the use of Roundup as a broad acre herbicide in Australia.
- (4) To date, how much has the current application for the use of Roundup as a broad acre herbicide in Australia cost the APVMA to process.
- (5) What is the expected total cost to the APVMA of processing the application.
- (6) To date, what is the quantum of fees and charges which have been levied upon the applicant in relation to the application.
- (7) What is the expected total of fees and charges that will be levied upon the applicant in relation to the application.

*1885 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Veterans' Affairs—With reference to the Homecare program:

- (1) For the period 1 January to 30 June 2003: How many assessments, by region, were: (a) made; (b) reviewed up; (c) reviewed down; and (d) deferred pending funding availability.
- (2) Of those assessed but deferred pending availability of funds: How many, by region, have since been admitted after 1 July 2003.
- (3) Of the additional \$8.6 million added to the program for the 2003-04 financial year: (a) for each item, how much has been consumed by cost increases; and (b) how much remains available for increased numbers of clients in the program.
- (4) What cost increases have occurred since 1 July 2003.

*1886 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Minister for Justice and Customs—

- (1) What is the current public relations budget for the Australian Customs Service.
- (2) How many: (a) journalists; and (b) other staff, are employed.
- (3) How many regular publications are printed.
- (4) What is the size of each distribution list.
- (5) How much was spent on postage in the 2002-03 financial year.
- (6) How many media releases did the Minister issue in each of the past 24 months.
- (7) What sum was spent on film media products in each of the following financial years: (a) 2002-03; and (b) 2003-04.
- (8) How many journalists are employed under contract.
- (9) How much has been spent in 2003 on transport charters.
- (10) How much has been spent in 2003 for services to external media agencies.
- (11) How much has been spent on the *Viarsa* media campaign.

*1887 **Senator Bishop:** To ask the Minister for Justice and Customs—

- (1) What is the estimated cost of the charter of the *Southern Supporter*.
- (2) Who owns the vessel; and (b) what is the term of the charter.
- (3) In the recent pursuit of the *Viarsa*, when did the *Southern Supporter* first come within sight of the *Viarsa*.
- (4) What attempts did the crew of the *Southern Supporter* make to board the *Viarsa*.

- (5) On how many occasions and on which days of the chase was the *Viarsa* ordered to heave to or change direction.
- (6) (a) What arms are carried on board the *Southern Supporter*; and (b) were they deployed for use during the chase.
- (7) What assistance was sought and given by the Governments of France, South Africa and Great Britain in apprehending the *Viarsa*.
- (8) Will the Australian Government be asked to reimburse those governments for assisting the *Southern Supporter*; if so, what sum is estimated for each.
- (9) (a) What is the estimated cost of sending Royal Australian Naval personnel to sail the *Viarsa* back to Australia; and (b) how will that cost be funded.
- (10) Is any consideration being given to installing heavy armament on the *Southern Supporter* to facilitate its interception power; if not, why not.

*2176 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Health and Ageing—With reference to the report, *The Health and Welfare of Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples*, which identified poorer living conditions and health for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians than for non-Indigenous Australians, can specific details be provided of current or planned programs, including details of budgets and targets for populations reached and outcome improvements in respect of the following problems identified in the report:

- (a) over a quarter of the communities with a population of 50 or more that were not connected to the town water supply had failed water quality tests at least once during the previous 12 months;
- (b) a fifth of the communities had water supplies that had not been tested in the past 12 months;
- (c) more than one in three communities with 50 people or more experienced water restrictions in the past 12 months;
- (d) just under half of the communities with a population of 50 or more reported that sewerage system overflows or leakages had occurred in the past 12 months;
- (e) ponding of stagnant water occurred in 42 per cent of the communities with a population of more than 50;
- (f) Indigenous adults were about half as likely as non-Indigenous adults to be employed in health-related occupations;
- (g) Indigenous separation rates were higher than non-Indigenous rates for all age groups except those aged 75 years and over, with the highest rate differences being for both males and females in the age groups between 35 and 64 years;
- (h) principal diagnoses for which high incidence ratios were evident in the 2000-01 financial year were: (i) care involving dialysis (6.6:1 for males, 12.6:1 for females), (ii) endocrine, nutritional and metabolic diseases (3.5:1 for males, 3.8:1 for females), and (iii) diseases of the respiratory system (2.6:1 for males, 3.1:1 for females);
- (i) babies of Indigenous mothers were twice as likely to be of low birthweight (13 per cent of births) than babies of non-Indigenous mothers (6 per cent);
- (j) the perinatal death rate for births to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander mothers was 20 per thousand live births and stillbirths, compared with 10 per thousand for non-Indigenous mothers;

- (k) reports of long-term health conditions increased with age from 34 per cent of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children aged under 5 years to 99 per cent of Indigenous Australians aged 55 years and over;
- (l) eye/vision problems were the most commonly reported conditions (29 per cent), followed by asthma (16 per cent), back problems (15 per cent) and ear/hearing problems (15 per cent);
- (m) the National Notifiable Diseases Surveillance System reports disease rates for Indigenous Australians are many times those among non-Indigenous Australians with incidence ratios particularly high for: (i) gonococcal infection (69:1), (ii) syphilis (42:1), and (iii) chlamydia (18:1); and for most other communicable diseases reported to the surveillance system, the incidence rates for Indigenous persons are generally in the range 5 to 10 times higher than for non-Indigenous persons;
- (n) incidence ratios for: (i) ischaemic heart disease hospitalisations are 1.4:1 for males and 2.4:1 for females, (ii) respiratory diseases, 2.6:1 for males and 3.1:1 for females, (iii) infectious and parasitic diseases, 2.7:1 for males and 3.1:1 for females, and (iv) injury and poisoning, 1.9:1 for males and 2.3:1 for females;
- (o) among the latter group (injury and poisons), hospitalisations that are attributed to 'assault' are 8 times higher for Indigenous males and 28 times higher for Indigenous females, compared with non-Indigenous males and females respectively;
- (p) Indigenous children living in non-remote areas were less likely than non-Indigenous children to have been breastfed for more than 6 months;
- (q) higher proportions of Indigenous Australians in non-remote areas reported medium to high vegetable intake (two or more serves per day) but more non-Indigenous Australians reported medium to high fruit intake;
- (r) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples were more likely to consume whole (full cream) milk rather than reduced fat alternatives and to add salt to meals after cooking;
- (s) the percentage of Indigenous adults classified as overweight or obese was 61 per cent, compared with 48 per cent of non-Indigenous adults;
- (t) Indigenous persons aged 18 years and over were twice as likely as non-Indigenous persons to be current smokers (51 per cent compared with 24 per cent); with higher rates applying to both sexes and across all age groups; and
- (u) Indigenous adults aged 18 years and over were less likely (42 per cent) than non-Indigenous adults (62 per cent) to have consumed alcohol in the week prior to interview for the 2001 National Health Survey; however, those who consumed alcohol were more likely to have consumed at risky/high levels than non-Indigenous consumers (29 per cent compared with 17 per cent).

*2177 **Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Health and Ageing—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 1643 (*Senate Hansard*, 8 September 2003, p. 14018);

- (1) Given that there is an apparent discrepancy in the Australian Grand Prix Corporation's (AGPC) claim of 55 billion television viewers of the Formula 1 series, (350 million viewers per race, multiplied by 17, the number of races, equals 5.9 billion, not 55 billion), and given that the figure of 350 million per race also cannot be proved, is the Minister satisfied that

the Formula 1 Grand Prix is an event of international significance; if so, why.

- (2) Given that according to the AGPC, spending by additional overseas visitors attracted by the Formula 1 Grand Prix equates to \$15.3 million; that this spending equates to about \$3 million in actual profit (assuming normal commercial margins); and that the operating loss of the event is now \$10 to 12 million, a major factor being the race licence fee (believed to be \$20-25 million, exported in US dollars): does the Minister consider that losing the event would cause economic hardship to Australia; if so, why.
- (3) Given that the grounds on which the AGPC applied for an exemption from the *Tobacco Advertising Prohibition Act 1992* appear to be incorrect, will the Minister give consideration to cancelling the exemption for the 2004 race; if not, why not.
- (4) In light of the Government's recently-stated intention to sign the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control: (a) can the Government confirm that this includes a commitment not to permit the export of tobacco advertising; and (b) does this mean that the Australian Grand Prix, because it is broadcast worldwide, will not receive an exemption from the requirements of the Tobacco Advertising Act for 2004 and beyond; if not, why not.

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 Questions on notice—Publication of replies

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 Senators' Interests—Resolutions relating to senators' interests and declaration of gifts to the Senate and the Parliament

That the orders be amended to read as follows:

Senators' interests

1 Registration

(1) 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;

each senator shall provide to the Registrar of Senators' Interests a statement of:

- (a) the senator's registrable interests; and
- (b) the registrable interests of which the senator is aware:
 - (i) of the senator's spouse or partner, and
 - (ii) of any children who are wholly or mainly dependent on the senator for support;

in accordance with this resolution and in a form determined by the Committee of Senators' Interests from time to time, and shall also notify any alteration of those interests to the Registrar within 28 days of that alteration occurring.

(2) Any senator who:

- (a) knowingly fails to provide a statement of registrable interests to the Registrar of Senators' Interests by the due date;
- (b) knowingly fails to notify any alteration of those interests to the Registrar of Senators' Interests within 28 days of the change occurring; or
- (c) knowingly provides false or misleading information to the Registrar of Senators' Interests;

shall be guilty of a serious contempt of the Senate and shall be dealt with by the Senate accordingly, but the question whether any

senator has committed such a serious contempt shall first be referred to the Privileges Committee for inquiry and report and may not be considered by any other committee.

2 Registrable interests of spouses or partners and dependants

Statements of the registrable interests of a senator's spouse or partner or of any dependent children submitted in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be maintained in a separate part of the register and shall remain confidential to the Committee of Senators' Interests except where the committee considers that a conflict of interest arises, at which time the committee may table the declaration.

3 Registrable interests

The statement of a senator's registrable interests to be provided by a senator shall include the registrable interests of which the senator is aware of the senator's spouse or partner and of any children who are wholly or mainly dependent on the senator for support, and shall cover the following matters:

- (a) shareholdings in public and private companies (including holding companies) indicating the name of the company or companies;
- (b) family and business trusts and nominee companies:
 - (i) in which a beneficial interest is held, indicating the name of the trust and the nature of its operation and beneficial interest, and
 - (ii) in which the senator, the senator's spouse or partner, or a child who is wholly or mainly dependent on the senator for support, is a trustee (but not including a trustee of an estate where no beneficial interest is held by the senator, the senator's spouse or partner or dependent children), indicating the name of the trust, the nature of its operation and the beneficiary of the trust;
- (c) real estate, including the location (suburb or area only) and the purpose for which it is owned;
- (d) registered directorships of companies;
- (e) partnerships, indicating the nature of the interests and the activities of the partnership;
- (f) liabilities, indicating the nature of the liability and the creditor concerned;
- (g) the nature of any bonds, debentures and like investments;
- (h) saving or investment accounts, indicating their nature and the name of the bank or other institutions concerned;
- (i) the nature of any other assets (excluding household and personal effects) each valued at more than \$7 500;
- (j) the nature of any other substantial sources of income;
- (k) gifts valued at more than \$750 received from official sources (such sources being an Australian or foreign national, state, provincial or local government or a person holding an office in such a government) or at \$300 or more where received from other than official sources, provided that a gift received by a senator, the senator's spouse or partner or dependent children from family members or personal friends in a purely personal capacity need not be registered unless the senator judges that an appearance of conflict of interest may be seen to exist;

- (l) any sponsored travel or hospitality received where the value of the sponsorship or hospitality exceeds \$300;
- (m) being an officeholder of or financial contributor donating \$300 or more in any single calendar year to any organisation; and
- (n) any other interests where a conflict of interest with a senator's public duties could foreseeably arise or be seen to arise.

4 Register and Registrar of Senators' Interests

- (1) At the commencement of each Parliament, and at other times as necessary, the President shall appoint an officer of the Department of the Senate as the Registrar of Senators' Interests and that officer shall also be secretary of the Committee of Senators' Interests.
- (2) The Registrar of Senators' Interests shall, in accordance with procedures determined by the Committee of Senators' Interests, maintain a Register of Senators' Interests in a form to be determined by that committee from time to time.
- (3) As soon as possible after receipt of statement of registrable interests in accordance with resolution 1(1), the chairman of the Committee of Senators' Interests shall table in the Senate a copy of the completed Register of Senators' Interests and shall also table every 6 months any notification by a senator of alteration of those interests.
- (4) The Register of Senators' Interests shall be available for inspection by any person under conditions to be laid down by the Committee of Senators' Interests from time to time.
- (5) That part of the Register of Senators' Interests relating to spouses or partners and dependent children shall remain confidential to the Committee of Senators' Interests as provided for in paragraph 2.

5 Interpretation

For the purposes of paragraphs 1 to 4 of this resolution "partner" means a person who is living with another person in a *bona fide* domestic relationship.

(Agreed to 17 March 1994; amended 21 June 1995; 13 May 1998; 22 November 1999 and 15 September 2003.)

Receipt of gifts – declaration

The Senate resolves that the following procedures apply for the declaration by senators of their receipt of any gift intended by the donor to be a gift to the Senate or the Parliament:

- (1) (a) Any senator, including any Senate office holder and any senator who is a leader or a member of a parliamentary delegation, who in any capacity receives any gift which is intended by the donor to be a gift to the Senate or the Parliament must, as soon as practicable, place the gift in the custody of the Registrar of Senators' Interests and declare receipt of the gift to the Registrar.
- (b) A gift is to be taken as intended to be a gift to the Senate or the Parliament where:
 - (i) the donor expressly states that the gift is to the Senate or to the Parliament; or
 - (ii) the identity of the donor, the nature of the occasion, or the intrinsic significance or value of the gift is such that it is

reasonable to assume that the gift was intended for the Senate or the Parliament.

- (ba) In the absence of express intent, it will not be assumed that a gift was intended for the Senate or the Parliament where the gift has a value below the following thresholds:
 - (i) \$750 when given by an official government source; or
 - (ii) \$300 when given by a private person or non-government body on any occasion when the senator is present in his or her capacity as a senator, Senate office-holder or delegation leader or member.
- (bb) In the absence of express intent, it will not be assumed that a gift was intended for the Senate or the Parliament merely because the gift has a value above those thresholds.
- (c) The Registrar of Senators' Interests is to maintain a public Register of Gifts to the Senate and the Parliament.
- (d) The Committee of Senators' Interests is to recommend to the President whether, and how, the gift may be used or displayed in Parliament House, including in the office of any senator, or used or displayed on loan elsewhere, including in a museum, library, gallery, court building, government building, government office or other place.
- (e) Where a gift given to a senator is intended to be for the Parliament, the President is to consult with the Speaker prior to agreeing to a recommendation of the committee as to its use, display or loan.
- (f) Where the President disagrees with a recommendation of the committee, the President is to report the disagreement to the Senate, which may determine the use, display or loan of the gift in question.
- (g) In making recommendations the committee is to take into account the intention of the Senate that gifts are to be used, displayed or loaned in a way which:
 - (i) reflects proper respect for the intentions of the donor and the dignity of the Senate or the Parliament;
 - (ii) recognises the interest of the public in gifts to the Senate or the Parliament; and
 - (iii) takes account of practical issues including space, custody, preservation and propriety in the use, display or loan of such gifts.
- (h) Where a senator is uncertain of the nature of a gift the senator may request advice from the committee.
- (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 \$750 for a gift received from an official government source, or \$300 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.
 - (l) Where a senator disagrees with the advice of the committee the senator is to report the disagreement to the Senate, which may determine the nature of the gift and its use, display or loan, if any.
 - (m) In paragraph (1) a reference to a gift to the Parliament includes a gift given to a senator for the House of Representatives.
- (2) This resolution applies to a gift received by the spouse, family member or staff member of a senator on any occasion when the senator is present in his or her capacity as a senator, Senate office holder or delegation leader or member, as if the gift had been received by the senator.
- (3) The committee:
- (a) is empowered to consider any matter placed before it pursuant to this resolution, and for the purposes of this resolution the committee has the powers provided in the resolution of 17 March 1994 establishing the committee; and
 - (b) may make, and must as soon as practicable thereafter table, procedural rules to facilitate the operation of this resolution.
- (4) Any senator who:
- (a) knowingly fails to tender and declare a gift that is taken to be a gift to the Senate or the Parliament as required by this resolution; or
 - (b) knowingly fails to return to the Registrar a gift which it was agreed or determined the senator might use or display; or
 - (c) knowingly provides false or misleading information to the Registrar or the committee,

is guilty of a serious contempt of the Senate and is to be dealt with by the Senate accordingly, but the question whether any senator has committed such a contempt is to be referred to the Privileges Committee for inquiry and report and may not be considered by any other committee.

(Agreed to 26 August 1997; amended 8 December 1999 and 15 September 2003.)

7 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

8 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.)

9 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.)

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*).

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*).

- (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; amended 11 September 2003.)

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.)

Legislation

13 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.)

14 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.)*

Meeting of Senate**15 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, 24 November to Thursday, 27 November

Monday, 1 December to Thursday, 4 December.

(Agreed to 12 November 2002; amended 11 September 2003.)

16 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**17 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.)

18 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.)

19 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.)

20 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.)

21 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.)

22 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.)

23 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.)

24 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.)

25 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.)

26 Trade—General Agreement on Trade in Services—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.)

27 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.)

28 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.)

29 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.)

30 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.)

31 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.)

32 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.)

33 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.)

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 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.)

35 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.)

36 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.)

37 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.)

38 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.)

39 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.)

40 Animal Welfare—Live sheep trade—Order for production of documents

That the Senate—

- (a) notes that:
 - (i) the *Cormo Express* shipment of 57 000 sheep rejected by Saudi Arabia 3 weeks ago, because of suspected scabby mouth, and subsequently rejected by a second unnamed country is now to be offered free to a third unnamed country in the region,
 - (ii) the *Cormo Express* sailed with a shipment of 57 000 sheep in mid-August 2003 but, by 12 September 2003, after around 5 weeks at sea, the number had been reduced by at least 6 per cent,
 - (iii) Saudi Arabia's rejection of Australian shipments because of disease concerns resulted in the cessation of the live sheep trade for a

decade from 1991, and trade only resumed in 2000 after Australian exporters agreed to vaccinate all sheep against scabby mouth before shipment,

- (iv) throughout the period the *Cormo Express* has been at sea, Livecorp spokespeople have continually assured the Australian Government, media and community that the *Cormo Express*' shipment of live sheep would soon find an alternative port,
 - (v) on Wednesday, 10 September 2003, it was reported in the Australian media that *Cormo Express*' shipment of 57 000 were still stranded; a day later Meat and Livestock Australia announced that Australia's live sheep exports were soaring, with reference made to exports to Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain and Jordan all being on the increase,
 - (vi) Tuesday, 9 September 2003, saw the National Livestock Service announcing that the number of sheep slaughtered in Australia's eastern states was in decline due to the huge numbers of sheep euthanased and dead because of the drought,
 - (vii) the Australian Bureau of Statistics export data for the 2002-03 financial year and the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics estimates that the beef, veal, mutton and lamb carcass trade was worth \$4 964 million while the live cattle and sheep trade was worth in the vicinity of \$976 million; and
- (b) demands that the Government:
- (i) provide full details to the Senate by 3 pm on Thursday, 18 September 2003 of the number of mortalities aboard the *Cormo Express*, and identify the second and any subsequent ports approached after the Saudi Arabian rejection of the shipment, and identify the port, if any, prepared to accept the sheep and at what cost, and
 - (ii) enforce minimum welfare standards in the live export trade and increases support for the chilled and frozen meat export trade.

(Agreed to 17 September 2003.)

Orders for production of documents still current from previous parliaments

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)

Date of order	Subject	Addressed to
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

Qualification of senator

***41 Provision of advice**

That—

- (a) the Senate authorises the President of the Senate to engage Mr Brian Shaw, QC, to advise on answers to a list of questions relating to whether certain matters brought to the attention of the then President of the Senate by Senator Scullion on 10 May 2002 may have put him in conflict with section 44(v) of the Constitution; and
- (b) the person appointed under paragraph (a) shall be paid such fee as is approved by the President after consultation with senators.

(Agreed to 18 September 2003.)

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*)

* Annual report for 2002-03 (*tabled 18 September 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 Humphries (*Deputy Chair*), Senators, Knowles, 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 Cherry to replace Senator Murray for the committee's consideration of the provisions of the Taxation Laws Amendment (Superannuation Contributions Splitting) 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 Energy Grants (Cleaner Fuels) Scheme Bill 2003 and the Energy Grants (Cleaner Fuels) Scheme (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2003 (*referred 17 September 2003; reporting date: 16 October 2003*)

Provisions of the International Tax Agreements Amendment Bill 2003 (*referred 17 September 2003; reporting date: 3 November 2003*)

Provisions of the Taxation Laws Amendment (Superannuation Contributions Splitting) Bill 2003 (*referred 17 September 2003; reporting date: 3 November 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*)

Provisions of the ACIS Administration Amendment Bill 2003 and the Customs Tariff Amendment (ACIS) Bill 2003 (*tabled 10 September 2003*)

Provisions of the Taxation Laws Amendment Bill (No. 7) 2003 (*tabled 10 September 2003*)

Annual reports (No. 2 of 2003), September 2003 (*tabled 10 September 2003*)

Economics References Committee

Members

Senator Stephens (*Chair*), Senator Brandis (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Buckland, Chapman, Ridgeway and Webber

Substitute members

Senator Allison to replace Senator Ridgeway for matters relating to the Resources portfolio

Senator Murray to replace Senator Ridgeway for the committee's inquiry into the structure and distributive effects of the Australian taxation system

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Barnett, Boswell, 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 inquiries

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)

Workplace Relations Amendment (Improved Remedies for Unprotected Action) Bill 2002 (referred 17 September 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: 7 November 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 consideration of 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 consideration of the provisions of the Fuel Quality Standards Amendment Bill 2003

Senator O'Brien to replace Senator Mackay for the committee's consideration of the provisions of the Fuel Quality Standards Amendment Bill 2003

Senator Heffernan to replace Senator Santoro for the committee's consideration of the provisions of the Telstra (Transition to Full Private Ownership) Bill 2003 on Wednesday, 1 October 2003

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Bolkus, Boswell, Brown, George Campbell, Carr, Chapman, Conroy, Coonan, Evans, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Harradine, Harris, Heffernan, 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*)

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*)

Communications Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2003 (*tabled 15 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 regulation of the Ranger, Jabiluka, Beverley and Honeymoon uranium operations

Senator Buckland to replace Senator Lundy for the committee's inquiry into environmental regulation of the Ranger, Jabiluka, Beverley and Honeymoon uranium operations

Senator Scullion to replace Senator Tierney for the committee's inquiry into environmental regulation of 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 regulation of the Ranger, Jabiluka, Beverley and Honeymoon uranium operations

Senator Wong for the committee's inquiry into the Australian telecommunications network

Current inquiries

Environmental regulation of the Ranger, Jabiluka, Beverley and Honeymoon uranium operations (*referred 20 June 2002; reporting date: 14 October 2003*)

The role of libraries as providers of public information in the online environment (*referred 25 June 2002; reporting date: 16 October 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: last sitting day in March 2004*)

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 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*)

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*)

* Recruitment and training in the Australian Public Service (*tabled 18 September 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*)

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*)

Expanding Australia's trade and investment relationship with the countries of Central Europe (*tabled 15 September 2003*)

Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee

Portfolios

Foreign Affairs and Trade; Defence (including Veterans' Affairs)

Members

Senator Sandy Macdonald (*Chair*), Senator Cook (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Evans, Ferguson, Payne and Ridgeway

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

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*)

Provisions of the Non-Proliferation Legislation Amendment Bill 2003 (*tabled 11 September 2003*)

* Aspects of the *Veterans' Entitlements Act 1986* and the Military Compensation Scheme (*tabled 18 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, Conroy, 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: 15 October 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, Crossin, 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 inquiry

Australian Protective Service Amendment Bill 2003 (*referred 10 September 2003; reporting date: 7 October 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*)
- * Provisions of the Age Discrimination Bill 2003 (*tabled 18 September 2003*)

* Provisions of the Migration Legislation Amendment (Identification and Authentication) Bill 2003 (*tabled 18 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

Senator Murray to replace Senator Greig for the committee's consideration of the State Elections (One Vote, One Value) Bill 2001 [2002]

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: 8 October 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' offices – Senator Harris: Matters arising from the 105th report of the Committee of Privileges (*tabled 20 August 2003*)

- * 115th report—Persons referred to in the Senate (Board members of Electronic Frontiers Australia Inc.) (*tabled 18 September 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 Lundy, Hogg, 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 Williamstown 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*)

Construction of a new chancery building for the Australian High Commission, Colombo, Sri Lanka (Eighth report of 2003) (*tabled 10 September 2003*)

Construction of a new chancery, New Delhi, India (Ninth report of 2003) (*tabled 17 September 2003*)

Refurbishment of staff apartments, Australian Embassy complex, Paris, France (Tenth report of 2003) (*tabled 17 September 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*)

* 11th report (*tabled 18 September 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: 16 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: 7 October 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*)

Annual reports (No. 2 of 2003), September 2003 (*tabled 16 September 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*)
- No. 10 of 2003 (*tabled 10 September 2003*)
- No. 11 of 2003 (*tabled 17 September 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*)
No. 9 of 2003 (*tabled 10 September 2003*)
No. 10 of 2003 (*tabled 17 September 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*)
Report no. 10 of 2003 (*presented 10 September 2003*)
Report no. 11 of 2003 (*presented 17 September 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; final report tabled 10 September 2003*)

Members

Senator Watson (*Chair*), Senator Sherry (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Buckland, Chapman, Cherry, Lightfoot and Wong

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*)

Draft Superannuation Industry (Supervision) Amendment Regulations 2003 and draft Retirement Savings Accounts Amendment Regulations 2003 (*tabled 10 September 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)

Report 54—Treaties tabled in June and August 2003 (tabled 17 September 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

The Prime Minister has recommended to the Governor-General a number of changes to the Ministry. These changes will be advised in the next Notice Paper after the new Ministry is sworn in.

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 (Nick) <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 (Chris) <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 (Rod) <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 (Ron) <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.

