

**Senate Standing Committee  
for the  
Scrutiny of Bills**



**Alert Digest**

**No. 11 of 2000**

**30 August 2000**

**Senate Standing Committee**  
**for the**  
**Scrutiny of Bills**

**Alert Digest No. 11 of 2000**

**30 August 2000**

**ISSN 1329-668X**



# Senate Standing Committee for the Scrutiny of Bills

## Members of the Committee

Senator B Cooney (Chairman)  
Senator W Crane (Deputy Chairman)  
Senator T Crossin  
Senator J Ferris  
Senator B Mason  
Senator A Murray

## Terms of Reference

Extract from **Standing Order 24**

- (1) (a) At the commencement of each parliament, a Standing Committee for the Scrutiny of Bills shall be appointed to report, in respect of the clauses of bills introduced into the Senate, and in respect of Acts of the Parliament, whether such bills or Acts, by express words or otherwise:
- (i) trespass unduly on personal rights and liberties;
  - (ii) make rights, liberties or obligations unduly dependent upon insufficiently defined administrative powers;
  - (iii) make rights, liberties or obligations unduly dependent upon non-reviewable decisions;
  - (iv) inappropriately delegate legislative powers; or
  - (v) insufficiently subject the exercise of legislative power to parliamentary scrutiny.
- (b) The committee, for the purpose of reporting upon the clauses of a bill when the bill has been introduced into the Senate, may consider any proposed law or other document or information available to it, notwithstanding that such proposed law, document or information has not been presented to the Senate.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

• Interactive Gambling (Moratorium) Bill 2000	5
• Sex Discrimination Amendment Bill (No. 1) 2000	7
• Social Security and Veterans' Entitlements Legislation Amendment (Private Trusts and Private Companies—Integrity of Means Testing) Bill 2000	9
• States Grants (Primary and Secondary Education Assistance) Bill 2000	11

- **The Committee has commented on these bills**

This Digest is circulated to all Honourable Senators.  
Any Senator who wishes to draw matters to the attention of the  
Committee under its terms of reference is invited to do so.



## **Interactive Gambling (Moratorium) Bill 2000**

This bill was introduced into the Senate on 17 August 2000 by the Special Minister of State. [Portfolio responsibility: Communications, Information Technology and the Arts]

The bill proposes to impose a 12 month moratorium on the development of the interactive gambling industry in Australia, by creating a new criminal offence – the provision of an interactive gambling service. Under the bill, a person is prohibited from providing such a service unless the person was already providing the service when the moratorium commenced on 19 May 2000. As a 12 month moratorium has been imposed, the offence ceases to have effect at midnight on 18 May 2001.

### **Retrospective imposition of criminal liability**

#### **Clause 11**

Clause 10 of this bill creates an offence of intentionally providing an interactive gambling service. Clause 11 provides an exemption from liability for interactive gambling services that were in existence before 19 May 2000. This would seem to impose criminal liability retrospectively on any interactive gambling service established since 19 May, notwithstanding that the bill has not been passed.

However, clause 2 states that the bill commences on the day after it is assented to. Therefore, the penalty to be imposed under clause 10 applies only to persons providing an interactive gambling service on or after the day after assent. This means that a person who established an online gambling service on 20 May 2000 and operated it until the date on which the bill was assented to would have committed no offence under this legislation, provided the service was closed on that date.

*In these circumstances, the Committee makes no further comment on this provision.*



## Reversal of the onus of proof

### Clause 11

As noted above, clause 10 of this bill creates an offence of intentionally providing an interactive gambling service. Clause 11 states that, in a prosecution for an offence against clause 10, it is a defence if the defendant proves that he or she provided such a service before 19 May 2000, and that service had at least one arm's length paying customer, and the current service is substantially the same as the pre 19 May service, and is provided under the same name as that service. A note to clause 11 states that the defendant bears a legal burden in relation to all the matters mentioned in that clause.

The Explanatory Memorandum states that this reversal of the onus of proof is necessary "because all the elements of the defence are matters that are peculiarly within the knowledge of the defendant", and that it "would be almost impossible for the prosecution to disprove the elements of the defence raised by the defendant, whereas it would be possible for the defendant to prove the elements on the balance of probabilities".

Current providers of interactive gambling services are licensed by State and Territory authorities. Given this, it should not be too difficult or expensive for the prosecution to prove that a person charged with an offence under clause 10 was not licensed, on 19 May 2000, to conduct a service of the same name and with substantially the same content as that being conducted by the defendant at the time he or she was charged. The Committee, therefore, **seeks the Minister's advice** as to the nature of the difficulties in requiring the prosecution to fulfil its usual duty and prove these elements of the offence.

*Pending the Minister's advice, the Committee draws Senators' attention to this provision, as it may be considered to trespass unduly upon personal rights and liberties, in breach of principle 1(a)(i) of the Committee's terms of reference.*

## **Sex Discrimination Amendment Bill (No. 1) 2000**

This bill was introduced into the House of Representatives on 17 August 2000 by the Attorney-General. [Portfolio responsibility: Attorney-General]

The bill proposes to amend the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* to enable States and Territories to legislate to restrict access to assisted reproductive technology (ART) services on the basis of a person's marital status.

The bill will ensure that State and Territory legislation imposing, requiring, or permitting restrictions on access to ART services on the basis of marital status, is not inconsistent with section 22 of the Sex Discrimination Act. This will prevent such State and Territory legislation being rendered inoperative on account of inconsistency with Commonwealth law.

On the bill's commencement, any provisions of the Victorian and South Australian Acts that have previously been ruled inconsistent with the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* will revive. The bill will also ensure the validity of the existing Western Australian legislation.

### **Discrimination legislation**

#### **Schedule 1**

The Explanatory Memorandum accompanying this bill states that the bill is intended to ensure that State and Territory legislation imposing, requiring or permitting restrictions on access to assisted reproductive technology (ART) services on the basis of marital status is not inconsistent with section 22 of the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984*. This will prevent State and Territory legislation being rendered inoperative on account of inconsistency with Commonwealth law.

The Explanatory Memorandum goes on to state that the bill is not intended to regulate access to ART services directly, but to ensure that the Sex Discrimination Act does not prevent the States and Territories from legislating in this area, given their responsibilities in relation to the regulation of the provision of medical care and treatment.

The bill itself does not discriminate. However, by limiting the scope of the Sex Discrimination Act it does provide an opportunity for more discrimination

than is currently permitted. In this sense the bill has the potential to trespass on personal rights and liberties. Whether it trespasses unduly on personal rights and liberties is a matter that is best left for determination by the Senate as a whole.

*Other than this, the Committee makes no further comment on these provisions.*

## **Social Security and Veterans' Entitlements Legislation Amendment (Private Trusts and Private Companies—Integrity of Means Testing) Bill 2000**

This bill was introduced into the House of Representatives on 17 August 2000 by the Minister for Community Services. [Portfolio responsibility: Family and Community Services]

The bill proposes to amend the *Social Security Act 1991*, *Veterans' Entitlements Act 1986*, *Farm Household Support Act 1992*, *Income Tax Assessment Act 1936* and the *Taxation Administration Act 1953* to revise the means test treatment of private companies and private trusts under social security and veterans' affairs laws.

These measures seek to ensure that recipients of benefits who hold their assets in private companies or private trusts receive comparable treatment under the means test to those recipients who hold their assets directly. Under the provisions, the assets and income of the company or trust are to be attributed to the person(s) who control the company or trust, or to the persons(s) who were the source of capital or corpus of the company or trust.

### **Extension of tax file number regime**

#### **Proposed new subsections 1209H(2) and 52ZZZT(2)**

Among other things, this bill proposes to insert a new subsection 1209H(2) in the *Social Security Act 1991* and a new subsection 52ZZZT(2) in the *Veterans' Entitlements Act 1986*. These provisions will permit the Secretary of the Department of Family and Community Services and the Repatriation Commission respectively to obtain from the Commissioner of Taxation the tax file number (TFN) of a trust even though that trust is not a recipient of, or an applicant for, benefits under the relevant Acts.

The trust's TFN is to be provided if the Secretary (or Commission) has reason to believe that the relationship (whether direct or indirect) between a particular trust and a particular individual (or an associate of a particular individual) may be relevant to the operation of the other new provisions to be inserted by the bill.

The Explanatory Memorandum (at pp 99 and 100) notes that “Currently, with the exception of data-matching against tax returns conducted under the Data-matching Program, TFNs cannot be used in Centrelink/Australian Taxation Office information gathering for compliance purposes.”

These subsections, therefore, mark a further step in the process of providing information ostensibly collected solely for taxation purposes to persons outside the Tax Office.

The Committee notes that this bill has been introduced to ensure equity in the treatment of all social security “customers” irrespective of how their assets are held. However, the Committee again notes the words of the then Treasurer in the Parliament on 25 May 1988 when referring to the proposed introduction of the tax file number scheme:

The only purpose of the file number will be to make it easier for the Tax Office to match information it receives about money earned and interest payments.

This system is for the exclusive and limited use of the Tax Office – it will simply allow the better use of information the Tax Office already receives.

The Committee also notes the words of the then member for Kooyong in the Parliament on 21 December 1990, that “since the inception of the tax file number in 1988 as an identifying system, we have seen the gradual extension of that system to other areas by way of a process sometimes referred to as function creep”.

This process has continued and grown over a number of years, irrespective of the governing party of the day, and in spite of assurances that it would not occur. The provisions of this bill represent yet another example of this process.

*In these circumstances, the Committee draws Senators’ attention to the provisions, as they may be considered to trespass unduly on personal rights and liberties, in breach of principle 1(a)(i) of the Committee’s terms of reference.*

## **States Grants (Primary and Secondary Education Assistance) Bill 2000**

This bill was introduced into the House of Representatives on 29 June 2000 by the Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs. [Portfolio responsibility: Education, Training and Youth Affairs]

The bill proposes to provide funding to the States and Territories for primary and secondary education in Australia for the 2001-2004 quadrennium and to provide for:

- the introduction of new socio-economic-status (SES)-based funding arrangements for non-government schools;
- additional funding and consequential changes to funding arrangements for the School Transitional Emergency Assistance program, formerly known as the Short Term Emergency Assistance program;
- the introduction of a revised structure for Commonwealth programs for targeted assistance for schools; and
- improved accountability arrangements for Commonwealth schools programs.

The Committee previously dealt with this bill in *Alert Digest No 10 of 2000*, in which it made no comment. The Committee has since received some correspondence on the bill from Mr Vincent Thackeray (copy appended to this *Digest*), and now makes the following comments.

### **Non reviewable decisions**

#### **Proposed sections 18, 20 and 38**

This bill introduces a new method for determining funding for non-government schools. In so doing it provides a statutory formula for determining a year 2000 funding level (under clause 8), and provides that guidelines approved by the Minister for determining a school's SES score are disallowable instruments (under subclause 7(2)). Each of these measures introduces a level of accountability that was not present in previous funding methods.

However, while the bill has improved the accountability framework in these areas, it does not seem to have addressed the related issue of administrative discretions.

Under proposed subsection 18(5), the Minister may refuse to authorise, or may delay, a payment for a non-government body if the relevant authority of that body is not a body corporate and the Minister considers that the liabilities of that authority are substantially greater than its assets, or that the authority is unable (and unlikely to be able) to pay its debts as they fall due. While such a solvency requirement is necessary, it requires the exercise of a Ministerial discretion. No provision is made for the independent review of this discretion.

The Minister exercises a similar discretion under proposed section 20, where he or she may include in a section 18 agreement “any other provisions that the Minister thinks appropriate”.

More significantly, under proposed subsections 38(3) or (4), if the Minister is satisfied that a school’s SES score has not been determined correctly, or is no longer accurate because of a significant change in the school’s circumstances, the Minister must change the school’s funding level. Again, no provision is made for the independent review of this discretion.

Funding decisions may have significant consequences for those affected by them. The Committee, therefore, **seeks the Minister’s advice** as to the reasons why no provision has been made to enable the exercise of these discretions to be independently reviewed.

*Pending the Minister’s advice, the Committee draws Senators’ attention to these provisions, as they may be considered to make rights, liberties and obligations unduly dependent upon non-reviewable decisions, in breach of principle 1(a)(iii) of the Committee’s terms of reference.*

# VINCENT THACKERAY

B. Comm. A.C.A.

MOBILE & MESSAGES  
041 7727 552

PO BOX 1242  
RUNAWAY BAY  
QLD

PHONE & FAX  
(07) 5537 3328  
thack@fan.net.au

18 August 2000

The Secretary  
Senate Scrutiny of Bills Committee  
Parliament House  
Canberra

**RECEIVED**

18 AUG 2000

Senate Standing C'ttee  
for the Scrutiny of Bills

Dear James

## **States Grants (Primary and Secondary Education Assistance) Bill 2000**

I refer to my telephone discussion with you today. I have some concern that the above bill may make rights, liberties or obligations unduly dependent upon non-reviewable decisions as there are no rights of independent review of the merits of any administrative decisions which are conferred by the Bill. For example:

- a decision of the Minister to refuse to authorise or delay a payment under subsection 18(5);
- the inclusion of any other provisions in an agreement as determined by the Minister under section 20; or
- decisions of the Minister under subsections 38(3) or (4) to change the funding level of a school.

Consequently, I am attaching a submission to your Committee which briefly details the development of legislation for the funding of non-government schools and comments upon the inadequacy of both past enactments and the current bill in ensuring that a person is justly and fairly treated by the administrative decision-making process.

I am aware that some non-government schools have considered that they have been unjustly and unfairly treated as a result of decisions made under past enactments, but that they have been hampered by the lack of an independent review process to have the administrative decisions in question redressed.

I would be happy to expand upon any of the matters raised in my submission if your Committee requests me to do so.

Yours faithfully

  
Vincent Thackeray.



**A SUBMISSION TO THE SENATE SCRUTINY OF BILLS COMMITTEE.**

**PREPARED BY: VINCENT GREGORY THACKERAY.**

**DATED: 18 AUGUST 2000.**

1.1 The major program of funding for non-government schools is implemented under the auspices of States Grants Assistance legislation. However, the mechanism for payment of funding requires administrative decisions to be made about the entitlement of a person (i.e. a non-government school) to funding. There are no rights to have any of these administrative decisions independently reviewed under the legislation regulating funding. Consequently, the potential for a school to be denied a just and fair consideration of a claim for funding is limitless. This total disregard for the rights of a person to have an administrative decision independently reviewed has gone on unchecked. A number of enactments that regulate the funding of non-government schools and which do not include any rights to have the merits of administrative decisions independently reviewed have been legislated over the years. This disregard of a person's rights is about to be furthered if the States Grants (Primary and Secondary Education Assistance) Bill 2000 is passed in its current form.

1.2 The history of needs-based funding of non-government schools is documented in the issues paper "Schools Funding: Consultation Report" which was released by the then Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs (DEETYA) in October 1997. The purpose of the issues paper was to "seek community response to possible future directions for Commonwealth funding of non-government schools". The paper was produced as "part of the Review of the Education Resources Index (ERI)", which is "the mechanism used by the Commonwealth since 1981 to assess the appropriate level of Commonwealth recurrent funding to non-government schools". This

review of ERI has now resulted in the proposed changes to the method of funding of non-government schools which are incorporated in the States Grants (Primary and Secondary Education Assistance) Bill 2000.

1.3 Since 1988, the following legislation ('the education acts') has required the Minister to determine the funding of non-government schools:

- States Grants (Schools Assistance) Act 1988.
- States Grants (Primary and Secondary Education Assistance) Act 1992.
- States Grants (Primary and Secondary Education Assistance) Act 1996.

1.4 These education acts do not grant any rights of independent merits review of the myriad of administrative decisions which are conferred under them. For the purpose of this submission, I intend to focus on the administrative decisions which need to be made when the ERI mechanism is employed to assess the appropriate level of Commonwealth recurrent funding to non-government schools as these decisions are critical to the fair and just allocation of funding to a school and the implications (social and otherwise) of incorrect assessment decisions are extremely significant.

1.5 ERI compares the income which a non-government school is able to generate on its own behalf with a standard level of resources. It is calculated by dividing the Total Private Income (less allowances for boarding and capital costs) of a school by an Assessment Standard so that the ERI value of a school is expressed as a percentage. The resulting ERI then determines the funding level category into which a school will be

placed. The information for calculating the Total Private Income of a school is sourced from the financial records of a school. The information for calculating the Assessment Standard is sourced from DEETYA.

1.6 It can be seen, therefore, that there are two elements critical to the calculation of an ERI of a school which need to be determined by either Parliament or the Executive:

- The formula for calculating ERI; and
- The Assessment Standard which must be applied in the formula.

1.7 The formula for calculating ERI is not set down in the education acts under consideration nor is it set down in any regulations under them. In fact there is no reference to ERI at all in these Acts. Rather the funding level of a school is defined in each Act as meaning the level of assistance set out in a schedule to each Act that applies to the school. The schedule in each Act then identifies the funding levels categories, but the category that will apply to a school will depend upon the ERI calculated for it.

1.8 Consequently, there has never been any formula for the calculation of a school's ERI legislated but rather the Executive has determined the formula. DEETYA produces Commonwealth Programs for Schools Administrative Guidelines which detail matters under its administration. There was no formula for the calculation of ERI in these administrative guidelines prior to 1994.

1.9 Two categories of Assessment Standards have been published by DEETYA since 1981 which have had an influence in assessing the ERI of a school:

- Assessment costs for calculation of ERI; and
- Assessment costs for calculation of Maintenance of Effort.

1.10 DEETYA has employed both these Assessment Standards at different times to calculate ERI. Although the standards themselves are published by DEETYA, the Administrative Guidelines produced by DEETYA have never disclosed the appropriate Assessment Standard to be applied in the calculation of ERI at a given time. The department's first public release of details of the appropriate standard to be used in the calculation of ERI was in the 1997 Commonwealth General Recurrent Grant Funding Information Booklet which was distributed with the Application Booklet for new schools seeking Commonwealth General Recurrent Funding. In my discussions with the department about this matter, an officer of DEETYA told me that the non-disclosure of which Assessment Standard should be used in the ERI calculation was a deliberate ploy to enable the restriction of funding to non-government schools for a time.

1.11 The calculations of ERI for some schools have been disputed. However, these schools have not had the right to have the merits of the calculation of their ERI independently reviewed. A school may apply to the Non-Government School Funding Review Committee for a review of a funding level category but only if circumstances specified in the Administrative Guidelines are applicable to its case. This does not provide a school with a right to seek a review of a calculation of ERI nor does the Non-

Government School Funding Review Committee provide an independent means of review of funding as it is appointed by the Minister and makes recommendations only on its findings. These schools have been unjustly and unfairly treated as a result.

1.12 The absence of any right of review of the merits of administrative decisions under the education acts is all the more puzzling when reference is made to a statement made in the Senate by Senator Ryan, the then Minister for Education and Youth Affairs on 31 May 1984 in a debate on the States Grants (Schools Assistance) Amendment Bill 1984. This bill amended the States Grants (Schools Assistance) Act 1983, which was a precursor to the three education acts. Senator Ryan said:

“In the second reading debate on the States Grants (Schools Assistance) Bill 1983, I undertook to establish an independent appeals tribunal to consider appeals by non-government schools against their classification for recurrent funding purposes. I have had the matter under consideration and I have asked the Schools Commission to consult with non-government school authorities and organisations on the form of a suitable appeals mechanism before the necessary legislation is introduced in the budget session.” [Hansard at p.2270]

No such legislation was ever enacted.

1.13 In discussing a proposal by Senator Macklin of the Australian Democrats that decisions with regard to the categories of schools and income testing be reviewable by the Administrative Appeals Tribunal, Senator Ryan said on 9 December 1983:

**“We have now decided that a more appropriate, more effective strengthening of the existing appeals procedures would be to establish within the Schools Commission an independent tribunal, independently chaired, similar in character to the tertiary education assistance scheme tribunal or the Social Security Appeals Tribunal. Such a tribunal would provide expertise in the matters under consideration and would be an avenue of appeal other than that currently available to the Commission itself.” [Hansard p.3173]**

**No such tribunal was ever established.**

**1.14 The consequences of not providing a right of review of an administrative decision to determine the funding category for a non-government school are serious. A school can be financially disadvantaged by an incorrect funding category decision and yet be denied the opportunity to have the merits of such a decision independently reviewed. This clearly was not contemplated by the then Minister Ryan or the Senate in 1983 and 1984 but this state of affairs has since gone unchecked and caused some schools to be treated unjustly and unfairly.**

**1.15 For completeness, comment should also be made on two related issues which have facilitated the prolongation of this unacceptable state of affairs:**

- the use of a funding formula that is not endorsed by Parliament; and**
- the conferring of administrative decision-making powers by guidelines that are not authorised by Parliament.**

1.16 Commonwealth legislation provides ample precedence for the proposition that the legislature should either regulate matters of these types, or if their regulation is left to the Executive, provision must be made for the Executive to be accountable to Parliament:

- sections 10L and 10M of the Indigenous Education (Supplementary Assistance) Act 1989 provides for the funding of ABSTUDY approved courses by detailing a formula for calculation purposes.
- the Higher Education Funding Act 1988 provides for administrative decision-making powers in relation to funding to be conferred by guidelines but these guidelines are classified as disallowable instruments under subsection 110(c) of that Act.

1.17 The States Grants (Primary and Secondary Education Assistance) Bill 2000, which is currently before Parliament, replaces the ERI method of determining a non-government school's funding category with a socioeconomic status method (SES). The drafters of this bill have now addressed some of the shortfalls in previous education funding legislation and have provided in this draft legislation for:

- the classification of guidelines for the calculation of the SES score as instruments disallowable by Parliament [at section 7]; and
- the incorporation of formulas for the determination of the funding level of a school for ratification by Parliament (if completed) [at section 8].



1.18 However, there are no rights of independent review of the merits of the many administrative decisions which are conferred by the States Grants (Primary and Secondary Education Assistance) Bill 2000. For example:

- a decision of the Minister to refuse to authorise or delay a payment under subsection 18(5);
- the inclusion of any other provisions in an agreement as determined by the Minister under section 20; or
- decisions of the Minister under subsections 38(3) or (4) to change the funding level of a school.

1.19 While the States Grants (Primary and Secondary Education Assistance) Bill 2000 makes some advances in having the Executive accountable to Parliament for its decisions, it does not address the unjust and unfair consequences of the absence of independent merits review of administrative decisions in education funding legislation.





## STANDING COMMITTEE FOR THE SCRUTINY OF BILLS

## INDEX OF BILLS COMMENTED ON AND MINISTERIAL RESPONSES SOUGHT/RECEIVED - 2000

NAME OF BILL	ALERT DIGEST	INTRODUCED		MINISTER	RESPONSE SOUGHT RECEIVED	REPORT NUMBER
		HOUSE	SENATE			
<b>Bills Carried over from 1999</b>						
Convention on Climate Change (Implementation) Bill 1999	14(22.9.99)	2.9.99	2.9.99	Senator Brown	3.9.99	
Copyright Amendment (Digital Agenda) Bill 1999	14(22.9.99)	2.9.99	14.8.00	Attorney-General	23.9.99	10(16.8.00)
Criminal Code Amendment (Theft, Fraud, Bribery and Related Offences) Bill 1999	19(1.12.99)	24.11.99		Justice and Customs	2.12.99	15.3.00
Fair Prices and Better Access for All (Petroleum) Bill 1999	14(22.9.99)	30.8.99		Mr Fitzgibbon	23.9.99	23.12.99 DC 3.4.00
Fisheries Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 1) 1999	14(22.9.99)	1.9.99	14.10.99	Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry	23.9.99	14.2.00 1(16.2.00) Act No. 143
<i>Migration Legislation Amendment Act (No. 1) 1999</i> (previous citation: Migration Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 1998)	1(15.2.99)	30.6.99	3.12.98	Immigration and Multicultural Affairs	16.2.99 23.3.99 25.3.99 22.6.99 24.6.99 20.12.99 7.2.00	4(24.3.99) 10(23.6.99) 1(16.2.00)
<i>Telecommunications (Interception) Amendment Act 1999</i>	14(22.9.99)	2.9.99	14.10.99	Attorney-General	23.9.99 19.10.99 21.10.99 16.3.00	17(20.10.99) 3(5.4.00)

NAME OF BILL	ALERT DIGEST	INTRODUCED		MINISTER	RESPONSE		REPORT NUMBER
		HOUSE	SENATE		SOUGHT	RECEIVED	
<b>Bills being dealt with during 2000</b>							
A New Tax System (Family Assistance and Related Measures) Bill 2000	3(15.3.00)	9.3.00	5.4.00	Family and Community Services	16.3.00	4.4.00	5(12.4.00)
Administrative Review Tribunal Bill 2000	10(16.8.00)	28.6.00		Attorney-General	17.8.00		
Broadcasting Services Amendment Bill (No. 3) 1999	1(16.2.00)	6.12.99	9.12.99	Communications, Information and the Arts	17.2.00	4.5.00	Act No.198 7(7.6.00)
Broadcasting Services Amendment Bill (No. 4) 1999	1(16.2.00)	9.12.99		Communications, Information and the Arts	17.2.00	4.5.00	
Criminal Assets Recovery Bill 2000	4(5.4.00)	13.3.00		Mr Kerr, ALP	6.4.00	17.5.00	
Criminal Code Amendment (United Nations and Associated Personnel) Bill 2000	10(16.8.00)	28.6.00		Attorney-General	17.8.00		
Customs Legislation Amendment (Criminal Sanctions and Other Measures) Bill 2000 <small>(previous citation: Customs Legislation Amendment (Criminal Sanctions and Other Measures) Bill 1999</small>	*19(1.12.99) 2(8.3.00)	24.11.99	13.3.00	Justice and Customs	9.3.00		Act No. 23
Dairy Industry Adjustment Bill 2000	2(8.3.00)	16.2.00	15.3.00	Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry	9.3.00	14.3.00	2(15.3.00)
Defence Legislation Amendment (Aid to Civilian Authorities) Bill 2000	10(16.8.00)	28.6.00	14.8.00	Defence	17.8.00	25.8.00	11(28.8.00)
Excise Amendment (Compliance Improvement) Bill 2000	9(28.6.00)	21.6.00	22.6.00	Treasurer	29.6.00	11.8.00	10(16.8.00)

NAME OF BILL	ALERT DIGEST	INTRODUCED		MINISTER	RESPONSE SOUGHT		REPORT NUMBER
		HOUSE	SENATE		RECEIVED		
Family and Community Services Legislation Amendment Bill 2000	3(15.3.00)	9.3.00	13.4.00	Family and Community Services	16.3.00	4.4.00	6(10.5.00)
Financial Management and Accountability Amendment Bill 2000	7(7.6.00)	10.5.00	8.6.00	Finance and Administration	8.6.00	20.6.00	8(21.6.00)
Financial Sector Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 1) 2000	6(10.5.00)	13.4.00	26.6.00	Treasurer	11.5.00	25.5.00	9(28.6.00)
Gene Technology Bill 2000	9(28.6.00)	22.6.00		Health and Aged Care	29.6.00		
Gene Technology (Licence Charges)	9(28.6.00)	22.6.00		Health and Aged Care	29.6.00		
Jurisdiction of Courts Legislation Amendment Bill 2000	3(15.3.00)	8.3.00	11.4.00	Attorney-General	16.3.00	30.3.00 13.4.00	5(12.4.00) 6(10.5.00)
Migration Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2000	4(5.4.00)	14.3.00		Immigration and Multicultural Affairs	6.4.00	26.4.00	
Migration Legislation Amendment (Parents and Other Measures) Bill 2000	8(21.6.00)	7.6.00	27.6.00	Immigration and Multicultural Affairs	22.6.00	27.6.00	9(28.6.00)
National Crime Authority Amendment Bill 2000	4(5.4.00)	13.3.00		Mr Kerr	6.4.00	17.5.00	
New Business Tax System (Miscellaneous) Bill (No. 2) 2000	6(10.5.00)	13.4.00	27.6.00	Treasurer	11.5.00	8.6.00	9(28.6.00)
Pooled Development Funds Amendment Bill 1999	1(16.2.00)	8.12.99	13.4.00	Industry, Science and Resources	17.2.00	2.3.00	6(10.5.00)

NAME OF BILL	ALERT DIGEST	INTRODUCED		MINISTER	RESPONSE		REPORT NUMBER
		HOUSE	SENATE		SOUGHT	RECEIVED	
Postal Services Legislation Amendment Bill 2000	5(12.4.00)	6.4.00		Communications, Information Technology and the Arts	13.4.00		
Privacy Amendment (Private Sector) Bill 2000	6(10.5.00)	12.4.00		Attorney-General	11.5.00		
Product Grants And Benefits Administration Bill 2000	6(10.5.00)	12.4.00	11.5.00	Treasurer	11.5.00	5.6.00	7(7.6.00)
Protection of the Sea (Civil Liability) Amendment Bill 2000	10(16.8.00)	28.6.00		Transport and Regional Services	17.8.00		
Renewable Energy (Electricity) Bill 2000	9(28.6.00)	22.6.00	14.8.00	Environment and Heritage	29.6.00	14.8.00	10(16.8.00)
Sales Tax (Industrial Safety Equipment) (Transitional Provisions) Bill 2000	7(7.6.00)	11.5.00	5.6.00	Treasurer	8.6.00	20.6.00	8(21.6.00)
Sex Discrimination Legislation Amendment (Pregnancy and Work) Bill 2000	4(5.4.00)	13.3.00		Mrs Macklin	6.4.00		
Sex Discrimination Legislation Amendment (Pregnancy and Work) Bill 2000 [No. 2]	4(5.4.00)		14.3.00	Senator Crossin	6.4.00		
Sydney Harbour Federation Trust Bill 1999	1(16.2.00)		8.12.99	Environment and Heritage	17.2.00	22.3.00	4(5.4.00)
Taxation Laws Amendment Bill (No. 11) 1999	1(16.2.00) 2(8.3.00)	9.12.99	10.5.00	Treasurer	17.2.00 9.3.00	30.3.00 5.4.00	7(7.6.00)
Telecommunications (Consumer Protection and Service Standards) Amendment Bill (No. 1) 2000	7(7.6.00)	10.5.00	22.6.00	Communications, Information Technology and the Arts	8.6.00	2.8.00	10(16.8.00)

NAME OF BILL	ALERT DIGEST	INTRODUCED		MINISTER	RESPONSE		REPORT NUMBER
		HOUSE	SENATE		SOUGHT	RECEIVED	
Telecommunication (Consumer Protection and Service Standards) Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2000	10(16.8.00)	29.6.00		Communications, Information Technology and the Arts	17.8.00		
Telecommunications (Interception) Legislation Amendment Bill 2000	3(15.3.00)	16.2.00	13.3.00	Attorney-General	16.3.00	27.4.00	6(10.5.00)
Trade Practices Amendment (Unconscionable Conduct—Saving of State and Territory Laws) Bill 2000	8(21.6.00)	5.6.00		Mr Fitzgibbon	22.6.00		
Veterans' Affairs Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 1) 2000	10(16.8.00)	29.6.00		Veterans' Affairs	17.8.00	29.8.00	



