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Notifications prefixed by an (*) appear for the first time.
BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

Notices of Motion

Notice given 12 March 2002

*1 Chair of the Employment, Workplace Relations and Education References Committee (Senator George Campbell): To move—

(1) That the Employment, Workplace Relations and Education References Committee inquire into the education of students with disabilities, including learning disabilities, throughout all levels and sectors of education, with particular reference to:

(a) whether current policies and programs for students with disabilities are adequate to meet their education needs, including, but not limited to:
   (i) the criteria used to define disability and to differentiate between levels of handicap,
   (ii) the accuracy with which students’ disability-related needs are being assessed,
   (iii) the particular needs of students with disabilities from low socio-economic, non-English speaking and Indigenous backgrounds, and from rural and remote areas,
   (iv) the effectiveness and availability of early intervention programs,
   (v) access to and adequacy of funding and support in both the public and private sectors,
   (vi) the nature, extent and funding of programs that provide for full or partial learning opportunities with mainstream students,
   (vii) teacher training and professional development, and
   (viii) the legal implications and resource demands of current Commonwealth and state and territory legislation; and

(b) what the proper role of the Commonwealth and states and territories should be in supporting the education of students with disabilities.

(2) That the committee report to the Senate by the last sitting day in October 2002.

*2 Chair of the Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee (Senator Hogg): To move—

(1) That the following matter be referred to the Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee for inquiry and report by 2 December 2002: Whether the current materiel acquisition and management framework of the Department of Defence is effective in meeting the organisation’s equipment requirements.

(2) In considering this matter, the committee is to examine and report on the following issues:

(a) whether the current materiel acquisition and through-life support system is meeting, and will continue to meet, the needs of Defence and Defence industries in a timely, cost-effective and qualitative manner;
(b) the impact of the Defence Materiel Organisation acquisition reform program on materiel acquisition and management;
(c) the current status of major equipment projects in meeting the organisation’s requirements;
(e) the impact of the creation of decentralised System Program Offices on materiel acquisition and management; and
(f) any other issues relevant to the effectiveness of the current acquisitions framework which arise in the course of the inquiry.

*3 Chair of the Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee (Senator Hogg): To move—That the following matter be referred to the Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee for inquiry and report by 2 December 2002:
Australia’s relationship with Papua New Guinea and the island states of the south-west Pacific (known as Oceania or the South Pacific), with particular reference to:
(a) the current state of political relations between regional states and Australia and New Zealand;
(b) economic relations, including trade, tourism and investment;
(c) development cooperation relationships with the various states of the region, including the future direction of the overall development cooperation program; and
(d) the implications for Australia of political, economic and security developments in the region.

Order of the Day
1 Community Affairs Legislation Committee
   Employment, Workplace Relations and Education Legislation Committee
   Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts Legislation Committee
   Finance and Public Administration Legislation Committee
   Reports to be presented in respect of the 2001-02 additional estimates.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Notice of Motion

Notice given 12 March 2002

*1 Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer (Senator Ian Campbell): To move—That the following bill be introduced: A Bill for an Act to amend the Plant Breeder’s Rights Act 1994, and for related purposes. Plant Breeder’s Rights Amendment Bill 2002.
Orders of the Day

1 Regional Forest Agreements Bill 2002—(Senate bill)
   In committee (12 March 2002).

2 States Grants (Primary and Secondary Education Assistance) Amendment Bill 2002—(Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell)

3 Disability Services Amendment (Improved Quality Assurance) Bill 2002—(Senate bill)—(Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell)
   Second reading—Adjourned debate (13 February 2002).

4 Governor-General’s Opening Speech
   Adjourned debate on the motion—that the following address-in-reply be agreed to:

   To His Excellency the Governor-General

   MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY—

   We, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Australia in Parliament assembled, desire to express our loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign and to thank Your Excellency for the speech which you have been pleased to address to Parliament.

   And on the amendment moved by the Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Stott Despoja)—That the following words be added to the address-in-reply:

   “,” but the Senate is of the opinion that:

   (a) the Government must move towards a more humane and workable approach to asylum seekers; and

   (b) Woomera detention centre should be closed”—(Senator Forshaw, in continuation, 12 March 2002).

5 Workplace Relations Amendment (Fair Dismissal) Bill 2002—(Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell)

6 Criminal Code Amendment (Anti-hoax and Other Measures) Bill 2002—(Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell)

7 Ministers of State Amendment Bill 2002—(Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell)

8 Commonwealth Inscribed Stock Amendment Bill 2002—(Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell)

9 Financial Services Reform (Consequential Provisions) Bill 2002—(Senate bill)—(Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, Senator Troeth)
   Second reading—Adjourned debate (14 February 2002).

10 Radiocommunications (Transmitter Licence Tax) Amendment Bill 2002—(Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell)

*11 Advance to the Finance Minister as a final charge for the year ended 30 June 2001

Consideration in committee of the whole (12 March 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 Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee—Report—Human Rights
(Mandatory Sentencing for Property Offences) Bill 2000

Adjourned debate on the motion of the chair of the committee (Senator McKiernan)—That the Senate take note of the report (adjourned, Senator McGauran, 12 March 2002).

2 Economics References Committee—Report—Inquiry into mass marketed tax
effective schemes and investor protection

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Cooney—That the Senate take note of the report (Senator Cooney, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

3 Superannuation and Financial Services—Select Committee—Report—Early
access to superannuation benefits

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Sherry—That the Senate take note of the report (Senator Cooney, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

4 Employment, Workplace Relations, Small Business and Education References Committee—Report—Universities in crisis: Report into the capacity of public universities to meet Australia’s higher education needs—Addendum

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator West—That the Senate take note of the report (Senator West, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

5 Australian Security Intelligence Organisation—Joint Statutory Committee—
Report entitled: A watching brief: The nature, scope and appropriateness of ASIO’s public reporting activities—Government response

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Sandy Macdonald—That the Senate take note of the document (Senator Sandy Macdonald, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

6 Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee—Report—
Recruitment and retention of ADF personnel

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Hogg—That the Senate take note of the report (Senator West, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

7 Employment, Workplace Relations, Small Business and Education References Committee—Report—The education of gifted children

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Tierney—That the Senate take note of the report (Senator Tierney, in continuation, 14 February 2002).
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator West—That the Senate take note of the document (Senator West, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

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

1 Auditor-General—Audit report no. 16 of 2001-02—Performance audit—Defence Reform Program management and outcomes: Department of Defence
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Hogg—That the Senate take note of the document (Senator Hogg, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

2 Auditor-General—Audit report no. 24 of 2001-02—Performance audit—Status reporting of major defence acquisition projects: Department of Defence
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Hogg—That the Senate take note of the document (Senator Hogg, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

3 Auditor-General—Audit report no. 26 of 2001-02—Performance audit—Management of fraud and incorrect payment in Centrelink
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Cooney—That the Senate take note of the document (Senator Cooney, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

4 Auditor-General—Audit report no. 30 of 2001-02—Performance audit—Test and evaluation of major defence equipment acquisitions: Department of Defence
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Hogg—That the Senate take note of the document (Senator Cooney, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

5 Auditor-General—Audit report no. 31 of 2001-02—Audit activity report: July to December 2001: Summary of outcomes
Consideration (14 February 2002).

6 Auditor-General—Audit report no. 32 of 2001-02—Performance audit—Home and community care follow-up audit: Department of Health and Ageing
Consideration (14 February 2002).

7 Auditor-General—Audit report no. 33 of 2001-02—Assurance and control assessment audit—Senate order of 20 June 2001 (February 2002)
Consideration (11 March 2002).

8 Auditor-General—Audit report no. 34 of 2001-02—Assurance and control assessment audit—Management of travel—Use of taxis
Consideration (11 March 2002).

9 Auditor-General—Audit report no. 35 of 2001-02—Performance audit—ATO progress in addressing the cash economy: Australian Taxation Office
Consideration (11 March 2002).
GENERAL BUSINESS

Notices of Motion

Notice given 12 February 2002

1 Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Stott Despoja): To move—That
the Senate calls upon the Inspector-General of Intelligence and Security to
investigate:

(a) with specific reference to the events related to the MV Tampa:
   (i) whether the Defence Signals Directorate (DSD) or any other
       intelligence or security agency intercepted communications to or
       from the MV Tampa, or any other communications relating to the
       MV Tampa,
   (ii) on what legal basis any such interceptions were undertaken,
   (iii) for what purpose any such interceptions were undertaken, and
   (iv) on whose instructions any such interceptions were undertaken; and

(b) whether legislation, regulations and guidelines relating to the DSD’s
activities adequately guard against:
   (i) improper actions by the DSD, and
   (ii) the improper use of the DSD by the Government; and

   to fully report to the Senate on the result of the investigation.

2 Senator Allison: To move—

(1) That a select committee, to be known as the Select Committee on
Superannuation, be appointed to inquire into matters pertaining to
superannuation referred to it by the Senate, and inquire initially into:
   (a) the adequacy of the tax system and related policy to address the
       retirement income and aged and health care needs of Australians;
       and
   (b) the taxation treatment applying to transfers from an overseas
       superannuation fund to an Australian regulated fund, with particular
       reference to whether the lump sum payment from an eligible non-
       resident/non-complying superannuation fund, under section 27CAA
       of the Income Tax Assessment Act 1936, should be treated as
       income and when such tax liability (if any) should accrue and be
       paid.

(2) That the committee present its final report on (a) by the last sitting day in
June 2002 and on (b) by the last sitting day in December 2002.

(3) That the committee have power to consider and use for its purposes the
minutes of evidence, records and documents of the Select Committees on
Superannuation and the Select Committee on Superannuation and Financial
Services appointed in previous parliaments.

(4) That the committee consist of 7 senators, 3 nominated by the Leader of the
Government in the Senate, 3 nominated by the Leader of the Opposition in
the Senate, and 1 nominated by minority groups and independent senators.

(5) That the chair of the committee be elected by and from the members of the
committee, and that the deputy chair of the committee be elected by and
from the members of the committee immediately after the election of the chair.

(6) That the committee may proceed to the dispatch of business notwithstanding that not all members have been duly nominated and appointed and notwithstanding any vacancy.

(7) That the deputy chair act as chair when there is no chair or the chair is not present at a meeting.

(8) That, in the event of the votes on any question before the committee being equally divided, the chair, or the deputy chair when acting as chair, have a casting vote.

(9) That the quorum of the committee be 3 members.

(10) That the committee and any subcommittee have power to send for and examine persons and documents, to move from place to place, to sit in public or in private, notwithstanding any prorogation of the Parliament or dissolution of the House of Representatives, and have leave to report from time to time its proceedings and the evidence taken and such interim recommendations as it may deem fit.

(11) That the committee have power to appoint subcommittees consisting of 3 or more of its members and to refer to any such subcommittee any of the matters which the committee is empowered to consider, and that the quorum of a subcommittee be a majority of senators appointed to the subcommittee.

(12) That the committee be provided with all necessary staff, facilities and resources and be empowered to appoint persons with specialist knowledge for the purposes of the committee with the approval of the President.

(13) That the committee be empowered to print from day to day such documents and evidence as may be ordered by it, and a daily Hansard be published of such proceedings as take place in public.

Notice of motion altered on 12 February 2002 pursuant to standing order 77.

3 Senator Bourne: To move—That the Senate—

(a) notes the Agreement reached in Abuja on 6 September 2001 between the Committee of Commonwealth Foreign Ministers, including a number of African States and the Zimbabwean Government, to return Zimbabwe to the rule of law and end all illegal occupations of farmland;

(b) welcomes the Zimbabwe Government’s decision to allow international election observers but notes, with disapproval, the continued violence, repression of the media and free speech, and the passage of legislation such as the Land Acquisition Act, the Public Order and Security Act, amendments to the Electoral Act and the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act;

(c) calls on the Government of Zimbabwe to take all necessary action to ensure a free and fair presidential election, end political violence and repression, and repeal all legislation that undermines human rights and democratic freedoms;

(d) joins with the European Parliament and the United States Congress in endorsing the use of targeted sanctions against the Government of Zimbabwe; and
(e) endorses the use of targeted sanctions by the Australian Government and the international community against the Government of Zimbabwe to encourage the restoration of democracy and the rule of law.

4 Senator Bourne: To move—That the Senate—
(a) recalls its resolutions on Tibet passed on 6 December 1990 and 18 September 1996;
(b) notes:
   (i) continued repression of religious freedom in Tibet and persecution of Tibetan nuns and monks,
   (ii) ongoing reports of human rights abuses against the Tibetan people by the People’s Republic of China, and
   (iii) the impact of education, economic and migration policies in the Tibetan Autonomous Region on Tibetan language and culture;
(c) further notes:
   (i) the Dalai Lama’s important role as one of the world’s most eminent and respected spiritual leaders,
   (ii) the Dalai Lama’s affirmation of a commitment to non-violence and negotiation to solve conflict, as exemplified in His Holiness’ receipt of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1989, and
   (iii) the Dalai Lama’s successful visit to Australia in 1996 and the ongoing interest of many Australians in his teachings; and
(d) requests the President of the Senate, in her capacity as a Presiding Officer of the Joint House Department, to take the necessary action to allow the Dalai Lama to give a televised address in the Great Hall.

7 Senator Murray: To move—That the Senate calls on the Government:
(a) to cancel the present retirement travel entitlements, including Life Gold Pass and severance travel entitlements, for all senators and members of the House of Representatives retiring after the commencement of the 40th Parliament, and their spouses;
(b) to give consideration to restricting, rationalising and eventually phasing-out these entitlements presently applying to senators and members of the House of Representatives who retired prior to the 40th Parliament, and their spouses; and
(c) to note that this motion does not apply to the office of Prime Minister.

Notice given 13 February 2002

14 Senator Harris: To move—
(1) That a select committee, to be known as the Select Committee on the Lindeberg Grievance, be appointed to inquire into and report, by 30 June 2002, on the following matters:
   (a) whether any false or misleading evidence was given to the Select Committee on Public Interest Whistleblowing, the Select Committee on Unresolved Whistleblower Cases or the Committee of Privileges in respect of its 63rd and 71st reports;
   (b) whether any contempt was committed in that regard, having regard to previous inquiries by Senate committees relating to the shredding of the Heiner documents, the fresh material that has subsequently been revealed by the Dutney Memorandum, and Exhibits 20 and 31 tabled at the Forde Commission of Inquiry into the Abuse of
Children in Queensland Institutions, and any other relevant evidence; and
(c) whether this matter should be taken into account in framing the proposed legislation on whistleblower protection recommended by the Select Committee on Public Interest Whistleblowing.

(2) That the committee consist of 7 senators, 2 nominated by the Leader of the Government in the Senate, 2 nominated by the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate, 1 nominated by the Leader of the Australian Democrats, 1 nominated by the One Nation Party and 1 nominated by the Australian Greens or Senator Harradine.

(3) That the committee may proceed to the dispatch of business notwithstanding that not all members have been duly nominated and appointed and notwithstanding any vacancy.

(4) That:
(a) the chair of the committee be elected by and from the members of the committee;
(b) in the absence of agreement on the selection of a chair, duly notified to the President, the allocation of the chair be determined by the Senate;
(c) the deputy chair of the committee be elected by and from the members of the committee immediately after the election of the chair;
(d) the deputy chair act as chair when there is no chair or the chair is not present at a meeting; and
(e) in the event of the votes on any question before the committee being equally divided, the chair, or deputy chair when acting as chair, have a casting vote.

(5) That the quorum of the committee be a majority of the members of the committee.

(6) That the committee and any subcommittee have power to send for and examine persons and documents, to move from place to place, to sit in public or in private, notwithstanding any prorogation of the Parliament or dissolution of the House of Representatives, and have leave to report from time to time its proceedings and the evidence taken, and such interim recommendations as it may deem fit.

(7) That the committee have power to appoint subcommittees consisting of 3 or more of its members and to refer to any such subcommittee any of the matters which the committee is empowered to consider, and that the quorum of the subcommittee be a majority of the members appointed to the subcommittee.

(8) That the committee be provided with all necessary staff, facilities and resources and be empowered to appoint investigative staff and persons, including senior counsel, with specialist knowledge for the purposes of the committee, with the approval of the President.

(9) That the committee have access to, and have power to make use of, the evidence and records of the Select Committee on Public Interest Whistleblowing, the Select Committee on Unresolved Whistleblower Cases and the Committee of Privileges in respect of its 63rd and 71st reports.
(10) That the committee be empowered to print from day to day such documents and evidence as may be ordered by it, and a daily Hansard be published of such proceedings as take place in public.

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.

24 Senator Bourne: To move—

(1) That the Senate—

(a) notes:

(i) the statement made on the ‘Agni’ missile launch by the President of the European Community on 29 January 2002,

(ii) the statements made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs (Mr Downer) on 2 January and 25 January 2002, and representations made by the Australian Government to the Indian and Pakistani high commissions,

(iii) the proposal made on 23 January 2002 by President Musharraf for a denuclearised South Asia, and

(iv) that a nuclear exchange in South Asia would be an unimaginable catastrophe, with casualty estimates starting in the millions and upper estimates exceeding 100 million;

(b) calls on:

(i) India and Pakistan not to use either conventional or nuclear force against each other to resolve the problems of Kashmir or cross-border terrorism,

(ii) the Indian and Pakistani governments to take specific measures, including no-first use guarantees and non-deployment, to positively ensure that nuclear weapons will never be used,

(iii) India and Pakistan to take measures to ensure that conventional conflict does not take place, including moving troops away from forward deployments especially at the line of control,

(iv) the governments of India and Pakistan to restore road, rail and air links, and

(v) India and Pakistan to commence a process of dialogue over Kashmir and the elimination of cross-border terrorism, and the establishment of a lasting and just peace in South Asia; and

(c) urges both nations to consider signing the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and to roll back their nuclear weapons programs.

(2) Requests the President of the Senate to transmit this resolution to President Musharraf, Prime Minister Vajpayee, the foreign and defence ministers of India and Pakistan, and their high commissions in Canberra.

(3) Urges the Australian Government to make further representations to the above effect.

26 Leader of the Australian Democrats (Senator Stott Despoja) and Senator Murray: To move—That the following bill be introduced: A Bill for an Act to regulate certain post-retirement employment of Ministers of State, and for related purposes. Ministers of State (Post-Retirement Employment Restrictions) Bill 2002.
29 Senator Allison: To move—That the Senate—
   (a) notes that:
      (i) the press coverage for the Australian Grand Prix in Melbourne on
          28 February to 3 March 2002 again provided tobacco companies
          with unparalleled advertising opportunities, and
      (ii) this will be the seventh year that the race has made an operating
          loss, and again Victoria taxpayers will underwrite the event;
   (b) urges the Federal Government to ban incidental advertising of tobacco
       products outside the confines of the Grand Prix; and
   (c) urges the Victorian Government to:
      (i) investigate alternative venues for the Grand Prix,
      (ii) make public the contract signed with the Grand Prix Corporation,
           and
      (iii) reveal the extent to which it subsidised the race.

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.

*31 Senator Allison: To move—That there be laid on the table by the Minister for
   Defence (Senator Hill), no later than immediately after motions to take note of
   answers on 20 March 2002, the following documents:

R225.040 Health Physics - Tolerances Ingested and Inhaled Materials
R225.041 Health Physics - External Radiations
R216.010 Chemical Warfare Testing Sites - Report by Joint Aus/US
    Survey Team
R217.025 Effect on Personnel of Atomic Testing at Maralinga
R100.018 DCMO Brisbane and Amberley
R208.010 Certificates for wounds and hurts
R065.015 Likelihood of Clandestine Introduction of Nuclear Weapons
    into Australia
R065.046 UK Testing at Woomera of Missiles with Nuclear Warheads
R210.004 Radiation Dose Records
R010.002 Comparison of UK Personnel Listings Against Exposure
    Records in Australia
R228.022 Safety Procedures and Health Effects - Investigations
R009.011 Weapons Atomic Test Program Investigation of Safety and
    Health Effect.
Senator Carr: To move—That there be laid on the table, by the Minister for Health and Ageing (Senator Patterson), no later than immediately after motions to take note of answers on Tuesday, 19 March 2002, the following documents:

(a) all documents provided by Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation (ANSTO) officials based in Argentina to ANSTO or the Government since September 2001, including but not restricted to matters of the financial condition of INVAP, its capacity to fully deliver the current contract, its repeated applications for Argentinian government loans and any discussion of renegotiated financial arrangements for the Lucas Heights contract;

(b) all documents relating to discussions between the CEO of ANSTO and other senior ANSTO staff and INVAP or any other Argentinian government agency, including but not restricted to the financial circumstances of INVAP, its capacity to fully deliver the current Lucas Heights contract, its repeated applications for Argentinian government loans and any discussion or consideration of renegotiated financial arrangements for the contract;

(c) all documents relating to the termination provisions in the contract entered into with INVAP;

(d) all documents substantiating the claims made by the Minister for Science (Mr Peter McGauran) on the Radio National Earthbeat program on 23 February 2002 that, ‘We are constantly monitoring the situation, through our Ambassador specifically’ and ‘We are alert to any flow on effects from the difficulties of the Argentinian economy, but INVAP is insulated, to all intents and purposes, from those problems’; and

(e) all documents relating to:
   (i) any variations in the specifications and capacity of the proposed new reactor since formal negotiations with INVAP were commenced,
   (ii) any amendment to the provision of neutron beam assemblies, specifically any amendment to the provision of two thermal neutron beam assemblies and an additional beam assembly for a hot neutron source, and
   (iii) project cost revisions consequent on such variations, as well as documents relating to the effect of any such variations on the research capacity and potential of the reactor.

Orders of the Day relating to Government Documents

   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Ludwig—that the Senate take note of the document (Senator Ludwig, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

2 Aged Care Act 1997—Report for 2000-01 on the operation of the Act
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator West—that the Senate take note of the document (Senator Buckland, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

3 Wet Tropics Management Authority—Report for 2000-01
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Bartlett—that the Senate take note of the document (Senator Bartlett, in continuation, 14 February 2002).
4 **Aged Care Standards and Accreditation Agency Limited—Report for 2000-01**
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Buckland—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator West, in continuation, 14 February 2002*).

5 **Tiwi Land Council—Report for 2000-01**
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Ludwig—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator Ludwig, in continuation, 14 February 2002*).

6 **Torres Strait Regional Authority—Report for 2000-01**
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Ludwig—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator Ludwig, in continuation, 14 February 2002*).

7 **Aboriginal Hostels Limited—Report for the period 25 June 2000 to 23 June 2001**
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Ludwig—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator Ludwig, in continuation, 14 February 2002*).

8 **Indigenous Land Corporation—Report for 2000-01**
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Ludwig—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator Ludwig, in continuation, 14 February 2002*).

9 **Northern Land Council—Report for 2000-01**
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Ludwig—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator Ludwig, in continuation, 14 February 2002*).

10 **Australian Postal Corporation (Australia Post)—Report for 2000-01**
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Mackay—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator Mackay, in continuation, 14 February 2002*).

11 **Centrelink—Report for 2000-01**
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator West—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator West, in continuation, 14 February 2002*).

12 **Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs—Report for 2000-01, including reports pursuant to the Immigration (Education) Act 1971 and the Australian Citizenship Act 1948**
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Bartlett—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator Cooney, in continuation, 14 February 2002*).

13 **Department of Reconciliation and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs—Report for the period 30 January to 30 June 2001**
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Ludwig—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator Ludwig, in continuation, 14 February 2002*).

14 **Australian Customs Service—Report for 2000-01**
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Ludwig—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator Ludwig, in continuation, 14 February 2002*).

   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Ludwig—That the Senate take note of the document (*Senator Ludwig, in continuation, 14 February 2002*).
16 Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade—Report for 2000-01—Volume 1:
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Cooney—That the Senate take note of
the document (Senator Cooney, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

17 Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade—Report for 2000-01—Volume 2:
Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID)
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Cooney—That the Senate take note of
the document (Senator Cooney, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

18 Insolvency and Trustee Service Australia—Report for 2000-01
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Ludwig—That the Senate take note of
the document (Senator Ludwig, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

19 Inspector-General in Bankruptcy—Report for 2000-01 on the operation of
the Bankruptcy Act 1966
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Ludwig—That the Senate take note of
the document (Senator Ludwig, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

20 Office of Film and Literature Classification—Classification Board and
Classification Review Board—Reports for 2000-01
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Ludwig—That the Senate take note of
the document (Senator Ludwig, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

21 Department of the Environment and Heritage—Report for 2000-01, including
the report of the Supervising Scientist and reports on the operation of the
Hazardous Waste (Regulation of Exports and Imports (Act) 1989 and the Ozone
Protection Act 1989
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Bartlett—That the Senate take note of
the document (Senator Bartlett, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

22 National Oceans Office—Report for 2000-01
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Bartlett—That the Senate take note of
the document (Senator Bartlett, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

23 Defence Force Retirement and Death Benefits Authority—Report for 2000-01
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator West—That the Senate take note of
the document (Senator West, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

24 Department of Family and Community Services—Report for 2000-01
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator West—That the Senate take note of
the document (Senator West, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator West—That the Senate take note of
the document (Senator West, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

26 Crimes Act 1914—Report on controlled operations for 2000-01
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Hogg—That the Senate take note of
the document (Senator Hogg, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Tierney—That the Senate take note of
the document (Senator Tierney, in continuation, 14 February 2002).
28 Australia New Zealand Food Authority—Report for 2000-01
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator West—That the Senate take note of
   the document (Senator West, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Hogg—That the Senate take note of
   the document (Senator Hogg, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

30 Refugee Review Tribunal—Report for 2000-01
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Hogg—That the Senate take note of
   the document (Senator Hogg, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

31 Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency—Report for
   2000-01
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Bartlett—That the Senate take note of
   the document (Senator Bartlett, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

32 Department of Employment, Workplace Relations and Small Business—
   Report for 2000-01
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Hutchins—That the Senate take note of
   the document (Senator Hutchins, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

33 Inspector-General of Intelligence and Security—Report for 2000-01
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator West—That the Senate take note of
   the document (Senator West, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

34 Australian Fisheries Management Authority—Report for 2000-01
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Bartlett—That the Senate take note of
   the document (Senator Bartlett, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

35 Fisheries Research and Development Corporation and Fisheries Research
   and Development Corporation Selection Committee—Reports for 2000-01
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Bartlett—That the Senate take note of
   the document (Senator Bartlett, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

36 Grains Research and Development Corporation—Report for 2000-01
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Bartlett—That the Senate take note of
   the document (Senator Bartlett, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

37 Migration Review Tribunal—Report for 2000-01
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Bartlett—That the Senate take note of
   the document (Senator Bartlett, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

38 Comcare Australia—Report for 2000-01, including the report of QWL
   Corporation Pty Limited
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Hogg—That the Senate take note of
   the document (Senator Hogg, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

39 Attorney-General’s Department—Report for 2000-01
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Ludwig—That the Senate take note of
   the document (Senator Ludwig, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

40 Department of Defence—Report for 2000-01
   Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator West—That the Senate take note of
   the document (Senator West, in continuation, 14 February 2002).
41 Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation Commission—Report for 2000-01
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Hogg—That the Senate take note of the document (Senator Hogg, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

42 Australian Industrial Relations Commission and Australian Industrial Registry—Reports for 2000-01
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Hogg—That the Senate take note of the document (Senator Hogg, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

43 Federal Court of Australia—Report for 2000-01
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Hogg—That the Senate take note of the document (Senator Hogg, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

44 Office of Parliamentary Counsel—Report for 2000-01
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Hogg—That the Senate take note of the document (Senator Hogg, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

45 Department of Health and Aged Care—Report for 2000-01, including a report on the administration and operation of the Therapeutic Goods Administration—Volumes 1 and 2
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator West—That the Senate take note of the document (Senator West, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

46 Australian Research Council—Report for 2000-01
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Tierney—That the Senate take note of the document (Senator Tierney, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

47 Social Security Appeals Tribunal—Report for 2000-01
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Bartlett—That the Senate take note of the document (Senator Bartlett, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Bartlett—That the Senate take note of the document (Senator Bartlett, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

49 Forest and Wood Products Research and Development Corporation—Report for 2000-01
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Bartlett—That the Senate take note of the document (Senator Bartlett, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

50 Federal Magistrates Service—Report for 2000-01
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Hogg—That the Senate take note of the document (Senator Hogg, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

51 Family Court of Australia—Report for 2000-01
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Hogg—That the Senate take note of the document (Senator Hogg, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

52 Australian Communications Authority—Report for 2000-01
Adjourned debate on the motion of Senator Mackay—That the Senate take note of the document (Senator Mackay, in continuation, 14 February 2002).

Consideration (12 February 2002).

54 Australian Heritage Commission—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

55 Members of Parliament (Staff) Act 1984—Report for 2000-01 on consultants engaged under section 4 of the Act
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

56 Civil Aviation Safety Authority Australia—Report for 2000-01
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

57 Airservices Australia—Report for 2000-01
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

   Consideration (12 February 2002).

59 Australian Film Finance Corporation Limited—Report for 2000-01
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

60 Australian Maritime Safety Authority—Report for 2000-01
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

61 Australian Institute of Family Studies—Report for 2000-01
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

62 Dairy Adjustment Authority—Report for the period 3 April 2000 to 30 June 2001
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

63 Snowy Mountains Council—Report for 2000-01
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

64 Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research—Report for 2000-01
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

65 Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs—Report for 2000-01—Corrigenda
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

66 Migration Agents Registration Authority—Report for 2000-01
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

67 Office of the Official Secretary to the Governor-General—Report for 2000-01
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

68 CrimTrac Agency—Report for 2000-01
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

   Consideration (12 February 2002).

70 Australian Law Reform Commission—Report for 2000-01 (Report no. 93)
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

71 National Native Title Tribunal—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

72 Dried Fruits Research and Development Council—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

73 Comcare Australia—Report for 2000-01, including the report of QWL Corporation Pty Limited—Addendum
Consideration (12 February 2002).

74 Australian Landcare Council—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

75 Department of the Environment and Heritage—Report for 2000-01, including the report of the Supervising Scientist and reports on the operation of the Hazardous Waste (Regulation of Exports and Imports (Act) 1989 and the Ozone Protection Act 1989—Corrigendum
Consideration (12 February 2002).

76 Land and Water Resources Research and Development Corporation—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

77 Australian Sports Commission—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

78 Employment National Limited—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

79 Australian Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre (AUSTRAC)—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

80 Commissioner of Taxation—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

81 Medibank Private—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

82 Medibank Private—Statement of corporate intent 2001-2004
Consideration (12 February 2002).

83 National Standards Commission—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

84 ComLand Limited—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

85 Family Law Council—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

86 Superannuation Complaints Tribunal—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

87 Financial Reporting Council and Australian Accounting Standards Board—Reports for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).
88 Companies and Securities Advisory Committee—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

89 Australian Securities and Investments Commission—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

90 Goldfields Land and Sea Council—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

91 Commonwealth Government of Australia—Consolidated financial statements for the year ended 30 June 2001—Statement
Consideration (12 February 2002).

92 Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

93 Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation (ANSTO)—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

94 Australian Institute of Health and Welfare—Australia’s welfare 2001: Services and assistance—Fifth biennial report
Consideration (12 February 2002).

95 Australian Broadcasting Corporation—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

96 Department of the Treasury—Tax expenditures statement 2001, December 2001
Consideration (12 February 2002).

97 Industry Research and Development Board—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

98 Foreign Investment Review Board—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

Consideration (12 February 2002).

Consideration (12 February 2002).

101 Australia Business Arts Foundation Ltd—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

102 Private Health Insurance Ombudsman—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

103 Department of Finance and Administration—Parliamentarians’ travel paid by the Department of Finance and Administration—1 January to 30 June 2001, December 2001
Consideration (12 February 2002).
104 Department of Finance and Administration—Former parliamentarians’ travel paid by the Department of Finance and Administration—1 January to 30 June 2001, December 2001
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

   Consideration (12 February 2002).

106 Productivity Commission—Report no. 16—Telecommunications competition regulation, 21 September 2001
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

   Consideration (12 February 2002).

108 Special Broadcasting Service Corporation (SBS)—Report for 2000-01
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

109 Commonwealth Government of Australia—Consolidated financial statements for the year ended 30 June 2001
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

   Consideration (12 February 2002).

111 Private Health Insurance Administration Council—Report for 2000-01 on the operations of the registered health benefits organisations
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

112 Australian Government Solicitor—Statement of corporate intent 2001-02
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

113 Australian Competition and Consumer Commission—Report for 2000-01
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

114 Joint Coal Board—Report for 2000-01
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

115 Central Queensland Land Council Aboriginal Corporation—Report for 2000-01
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

116 North Queensland Land Council Native Title Representative Body Aboriginal Corporation—Report for 2000-01
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

117 Yamatji Barna Baba Maaja Aboriginal Corporation—Report for 2000-01
   Consideration (12 February 2002).

   Consideration (12 February 2002).

119 High Court of Australia—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

120 Private Health Insurance Administration Council—Report for 2000-01 on the operations of the registered health benefits organisations—Errata
Consideration (12 February 2002).

121 Landcare Australia Limited—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

122 Torres Strait Protected Zone Joint Authority—Report for 1999-2000
Consideration (12 February 2002).

123 Wheat Export Authority—Report for 1 October 2000 to 30 September 2001
Consideration (12 February 2002).

124 Commissioner of Taxation—Data-matching program—ATO’s interaction with the program—Report for 1998-99 to 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

125 Medical Training Review Panel—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

126 Australian Rail Track Corporation Limited (ARTC)—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

127 Australian Rail Track Corporation Limited (ARTC)—Statement of corporate intent 2001-02
Consideration (12 February 2002).

128 International Air Services Commission—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

129 Stevedoring Industry Finance Committee—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 February 2002).

Consideration (12 February 2002).

131 Employment Advocate—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (13 February 2002).

132 Mid-year economic and fiscal outlook 2001-02—Statement by the Treasurer (Mr Costello) and the Minister for Finance and Administration (Mr Fahey)
Consideration (13 February 2002).

133 Telstra Corporation Limited—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (13 February 2002).

134 Australian Broadcasting Corporation—Equity and diversity program—Report for 1 September 2000 to 31 August 2001
Consideration (13 February 2002).

135 Telstra Corporation Limited—Equal employment opportunity program—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (13 February 2002).
Consideration (13 February 2002).

137 Australian Postal Corporation (Australia Post)—Statement of corporate intent 20001-02 to 2003-04
Consideration (13 February 2002).

138 Australian Broadcasting Authority—Co-regulatory scheme for Internet content regulation—Report for the period 1 January to 30 June 2001
Consideration (13 February 2002).

139 Australian Communications Authority—Telecommunications performance—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (13 February 2002).

140 Australian Broadcasting Authority—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (13 February 2002).

141 Australian Postal Corporation (Australia Post)—Equal employment opportunity program—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (13 February 2002).

142 Pooled Development Funds Registration Board—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (13 February 2002).

143 Australian Security Intelligence Organisation—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (13 February 2002).

144 National Residue Survey—Results—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (13 February 2002).

145 Australian Political Exchange Council—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (13 February 2002).

146 Sydney Airports Corporation Limited—Statement of corporate intent, 2001-2004
Consideration (13 February 2002).

147 Essendon Airport Limited—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (13 February 2002).

148 Centrelink—Compliance activity for Family and Community Services—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (13 February 2002).

149 National Competition Council—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (13 February 2002).

Consideration (13 February 2002).

Consideration (13 February 2002).
Consideration (13 February 2002).

Consideration (13 February 2002).

Consideration (13 February 2002).

Consideration (13 February 2002).

156 United Nations—International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights—Communication No. 1014/2001—Outline
Consideration (13 February 2002).

Consideration (13 February 2002).

158 Gene Technology Regulator—Quarterly report for the period 1 July to 30 September 2001
Consideration (11 March 2002).

159 Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet—Expenditure on travel by former Governors-General between 1 January 2001 and 30 June 2001
Consideration (11 March 2002).

Consideration (11 March 2002).

*161 Anglo-Australian Telescope Board—Anglo-Australian Observatory—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 March 2002).

*162 Productivity Commission—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 March 2002).

*163 Australia–Indonesia Institute—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 March 2002).

*164 Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research—Report for 2000-01—Erratum
Consideration (12 March 2002).

*165 Christmas Island Casino Surveillance Authority—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 March 2002).

*166 Copyright Agency Limited—Report for 2000-01
Consideration (12 March 2002).
*167 **Official Establishments Trust—Report for 2000-01**
Consideration (12 March 2002).

*168 **ScreenSound Australia—Report for 2000-01**
Consideration (12 March 2002).

*169 **Remuneration Tribunal—Report for 2000-01**
Consideration (12 March 2002).

*170 **Administrative Review Council—Report for 2000-01**
Consideration (12 March 2002).

*171 **National Australia Day Council—Report for 2000-01**
Consideration (12 March 2002).

*172 **Ngaanyatjarra Council (Aboriginal Corporation)—Report for 2000-01**
Consideration (12 March 2002).

*173 **Kimberley Land Council—Report for 2000-01**
Consideration (12 March 2002).

*174 **Gurang Land Council (Aboriginal Corporation)—Report for 2000-01**
Consideration (12 March 2002).

*175 **Cape York Land Council—Report for 2000-01**
Consideration (12 March 2002).

*176 **Mirimbiak Nations Aboriginal Corporation—Report for 2000-01**
Consideration (12 March 2002).

*177 **Queensland South Representative Body Aboriginal Corporation—Report for 2000-01**
Consideration (12 March 2002).

Consideration (12 March 2002).

Consideration (12 March 2002).

*180 **Australian Submarine Corporation Pty Limited—Report for 2000-01**
Consideration (12 March 2002).

*181 **Commonwealth Grants Commission—Report on state revenue sharing relativities—2002 update**
Consideration (12 March 2002).

*182 **Bundanon Trust—Report for 2000-01**
Consideration (12 March 2002).


#188 Bilateral treaty—Text, together with national interest analysis—Agreement between the Government of Australia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands on Mutual Administrative Assistance for the proper application of Customs law and for the prevention, investigation and combating of Customs offences, done at The Hague on 24 October 2001 Consideration (12 March 2002).


#190 Bilateral treaty—Text, together with national interest analysis—Agreement between Australia and Uruguay on the Promotion and Protection of Investments, done at Punta del Este, Uruguay, on 3 September 2001 Consideration (12 March 2002).


Multilateral treaty—Text, together with national interest analysis—Pacific Agreement on Closer Economic Relations (PACER), done at Nauru on 18 August 2001 Consideration (12 March 2002).


Orders of the Day

1 ABC Amendment (Online and Multichannelling Services) Bill 2001 [2002]—(Senate bill)—(Senator Bourne)
   Second reading—Adjourned debate (adjourned, Senator Calvert, 3 April 2001)—(restored pursuant to resolution of 13 February 2002).

   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)—(Senator Bourne)

5 Electoral Amendment (Political Honesty) Bill 2000 [2002]—(Senate bills)—(Senator Murray)
   Second reading—Adjourned debate (adjourned, Senator Calvert, 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)—(Senator Murray and the Leader of the Australian Democrats, Senator Stott Despoja)
   Second reading—Adjourned debate (adjourned, Senator Calvert, 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 (adjourned, Senator Calvert, 4 April 2000)—(restored pursuant to resolution of 13 February 2002).

8 Corporate Code of Conduct Bill 2000 [2002]—(Senate bill)—(Senator Bourne)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (adjourned, Senator Calvert, 6 September 2000)—(restored pursuant to resolution of 13 February 2002).

Second reading—Adjourned debate (adjourned, Senator Calvert, 5 September 2000)—(restored pursuant to resolution of 13 February 2002).

10 Parliamentary Approval of Treaties Bill 1995 [2002]—(Senate bill)—(Senator Bourne)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (31 May 1995)—(restored pursuant to resolution of 23 November 1998)—(restored pursuant to resolution of 13 February 2002).

11 Public Interest Disclosure Bill 2001 [2002]—(Senate bill)—(Senator Murray)

12 Reconciliation Bill 2001 [2002]—(Senate bill)—(Senator Ridgeway)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (adjourned, Senator Calvert, 5 April 2001)—(restored pursuant to resolution of 13 February 2002).

13 State Elections (One Vote, One Value) Bill 2001 [2002]—(Senate bill)—(Senator Murray)
Second reading—Adjourned debate (adjourned, Senator Calvert, 7 August 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).
BUSINESS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION

Next day of sitting (14 March 2002)

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

1 Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee

Report to be presented on the provisions of the Proceeds of Crime Bill 2002 and the provisions of the Proceeds of Crime (Consequential Amendments and Transitional Provisions) Bill 2002. (Referred immediately upon the introduction of the bills in the House of Representatives pursuant to the order of the Senate of 14 February 2002.)

On 19 March 2002

Business of the Senate—Notice of Motion

Notice given 12 February 2002

1 Senator Bartlett: To move—that the following matters be referred to the Legal and Constitutional References Committee for inquiry and report by 19 June 2002:

Aspects of the Government’s current policy in relation to asylum seekers and refugees, including, but not limited to:

(a) the impact on the operations of Navy and other Defence forces due to their use in turning around, detaining and transporting boat people;
(b) the processes and criteria being used to assess the asylum seekers who have been transferred to Papua New Guinea (PNG) and Nauru;
(c) the level of access to legal advice for people on PNG and Nauru;
(d) the nature of the facilities which asylum seekers are detained in;
(e) the placement options for those people on PNG and Nauru who are found to be refugees;
(f) whether any asylum seekers who are not found to be refugees will be unable to return to their country of origin and what will be done in such an event;
(g) the extent and nature of Australia’s international involvement in facilitating an orderly worldwide system for movement and settlement of refugees;
(h) likely future worldwide trends on the movement of refugees;
(i) the impact and operation of the seven bills amending the Immigration Act which were passed by the Senate on 26 September 2001; and
(j) reviewing all reports, proposals and recommendations in relation to activities and facilities at the Woomera Immigration Detention Centre, including whether or not the centre should be closed down or its operations scaled back.

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

1 Economics Legislation Committee

Report to be presented in respect of the 2001-02 additional estimates.

General Business—Notice of Motion
Notice given 12 February 2002

10 Senator Murphy: To move—

(1) That a select committee, to be known as the Select Committee on Forestry and Plantation Matters, be appointed to inquire into and report, by 27 June 2002, on the following matters:
   (a) the administration of the Plantations for Australia – The 2020 Vision Strategy;
   (b) whether or not the imperatives, goals and actions have been proceeded with or met in accordance with the aforementioned strategy;
   (c) whether or not the practices employed to implement the strategy thus far have been consistent with the stated intentions of the strategy;
   (d) whether or not the current and proposed taxation structures are suitable and or adequate for the purpose of achieving the 2020 Vision Strategy;
   (e) whether or not the states are employing world’s best practice in sustainability and environmental applications for plantation development;
   (f) whether or not the review process conducted through December 2001 and January 2002 allows for adequate public input; and
   (g) what the long-term strategies are for companies currently involved in the plantation industry.

(2) That the committee consist of 9 senators, 3 nominated by the Leader of the Government, 3 nominated by the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate, and 3 nominated by the minority groups and independent senators.

(3) That the committee may proceed to the dispatch of business notwithstanding that not all members have been duly nominated and appointed and not withstanding any vacancy.

(4) That the chair and deputy chair of the committee be elected by the committee.

(5) That the deputy chair act as chair when there is no chair or the chair is not present at a meeting.

(6) That, in the event of the votes on any question before the committee being equally divided, the chair, or deputy chair when acting as chair, have a casting vote.

(7) That the committee and any subcommittee have power to send for and examine persons and documents, to move from place to place, to sit in public or private, notwithstanding any prorogation of the Parliament or dissolution of the House of Representatives, and have leave to report from time to time its proceedings and the evidence taken and such interim recommendations as it may deem fit.

(8) That the committee have power to appoint subcommittees consisting of 3 or more of its members and to refer to any such subcommittee any of the matters which the committee is empowered to consider.

(9) That the committee be provided with all necessary staff, facilities and resources and be empowered to appoint persons with specialist knowledge for the purposes of the committee with the approval of the President.
(10) That the committee be empowered to print from day to day such documents and evidence as may be ordered by it, and a daily Hansard be published of such proceedings as take place in public.

**On 20 March 2002**

General Business—Notice of Motion

*Notice given 13 February 2002*


**On 21 March 2002**

Business of the Senate—Orders of the Day

1 **Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**
   Report to be presented in respect of the 2001-02 additional estimates.

2 **Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee**
   Report to be presented in respect of the 2001-02 additional estimates.

3 **Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee**
   Report to be presented in respect of the 2001-02 additional estimates.

**On the tenth sitting day of 2002 (21 March 2002)**

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

1 **Legislation Committees**
   Reports to be presented on annual reports tabled by 31 October 2001.

**On the first day of the budget sittings 2002 (14 May 2002)**

Government Business—Order of the Day

*1 **Financial Corporations (Transfer of Assets and Liabilities) Amendment Bill 2002**—*(Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, Senator Ian Campbell)*
   Second reading—Adjourned debate (12 March 2002).

**On 14 May 2002**

Business of the Senate—Orders of the Day

1 **Legal and Constitutional References Committee**
   Report to be presented on outsourcing of the Australian Customs Service’s Information Technology.

2 **Legal and Constitutional References Committee**
   Report to be presented on sections 46 and 50 of the *Trade Practices Act 1974.*
On 15 May 2002

General Business—Notice of Motion

Notice given 14 February 2002

18 Senator Bourne: To move—that the following bill be introduced: A Bill for an Act to provide for parliamentary scrutiny of appointments to the ABC Board and for related purposes. Australian Broadcasting Corporation Amendment Bill 2002.

On 16 May 2002

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

1 A Certain Maritime Incident—Select Committee
   Report to be presented.

On 19 June 2002

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

1 Legislation Committees
   Reports to be presented in respect of the 2002-03 budget estimates.

On 27 June 2002

Business of the Senate—Orders of the Day

1 Community Affairs References Committee
   Report to be presented on nursing.

2 Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts References Committee
   Report to be presented on urban water management.

On 30 June 2002

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

1 Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee
   Report to be presented on statutory powers and functions of the Australian Law Reform Commission.

On the tenth sitting day after 30 June 2002 (17 September 2002)

Business of the Senate—Order of the Day

1 Legislation Committees
   Reports to be presented on annual reports tabled by 30 April 2002.
**BILLS REFERRED TO COMMITTEES**

**Provisions of bills currently referred†**

**Proceeds of Crime Bill 2002**

**Proceeds of Crime (Consequential Amendments and Transitional Provisions) Bill 2002**

Referred to the Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee (referred immediately upon the introduction of the bills in the House of Representatives pursuant to the order of the Senate of 14 February 2002; reporting date: 14 March 2002).

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

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Questions remaining unanswered**

No questions have remained unanswered for more than 30 days.

Notice given 12 February 2002

1 **Senator Faulkner**: To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—
   
   (1) Has former Senator Michael Baume been appointed to the Superannuation Complaints Tribunal.
   
   (2) Is the letter of appointment dated 3 October 2001, two days before the announcement of the federal election.
   
   (3) Was there a public announcement of Mr Baume’s appointment; if not, why not.
   
   (4) Was Mr Baume’s appointment made in accordance with the usual process for appointments to the Superannuation Complaints Tribunal.
   
   (5) Was a shortlist of potential appointees to the Superannuation Complaints Tribunal drawn up following the national advertisement for applicants earlier in 2001.
   
   (6) Was Mr Baume’s name on this shortlist.
   
   (7) If Mr Baume’s name was not on the shortlist, who recommended him for appointment.
   
   (8) Was the Prime Minister or his office involved in the appointment process.
   
   (9) What expertise does Mr Baume have to offer the Superannuation Complaints Tribunal.

4 **Senator Brown**: To ask the Minister for Forestry and Conservation—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 3641 (Senate Hansard, 20 August 2001, p. 26203): How much of the Commonwealth Government’s plantation and industry package, under the Tasmanian Regional Forest Agreement, is planned to be or has already been spent on replacing native forests by plantations.
Senator Brown: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 6-8)—Are any of the security services in Australia able to detect, measure and trace electromagnetic transmissions.

6 Minister representing the Prime Minister
7 Minister for Defence
8 Minister representing the Attorney-General

(Questions 6 and 7 were subsequently transferred to the Minister representing the Attorney-General)

9 Senator Brown: To ask the Minister for Defence—Following the death of Eleanore Tibble in November 2000 and the Stunden report of 3 May 2001:

(1) What actions have been taken to implement the recommendations of the Stunden report.

(2) What procedures have been put in place to ensure that in future no cadet is: judged guilty on what they deny, not provided with a right of appeal, denied natural justice, treated less favourably by virtue of their age than an adult enlisted member, and victimised and hounded to death.

(3) What changes have been made to policy and procedures to ensure that procedural practice is determined by policy and not by summary decisions and ad hoc personal persuasion.

11 Senator Brown: To ask the Minister for Family and Community Services—

(1) Is the Minister aware of the promising results of the Safecare Programs in Western Australia, aimed at reducing child abuse.

(2) What measures is the Government taking to assess or help implement Safecare in Australia generally.

12 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—With reference to the Minister’s visit to the United States of America (US) in early December 2001:

(1) (a) Who travelled with the Minister; (b) what was the cost of the trip; and (c) who met that cost.

(2) (a) Who initiated the visit; (b) when was the final decision made to visit the US; and (c) when was the itinerary for the visit finalised.

(3) Who did the Minister meet during his visit to the US and what were the times and dates on which each meeting took place.

13 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

(1) In 2000 and 2001 what contact did the Minister or his office have with the United States of America (US) administration regarding the US Farm Bill.

(2) In each case: (a) who initiated the contact; (b) when was the contact made; and (c) what was the nature of the contact.

(3) On each occasion contact was made with the US Administration, what follow-up action was taken by the Minister, his office or the department.

(4) In each case: (a) what was the nature of the follow-up action; and (b) what was the result of the follow-up action.

14 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—
(1) In 2000 and 2001 on how many occasions did the Minister or his office seek a briefing, or receive a briefing, on proposed assistance to farmers in the United States of America (US) through the US Farm Bill.

(2) In 2000 and 2001 on how many occasions was the Minister or his office provided with a briefing, at the initiative of the department, on the proposed assistance to farmers in the US through the US Farm Bill.

(3) In each case: (a) what was the nature of the briefing; (b) was the briefing in written form; and (c) on what date was the briefing provided to the Minister or his office.

15 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

(1) When was the Minister or his office first advised of a proposed increase in financial support to farmers in the United States of America (US) through the US Farm Bill.

(2) (a) Who advised the Minister or his office of the proposed increase in assistance to farmers in the US; (b) when was the Minister or his office advised; and (c) how was the Minister or his office advised.

17 Senator Murray: To ask the Special Minister of State—With reference to the Australian National Audit Office Performance Audit entitled Parliamentary Entitlements: 1999-2000, which indicates that ‘as of June 2001, around 30 per cent of current and former Parliamentarians had not provided a certification of their 1999-2000 management reports’ (page 25): Are there any 1999-2000 management reports which have still not been certified; if so: (a) how many reports have not been certified; and (b) what are the names of all current and former parliamentarians who have not provided a certification of their 1999-2000 management reports.

18 Senator Bartlett: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—


(2) Where in the Park did the competition take place.

(3) Did the competition apply for and receive a permit from the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority.

(4) Was the permit application publicly advertised, allowing for public comment on the proposal.

(5) Who assessed the permit application.

(6) Who signed the permit.

(7) Can details provided of the environmental assessment of the proposal that occurred, including sources of information and studies conducted.

(8) Can a detailed summary of the findings and recommendations of that assessment be provided.

(9) Was the competition proposal assessed in terms of the World Heritage obligations owed to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area.

(10) How does a spearfishing competition conform to those World Heritage obligations.

(11) What conditions were imposed on the permit holder.

(12) What zoning was the competition site.
(13) How many fish were killed during the competition.
(14) What species (and numbers of each species) were killed during the competition.
(15) Did any Authority staff participate in the competition; if so, who and what positions do they hold.
(16) Were any Authority staff present during the competition as monitors; if so, who.
(17) What number of killed fish were subject to scientific study.
(18) Can details be provided of: (a) all scientists involved; (b) the nature of the studies undertaken; and (c) the results, if available, of those studies.
(19) Were the dead fish used for other purposes; if so, what purposes and what numbers.
(20) How many fish were not used at all but were discarded for whatever reason.
(21) What impacts occurred as a result of the competition.
(22) What post-competition monitoring has occurred.

19 Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—
(1) Have Mrs Kefaya Ahmad and her son Ali Abdul-Razzaq been in detention for more than 2 years.
(2) What is the difficulty and what has caused the delay in assessing their request for asylum.
(3) What are the options being considered for the two and when is a decision expected.

20 Senator Bartlett: To ask the Minister for Defence—
(1) Is research into active sonar a research priority of the department.
(2) (a) What is the decibel range of the low frequency active sonar (LFAS); and (b) in the marine environment, how far can that sound travel.
(3) Have any active sonar tests been conducted by the Australian Navy; if so, where, when, and what permits were: (a) applied for; and (b) received.
(4) If tests were conducted in the marine environment: (a) what impact assessment was undertaken; and (b) can those documents be provided.
(5) What mitigation measures were imposed.
(6) What information does the Navy have regarding the impacts of LFAS on marine mammals and other marine life.
(7) (a) What distances/levels of exposure to underwater noise are considered safe for: (i) humans, (ii) different species of whales found in Australian waters, (iii) different species of dolphins found in Australian waters, (iv) dugong, (v) different species of seals found in Australian waters, (vi) fish, with particular reference to threatened species, (vii) different species of turtles, and (viii) different species of marine birds; and (b) can details of the scientific basis for these assessments be provided.
(9) Is the Navy currently conducting any research into the impacts of LFAS on any species of marine life found in Australian waters; if so, can details be provided.
(10) Why did the Navy recently withdraw an application for a test of LFAS in the Rottnest Trench.
(11) Are any other tests planned; if so, can details be provided.

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

1. How many seismic tests have been conducted in Australian waters in the past 5 years.

2. Can details of those tests be provided, including: (a) the nature of impact assessment that took place; (b) locations of all tests; (c) duration of all tests; (d) intensity of sound (including decibel level); (e) permits applied for and received by the proponent; (f) mitigation measures imposed; (g) the monitoring program in place during the testing; (h) conclusions of any monitoring; (i) the purpose of the tests; and (j) the companies undertaking the tests.

3. What is the current state of knowledge regarding noise pollution in Australia; in particular: (a) (i) are the impacts of marine noise on different species of mammals established, and (ii) can details of studies and reports that investigate potential harm to marine life as a result of marine noise be provided; (b) is there any data on the levels of noise in Australian waters from all sources, natural and human; if so, can details be provided; and (c) is there any data on the cumulative impacts of those noise sources; if so, can details be provided.

**Senator Allison:** To ask the Minister for Family and Community Services—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 3919, asked on 8 October 2001:

1. What has the department discovered in its monitoring of child care award rates and the impact of increasing costs on child care services as they relate to the Special Needs Subsidy Scheme (SNSS).

2. Has there been any further consideration of a review of the SNSS.

**Senator Bourne:** To ask the Minister for Defence—

1. What is the daily at-sea operating cost inclusive of spares, POL contractor and in-house maintenance and crew costs of: (a) an FFG frigate; (b) an ANZAC frigate; (c) a Collins class submarine; (d) the former fast catamaran, *Jervis Bay*, while in service; (e) a Fremantle class patrol boat; and (f) by class, each other ship type in service with the Royal Australian Navy of displacement not less than 500 tons.

2. What are the hourly operating costs, inclusive of spares, POL contractor and in-house maintenance and crew costs, by each type of aircraft in service with the Royal Australian Air Force.

**Senator Bourne:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the questions without notice asked of the Minister by Senator Bourne in September 2001 regarding the aid money given to Nauru in exchange for processing refugees, the allegations of financial impropriety against members of the Nauru Government and Nauru’s involvement in money laundering:

1. (a) Is the Minister aware of the role the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s Financial Action Task Force is now playing in the international effort to combat terrorism through stamping out money laundering; and (b) is the Minister also aware that the organisation still considers Nauru’s efforts to stamp out the practice unsatisfactory.

2. (a) Did the additional $10 million of aid given in September 2001 include substantial cash payments; (b) is this not contrary to the Minister’s ‘in kind’
description of aid to Nauru; and (c) what transparency and accountability measures have been put in place for these new payments.

(3) Will the Minister renew his unfulfilled undertaking to provide a listing of the component parts of Australian money given to Nauru as part of the so-called ‘Pacific Solution’.

25 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Trade—

(1) Is the department currently involved in attempting to facilitate access for Australian rural exports to the Philippines; if so, in each case: (a) what is the product Australia is seeking to export; (b) what was the original timetable set by the department for accessing the Philippine market; (c) what is the process being following in order to facilitate access; and (d) what is the current timetable for accessing the market.

(2) In each case, if there have been any delays in accessing the Philippine market: (a) what caused the delay; (b) when did the action or incident that caused the delay occur; and (c) what action has the department taken to overcome the problem.

26 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

In the 1998-99, 1999-2000 and 2000-01 financial years, by month: (a) how many air operating certificates (AOCs) were suspended; (b) how many AOC holders were issued with a ‘Show Cause’ notice; (c) how many AOCs were cancelled; and (d) how many AOC holders surrendered their AOCs.

27 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Trade—

(1) (a) What is the cost of the Reflection Sydney 2000 promotion; and (b) who met that cost.

(2) What consultancies have been let as part of the campaign, in each case: (a) who is the consultant; (b) what is the cost of each consultancy; and (c) what is the duration of each consultancy.

(3) (a) How many videos were produced as part of the promotion; (b) to whom were these videos distributed; and (c) what was the cost of the production of the videos.

(4) (a) How many books were produced as part of the promotion; (b) to whom were these books distributed; and (c) what was the cost of the production of the books.

(5) (b) How many CD ROMS were produced as part of the promotion; (b) to whom were these CD ROMS distributed; and (c) what was the cost of the production of the CD ROMS.

(6) What additional costs including travel costs have been, or will be incurred, as part of this promotion.

28 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) (a) When did the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) enter into a formal agreement with the sports aviation sector in relation to the administration of sports aviation; and (b) when did that agreement come into affect.

(2) Can a copy of that agreement be provided.

(3) Did that agreement impose conditions on the sports aviation sector in relation to the maintenance of ultralight aircraft; if so: (a) what were those conditions; and (b) were they provided in a technical manual that required
the approval of the CAA; if so, (i) when was the manual approved, and (ii) can a copy be provided.

(4) (a) When did the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) enter into an agreement with the Australian Ultralight Federation in relation to the administration of sports aviation; and (b) when did that agreement come in affect.

(5) Can a copy of that agreement be provided.

(6) Did that agreement impose conditions on the sports aviation sector in relation to the maintenance of ultralight aircraft; if so: (a) what were those conditions; and (b) were they provided in a technical manual that required the approval of CASA; if so, (i) when was the manual approved, and (ii) can a copy be provided.

(7) Since the first sports aviation technical manual was approved: (a) on how many occasions has the manual been amended; (b) when was each amendment made; (c) on each occasion who initiated the amendment; and (d) what was the nature of each amendment.

29 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) Did the agreement between the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and the sports aviation sector in relation to the administration of sports aviation require the development and approval of an operations manual prior to the agreement coming into effect; if so: (a) when was that operations manual approved by the CAA; and (b) can a copy be provided.

(2) Did the agreement between the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) and the Australian Ultralight Federation in relation to the administration of sports aviation require the development and approval of an operations manual prior to the agreement coming into effect; if so: (a) when was the operations manual approved by CASA; and (b) can a copy of that agreement be provided.

(3) Since the first sports aviation operations manual was approved: (a) on how many occasions has the manual been amended; (b) when was each amendment made; (c) on each occasion who initiated the amendment; and (d) what was the nature of each amendment.

30 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) When was the proposal for a bypass around Moree first brought to the Minister’s attention or the attention of his staff.

(2) (a) Who raised the Moree bypass proposal with the Minister or his staff; and (b) how was the proposal first raised.

(3) (a) When was the proposal for a Moree bypass first raised with the department; (b) who raised the proposal; and (c) how was it first raised with the department.

31 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—Did the Minister or his staff contact the Moree Plains Council about the proposed Moree bypass; if so: (a) when was contact made; (b) who initiated the contact; and (c) was the contact with or by the Minister, or his staff.

32 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—Did the Minister or his staff contact the Moree Chamber of Commerce about the proposed Moree bypass; if so: (a) when was contact made;
(b) who initiated the contact; and (c) was the contact with or by the Minister, or his staff.

33 **Senator O’Brien**: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—Did the Minister or his staff contact the New South Wales Roads and Traffic Authority about the proposed Moree bypass; if so: (a) when was contact made; (b) who initiated the contact; and (c) was the contact with or by the Minister, or his staff.

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

(1) When did the department first become aware of a proposal for a Moree bypass contained in forward strategy reports prepared by the New South Wales Roads and Traffic Authority.

(2) When did the proposed Moree bypass first appear in the above forward strategy reports.

(3) When was federal funding first allocated for the development of a proposal for the construction of the proposed bypass.

(4) (a) How much funding has been allocated to date; and (b) what is the purpose of this funding.

(5) If no funding has yet been allocated, when will funding be allocated for the Moree bypass.

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

(1) What negotiations or discussions have there been with the New South Wales Roads and Traffic Authority (RTA), the Moree Plains Council and the Moree Chamber of Commerce about possible Commonwealth funding for the proposed Moree bypass.

(2) (a) When did those negotiations or discussions take place with the RTA, the Council and the Chamber of Commerce; (b) who initiated those discussions; (c) what role did the Minister or his staff play in those discussions; and (d) what was the outcome of those discussions.

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

(1) What assessment process has been undertaken to date of the route selection for the proposed Moree bypass.

(2) What role has, or will, the department play in the above route selection process.

(3) What role has, or will, the Minister or his staff play in the above route selection process.

(4) (a) Who initiated the route selection process; (b) what has been the cost to date; and (c) who has undertaken the above work.

(5) (a) What has been the public consultative process followed to date in relation to the above route selection process; (b) who is managing that process; and (c) what has been the outcome of that process.

(6) (a) How many routes are currently under consideration; (b) what is the estimated cost of each of these options; (c) what is the level of community support and what is the basis of that support for each of the above options; and (d) what is the environmental impact of each of these options.
37 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) What negotiations or discussions have there been with the New South Wales Roads and Traffic Authority (RTA), the Moree Plains Council and the Moree Chamber of Commerce about route options for the proposed Moree bypass.

(2) (a) When did those negotiations or discussions take place with the RTA, the Council and the Chamber of Commerce; (b) who initiated those discussions; (c) what role did the Minister or his staff play in those discussions; and (d) what was the outcome of those discussions.

(3) What route options for a Moree bypass have been contained in forward strategy reports prepared by the RTA.

(4) When did those route options first appear in the RTA forward strategy reports.

38 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) Since January 1999, how many staff employed by the Civil Aviation Safety Authority have been relocated at the Authority’s expense.

(2) In each case: (a) what position did the officer hold prior to the transfer; (b) where was the officer located; (c) where was each officer transferred to; and (d) what position did the officer hold following the transfer.

(3) In each case: (a) when did the transfer take place; and (b) what relocation and other allowances were paid to the officer.

(4) In each case, what was the value and duration of each of the above location and other allowances.

(5) Since January 1999, have any officers been relocated on more that one occasion; if so: (a) how many officers were involved; and (b) in each case, on how many occasions has each officer been relocated.

39 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) Can the Minister confirm that a letter (reference K98/1492—K98/1751) contained in documents (file reference K99—92—0007) relating to an investigation into heavy vehicles undertaken by Roaduser International, and tabled in response to an order for the production of documents by the Senate, was not the only written communication from Louise and John Bauer.

(2) If all written communications from Mrs and Mr Bauer were contained in the documents tabled on 27 November 2000 in response to the order, can the Minister provide specific reference numbers for the additional documents.

(3) If all written communications from Mrs and Mr Bauer were not contained in the tabled documents: (a) why were they deleted; and (b) can copies of all these documents be provided.

40 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) Can the Minister confirm that an inspection of a heavy vehicle, a Mack CH Fleetliner (F4), took place on 24 March 1999 as part of an investigation into

(2) Was the inspection undertaken by Mr Warren Duncan.

(3) Did Mr Duncan discover serious safety problems with that vehicle.

(4) Did Mr Duncan make a number of recommendations following his inspection of the above vehicle; if so: (a) what were those recommendations; and (b) who was responsible for implementing those recommendations.

(5) Is the Minister, his office or the department aware that the significant safety problems discovered with the above vehicle have still not been corrected and the vehicle continues to operate on public roads; if so, when was the Minister, his office or the department made aware that this vehicle was still operating on public roads despite significant safety problems.

(6) (a) What action has the Minister taken to ensure the above vehicle does not pose a threat to other road users; and (b) when was that action taken.

41 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) Can the Minister confirm that Mr Scott McFarlane wrote to Mr McLucas from the Federal Office of Road Safety (FORS) on 18 February 1999, advising of inspections of nine prime movers (reference K99—92—00117 in documents tabled in the Senate on 27 November 2000).

(2) Did Mr McFarlane advise that while all vehicles exhibited problems, four vehicles: a 1997 Mack Titan (F17), a 1997 HN 80 Ford (F6), a HN 80 Ford (F13) and another Ford prime mover were, in fact, unsafe.

(3) Is the Minister aware of a fax from Mr Peter Sweatman from Roaduser International to Mr Bill Ellis from the department dated 30 June 1999, concerning a draft report from the Driver Education Centre of Australia (DECA) relating to the above inspections (reference L99—390—38 in the documents tabled).

(4) (a) Is the Minister aware that that fax stated in part: ‘Subsequently we have confirmed with DECA that the report prepared by Lindsay Pollock is a draft only. We are now awaiting a copy of the final report which may not include the opinion comments on safety concerns to which you have referred’; and (b) is the Minister aware that Mr Ellis noted in the margin of that fax that the contents of the above paragraph were ‘amazing’.

(5) Did FORS request that it continue to be advised of any safety problems identified by DECA or Roaduser International following the fax from Mr Sweatman to Mr Ellis dated 30 June 1999; if so: (a) on how many occasions was such information provided to FORS; (b) when was the information provided; and (c) what action did FORS take following receipt of that information.

(6) Did FORS provide that information to vehicle owners or manufacturers; if so: (a) when was it provided; (b) what was the nature of the information provided; and (c) to whom was it provided.

(7) If FORS did not request that information relating to the safety of vehicles used as part of the inquiry continue to be provided, why not.

(8) Did FORS seek legal advice as to the status of the reports from Roaduser International and any comments about vehicle safety contained in those reports; if not, why not; if so: (a) when was the legal advice sought; (b) who
provided the advice; (c) when was the legal advice received; (d) what did the advice relate to; and (e) what action did FORS take following receipt of that legal advice.

(9) When was the Minister or his office first advised that a number of the vehicles tested were found to be unsafe to operate.

(10) What action did the Minister or his office take in response to that advice to ensure unsafe heavy vehicles did not continue to operate on public roads.

(11) If the Minister or his office was not advised, why not.

(12) Given that these vehicles were deemed to be unsafe at that time: (a) what action was taken; and (b) who took the action to correct the problems with the vehicles or required that they be removed from public roads until they were considered to be safe to operate.

(13) Did these four vehicles referred to in document K99—92—00117 exhibit exactly the same unsafe characteristics; if not, what were the differences in the problems identified in each of the above vehicles.

(14) If those four vehicles did exhibit the same unsafe characteristics, does that suggest a design problem with those vehicles.

42 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) Can the Minister confirm that a Mack Titan truck (F19) inspected as part of an investigation into problems associated with heavy vehicles exhibited similar problems to those identified in the Mack Titan prime mover (F7) (reference K99—590—00030 in documents tabled in the Senate on 27 November 2000).

(2) If both the above vehicles displayed similar problems, does that suggest a design problem with that vehicle type.

43 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) Is the Minister aware that Mr Michael Klug, a partner from Clayton Utz, wrote to Mr John Lambert from Roaduser International on 8 April 1999, on behalf of Mack Trucks Australia, criticising a report on the results of vehicle tests carried out in Adelaide on 25 March 1999 (reference K99—590—00098 in documents tabled in the Senate on 27 November 2000).

(2) Is the Minister aware that the letter states in part: ‘We find it astounding that Mack Trucks Australia has not been afforded the opportunity to drive and/or test this vehicle or indeed any of the vehicles that you have been testing’.

(3) Can the Minister confirm that on three separate occasions prior to vehicle F4 being involved in the heavy vehicle investigation, Mack Trucks Australia was given the opportunity to test drive vehicle F4 but refused.

(4) Can the Minister also confirm that Mack Trucks Australia was also given a number of opportunities to test drive vehicle F26 but refused those offers.

(5) If the Minister cannot confirm that Mack Trucks Australia was invited to test both of the above vehicles, will he seek advice from Mack Trucks Australia as to whether such offers were made and the basis for the company’s refusal to test drive the trucks.

44 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—
(1) Can the Minister confirm that Mack Trucks Australia were given the opportunity to attend a Mack instrumentation test drive in Melbourne on 17 May 1999 (reference K99—804—143 in documents tabled in the Senate on 27 November 2000).

(2) Was the attendance of the company at the tests a result of a request by Mack Trucks Australia, an offer by the Minister or his office, an offer by the department, or an offer by the Federal Office of Road Safety (FORS).

(3) If the attendance of the company at the tests was the result of an offer from the Minister, his office or the department: (a) when was the offer made; (b) what was the reason for the offer; and (c) who approved the offer.

(4) If the attendance of the company at the tests was the result of an request to the Minister or his office, the department or FORS, by the company: (a) who was the request made to; (b) when was the request made; (c) what was the reason for the request; (d) who made the decision to agree to the request; and (e) did the Minister or his office approve the decision to agree to the request.

45 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) Can the Minister confirm that the owners of vehicle F4 inspected as part of an investigation into problems associated with heavy vehicles by Roaduser International were denied the opportunity to be present when the vehicle was being tested in May 1999.

(2) Was the attendance of the vehicle owners at the tests refused as a result of a decision by the Minister, his office, the department or by the Federal Office of Road Safety (FORS).

(3) If the attendance of the owners of the vehicle was denied as a result of a decision by the Minister, his office, the department or FORS: (a) when was the decision made; and (b) what was the reason for the decision.

46 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) Did an engineer acting on behalf of Mrs and Mr Bauer request, on 26 May 1999, access to the Mack trucks F4 and F26, owned by the Bauers, at the Driver Trainer Education Centre of Australia in Melbourne, to facilitate a superficial inspection (reference K99—804—221 in documents tabled in the Senate on 27 November 2000).

(2) Was the request refused; if so: (a) who refused the request; (b) what was the basis for the refusal; and (c) was the Minister or his office aware of the request and did the Minister or his office approve the decision to refuse the request.

47 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) Did the Federal Office of Road Safety invite Mack Trucks Australia, Ford/Stirling and Kenworth Australia to attend a technical briefing in Melbourne on 10 June 1999, conducted by Roaduser International relating to its inquiry into heavy vehicles (reference K99—804—268 in documents tabled in the Senate on 27 November 2000).

(2) Were any of the owners of vehicles that were the subject of testing by Roaduser International or independent engineers representing those owners invited to attend the briefing; if not, why not.
(3) (a) Who made the decision not to invite the vehicle owners or their technical advisers; (b) was the Minister or his office advised of the decision; and (c) did the Minister or his office endorse the decision.

48 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) Can the Minister confirm that there were three permits to operate unlicensed vehicles obtained to test vehicles F4 and F1 as part of the inquiry into heavy vehicles conducted by Roaduser International (reference K99—917—24 in documents tabled in the Senate on 27 November 2000).

(2) Was vehicle F4 tested on two occasions.

(3) (a) Why was vehicle F4 tested on two occasions; and (b) was raw data collected and stored on a CD Rom on both occasions.

(4) Can the Minister confirm that only one CD Rom was provided to the owners of vehicle F4; if so: (a) why was the second CD Rom withheld from the vehicle owners; and (b) does the Minister plan to provide the second CD Rom to the owners of vehicle F4 at some future time.

49 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) Further to the answer provided to question on notice no. 3531 (Senate Hansard, 20 August 2001, pp 26019-22), what funding has been allocated to specific projects on each of the roads identified in answers (4)(a) to (d).

(2) (a) What is the nature of each of the above projects; (b) what is the level of funding allocated to each of the above projects; (c) over what period has funding been allocated to each of the above projects; and (d) in what category of funding does each of the above projects appear.

(3) Is the above information relating to specific projects for all roads identified in answers (4)(a) to (d) provided to each state government or state transport department; if so: (a) how often is this information provided to each state; and (b) when is the above information provided to each state.

50 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) When did Mr Kym Brougham, or someone on behalf of Mr Brougham, first approach the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) seeking approval to take the position of acting Chief Pilot with Whyalla Airlines.

(2) How was the above approach made and to whom was the approach made.

(3) (a) When did CASA respond to the above approach; (b) who responded; and (c) what was the nature of the response.

51 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) When did Mr Kym Brougham, or someone on behalf of Mr Brougham, apply to the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) for approval to take the position of acting Chief Pilot with Whyalla Airlines.

(2) How was the above application made and to whom was the application made.

(3) (a) When did CASA respond to the above application; (b) who responded; and (c) when did the approval for Mr Brougham to act as Chief Pilot take effect.
 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

1. On how many occasions did the Minister or his staff meet with, or hold a discussion with, the owners, directors or employees of Whyalla Airlines between 1 December 1999 and 31 May 2000.

2. On each occasion: (a) who attended the meeting, or participated in the discussion; (b) when did the meeting or discussion take place; and (c) where did the meeting or discussion take place.

3. If any of the above discussions took place by telephone, where were the parties involved in each discussion located.

 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

1. Did the Minister receive any written, electronic or oral representations on behalf of Mr Chris Brougham or Mr Kym Brougham concerning the appointment of Mr Kym Brougham as acting Chief Pilot, and later Chief Pilot, for Whyalla Airlines between 1 December 1999 and 31 May 2000; if so: (a) when was each representation made; (b) what was the form of the representation; and (c) what was nature of the representation.

2. (a) When were the above representations responded to; (b) who responded; and (c) what was the nature of the response.

 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

1. When did Mr Kym Brougham, or someone on behalf of Mr Brougham, first approach the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) seeking approval to take the position of Chief Pilot with Whyalla Airlines.

2. How was the above approach made and to whom was the approach made.

3. (a) When did CASA respond to the above approach; (b) who responded; and (c) what was the nature of the response.

 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.

 Senator Allison: To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—When will the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency be updating its website (The Maralinga Rehabilitation Project 1996-1999 and Maralinga
Rehabilitation Project Gallery: Part 1 (1998) with respect to the pits in which *in situ* vitrification was not used.

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

(1) Is it the case that the Chiltern Hospital in Victoria will receive $185 000 a year for support services from the Small Rural Hospitals Fund.

(2) When will this funding commence.

(3) Is the Minister aware that the Chiltern Hospital Committee of Management has advised that this support will not be adequate to avert closure of the hospital because of the number of older people in the hospital.

(4) What measures does the Government propose to adopt in the event of closure of the hospital.

(5) Will the Government consider providing a $55 a day operational subsidy to the hospital for these residents given that this is the only aged care option for these people; if not, why not.

**Senator Allison:** To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 61-76)—

(1) (a) When did the department last conduct an audit of heritage values in its properties; and (b) can that report be made available.

(2) Does the department have policies, protocols and/or guidelines for the protection of heritage values in its properties; if not, why not.

(3) (a) What is the budget for maintenance and conservation works in the department for the 2001-02 financial year; and (b) how does this compare with each of the previous four financial years.

(4) Which properties has the department sold over the past five years that have heritage values.

(5) Which of these are listed on the Register of the National Estate.

(6) Which of these have state government and local government protection.

(7) What are the department’s policy, protocol and/or guidelines for archiving documents.

(8) (a) Does the department have a collection of artworks and/or artefacts, including documents, of heritage value; (b) are these documented; and (c) is there a budget for acquisition or conservation of such work.

(9) Does the department use the National Culture-Leisure Industry Statistical Framework prepared by the Cultural Ministers’ Council in compiling data; if not, why not.

(10) For those services contracted out, what arrangements, guidelines and requirements are in place to safeguard records for archiving.

(11) (a) What, if any, historical guides and publications on heritage were prepared by the department in the 2000-01 financial year; and (b) what is the budget for this purpose in the 2001-02 financial year.

61 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

62 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

63 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

64 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

65 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

66 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

67 Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage
Senator Allison: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Ageing—

1. How many 20 year-olds were provided with government-funded hearing aids by the Australian Hearing Service (AHS) in the 1999-2000 financial year, broken down by state.

2. How many 21 year-olds were provided with government-funded hearing aids by the AHS in the 1999-2000 financial year.

3. How many 21 year-olds were provided with government-funded hearing aids by the AHS in the 2000-01 financial year.

4. (a) What, if any, AHS centres were closed in 1999, 2000 and to date in 2001; and (b) which of these were in country areas.

5. What was the reason for these closures.

6. (a) How many audiologists are currently employed by the AHS; (b) how many were employed in 1999; and (c) how many were employed in 2000.

7. What is the policy rationale for hearing aids not being provided by the AHS to hearing impaired people over 21 years of age.

8. Why is it that hearing impaired people over 21 years of age are not able to purchase services, including hearing aids, from the AHS.

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

1. Was the Prime Minister accurately reported in the Sydney Morning Herald of 24 May 2001 as saying, ‘...I don’t think people should be in any way discriminated against or personalised against if they are homosexual.’

2. Does the Government intend to remove discrimination against homosexual couples with regard to superannuation entitlements for surviving partners of members of the Commonwealth Superannuation Scheme; if so, when.

Senator Sherry: To ask the Minister for Finance and Administration—With reference to submissions 197 and 216 by the Department of Finance and Administration to the inquiry into the benefit design of Commonwealth public sector and defence force unfunded superannuation funds and schemes, by the Select Committee on Superannuation and Financial Services, which provide the following information:

(a) in submission 197 the department notes that, under AWOTE or MTAWE (as opposed to CPI) indexation of pensions, unfunded liabilities would increase by $6.6 billion assuming a positive difference of 1 per cent between the new indexation measure and CPI and by $4.1 billion assuming a positive difference of 1.5 per cent;
(b) in submission 216 the department provides a table outlining the fiscal impact, over the forward estimate period, of applying AWOTE indexation to the CSS and PSS schemes;

Can the following information be provided:

(1) What assumptions about the difference between AWOTE and CPI were made in these calculations.

(2) Are estimates available of the cost of MTAWE indexation of CSS and PSS benefits and pensions as opposed to CPI or AWOTE indexation.

(3) What is the estimated cost of changing to AWOTE or MTAWE indexation of CSS and PSS pensions while retaining CPI indexation of preserved benefits.

(4) Do these estimates include any offsetting increases in taxation revenue from AWOTE or MTAWE indexation instead of CPI indexation for both CSS and PSS pensions and preserved benefits or pensions in isolation.

(5) What is the expected increase in taxation revenue from AWOTE or MTAWE indexation instead of CPI indexation for both CSS and PSS pensions and preserved benefits or pensions in isolation.

80 Senator Harris: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—

(1) What was the purchase price paid by the Indigenous Land Corporation to acquire the Roebuck Plains cattle station.

(2) What was the price paid by the vendors of the Roebuck Plains when it was purchased some 12 months prior to the resale to the Indigenous Land Corporation.

(3) What was the reason for the substantial increase in sale price over that 12-month period.

(4) Was the price paid by the Indigenous Land Corporation for Roebuck Plains within commercial valuation at the time.

(5) Was a commercial valuation of Roebuck Plains undertaken prior to its purchase by the Indigenous Land Corporation.

(6) Why did the Indigenous Land Corporation purchase Roebuck Plains when there was no registration of a land need or application by proponents.

(7) Was there an assessment of Roebuck Plains against National Indigenous Land Strategy criteria before the Indigenous Land Corporation Board considered a purchase proposal.

(8) Who negotiated the purchase price of Roebuck Plains.

(9) Why did the Indigenous Land Corporation not utilise its usual service provider, KFPW, in negotiating a purchase price.

(10) Was a cattle muster conducted prior to the Indigenous Land Corporation’s purchase of Roebuck Plains.

(11) Why did the Indigenous Land Corporation enter into a 15-year management agreement with the vendors of Roebuck Plains that effectively locked Aboriginal people out of the arrangement.

(12) What capital investment did the vendors of Roebuck Plains (Great Northern Pastoral Company) make to entitle their retaining about 50 per cent of all profits for the 15-year period of the management agreement.
(13) Why did the Indigenous Land Corporation pay the Great Northern Pastoral Company $1 million to extricate itself from the 15-year management agreement that still had 14 years to run.

(14) Who negotiated the 15-year management agreement.

(15) Was a commission paid to the person or persons who negotiated the purchase price and management agreement.

(16) (a) Who are the directors of the Great Northern Pastoral Company; and (b) do any of them have a criminal record.

(17) Was there any relationship between the Great Northern Pastoral Company and the deceased Max Green.

(18) Is there any relationship between David Baffsky, a director of the Indigenous Land Corporation, and the Great Northern Pastoral Company.

(19) Is there any relationship between David Baffsky and John Vereker, a director of the Great Northern Pastoral Company.

(20) Was there a relationship between David Baffsky and Max Green.

(21) Have there been any money laundering activities evident at Roebuck Plains, or investigations into such activities.

(22) Has a commercial crop of marijuana been grown at Roebuck Plains whilst that station was owned or jointly managed by the Great Northern Pastoral Company.

(23) When the Indigenous Land Corporation purchased a related cattle property, Cardabia Station, did the corporation assist the vendor in avoiding a taxation obligation by attributing false valuations to land and stock.

(24) Did two directors and the Chief Executive Officer of the Indigenous Land Corporation enter into negotiations with the former owners of Roebuck Plains (Great Northern Pastoral Company) to strip the station of its stock without the knowledge or consent of other directors of the corporation.

(25) Was the price proposed by the Great Northern Pastoral Company for the purchase of the entire cattle herd of Roebuck Plains in accord with then current market prices.

81 Senator Harris: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to documents relating to heavy truck specifications tabled pursuant to orders of the Senate:

(1) In the middle of 1999 was a data disc deliberately corrupted by Mr Scott McFarlane of Roaduser International before being sent to the owner of F1, so that it would be unusable and thus prevent others from analysing the data, and that an uncorrupted disc was not sent until 2 to 3 months later.

(2) Were the air fare and related accommodation costs for the Melbourne to Brisbane return trip on 13 May 1999 that were listed in the external supplier expense document (K99-917, 024-026) relating to the Roaduser Report used solely for that purpose and not used to subsidise the costs of Roaduser personnel attending other functions at the Brisbane Truck Show, unrelated to the report.

(3) Was the second testing of F4, a Mack CH Fleetliner prime mover, undertaken at the request of the manufacturer; if so, was the expense of this additional test costed to the report or to the manufacturer.

(4) (a) Did the manufacturer of the Australian-designed and tested Hendrickson WD2 460 suspension that was fitted to the worst performing vehicle, F6, withdraw that suspension from the market early in 2001 after claiming there
was nothing wrong with it; and (b) is it a fact that the manufacturer has no substitute available until a new suspension is introduced in 2002; if so: (i) why was the suspension withdrawn, and (ii) if it was due to its poor performance, why has there not been a recall or other action taken in relation to other vehicles similar in style to F6 fitted with that suspension.

(5) (a) Was Roaduser International’s tender for this investigation $79 400, compared with the losing bidder’s quote of about $120 000; and (b) was the final payment to Roaduser International close to $580 000.

(6) With reference to documents T1112-121-138 and K99-804—126-132, did Roaduser International tender to undertake publicity and problem definition for $8 000, inspect-and-drive appraisals of 6 vehicles for $14 850 ($2 470 each), instrumented testing of 4 vehicles for $33 050 ($8 250 each), computer simulation and analysis relating to 4 instrumented tests for $21 000, assessment of vehicles against industry standards for $5 000, risk amelioration and problem scoping for $3 000 and a report of the investigation for $5 000.

(7) Did Roaduser charge about $80 000 to appraise 13 vehicles ($6 200 each, or 2.5 times the quoted cost per vehicle) even though it did not undertake analysis of each vehicle using Roaduser’s in-house, computer-based performance assessment and did not undertake a lane-change manoeuvre.

(8) Did Roaduser charge about $340 000 for 8 instrumented tests and drives ($42 500 each, or 5 times the quoted cost per vehicle) even though the number of channels of data quoted to be collected was a minimum of 28 compared with only 3 more collected, and evaluation of the vehicle negotiating a standard bump and a steady turn and under severe braking were not carried out.

(9) In relation to the investigation: (a) was Roaduser allowed to charge, for graduate engineers with about 2-years experience on $40 000 per year (or $30 per chargeable hour), a rate around $150 per hour, or more than twice the rate generally charged by consultants for such engineers; (b) were the charge-out rates for the Chief Engineer and Manager Accident Mitigation $250 per hour, and the rate for Dr Peter Sweatman $350 per hour; and (c) have there been any other consultants in the road transport field for which the Australian Transport Safety Bureau has paid similar charge-out rates; if not, can the Minister advise why these rates were paid for this investigation.

(10) Can the Minister confirm that: (a) while the Federal Office of Road Safety tender suggested the use of subcontracted, experienced and qualified organisations to conduct the vibration related tests of the investigation, Roaduser, which was not an experienced or qualified organisation in this field, undertook this work itself; (b) Roaduser quoted on, and undertook measuring of, driver’s seat vibration in the vertical and fore-aft directions only, even though the relevant international standard (ISO 2631-1) required measurements in the side-to-side direction as well, and rates this vibration as being more important than the vertical direction; (c) in order to undertake this work, the Chief Engineer purchased a text on vibration around August 1999; (d) much of the analysis of ‘vibration’ and other data was undertaken by a PhD student with no specific skills in either heavy vehicles or vibration; and (e) Roaduser charged the same hourly rate for this work even though it was not expert in the field.

(11) Given the above, what action is being taken to recover excess monies paid to Roaduser under this contract.
Senator Harris: To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—

(1) Why did the Minister’s office take from 14 June 2000 until 14 November 2000 to initially respond to a freedom of information (FOI) request by Kenneth Ivory, in relation to ‘Casualties of Telstra’ (COT) related matters.

(2) What action is the Minister going to take to rectify the fact that the department’s delay has, whether intentionally or inadvertently, resulted in Mr Ivory not having FOI documents and not being in a position to present his case in January 2001 to the Supreme Court of Queensland.

(3) Is the Minister aware that this FOI delay potentially had the same effect as in the five COT cases listed in Schedule A and Schedule B of the Senate working paper of 1997, whose matters also related to breaches of FOI by Telstra.

(4) What action will the Minister take to have Telstra, or the relevant department, settle Mr Ivory’s damages immediately.

(5) Why were Mr Ivory’s (Solar-Mesh) COT-related matters not settled prior to the Telstra ‘T2’ float, under the same terms and conditions as the five COT cases listed in Schedule A of the Senate committee’s working paper of 1997.

(6) Will Mr Ivory’s damages claim immediately be resolved, under no less than the same terms and conditions as the five resolved COT cases listed in Schedule A that were settled just before the T2 float; if not, why not.

(7) (a) How many people with COT-related issues has Telstra had arrested, or attempted to have arrested, under a mental health warrant, peace and good behaviour warrant or criminal warrant.

(8) Was the purpose of that action to assist Telstra to assassinate the character of the COTs and to conceal the truth about systemic faults, to comply with Freehill, Hollingdale and Page’s ‘COT case strategy’, dated 10 September 1993.

(9) How many of these COT-related matters have already been settled.

(10) Against how many people with COT-related issues has Telstra and/or its lawyers prevailed on federal or state police to falsify police records to assassinate those people’s character and reputation to assist in concealing the truth about Telstra’s defective network, by use of corporate thuggery and neglect of duty of care.

(11) Were any Telstra employees (and/or their agents) involved in having police records and/or mental health reports falsified to cause injury to COT-related people; if so, who were they.

(12) What are the names of the police officers, medical practitioners, or others (and/or their agents) involved in having COTs defamed, intimidated, harassed or wrongfully arrested and who have been obtaining either mental health warrants, bogus psychiatric reports or bogus psychologists assessments made, based solely on information from Telstra or its agents, or who were involved in apprehension warrants being wrongfully obtained against COTs.

(13) (a) Were any persons from within or associated with the Minister’s office involved in the actions described in (12); if so, who were they; and (b) were any of these warrants ever condoned by the Minister.

(14) Were any Telstra employees (and/or their agents) involved in wrongfully obtaining warrants; if so, who were they.
(15) Did Telstra’s former chairman, Mr David Hoare, have any conflict of interest.

(16) What other directorships has Mr David Hoare held from 1990 to date.

(17) Did any conflict of interest occur when Mr Stephen Mead, while seconded from Mallesons Stephen Jacques to Telstra, became in January 1996 a partner in Mallesons Stephen Jacques, while remaining on secondment to Telstra.

(18) On what specific date did Mr Stephen Mead cease being a seconded employee of Telstra.

(19) Is there any outstanding Telstra documentation that has not been provided under FOI and discovery processes; if so: (a) why has there been a delay in providing that information; and (b) when can Mr Ivory expect to receive that outstanding information, whether professional legal privilege has previously been claimed or not.

(20) Are there any outstanding documents under FOI and non-party disclosure in the Minister’s offices; if so, when can Mr Ivory expect to receive this outstanding information, whether professional legal privilege has been previously claimed or not.

(21) Did Telstra employee, Mr Armstrong, attempt to have Mr Ivory sign a Telstra deed of settlement in January or February 2001, to walk away from his claims against Telstra and Mr Mead.

(22) Was the Minister aware that Telstra was attempting to have Mr Ivory commit illegal and unauthorised acts had he signed the settlement deed.

(23) Has the Minister condoned unconscionable conduct by Telstra’s authorised officer in his attempt to silence Mr Ivory’s claims while Mr Ivory was unrepresented.

(24) Why did Telstra refuse to pay for Mr Ivory to seek independent legal representation to advise Mr Ivory of Telstra’s proposed settlement deed terms that Telstra tried to force Mr Ivory into signing without time or money to seek advice before Telstra withdrew the settlement offer.

(25) What action will be taken under administrative law to prevent such mismanagement of Telstra continuing to unjustly sabotage Mr Ivory’s life and livelihood.

(26) (a) Why did Telstra take from 11 May 1994 until 1 June 1994 to test Mr Ivory’s 1800 prefix complaint.

(27) (a) Is it Telstra’s policy that, when any line/number fault is reported it is logged into Telstra’s fault reporting system; (b) is it correct that a standard set of remote tests are immediately conducted in the first instance; and (c) if the fault cannot be rectified or found remotely, is a field technician dispatched to attend the premises; if so, why was this process not followed with Mr Ivory’s 1800 fault complaint.

(28) Why did Telstra only test the 1800 fault reported by Mr Ivory after the fault had been rectified at the exchange on the 31 May 1994.

(29) Did Telstra fabricate and falsify its records and documentation to conceal the 1800 prefix systemic fault.

(30) How many 1800 subscribers did Telstra have in September 1993.

(31) Why has Telstra withheld ‘as obviously irrelevant’ information consistent with the possibility of proving innocence.
83 Senator Harris: To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—With reference to the Family Court of Australia:

1. Given that there are obviously financial costs involved in family breakdown, the chief of these being the costs of litigation, what are the department’s estimates of the average cost of such litigation and the number of children affected for each of the past 5 years.

2. Would the Minister please confirm or deny the accuracy of the following statistics: That children from fatherless homes account for: (a) 60 per cent of youth suicides; (b) 65 per cent of teenage pregnancies; (c) 65 per cent of adolescent drug abusers; and (d) 75 per cent of all homeless or run away children.

3. What are the liaison procedures between the Family Court and state government agencies that ensure that no Family Court litigant can manipulate differing jurisdictions in ways that can result in functional abuses of process.

4. How many convictions for perjury have there been in the Family Court since its inception.

5. Is section 121 of the Family Law Act in need of revision or repeal.

6. Would the Minister please confirm or deny that three men in Australia commit suicide every day whilst involved in Family Court proceedings or following such proceedings.

7. What is the Government’s position with regard to the concept that ‘joint parenting’ should be the Family Court’s first and favoured residential presumption (as was the objective of the amendments of 1995).

84 Senator Harris: To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—

1. Is it correct that the Minister and/or his department claimed that the terms of reference for the Senate Working Party investigating the ‘Casualties of Telstra’ (COT) allegations in 1997 had to be changed on the basis that the previously settled terms, which included all the 21 COT group members would impede upon and prevent the further privatisation of Telstra (ie the ‘T2’ float).

2. Can the Minister explain how the amended terms of reference did not impede upon the T2 float and how, by omitting the other 16 members of the COT group, this would do so.

85 Senator Murray: To ask the Special Minister of State—With reference to members’ and senators’ entitlements:

1. Which entitlements are not separately identified in management reports.

2. Which entitlements are not audited.

3. Which entitlements are not benchmarked (assuming ‘benchmarking’ means that members and senators that incur abnormal expenditures would be asked to explain significant deviances).

4. Which entitlements are not the subject of public reports.

86 Senator Murray: To ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer—

1. Were any applications made to the Australian Securities and Investment Commission (ASIC) prior to 1 July 1998 for finance brokers in Western Australia to be exempted from the Corporations Law requirements with respect to prescribed interests; if so: (a) when was each application made;
(b) by whom and on whose behalf was each application made; (c) when was the application determined; and (d) what was the outcome of each application and what were the reasons for the decision for each application.

(2) Did ASIC enforce the Corporations Law against finance brokers who were offering ‘Pooled Mortgage Schemes’ in contravention of the law in Western Australia.

(3) Is ASIC, in Western Australia, now taking steps to ensure that each prospectus issued in Western Australian Pooled Mortgage Schemes are in all respects accurate and reliable; if not, why not.

87 Senator Murray: To ask the Special Minister of State—

(1) Can the full details of all use of entitlements by retired members of parliament (on the same reporting basis as applies to current members of parliament) for the 2000-01 financial year be provided.

(2) With reference to the revelation in the Australian National Audit Office’s report Parliamentarians’ Entitlements: 1999-2000 that a number of parliamentarians had used entitlements that significantly exceeded the average, could the Minister please indicate (with respect to those that did significantly exceed the average): (a) whether the use of these entitlements by those parliamentarians has been investigated to determine if it is proper; and (b) what action is being taken with regard to the use of these entitlements that significantly exceeded the average.

(3) Without limiting the scope of the questions above, which apply to all relevant entitlements, could the Minister please address the questions outlined in (2) (a) and (2) (b) with respect to the following entitlements: (a) personalised stationery, newsletters and other printing; (b) photographic services; (c) photocopy paper; and (d) flags for presentation to constituents.

Notice given 13 February 2002

88 Senator Ray: To ask the Minister representing the Treasurer—

(1) Has the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) used an electronic version of the Electoral Roll provided by the Australian Electoral Commission (AEC); if so: (a) when did the AEC provide the Electoral Roll; and (b) for what purpose(s) has it been used.

(2) Has the ACCC ever sought legal advice as to the lawfulness of using the Electoral Roll for those purposes; if so, from whom has this legal advice been sought.

(3) Following the provision of the legal advice, was the ACCC satisfied that the use of the Electoral Roll was in fact lawful; if so, on what basis was the ACCC satisfied that the use of the Electoral Roll was lawful.

89 Senator Ray: To ask the Minister representing the Treasurer—

(1) Has the Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC) used an electronic version of the Electoral Roll provided by the Australian Electoral Commission (AEC); if so, (a) when did the AEC provide the Electoral Roll; and (b) for what purpose(s) has it been used.

(2) Has ASIC ever sought legal advice as to the lawfulness of using the Electoral Roll for those purpose; if so, from whom has this legal advice been sought.
(3) Following the provision of the legal advice, was ASIC satisfied that the use of the Electoral Roll was in fact lawful; if so, on what basis was ASIC satisfied that the use of the Electoral Roll was lawful.

90 Senator Ray: To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—

(1) How many Freedom of Information (FOI) requests were received by the department in the 1999-2000 financial year.

(2) (a) How many of those requests have been finalised; (b) how many are pending; and (c) how many were refused and, in each instance, on what grounds.

(3) On how many occasions have costs been waived for the processing of FOI requests.

Senator Ray: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 91-92)—

(1) What contracts has the department or any agency of the department provided to the firm Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu in the 1999-2000 financial year.

(2) In each instance what was the purpose of the work undertaken by Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu.

(3) In each instance what has been the cost to the department of the contract.

(4) In each instance what selection process was used to select Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu (open tender, short-list or some other process).

91 Minister representing the Treasurer

92 Minister for Health and Ageing

Senator Ray: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 93-94)—

(1) What contracts has the department or any agency of the department provided to the firm KPMG in the 1999-2000 financial year.

(2) In each instance what was the purpose of the work undertaken by KPMG.

(3) In each instance what has been the cost to the department of the contract.

(4) In each instance what selection process was used to select KPMG (open tender, short-list or some other process).

93 Minister representing the Treasurer

94 Minister for Health and Ageing

Senator Ray: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 95-96)—

(1) What contracts has the department or any agency of the department provided to the firm PriceWaterhouseCoopers in the 1999-2000 financial year.

(2) In each instance what was the purpose of the work undertaken by PriceWaterhouseCoopers.

(3) In each instance what has been the cost to the department of the contract.

(4) In each instance what selection process was used to select PriceWaterhouseCoopers (open tender, short-list or some other process).

95 Minister representing the Treasurer

96 Minister for Health and Ageing

Senator Ray: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 97-98)—

(1) What contracts has the department or any agency of the department provided to the firm Ernst & Young in the 1999-2000 financial year.
(2) In each instance what was the purpose of the work undertaken by Ernst & Young.
(3) In each instance what has been the cost to the department of the contract.
(4) In each instance what selection process was used to select Ernst & Young (open tender, short-list or some other process).

97 Minister representing the Treasurer
98 Minister for Health and Ageing

Senator Ray: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 99-100)—

(1) What contracts has the department or any agency of the department provided to the firm Arthur Andersen in the 1999-2000 financial year.
(2) In each instance what was the purpose of the work undertaken by Arthur Andersen.
(3) In each instance what has been the cost to the department of the contract.
(4) In each instance what selection process was used to select Arthur Andersen (open tender, short-list or some other process).

99 Minister representing the Treasurer
100 Minister for Health and Ageing

Senator Ray: To ask the Ministers listed below (Question Nos 101-102)—

(1) What was the total value of market research sought by the department and any agencies of the department for the 1999-2000 financial year.
(2) What was the purpose of each contract let.
(3) In each instance: (a) how many firms were invited to submit proposals; and (b) how many tender proposals were received.
(4) In each instance, which firm was selected to conduct the research.
(5) In each instance: (a) what was the estimated or contract price of the research work; and (b) what was the actual amount expended by the department or any agency of the department.

101 Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services
102 Minister representing the Treasurer

103 Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—With reference to Environment Australia’s Threat Abatement Plan for the Predation by the European Fox, in particular relating to Tasmania, and with particular reference to page 8 of the report, dated June 1999, which refers to the threats posed by foxes on islands.

(1) What action (please provide dates) has the Government taken to fulfil the recommendation of the report.
(2) How much money has been spent by the Government on fox control in Tasmania, and when.
(3) (a) What specific requests have been made by the Tasmanian Government, or any other individual or entity, to the Government for assistance in fox control for Tasmania since 1996; and (b) what response did the Government make in each case.
(4) How many foxes are in Tasmania.
(5) What is the annual cost (in dollars and in damage to the land and wildlife) of foxes to Australia.
104 **Senator Hutchins:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations—

1. Is the Minister aware that more than five hundred former staff of Traveland lost their jobs as a result of the collapse of Ansett and Internova Travel.

2. Is the Minister aware that none of the former employees of Traveland have received their workers’ entitlements.

3. Will the Government Employee Entitlements Scheme (GEERS) provide payment of workers’ entitlements to former employees of the Ansett subsidiary Traveland.

4. Can details be provided of the processing of applications received from workers applying for their entitlements under GEERS.

5. Has GEERS begun processing the applications of former Traveland workers.

6. Were the former Traveland employees misled when they were informed that the processing of their payments would begin on 7 January 2002.

7. How much time was taken by GEERS to process the applications of former National Textiles workers.

8. When will former Traveland employees receive their workers’ entitlements.

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

1. Was a decision made by Telstra, on 4 April 2001, to retrench 25 customer field workforce employees in the Sydney metropolitan area.

2. Is the Minister aware that there are some 8 000 Telstra customers within the Sydney metropolitan area waiting for their phone services to be repaired.

3. Was the decision made for commercial reasons.

4. Is the Minister aware that an additional 260 staff were brought in from interstate and regional New South Wales.

5. (a) Is the Minister aware that 170 telephone installations are being carried out by contractors every day; and (b) would permanent staff be more economically efficient in terms of cost for installing telephones.

6. Will the decision to retrench 25 customer field workforce employees impact upon the level of service provided to Telstra customers.

7. Is the Government able to use its majority shareholding in Telstra to reverse the decision.

8. How is the decision to retrench the workers in the interest of the provision of an effective telecommunications service to the people of Sydney.

106 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—With reference to the use of coltan in mobile phones:

1. (a) What is the availability of this mineral in Australia; and (b) is this sufficient to meet domestic needs.

2. Is it a fact that mining for coltan in Africa is a major threat to the survival of the population of eastern lowland Grauer gorillas, *gorilla beringei graueri*, a subspecies distinct from the mountain gorilla; if so, what steps has the Government taken, or will it take, to ensure Australia is not importing, directly or indirectly, coltan from this region.
(3) What measures has the Australian Government taken otherwise to help avoid the extinction of gorillas in the wild.

Notice given 15 February 2002

107 **Senator Harris**: To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—

1. Why did the testing procedures fail to detect inherent data faults with the Telstra 1800 prefix ‘conditioning’ from and/or prior to 1 September 1993.

2. Why have the ‘008 – 1800’ subscribers still not been advised of the conditioning faults.

3. Is it a fact that the above conditioning faults were the result of exchanges not being conditioned by 1 September 1993, and one of those not conditioned was Salisbury ARE in Brisbane (Mr Ivory’s 1800 prefix exchange) thus preventing incoming 1800 calls to all Telstra subscribers who were reliant on the Salisbury exchange.

4. Is it a fact that exchanges that were not conditioned by 1 September 1993 and/or by 20 September 1993 would have then not been conditioned except in response to a customer complaint that callers could not get through; if not, can evidence to the contrary be provided.

5. Please advise, with documented evidence, the specific date of the initial complaint that was lodged by Mr Ivory, on 11 May 1994, in relation to the Solar-Mesh 1800 777 592 service, and what date it was finally conditioned to rectify the initial 1800 prefix fault.

6. From 1 September 1993, was there also a problem with the DMS accepting 1800 numbers for trunking in some exchanges.

7. If the above referred to ‘DMS 1800 accepting faults’ existed, could it have adversely affected incoming (Australia Wide) Telstra subscribers’ calls after the initial conditioning fault had been rectified, and/or from day one for the few 1800 services that were lucky enough not to have suffered damage from a conditioning fault.

8. Did 10-digit number faults occur pertaining to numbers beginning with ‘1’.

9. If 10-digit number faults occurred on numbers beginning with ‘1’, would Telstra subscribers’ customers have been prevented from receiving calls when 1800 prefixes were dialled.

10. During the 10-digit number faults and during the conditioning fault periods, could Telstra subscriber’s freecall customers still have received incoming 008 dialled calls if customers knew to dial 008 in front of the number instead of dialling the new 1800 prefix.

11. (a) Is it correct that Telstra ‘number length difficulties’ caused further faults with 1800 numbers from 1 September 1993 in relation to the CPE problems; (b) did these faults still exist on 16 March 1995; and (c) would the ANP have escalated these systemic fault difficulties.

12. (a) Is it a fact that Telstra has 1800 ‘cyclic storage problems’ with ARF common register and KS failure that prevented proper digit transfer (eg. 1800 123 456 will be changed to 1800 123 418, i.e. The first two digits will be reinserted after the 8th digit); (b) was this cyclic storage problem another 1800 prefix systemic fault; if so, did Telstra have difficulties with having sufficient maintenance staff trained to be able to attend the faulty exchanges for rectification;
(c) would this fault have occurred not just when dialling 1800 code prefix numbers but also where more than 8 digits are dialled (eg. 100, 1800, ANP 1818 etc.); and

(d) was this another very major fault covered up by Telstra.

(13) If the cyclic storage fault existed, could it have adversely affected incoming Australia Wide 1800 customer calls.

(14) Is it a fact that Telstra also had another 1800 prefix systemic fault called a ‘no progress fault’ whereby the switching of 1800 calls takes a longer switching time than 008 calls, leaving customers to believe that their calls had failed.

(15) If the above referred to ‘no progress fault’ existed, would it have adversely affected incoming Australia Wide 1800 customer calls.

(16) Is it a fact that Telstra also had another 1800 prefix fault, called a ‘congestion tone fault’ route fault for 18 codes not graded to sufficient capacity, causing 1800 customers to have insufficient answering capacity to receive incoming 1800 code prefix calls.

(17) If the ‘congestion tone fault’ existed, could it have also adversely affected incoming Australia Wide 1800 customer calls.

(18) Between 1 December 1994 and 31 December 1994, over its entire 008 - 1800 network, did Telstra calls received total 27,565,289; if so, how many of those calls were 008 dialled calls and how many were 1800 dialled calls.

(19) How many total Telstra network 008 / 1800 dialled calls were recorded between and including 1 August 1993 and 31 August 1993.

(20) How many total Telstra network 008 / 1800 dialled calls were recorded between and including 1 September 1993 and 30 September 1993.

(21) How many total Telstra network 008 / 1800 dialled calls were recorded between and including 1 October 1993 and 31 October 1993.

(22) How many total Telstra network 008 / 1800 dialled calls were recorded between and including 1 November 1993 and 30 November 1993.

(23) How many total Telstra network 008 / 1800 dialled calls were recorded between and including 1 December 1993 and 31 December 1993.

(24) (a) How many total Telstra network 008 / 1800 dialled calls were recorded between and including 1 January 1994 and 31 May 1994; and (b) how many total Telstra network 008 / 1800 dialled calls were recorded between and including 1 June 1994 and 21 December 1994.

(25) (a) Did Telecom/Telstra do any print, radio or television advertising to advise its 008 – 1800 subscribers and to also advise its 1800 subscribers and/or to advise the general public of the defective limitations adversely affecting 1800 prefix subscribers’ businesses;

(b) if no such advertising was published nationally to the public by Telstra, could it have adversely restricted nationally the number of incoming 1800 customer calls being received by Telstra’s subscribers from their potential customers and/or from the general public who were not informed by Telstra (the then trusted fully Commonwealth-owned carrier), which was still promoting the use of 1800 prefix numbers nationally;

(c) did Telstra keep concealing from its 1800 subscribers and from the public that Telstra’s 1800 prefix network was not fit for use from the 1 September 1993 change-over commencement date; if so, why was a large
pool of Telstra’s subscribers not informed of their daily accruing potential
damage; if not, why not; and
(d) were these potential liabilities fully disclosed in the T1 and T2 public
offer documents; if not, why not.

(26) (a) What action will the Commonwealth be taking to ensure that the Telstra
Board informs all of its investor/shareholders of their right to pursue Telstra
for any failure to disclose all of its potential liabilities from the T1 and T2
public offer documents;
(b) (i) was Mr David Hoare, then Chairman of Telstra, also the chairman of
Telstra’s share sale legal advisory law firm, (ii) was Mr Stephen Mead, a
partner of the law firm also a Telstra employee, and (iii) did this represent a
conflict of interest;
(c) was the above conflict of interest revealed in Telstra’s public offer
documents; if not, why not; and
(d) were these potential liabilities fully disclosed in the T1 and T2 public
offer documents; if not, why not.

(27) (a) As the Minister responsible for the T1 and T2 share sell-off by the
Commonwealth, why did the Minister not ensure to have disclosed in the
T1 and T2 offer documents the fact that Telstra’s then Chairman, Mr David
Hoare, was at the same time Chairman of Telstra’s legal advisory firm,
Mallesons Stephen Jaques;
(b) as the Minister responsible for the T1 and T2 share sell-off by the
Commonwealth, why did the Minister not ensure to have disclosed in the
T1 and T2 offer documents the fact that Telstra’s then in-house Counsel,
Mr Stephen Mead, was at the same time a partner of Telstra’s legal
advisory firm, Mallesons Stephen Jaques; and
(c) as the Minister responsible for the T1 and T2 share sell-off by the
Commonwealth, why did the Minister not ensure to have disclosed in the
T1 and T2 offer documents the fact that the Commonwealth’s legal
advisory firm, Freehill Hollingdale and Page, was also on a Telstra retainer
in relation to the concealment of the potential liabilities to the COTs
(Casualties of Telecom/Telstra) in other COT related matters, including the
few COT cases settled just before the T2 sale.

(28) (a) Is the Minister aware that Mr Stephen Mead was a good friend of a
Mr Simon Dudley Williams who, along with the firm (Spruson and
Ferguson), were, since before Mr Ivory’s 11 May 1994 1800 conditioning
fault complaint to Telstra, being sued by Mr Ivory’s company for
professional negligence; and
(b) was the Minister aware that Mr Mead and Mr Hoare’s law firm
partnership of Mallesons Stephen Jaques was acting for Mr Ivory’s
multinational competitors, Boral Cyclone – Azon Cyclone Hardware, at the
same time Mr Mead’s friend (Mr Williams) of Spruson and Ferguson was
acting for Boral Cyclone.

(29) (a) Is it a fact that the 1800 universal exchanges could have only been
conditioned in blocks of 10,000 number ranges;
(b) was it possible for any single 10,000 lot 1800 number ranges to have
been missed completely in the 1 September 1993 conditioning;
(c) is it a fact that the 1800 universal exchange conditioning defects could
have accidentally allowed a single number to have been completely missed
in the 1 September 1993 conditioning of the 1800 prefixes; and
(d) is it a fact that Telstra would have been reliant on receiving a customer complaint to enable it to rectify any numbers that were not conditioned.

(30) (a) Is the Minister aware:

(i) that the Solar-Mesh 1800 777 592 code conditioning fault occurred from 1 September 1993, but was not initially uncovered and reported until 11 May 1994, when it was first reported to Telstra’s faults department by Telstra’s Miss Hatton and also by Mr Ivory, and

(ii) it was then not rectified until the 31 May 1994 when Miss Hatton, witnessed by Mr Ivory over the telephone in a three-way conversation, bypassed Telstra’s faults department and went straight to Telstra’s exchange;

(b) is the Minister aware that the phantom fault testing done on 1 June 1994, by Telstra’s Mr Adam Sears, was done the day after the conditioning fault had been rectified; and

(c) Given that these matters could be proven to the Minister if he were to instigate an internal investigation into Telstra and/or have a face-to-face meeting with Mr Ivory, is the Minister prepared to do so.

(31) (a) Is it a fact that Telstra’s Operational Processes Support People, Network Operations Manager and Product Integration Management, during October 1993, each became aware of many major 1800 code implementation fault problems that had resulted in no access to a large number of 1800 services right across Australia, not just in country areas but also in metropolitan areas;

(b) did these problems stem from system failures, equipment failures, planning failures and/or managerial neglect prior to and from 1 September 1993;

(c) is it also a fact that, by 8 October 1993, Telstra knew that some of these implementation faults and network faults existed and were likely to worsen unless some rationale and co-ordination was introduced at high level to the product introduction process; and

(d) is it a fact that Telstra has concealed these faults and defects.

(32) How many Australia Wide 1800 customers did Telecom/Telstra have as 008 – 1800 prefix subscribers as at 31 August 1993 at the Salisbury Queensland exchange.

(33) How many Australia Wide 1800 customers did Telecom/Telstra have as 008 – 1800 prefix subscribers as at 31 May 1994 at the Salisbury Queensland exchange.

(34) How many Australia Wide 1800 customers did Telecom/Telstra have as 008 - 1800 prefix subscribers as at 31 August 1993 at the Valley Queensland exchange.

(35) How many Australia Wide 1800 customers did Telecom/Telstra have as 008 – 1800 prefix subscribers as at 31 May 1994 at the Valley Queensland exchange.

(36) How many Australia Wide 1800 prefix exchanges did OPTUS have as at 1 September 1993.

(37) How many Australia Wide customers did OPTUS have as 008 – 1800 prefix subscribers as at 1 September 1993 in their Queensland exchanges.
(38) How many Australia Wide customers did OPTUS have as 008–1800 prefix subscribers as at 1 September 1993 in their New South Wales exchanges.

(39) How many Australia Wide customers did OPTUS have as 008–1800 prefix subscribers as at 1 September 1993 in their Victorian exchanges.

(40) How many Australia Wide customers did OPTUS have as 008–1800 prefix subscribers as at 1 September 1993 in their South Australia exchanges.

(41) How many Australia Wide customers did OPTUS have as 008–1800 prefix subscribers as at 1 September 1993 in their Western Australia exchanges.

(42) How many Australia Wide customers did OPTUS have as 008–1800 prefix subscribers as at 1 September 1993 in their Tasmanian exchanges.

(43) How many Australia Wide customers did OPTUS have as 008–1800 prefix subscribers as at 1 September 1993 in their Northern Territory exchanges.

(44) How many Australia Wide customers did OPTUS have as 008–1800 prefix subscribers as at 1 September 1993 in their Australian Capital Territory exchanges.

(45) In which, if any, states or territories were OPTUS’s 1800 prefix exchanges, as listed above, fully working and/or fully compatible with Telstra’s exchange equipment as at 1 September 1993.

(46) (a) Is it also a fact that, despite Telstra key staff knowing about the above 1800 code implementation and network faults and the possibility of the faults being likely to worsen, Telstra still failed to put in place an exchange by exchange, 1800 number by 1800 number, process of testing and sending staff out to each 1800 exchange across Australia to locate and rectify the systemic 1800 code implementation faults and network failures;

(b) is it a fact that Telstra elected to wait and fix individual faults in response to individual customer complaints being made that callers could not get through when dialling 1800 code numbers; and

(c) what does the Minister intend to do to have the appropriate department, or Telstra, immediately recompense subscribers for damage and injury.

(47) Is it a fact that it is a policy of Telstra that, since at least the 1995-96 financial year, its employees have not been allowed to obtain outside employment, and must keep their outside activities separate from Telstra Company work.

(48) Is it a fact that Telstra employees since at least the 1995-96 financial year have not been allowed to take outside employment without first obtaining written approval from their Telstra Manager; if so, can copies be provided of the signed approval for Mr David Hoare to become the dual hat Chairman of Mallesons Stephen Jaques and the signed authorisation for Stephen John Mead to become a partner in Mallesons Stephen Jaques while Mallesons Stephen Jaques was on a Telstra retainer and while Mr Mead was still employed by Telstra.

(49) If these signed authorities cannot be produced, what action will the Minister immediately be taking against Mr Hoare and Mr Mead, and against Mallesons Stephen Jaques and against Telstra’s negligent directors responsible for bringing Telstra into such disrepute in breach of Telstra’s own Code of Conduct.
(50) (a) Is it a fact that Telecom Australia/Telstra has, and has always had, a strict duty of care to keep secure and confidential its customers’ records, unless specifically authorised to do otherwise; and (b) does the Commonwealth ensure that such procedures and policies are in place within Telecom/Telstra and that they are at all times adhered to, even in the case of Casualties of Telecom complainants’ matters; if not, why not.

(51) (a) Is it a fact that Telecom Australia/Telstra employees are not allowed to be involved in bribes, pay-offs or kickbacks or in other considerations that are either paid or received directly or indirectly; and
(b) did the Minister know of Telstra’s potential liabilities pertaining to the 1800 network being sold and promoted from 1 September 1993 while the 1800 network of Telstra was not fit for use; if so, why did this occur.

(52) (a) With reference to Freehill Hollingdale and Page, the Telstra-retained COT claimants law firm from at least 1993: why did the 1994-95 financial year revenue received by Freehill Hollingdale and Page from Telstra fall below the amount that Mallesons Stephen Jaques received from Telstra in relation to COT claimant’s matters; and
(b) was the Minister aware of the conflicting loyalties of partnerships which occurred while both David Hoare and Stephen John Mead were Telstra employees.

(53) Can a detailed breakdown be provided, including claimants names, of which ‘Casualties of Telstra’ related matters Mallesons Stephen Jaques was specifically retained by Telstra to handle in exchange for the $1 129 767.00 paid by Telstra to Malleson Stephen Jaques from the 1993-94 financial year up to and including the 1996-97 financial year.

(54) Can a fully itemised detailed statement be provided of how much money, financial year by financial year, has been specifically paid by Telstra to Mallesons Stephen Jaques since the 1993-94 financial year up to and including the 2000-01 financial year with each individual matter separately itemised.

Notice given 18 February 2002

108 Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Prime Minister—With reference to whistleblower Alwyn Johnson, and the Minister’s commitment, on 12 August 2000, to undertake an inquiry to look at compensation for Mr Johnson, even if the Tasmanian Government refused to take part:
   (1) Why has no inquiry been instituted.
   (2) (a) When will the inquiry begin; and (b) who will arbitrate.

109 Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—Do mining booklets produced by Environment Australia offer any advice on what is considered best environmental practice in relation to ocean disposal of mining tailings.

110 Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—Has Environment Australia been asked for advice by any government agency, since 1 January 2000, on proposed mining projects involving the ocean disposal of tailings; if so: (a) by which agency; (b) when; (c) what project did it relate to; and (d) what was the nature of the advice.

111 Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—
(1) Did the former Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Senator Hill, state that: 'In certain circumstances and when correctly managed, the Government understands that deep sea tailings placement has been accepted as causing relatively low environmental impact. The subject, however, remains one of international debate. The choice of disposal mechanism must take account of the geophysical, biophysical and climatic environmental conditions but is ultimately the decision of the host country.'

(2) Does the Minister share this view.

(3) Has Environment Australia undertaken any independent assessment of the environmental impacts and risks of the ocean disposal of mine tailings; if not, what is the basis for the view that 'deep sea tailings placement has been accepted as causing relatively low environmental impact'; if so: (a) when was this review done; (b) what were the results of the review; (c) is the report publicly available; if not, why not; and (d) who did the review.

112 Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—Do mining booklets produced by Environment Australia clearly indicate that the riverine disposal of tailings does not constitute best environmental practice; if not, why not.

113 Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—Since 1 January 2000, has Environment Australia been consulted by any government agency on mining proposals involving riverine disposal of tailings.

114 Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 3649 (Senate Hansard, 20 August 2001, p. 26206), in which the Minister indicated that in certain circumstances the disposal of mine tailings into the oceans may be appropriate but that it was considered that the disposal of mine tailings into rivers in Australia was inappropriate: Does Environment Australia consider there are circumstances in which the riverine disposal of mine tailings by Australian companies operating overseas could ever be best environmental practice; if so, under what circumstances.

115 Senator Harris: To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—

(1) Will the Minister provide a detailed and itemised schedule of individual and total payments made to Mallesons Stephen Jaques (MSJ) by Telecom/Telstra during each of the following financial years:
   (a) 1 July 1990 to 30 June 1991;
   (b) 1 July 1991 to 30 June 1992;
   (c) 1 July 1992 to 30 June 1993;
   (d) 1 July 1993 to 30 June 1994;
   (e) 1 July 1994 to 30 June 1995;
   (f) 1 July 1995 to 30 June 1996;
   (g) 1 July 1996 to 30 June 1997;
   (h) 1 July 1997 to 30 June 1998;
   (i) 1 July 1998 to 30 June 1999;
   (j) 1 July 1999 to 30 June 2000;
   (k) 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001; and
   (l) 1 July 2001 to 31 January 2002.
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(2) Will the Minister provide a detailed and itemised schedule of individual and total payments made to MSJ either directly or indirectly by the Commonwealth of Australia during each of the following financial years:

(a) 1 July 1990 to 30 June 1991;
(b) 1 July 1991 to 30 June 1992;
(c) 1 July 1992 to 30 June 1993;
(d) 1 July 1993 to 30 June 1994;
(e) 1 July 1994 to 30 June 1995;
(f) 1 July 1995 to 30 June 1996;
(g) 1 July 1996 to 30 June 1997;
(h) 1 July 1997 to 30 June 1998;
(i) 1 July 1998 to 30 June 1999;
(j) 1 July 1999 to 30 June 2000; and
(k) 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001.

(3) Will the Minister provide a detailed and itemised schedule of individual and total payments made to Baker Johnson (Lawyers) and/or to any identity associated with that firm by Telecom/Telstra during each of the following financial years:

(a) 1 July 1990 to 30 June 1991;
(b) 1 July 1991 to 30 June 1992;
(c) 1 July 1992 to 30 June 1993;
(d) 1 July 1993 to 30 June 1994;
(e) 1 July 1994 to 30 June 1995;
(f) 1 July 1995 to 30 June 1996;
(g) 1 July 1996 to 30 June 1997;
(h) 1 July 1997 to 30 June 1998;
(i) 1 July 1998 to 30 June 1999;
(j) 1 July 1999 to 30 June 2000; and
(k) 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001.

(4) Will the Minister provide a detailed and itemised schedule of individual and total payments made to Spruson & Ferguson (Patent & Trade Mark Attorney’s) by Telecom/Telstra (including any amounts that Telecom/Telstra contracted to pay) during each of the following financial years:

(a) 1 July 1990 to 30 June 1991;
(b) 1 July 1991 to 30 June 1992;
(c) 1 July 1992 to 30 June 1993;
(d) 1 July 1993 to 30 June 1994;
(e) 1 July 1994 to 30 June 1995;
(f) 1 July 1995 to 30 June 1996;
(g) 1 July 1996 to 30 June 1997;
(h) 1 July 1997 to 30 June 1998;
(i) 1 July 1998 to 30 June 1999;
(j) 1 July 1999 to 30 June 2000; and
(k) 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001.

(5) Will the Minister provide a detailed and itemised schedule of individual and total payments made to Ebsworth & Ebsworth (Lawyers) by
Telecom/Telstra (including any amounts that Telecom/Telstra contracted to pay) during each of the following financial years:

(a) 1 July 1990 to 30 June 1991;
(b) 1 July 1991 to 30 June 1992;
(c) 1 July 1992 to 30 June 1993;
(d) 1 July 1993 to 30 June 1994;
(e) 1 July 1994 to 30 June 1995;
(f) 1 July 1995 to 30 June 1996;
(g) 1 July 1996 to 30 June 1997;
(h) 1 July 1997 to 30 June 1998;
(i) 1 July 1998 to 30 June 1999;
(j) 1 July 1999 to 30 June 2000; and
(k) 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001.

Will the Minister provide a detailed and itemised schedule of individual and total payments made to Williams Niblett (Solicitors) (now called Spruson Solicitors) by Telecom/Telstra (including any amounts that Telecom/Telstra contracted to pay) during each of the following financial years:

(a) 1 July 1990 to 30 June 1991;
(b) 1 July 1991 to 30 June 1992;
(c) 1 July 1992 to 30 June 1993;
(d) 1 July 1993 to 30 June 1994;
(e) 1 July 1994 to 30 June 1995;
(f) 1 July 1995 to 30 June 1996;
(g) 1 July 1996 to 30 June 1997;
(h) 1 July 1997 to 30 June 1998;
(i) 1 July 1998 to 30 June 1999;
(j) 1 July 1999 to 30 June 2000; and
(k) 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001.

Will the Minister provide a detailed and itemised schedule of individual and total payments made to Thynne & Macartney (Solicitors) by Telecom/Telstra (including any amounts that Telecom/Telstra contracted to pay) during each of the following financial years:

(a) 1 July 1990 to 30 June 1991;
(b) 1 July 1991 to 30 June 1992;
(c) 1 July 1992 to 30 June 1993;
(d) 1 July 1993 to 30 June 1994;
(e) 1 July 1994 to 30 June 1995;
(f) 1 July 1995 to 30 June 1996;
(g) 1 July 1996 to 30 June 1997;
(h) 1 July 1997 to 30 June 1998;
(i) 1 July 1998 to 30 June 1999;
(j) 1 July 1999 to 30 June 2000; and
(k) 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001.

Will the Minister provide a detailed and itemised schedule of individual and total payments made to Henderson Trout (Lawyers) (now Clayton Utz since 31 December 1991) by Telecom/Telstra (including any amounts that Telecom/Telstra contracted to pay) during each of the following financial years:
(9) Will the Minister provide a detailed and itemised schedule of individual and total payments made to Robert Douglas QC, James Douglas QC, Phillip McMurdoo QC, Jim North SC, or Peter Ambrose SC by Telecom/Telstra (including any amounts that Telecom/Telstra contracted to pay) during each of the following financial years:
(a) 1 July 1990 to 30 June 1991;
(b) 1 July 1991 to 30 June 1992;
(c) 1 July 1992 to 30 June 1993;
(d) 1 July 1993 to 30 June 1994;
(e) 1 July 1994 to 30 June 1995;
(f) 1 July 1995 to 30 June 1996;
(g) 1 July 1996 to 30 June 1997;
(h) 1 July 1997 to 30 June 1998;
(i) 1 July 1998 to 30 June 1999;
(j) 1 July 1999 to 30 June 2000; and
(k) 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001.

(10) Will the Minister provide a detailed and itemised schedule of individual and total payments made to JLB Allsop SC, JV Nicholas, barrister or Mr A McSporan by Telecom/Telstra (including any amounts that Telecom/Telstra contracted to pay) during each of the following financial years:
(a) 1 July 1990 to 30 June 1991;
(b) 1 July 1991 to 30 June 1992;
(c) 1 July 1992 to 30 June 1993;
(d) 1 July 1993 to 30 June 1994;
(e) 1 July 1994 to 30 June 1995;
(f) 1 July 1995 to 30 June 1996;
(g) 1 July 1996 to 30 June 1997;
(h) 1 July 1997 to 30 June 1998;
(i) 1 July 1998 to 30 June 1999;
(j) 1 July 1999 to 30 June 2000; and
(k) 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001.

(11) Have payments made by Telstra to MSJ increased since Mr Hoare became the Chairman of MSJ in 1995; if so, by what percentage have payments increased compared with the 3 years before Mr Hoare became the Chairman.
(12) Have payments made by Telstra to MSJ increased since Mr Mead became a partner of MSJ in 1996; if so, by what percentage have payments increased compared with: (a) the 3 years before Mr Mead became a partner in January 1996; and (b) the 3 years before Mr Mead became an employee of Telecom/Telstra Australia in about May 1994 on secondment from MSJ.

(13) Is the Minister aware that a complaint (to obtain an apprehension warrant against Mr Ivory) was sworn by Mr Mead contrary to written advice from MSJ.

(14) (a) Has the Minister been advised of a finding by the Magistrates Court, upheld on appeal, that Mr Ivory had been wrongfully arrested; and (b) what was the cost to Telstra of the legal action relating to Mr Ivory’s wrongful arrest.

(15) (a) Is the Minister aware that Mr Ivory in 2000 wrote to Telstra’s lawyers offering to accept a settlement of $28,000 in February 2001 in relation to this matter; (b) is the Minister also aware that Telstra’s lawyers rejected that offer; and (c) did Telstra then spend public funds in outlays and legal costs in further action against Mr Ivory, now a disability pensioner; if so, how much.

(16) Did Telstra publish a solution to the 1800 prefix problems and/or faults by telling the public that the old 008 prefix code was still working efficiently if they failed to get through by dialling the 1800 prefix code; if so, how much did Telstra spend in advertising this solution; please provide details of the dates of advertisements and the media outlets which carried them, together with copies of all advertising done.

(17) Did Telstra limit the scope of individual COT-related claimants’ FOI requests to their telephone lines; if so: (a) why did Telstra board meeting minutes record that ‘Congestion’ was one of the COT’s complaints; and (b) did documents relating to the performance of Telstra’s network contain information relating to ‘Congestion’, ‘1800 systemic faults’ and ‘Switching failures’ relevant to COT-related claimants’ telephone services.

(18) Will the Minister provide to Mr Kenneth Clyde Ivory, copies of all Telstra board meeting minutes that are related to COT-related complaints from July 1993 to 12 February 2002 including any minutes which relate to Mr Ivory and/or to Solar-Mesh complaints.

(19) (a) What reasons were given by Telstra in refusing Mr Ivory and Solar-Mesh Australia partnerships access under FOI to requested information; and (b) what means are available to COT claimants and/or Mr Ivory and/or Solar-Mesh Australia to obtain this important information.

(20) (a) Did the Minister have any knowledge of Mr Mead’s intentions in seeking the arrest of Mr Ivory; and (b) were Mr Mead’s actions authorised.

(21) Has Telstra attempted to have any COT-related claimants committed to psychiatric confinement or imprisonment; if so, on how many occasions and with what results.

(22) Will the Minister direct Telstra to comply fully with Mr Ivory’s FOI request of 28 November 2001.

(23) What action will the Minister take to have all unresolved COT-related claims, including those of Mr Ivory and Solar-Mesh Australia, fully settled on no less favourable terms of settlement than those reached in the process overseen by the Senate.
(24) Will the Minister cause information to be published about the rights of 1800 subscribers to sue Telstra and/or the Commonwealth for damages in relation to their 1800 services.

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

(1) Did the Ambassador to Indonesia, Mr Richard Smith, visit the mining area held by the Australian company, Aurora Gold, through its Indonesian subsidiary, PT Indo Muro Kencana, in May 2001.

(2) Was the trip at the request of Aurora Gold or its Indonesian subsidiary; if so, why was the invitation accepted.

(3) What was the duration of the trip.

(4) What was the purpose of the visit.

(5) Did the Ambassador make any formal speeches during the trip; if so, can a copy of each of his presentations be provided.

(6) (a) Did the Ambassador publicly urge the Indonesian government agencies and security forces to ensure secure conditions at mining operations run by Australian mining companies and their subsidiaries; and (b) did the Ambassador urge the government agencies to deal with what Aurora describes as ‘illegal’ miners working within its mine lease area; if so, why.

(7) What form of action did the Ambassador expect security agencies to take in dealing with small-scale miners.

117 Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the Aurora mine site in Kalimantan, and reports that approximately 1 week after the recent visit of the Australian Ambassador, Indonesian security forces shot and/or stoned to death within the Aurora lease area two local people considered to be ‘illegal’ miners:

(1) Was the Ambassador or any other representative of the department aware of this incident; if so, when was the Ambassador or any other representative of the department made aware of the two deaths.

(2) Did the Ambassador or any other representative of the department make any representations to any Indonesian government officials or agencies about the killings; if so, to whom and when.

(3) Did Aurora and/or its Indonesian subsidiary make any representation to the Ambassador or any other representative of the department after the deaths; if so, what was the nature of these representations and when did they occur.

(4) Did the Ambassador or any other representative of the department make any representations to Aurora and/or its Indonesian subsidiary about the events that had taken place.

118 Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the Aurora mine site in Kalimantan, and reports that on 27 August 2001 a local teenage boy considered to be an ‘illegal’ miner at the Kerikil mine within Aurora’s lease area was shot in the leg by Indonesian security forces:

(1) Was the Australian Ambassador or any other representative of the department made aware of this incident; if so, when was the Ambassador or representative of the department made aware of the incident.
(2) Did the Ambassador or any other representative of the department make any representations to any Indonesian government officials or agencies about the shooting; if so, to whom and when.

(3) Did Aurora and/or its Indonesian subsidiary make any representation to the Ambassador or any other representative of the department after the shooting; if so, what was the nature of these representations and when did they occur.

(4) Did the Ambassador make any representations to Aurora and/or its Indonesian subsidiary about the events that had taken place.

Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the mining company Aurora: Has the Australian Ambassador to Indonesia or any other representative of the department, at any stage, made any representation to any Indonesian government minister or agency expressing concern about the actions of Indonesian security forces at Aurora’s Indonesian subsidiary’s mine site; if so: (a) when; (b) to whom; and (c) what was the nature of the request made.

Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the mining company Aurora: Has the Australian Ambassador to Indonesia or any representative of the department made any visits to Aurora’s Indonesian mining operations since 1 January 2000; if so: (a) when; and (b) for what purpose.

Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the operations of Aurora at its Kalimantan mine site and recent deaths and injuries of local people on or near the site: Given the Government’s support for the Minerals Council of Australia’s voluntary Code for Environment Management (to which Aurora is a signatory) as adequate to deal with social and environmental issues of Australian companies operating overseas: Does the Minister believe the actions of Aurora and its Indonesian subsidiary are appropriate; if so, why.

Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—Has Austrade or any section of the department assisted the mining company Aurora in any way with the Indo Muro mine in Indonesia; if so, how.

Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the mining company Aurora: Has the Ambassador to Indonesia or any representative of the department made representations to Indonesian government agencies relating to issues involving Aurora’s Indonesian mining operations; if so: (a) what were the representations; (b) when did they occur; (c) what were the results of the representations; and (d) were the representations made at the request of Aurora and/or any of its agents.

Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—Has the department undertaken any review of its role in the tragic events at the Aurora mine site in Indonesia, and, in particular, the appropriateness of the Australian Ambassador urging Indonesian security forces to deal with local small scale-miners; if not, will it.

Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—With reference to the mining company Aurora’s Kalimantan operations, and reports that, on 19 January 2002, Indonesian security forces shot a local man, deemed to be an ‘illegal’ miner within the Aurora lease area, in the head with a rubber bullet at close range resulting in a serious injury:
(1) Was the Australian Ambassador or any representative of the department made aware of this incident; if so, when was the Ambassador or representative of the department made aware of the incident.

(2) Did the Ambassador or representative of the department make any representations to any Indonesian government officials or agencies about the shooting; if so, to whom and when.

(3) Did Aurora and/or its Indonesian subsidiary make any representation to the Ambassador or any other representative of the department after the deaths; if so, what was the nature of these representations and when did they occur.

(4) Did the Ambassador or any other representative of the department make any representations to Aurora and/or its Indonesian subsidiary about the events that had taken place.

126 Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—Since 1 January 1999, has the Australian Ambassador to Indonesia or any representative of the department ever raised with any Indonesian government agency or minister concerns about human rights abuses where they have been publicly reported, or where the department has been made aware of them, at mine sites where Australian mining companies have interests.

127 Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—Since 1 January 1999, has the Australian Ambassador to Indonesia or any representative of the department made representations to Indonesian government agencies or ministers over security issues at any mine sites in Indonesia.

128 Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—Since 1 January 1999, has the Australian Ambassador to Indonesia or any representative of the department visited any mine sites in Indonesia in which Australian companies have interests.

129 Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—Since 1 January 1999, has the Australian Ambassador to Indonesia or any representative of the department met with representatives of the Indonesian Mining Association to discuss security issues at mines that Australian companies have interests in; if so, when and what projects were discussed.

Notice given 20 February 2002

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

(1) What is the total number of visitor visa rejections, by country of origin, for males aged 50 to 59 years who applied for a visa for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(2) What is the total number of visitor visa rejections, by country of origin, for males aged 60 years and above who applied for a visa for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(3) What is the percentage of visitor visa non-return rates for females, by country of origin and age, for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(4) What is the total number of female visitor visa holders who do not return, by country of origin, for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.
(5) What is the percentage of visitor overstay rates for females, by country of origin and age, for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(6) What is the total number of female overstayers, by country of origin, for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(7) What is the percentage of visitor visa non-return rates for males, by country of origin and age, for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(8) What is the total number of male visitor visa holders who do not return, by country of origin, for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(9) What is the percentage of visitor overstay rates for males, by country of origin and age, for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(10) What is the total number of verified visitors, by country of origin, for 1999.

(11) What is the total number of verified visitors, by country of origin, for 2000.

(12) What is the total number of verified visitors, by country of origin, for 2001.

(13) What is the total number of visitors, by country of origin, who did not return in 1999.

(14) What is the total number of visitors, by country of origin, who did not return in 2000.

(15) What is the total number of visitors, by country of origin, who did not return in 2001.

(16) What is the total number of visitor overstayers, by country of origin, for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(17) What is the total number of visitors issued with an 8503 criterion, by country of origin, for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(18) What is the total number of visitor visas issued with bonds, by country of origin, for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(19) What is the total of funds received from bonds placed on visitor visas, by country of origin, for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(20) What is the total number of enforced departures, by country of origin, for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(21) What is the total number of visitor visa rejections, by country of origin, for females aged 18 to 29 years who applied for visas for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(22) What is the total number of visitor visa rejections, by country of origin, for females aged 30 to 39 years who applied for visas for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(23) What is the total number of visitor visa rejections, by country of origin, for females aged 40 to 49 years who applied for visas for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(24) What is the total number of visitor visa rejections, by country of origin, for females aged 50 to 59 years who applied for visas for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.
(25) What is the total number of visitor visa rejections, by country of origin, for females aged 60 years and above who applied for visas for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(26) What is the total number of females aged 18 to 29 years, by country of origin, who applied for visas for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(27) What is the total number of females aged 30 to 39 years, by country of origin, who applied for visas for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(28) What is the total number of females aged 40 to 49 years, by country of origin, who applied for visas for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(29) What is the total number of females aged 50 to 59 years, by country of origin, who applied for a visa for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(30) What is the total number of females aged 60 years and above, by country of origin, who applied for a visa for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(31) What is the total number of visas issued for females.

(32) What is the total number of males aged 18 to 29 years, by country of origin, who applied for visas for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(33) What is the total number of males aged 30 to 39 years, by country of origin, who applied for visas for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(34) What is the total number of males aged 40 to 49 years, by country of origin, who applied for visas for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(35) What is the total number of males aged 50 to 59 years, by country of origin, who applied for visas for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(36) What is the total number of males aged 60 years and above, by country of origin, who applied for visas for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(37) What is the total number of visas issued for males.

(38) What is the total number of visitor visa rejections, by country of origin, for males aged 18 to 29 years who applied for visas for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(39) What is the total number of visitor visa rejections, by country of origin, for males aged 30 to 39 years who applied for visas for each of the following years: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(40) (a) How many deaths have there been in immigration detention centres since 1996; and (b) can details of each death be provided.

(41) How many attempted suicides have there been in immigration detention centres since 1996.

(42) How many injuries have been recorded in immigration detention centres since 1996.

(43) How many teeth extractions have been performed in immigration detention centres comparative to other dental procedures.
(44) How many births have there been in immigration detention centres.
(45) How many immigration detainees have given birth in hospitals.
(46) How many times are pregnant asylum seekers seen by doctors before their confinement.
(47) How many times are pregnant asylum seekers seen by other medical staff (for example, nurses) before their confinement.
(48) How many times were chemical restraints used on immigration detainees in the year 2001.
(49) In what circumstances are chemical restraints used.

Notice given 21 February 2002

131 Senator Allison: To ask the Minister for Finance and Administration—

(1) What does the department plan to do with numbers 52 and 54 Temira Crescent, Darwin.

(2) (a) Why has the department withdrawn its offer to give numbers 52 and 54 Temira Crescent, Darwin, to the National Trust at no cost, as stated in a letter from Ms Janette Tate of the Domestic Property Group, on 4 December 1997, and subsequently accepted by the Trust in a letter dated 15 December 1997; (b) why has the department now asked the National Trust to pay $440 000 for the two buildings; and (c) does the department expect to receive $700 000 for the two properties on the open market.

(3) Does the department know how much money the Trust has spent maintaining the properties and, therefore, how much the Commonwealth has saved because of the Trust’s occupancy.

(4) Is the department aware that if the National Trust is made to purchase these two buildings it will severely curtail the Trust’s other conservation activities.

(5) Does the department agree that the best way to maintain the heritage values of these buildings and to ensure that the public continues to have access to them is either to give the properties to the Trust or to grant a crown lease in perpetuity to the Trust.

(6) Will the department consider transferring ownership of these two buildings to the Northern Territory Government.

(7) If the buildings are put up for private sale, how will the department ensure that the heritage values of the properties are maintained.

(8) (a) Is the department concerned that the private sale of these two historic buildings may either severely limit or totally restrict public access to these buildings, which are an important part of Darwin’s heritage; and (b) what will the department do to ensure that the public has continued access to these two buildings.

132 Senator Allison: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs—With reference to the Non-humanitarian Entry Program:

(1) What are the priorities for professional groups under the program.

(2) What is the current waiting time for teacher applicants under the program.

(3) How many teacher applicants are currently awaiting consideration under the program, broken down into specialist subject areas and country of origin.
(4) What advice, if any, has the department received regarding the demand for teachers.

Notice given 25 February 2002

133 Senator Allison: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—

(1) (a) How many renewable energy certificates (RECs) have been granted for hydro-electricity generation to date; and (b) can details of the RECs awarded to each individual, company and organisation be provided.

(2) How does the number of certificates for hydro-electricity compare to the number of certificates for solar, wind and biomass.

(3) What baseline has been set for Hydro Tasmania.

(4) How many RECs have been awarded to Hydro Tasmania.

(5) Has Hydro Tasmania made any additional investment to obtain these RECs.

Notice given 28 February 2002

134 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) Since January 2000, how many regular passenger transport passengers have passed through Australian airports each month.

(2) In each month, how many of the these passengers were taking: (a) international; (b) interstate; and (c) intrastate journeys.

135 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) What is the current estimated cost of the Sydney Airport Noise Amelioration Program.

(2) What is the total expenditure on the program to date.

(3) To date: (a) how many houses have been insulated; and (b) how many houses remain to be insulated.

(4) (a) How many houses were scheduled to be insulated in 2001; and (b) how many houses were actually insulated.

(5) (a) How many public buildings have now been insulated; and (b) how many public buildings remain to be insulated.

136 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) What is the current estimated cost of the Adelaide Airport Noise Amelioration Program.

(2) What is the total expenditure on the program to date.

(3) To date: (a) how many houses have been insulated; and (b) how many houses remain to be insulated.

(4) (a) How many houses were scheduled to be insulated in 2001; and (b) how many houses were actually insulated.

(5) (a) How many public buildings have now been insulated; and (b) how many public buildings remain to be insulated.
137 **Senator O’Brien**: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to the review of the 1991 Intergovernmental Agreement on Road Funding:

(1) (a) Who commissioned the review; and (b) who is conducting the review.
(2) What are the terms of reference for the review.
(3) (a) What role did the states and local government play in the development of the terms of reference for the review; and (b) what role will the states and local government play in the actual review.
(4) (a) When is the above review scheduled for completion; and (b) what process will be followed in the consideration and implementation of any recommendations that might flow from the above review.
(5) What role will the Australian Transport Council play in the development of recommendations from the above review and the implementation of those recommendations.

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

(1) What was the value of road funding announced by the Government in the lead-up the 2001 federal election.
(2) (a) How many road projects were announced in the lead-up to the 2001 federal election; (b) what is the level of funding allocated for each of these projects; and (c) what is the nature of the work to be carried out in each project.
(3) How much additional funding will be added to the roads budget as a result of road project announcements in the lead-up to the 2001 federal election.
(4) If there is additional funding required for the road budget as a result of spending announcements in the lead-up to the 2001 federal election, will that additional money go to the National Highway and Roads of National Importance Program; if not, where will the additional funding be allocated.

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

(1) Is the department conducting a review of the National Road Transport Commission (NRTC); if not, is there any other agency conducting a review of the NRTC.
(2) If a review is being conducted: (a) Who is actually undertaking the review; (b) what are the terms reference for the review; (c) what is the consultative process to be followed by the department or the reviewing agency as part of the review process; and (d) when is the review scheduled for completion.
(3) What process will be followed in relation to any recommendations that might flow from the review.
(4) When does the Minister expect to make a decision in relation to the recommendations that might flow from the review.

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

(1) Is the department funding any research into causes of deep vein thrombosis (DVT) in air travel; if so: (a) what is the nature of the research; (b) what is the cost of the research; (c) over what period is the research scheduled to run; and (d) who is undertaking that research.
(2) (a) What process was followed by the department in selecting the recipient of the research funding; and (b) who was the final decision-maker in relation to the approval of the expenditure.

(3) What programs are available in the department to fund research into issues like DVT.

(4) Is the department involved in any World Health Organisation or International Civil Aviation Organisation processes that might be investigating the causes of DVT; if so, what is the nature of that involvement.

141 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—

(1) (a) How much of the $4 million allocated for the construction of the Lismore Flood Levee is to be funded through the Flood Recovery Fund; and (b) how much is to be funded through the Flood Assistance Package Business Grants Program.

(2) How much has been spent, or committed, to date through these two programs.

(3) In each case: (a) what projects have attracted funding; (b) what was the amount of funding; and (c) when was the funding approved.

142 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

(1) Has the Minister, the department or the Forests and Wood Products Research and Development Corporation held discussions with the Australian plantation industry about data collection for that industry.

(2) Has any process been put in place, or proposed, that would enable the collection of data about the area of commercial tree planting, the types of trees being planted, the location of those plantings and the commercial returns being realised from the harvesting of plantation timber; if so: (a) who is, or will be, responsible for the data collection process; and (b) how is this process being managed.

(3) If no data collection regime for the plantation industry is in place, or being implemented, why not.

143 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

(1) (a) Was the original Forest Industry Structural Adjustment Package (FISAP) funding allocation for New South Wales for the 2000-01 financial year $24.8 million; and (b) was the FISAP funding for the 2001-02 financial year $11.3 million.

(2) (a) How much of the funding allocation for New South Wales for the 2000-01 financial year was actually spent; (b) what has been spent to date this financial year; and (c) what is the likely expenditure to the end of June 2002.

(3) (a) Was the original FISAP allocation in Victoria for the 2000-01 financial year set at $11.1 million; and (b) was funding of $4.1 million allocated to that state for the 2001-02 financial year.

(4) (a) How much of the funding allocation for Victoria for the 2000-01 financial year was actually spent; (b) what has been spent to date this financial year; and (c) what is the likely expenditure to the end of June 2002.
(5) (a) Was the FISAP funding allocation for Western Australia set at $7.9 million for the 2000-01 financial year; and (b) was the FISAP funding for the 2001-02 financial year set at $4.6 million.

(6) (a) How much of the funding allocation for Western Australia for the 2000-01 financial year was actually spent; (b) what has been spent to date this financial year; and (c) what is the likely expenditure to the end of June 2002.

(7) What is the level of FISAP funding allocation by state for the 2002-03 financial year.

144 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister for Forestry and Conservation—

(1) How many quota holders were actively fishing the Southern Shark Fishery in 2001.

(2) What tonnage was allocated to those quota holders who were not actively working the Southern Shark Fishery in 2001.

(3) What tonnage was allocated to fishers in state waters not actively fishing the Southern Shark Fishery in 2001.

(4) Has the Australian Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA) bought out any state fishers in the Southern Shark Fishery; if so: (a) how many fishers were bought out; and (b) in each case, what was the cost of the buy out.

(5) What gear effort was allocated to the fishers bought out by the AFMA.

(6) Has the AFMA allowed additional fishers into the Tasmanian state shark fishery; if so: (a) how many additional fishers have been allowed into the fishery; (b) when were they allowed into the fishery; and (c) what was the basis for allowing the additional capacity into the fishery.

(7) How many shark fishers in the Tasmanian state shark fishery lost their licences over the period 1994 to 1997 through state regulations.

145 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

(1) What form and what level of detail is required for plans, proposals or submissions seeking funding through the National Action Plan (NAP) on Salinity and Water Quality.

(2) What assessments preceded the approval of funding for the three areas in South Australia that were approved for NAP funding prior to the state election, namely: (a) the lower Murray, the South East and the Lofty Ranges; (b) the northern agricultural districts; and (c) Kangaroo Island.

(3) (a) Who undertook the assessments; (b) when did the assessment process commence; (c) when was the assessment process completed; (d) who approved the applications; and (e) when were the applications approved.

(4) In each case, what negotiations took place with the various community groups in these regions before the applications for funding were approved and the announcement made.

(5) (a) What community groups are associated with each of the above regions; (b) exactly when were they consulted; and (c) in each case, what was the outcome of those negotiations.

146 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

(1) What are the benchmarks referred to on page 121 of the 2001-02 Environment Australia’s Portfolio Budget Statement that will be used to
measure the efficiency of the administration of the National Action Plan on Salinity and Water Quality (NAP).

(2) What process will be followed to test the NAP against these benchmarks.

147 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

(1) What is the proposed level of funding from the Commonwealth, by year, for the Natural Heritage Trust stage 2.

(2) What is the proposed level of funding from the Commonwealth, by year, for the National Action Plan on Salinity and Water Quality.

(3) What was the level of funding for the National Landcare Program for the 2001-02 financial year.

(4) What is the proposed level of funding from the Commonwealth, by year, for the National Landcare Program.

(5) What level of funding, by year, will the National Landcare Program receive through the Natural Heritage Trust stage 2.

148 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

(1) Are Australian Quarantine Inspection Service (AQIS) meat inspectors employed under identical individual contracts.


(3) What process of consultation and negotiation was provided for in relation to the terms of that contract offered to inspectors by AQIS.

(4) (a) When did negotiations on the terms of the contract commence; (b) what were the nature of those negotiations; and (c) when did those negotiations conclude.

(5) (a) Did that contract require inspectors to return the document by 30 April 2001; and (b) would AQIS assume that inspectors who did not meet that deadline did not wish to provide contract services to AQIS.

(6) (a) What was the basis for the imposition of that deadline; and (b) how was that deadline compatible with proper negotiations over the terms of the AQIS offer.

(7) Under this contract, are meat inspectors required to: (a) provide an ABN to AQIS; (b) supply their own equipment, including a knife and a steel; and (c) make their own arrangements for taxation, superannuation, insurance and other overheads.

(8) Do any of the contracted meat inspectors receive more than 80 per cent of their income through their contract with AQIS; if so, would those contractors be regarded as employees for the purpose of their taxation assessment.

(9) Does the AQIS contract explicitly refuse the payment of superannuation guarantee contributions for meat inspectors; if so, is this permitted under the Superannuation Guarantee (Administration) Act 1992.

149 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

(1) (a) What is the budget for the Action Plan for Australian Agriculture (APAA) for the 2001-02 financial year; and (b) what funding is provided in the out years.
(2) Is the APAA still largely built around the *Rural Vision* magazine.

(3) When was the last time the APAA was the subject of a review.

(4) (a) When did that review commence; (b) when was it completed; and (c) what were the findings from that review.

(5) Has the Government responded to the recommendations from the review; if so: (a) which of those recommendations have been picked up, and why; and (b) which of those recommendations have been rejected, and why.

150 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

(1) Has the Australian Bureau of Agriculture and Resource Economics (ABARE) undertaken any research into the impact of deregulation on the Australian dairy industry in addition to the analysis commissioned by the Federal Government as part of the deregulation process; if so: (a) what was the nature of that work; (b) who commissioned the work; and (c) what were the major findings of that work.

(2) Has ABARE undertaken any investigations into the impact of the amendments to the Northern Prawn Fishery Management Plan in 2000 and 2001 on the North Queensland regional economy; if so: (a) when did that work commence; (b) what were the terms of reference; and (c) when was that work completed.

(3) (a) What were the results of that study; and (b) when were those results provided to the Federal Government.

(4) What has been the response from the Federal Government to the findings of that ABARE study.

151 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—

(1) Has the Bureau of Rural Sciences (BRS) commenced a salinity mapping consultancy as part of the National Action Plan on Salinity and Water Quality; if not, why not and when is the work scheduled to commence; if so: (a) where has this work been undertaken to date; and (b) what is the program, by region, to be followed by the BRS in completing this consultancy.

(2) What is the planned timing of the commencement and completion of this work, by state.

(3) (a) What is the value of the contract for the salinity mapping consultancy; and (b) who will meet that cost.

(4) If the states are to contribute to the cost of the project: (a) what is the cost to be met by each state; (b) what is the cost to be met by the Commonwealth; and (c) are there agreements in place with each state to meet those costs.

152 Senator Ridgeway: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Small Business and Tourism—With reference to the collapse of Ansett in 2001 and the $15 million Ansett Holiday Package Relief Scheme:

(1) Following newspaper advertisements in 2001: (a) how many applications were lodged; and (b) of these, how many applications met the funding criteria.

(2) Were all payments to the successful business applicants under this scheme made prior to 25 December 2001, as the department suggested would be the case at the time of the establishment of the scheme.
(3) How much of the $15 million for businesses under this scheme has been allocated.

(4) If funds available under the Ansett Holiday Package Relief Scheme remain unallocated: (a) will those funds remain with AusIndustry, and for what purpose; or (b) will those funds be redirected; if so, to where and for what purpose.

153 Senator Ridgeway: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Small Business and Tourism—with reference to the $5 million made available to Australian households under the Domestic Holiday Rebate Scheme:

(1) How much money has been allocated.

(2) How many households have received a rebate.

(3) What is the average rebate received by each household.

(4) What does the Government intend to do with any surplus funds.

(5) What promotional activities were undertaken by the Government to ensure Australian households were aware of this scheme and how to apply for the rebate.

(6) What costs were incurred as a result of these promotional activities.

154 Senator Ridgeway: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Small Business and Tourism—with reference to the Air Passenger Ticket Levy:

(1) How much money has been raised by the levy since its introduction on 1 October 2001.

(2) How does this amount compare to the expected revenue-raising potential of the levy.

(3) Has the Government made any of these funds available to Ansett workers retrenched prior to 27 February 2002.

(4) Are there sufficient funds available from the levy to meet the entitlements of all Ansett workers (ie, those retrenched prior to and after 27 February 2002); if not, will the levy remain in place until all Ansett workers’ entitlements have been met in full.

(5) Which government authority, instrumentality or entity is in receipt of the monies accrued under the levy to date.

(6) What types of investment schemes have the levy funds been directed to in the interim to ensure the funds maintain value.

(7) What has the performance of these funds been to date.

(8) (a) Is the interest on the principal being used to maintain value for the fund; (b) are these monies also available for the levy; and (c) have these monies been used in any way whatsoever; if so, how; if not, why not.

(9) If the levy generates more revenue than is required to meet the Ansett workers’ entitlements, how will the surplus funds be used.

(10) If the Government is not required to use the levy to repay Ansett workers’ entitlements: (a) how will the funds accrued to date be used; and (b) will the Minister cause the levy to be terminated.

Notice given 1 March 2002

155 Senator Greig: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—with reference to the Bellevue chemical fire in January 2001, and
the claims made on *Four Corners* that toxins have leached into and contaminated soil and groundwater, threatening Perth’s drinking water:


2. Why did the Commonwealth not step in to legislate to control hazardous wastes to the fullest extent of its power when it became clear that the Western Australian State Government had failed to introduce effective waste disposal strategies, as recommended in the report 20 years ago.

3. How does the Commonwealth ensure its citizens are not threatened by poor record keeping, and poor storage and disposal of highly toxic chemicals.

4. Is the Minister aware of the nearby toxic OMEX oil recycling site where the State Government planned to spend $7 million to protect freshwater supplies, largely because of the potential impact of the site on groundwater resources.

5. Given that the toxic disaster area at Bellevue remains one year on and the extent of the threat to water supplies has only just been revealed, will the Government step in and provide funds for the clean-up operation.

6. Given that Australia is a signatory to the Stockholm Convention regarding storage, disposal, production and use of persistent organic pollutants, and given that Australia has recognised the need for a national approach with national standards for certain hazardous wastes, what practical steps has Australia taken to fulfil the aims of the Stockholm Convention.

*Notice given 4 March 2002*

156 **Senator Evans**: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Ageing—With reference to Aged Care Assessment Teams (ACAT), can the following details be provided (in a breakdown by state and territory) for the 1997-98, 1998-99 and 1999-2000 financial years:

1. How many ACAT assessments were carried out.
2. How many individuals were assessed.
3. What was the average number of assessments for those assessed.
4. How many ACAT assessments resulted in an assessment that the person required residential high care.
5. How many ACAT assessments resulted in an assessment that the person required residential low care.
6. How many ACAT assessments resulted in an assessment that the person required community care in the form of a community aged care package.
7. How many ACAT assessments resulted in an assessment that the person did not require one of the above forms of care.
8. How many ACAT assessments took place (identify separately) while the person assessed was in hospital, at home, in a hostel or other location.

157 **Senator Evans**: To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—With reference to the answer to question 123 at the Senate additional estimates hearings of February 2001, can the department provide a full list of the departmental committees and advisory bodies on research education and training on which Dr Jack Best sits, and the remuneration and expenses that has gone to Dr Best from each appointment.

158 **Senator Evans**: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Ageing—
(1) How many serious risk reports under the Aged Care Act were submitted to
the Secretary of the department by the Standards and Accreditation Agency
(separately indicating the total for each state by month, from July 1999).

(2) Did any of these serious risk reports arise other than from a review audit
report; if so: (a) how many; and (b) under what circumstances.

(3) With reference to the Accreditation Grant Principles (3.21) which lists the
reasons why a review audit may be carried out after 1 January 2001: How
many review audits have been carried out to date (indicating how many
were carried out for each of the reasons outlined in 3.21).

159 Senator Evans: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Ageing—Can
the following information be provided on the impact of the Government’s policy
of funding equalisation in relation to nursing home care subsidies:

For each state and territory, and for levels 1 to 4 in the Resident
Classification Scale (RCS), can the Government indicate what the daily
subsidy would be for residents in the 2002-03 financial year through to the
2006-07 financial year, assuming an annual indexation of 1.5 per cent,
2 per cent and 2.5 per cent.

(For example, assuming an indexation of 1.5 per cent provide a table
showing daily care subsidy in each state and territory for RCS levels
1 through to 4. Similar tables would set out the subsidies assuming an
indexation of 2 per cent and 2.5 per cent. These are to be based on the
current daily subsidies for the 2001-02 financial year.)

160 Senator Evans: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Ageing—With
reference to the employment of external quality assessors for the accreditation of
residential aged care facilities:

(1) In each state and territory how many people accessed the training necessary
to become a quality assessor.

(2) What is the average cost of these courses.

(3) In each state and territory how many people are registered with the Quality
Society of Australia as aged care quality assessors.

(4) What is the cost of registering with the society.

(5) In each state and territory how many quality assessors have not participated
in one or more accreditation audits.

(6) In each state and territory how many quality assessors have only
participated in one accreditation audit.

(7) What is the average amount paid to an external quality assessor for
participating in an accreditation audit.

161 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Finance and
Administration—

(1) Since March 1996, by financial year, what was the cost of air charters used
by the Minister or his office.

(2) (a) In each financial year, on how many occasions did the Minister or his
office charter aircraft; and (b) in each case, what was the name of the
charter company that provided the service.

162 Senator O’Brien: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Finance and
Administration—Since March 1996, by financial year, what was the cost of air
charters provided by Vee H Aviation, or associated companies, to the Minister or
his office.
163 Senator Allison: To ask the Special Minister of State—

(1) What precisely are the arrangements that apply to Comcar drivers who volunteer to undertake assignments for senators or members which take longer than a regular or split shift.

(2) Are all the hours worked beyond regular or split shifts accumulated for the quarter.

(3) What are the circumstances under which a driver would get a credit for hours worked beyond the 546 hours on which certified agreements are based.

(4) In what circumstances is the credit for hours worked paid out in overtime.

(5) What are the other options for credited hours.

(6) What meal allowances are Comcar drivers entitled to for shifts that are longer than a regular or split shift.

(7) Is it the case that Comcar drivers are issued with charge cards for only one petrol company; if so, why.

164 Senator Allison: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—Has the Victorian State Government submitted its management plan for relocating grey headed flying foxes from the Melbourne Botanic Gardens to an alternative site; if so, can a copy of the plan be provided.

165 Senator Allison: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Ageing—

(1) Is air conditioning considered a requirement under the categories of ‘resident lifestyle’ or ‘physical environment’ for accreditation of aged care facilities, particularly in Queensland with its extremes of temperature.

(2) Is the Minister aware that Ashworth House, a high care facility in Brisbane, uses wet towels around residents’ necks and cold showers to try to cool them down because promised air conditioning has not been provided.

Notice given 7 March 2002

166 Senator Allison: To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—

(1) When does Telstra expect to install a full telephone service that will allow answer phone and message bank facilities and internet connection, etc. for the Kurungal Aboriginal Council in the West Kimberley region of Western Australia.

(2) Given that the application was made for a telephone connection on 4 December 2001, what is the reason for the delay.

(3) Is it the case that an ‘interim service’ was supplied on 1 March 2002, as promised; if not, why not.

(4) What compensation is payable for this delay in telephone service connection.

167 Senator Allison: To ask the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts—Does the Government intend to continue the current price control arrangements for Telstra beyond the end of June 2002 when they are due to expire; if not, why not; if so, what will be the price cap for household land lines.
168 Senator Brown: To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—With reference to answer to question on notice no. 2558 (Senate Hansard, 9 November 2000, p.19650):

(1) Which premises at Ridgley are being used for the University of Tasmania’s experiments.

(2) If they are not university premises: (a) whose are they; and (b) what is the role of the landlord in the experiments.

(3) When did the Ridgley experiment begin and who are the principals.

(4) What is the difference between these experiments, involving genes from *Agrobacterium rhizogenes*, and those being conducted by Monash University.

(5) How much has the Commonwealth contributed to each of the three sets of experiments listed in the answer to part (a) of question on notice no. 2558.

(6) Are there no expectations or plans to conduct field trials by Monash University, the University of Tasmania or the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation; if there are, what are the expectations or plans.

169 Senator Brown: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 3572 (Senate Hansard, 20 June 2001, p. 24697):

(1) When was the Minister invited to the Chevron Gas Pipeline Project at Moro in Papua New Guinea and by whom.

(2) (a) What was the purpose of the visit; and (b) how was this relevant to the Minister’s responsibilities as Minister for the Environment and Heritage.

(3) Who from the Minister’s office, Environment Australia or any other Government agency participated in the trip.

(4) What was the cost of the trip.

(5) What was the nature and purpose of the briefing by the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) at Moro camp.

(6) Was the Minister briefed on the Kikori Pacific Limited (KPL) ‘eco-forestry’ project.

(7) Did the Minister visit the KPL mill in Kikori.

(8) Did WWF indicate that it would be seeking funding from the Australian Government, through AusAid, to match the financial support provided by Chevron for its work in the area.

(9) What was the purpose of the flight over the Lake Kutubu area.

(10) Who paid for, and participated in, the flight over the Lake Kutubu area.

(11) Does the Government consider the logging of mangroves to supply the KPL mill in Kikori appropriate; if so, why; if not, why not.

(12) Has WWF communicated with the Minister, his staff or Environment Australia about the KPL operations subsequent to media reports of the concerns over mangrove logging; if so, when and what was the general nature of the communication.

(13) Did the Minister visit other project sites while in Papua New Guinea at that time; if so, where else did he visit during the trip.

(14) What and when was the response from WWF.
Senator Brown: To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—With reference to the Government’s decision to reduce Medicare rebates by 50 per cent for psychiatric patients who need more than 50 visits per year to a psychiatrist, and the decision to similarly reduce rebates by half for that group of patients who qualify for item 319 (and related Medicare Benefits Schedule items) if they need ongoing intensive treatment in excess of 160 sessions per year:

(1) How does the Minister explain the continued existence of item 319 (et al) restrictions on treatment of severely-ill patients when the department has been given evidence by the National Association of Practising Psychiatrists as to the detrimental impact, clinically and economically, of these restrictions.

(2) How can the Minister justify a $15 million taxpayer-funded advertising campaign for private health insurance, when he has refused to rebate through Medicare patients who need more than one visit per week to their psychiatrist but who do not satisfy the conditions for item 319.

(3) Can the Minister explain what steps have been taken to overcome the anomaly that there is a significant group of psychiatric patients with severe disorders (eg. borderline personality disorder) who can only be maintained at a functioning level if seen 4 or 5 times per week for long-term treatment, but are financially penalised through a 50 per cent rebate reduction when the item 319 cap is effected.

(4) Is the Minister aware that the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists has indicated in its quality assurance projects that, for these types of patients, long-term intensive treatment has been cited as the treatment of choice.

(5) Can the Minister explain what steps have been taken to eliminate the financial burden for patients who require more than 160 sessions in one year.

(6) Will the Minister agree to review item 319 restrictions, given that the rationale for their introduction (to increase access to services) no longer holds, as shown by the overall decrease in attendances to psychiatrists since 1996.

(7) Will the department meet with the National Association of Practising Psychiatrists to discuss the concerns of patients and clinicians who are entrusted with their care.

Senator Brown: To ask the Minister for Defence—Further to Senator Brown’s question on notice no. 3861 (Senate Notice Paper, 30 August 2001, p.23):

(1) (a) When was the last engagement in which RAAF pilots were involved in low-level flying attacks; and (b) does the Minister anticipate that such flying will be used in future engagements with a sophisticated and well-equipped enemy; if so, can the Minister explain the advantages of this form of use of RAAF craft; if not, can the Minister explain why training in this form of aircraft use is still being undertaken at the Salt Ash air weapons range.

(2) Can the Minister explain why there have been no compensation packages or noise attenuation packages, or even a noise amelioration plan offered to communities which are adversely affected by the RAAF operations at the Salt Ash air weapons range.
(3) Can the Minister explain why the RAAF base at Williamtown has no dedicated Community Liaison Officer and why there are no lines of direct communication between the RAAF base and the general public.

172 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister for Finance and Administration—With reference to the proposed development by the Catholic Education Office of Xavier College High School on approximately 6 hectares of land excised from the north-western sector of the former ADI site lands, adjacent to Llandilo, New South Wales: Is this land presently owned by the Catholic Church; if so, when and on what terms did the Catholic Church acquire this land from the Commonwealth.

173 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Trade—

1. Is Australia discussing or negotiating a free trade agreement with Thailand.
2. When did discussions begin and what is the timetable for completion.
3. Who is conducting the discussions on behalf of Australia and who on behalf of Thailand.
4. What is the scope of the proposed agreement, including the types of products and services that would be covered, the time period, any exclusions, and any related arrangements.
5. (a) What advantages and disadvantages does such an agreement offer Australia; and (b) what advantages and disadvantages does it offer Thailand.

174 **Senator Brown:** To ask the Minister for Forestry and Conservation—With reference to government and industry sources that have recently asserted that more than 8 000 Tasmanians are directly employed in the forest industry: (a) What is the correct figure; and (b) please provide a breakdown showing how many are employed in: (i) Forestry Tasmania; (ii) logging of native forests and of plantations; (iii) planting; (iv) maintenance; (v) transport by road; (vi) other modes of transport; (vii) sawmills; (viii) woodchip mills; (ix) export facilities (please specify); (x) manufacturing involving wood products only; (xi) manufacturing involving wood and other materials; (xii) tourism, recreation, education etc; and (xiii) other (please specify).

**Notice given 8 March 2002**

175 **Senator Conroy:** To ask the Minister representing the Treasurer—

1. (a) How does the Child Support Agency (CSA) determine the cost of raising children; and (b) if the determination is based on research completed by the CSA, or commissioned by or on behalf of the CSA, when and where was that research conducted.
2. Has the CSA made any effort to obtain more relevant and up to date information on the cost of raising children.

176 **Senator Bartlett:** To ask the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage—

1. Is the Minister aware of an assessment by the Queensland Government of the level of commercial fishing in Queensland National Parks in 1999.
2. Is the Minister aware that there is significant commercial fishing in the: (a) Cape Bowling Green National Park and Ramsar site; (b) Great Sandy National Park & World Heritage Area; (c) Hinchinbrook Island National Park and World Heritage Area; (d) Lumholtz National Park and World
Heritage Area; (e) Daintree National Park and World Heritage Area; and (f) Edmund Kennedy National Park and World Heritage Area.

(3) Is it the case that the Commonwealth has management obligations for these areas in line with its international responsibilities for World Heritage areas.

(4) Is the extent of fishing in the Cape Bowling Green and Ramsar site likely to have a significant impact on the ecological character of Cape Bowling Green.

(5) Has fishing in Cape Bowling Green been referred to the Minister under the referral provisions of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*.

(6) Is commercial fishing in the above locations likely to have a significant impact on the values associated with the World Heritage areas.

(7) Have any of the commercial fishing activities in the above World Heritage areas been referred to Environment Australia under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*.

(8) Would a national park system administered by the Commonwealth, instead of being regulated at a state level, be likely to improve the standard of protection and management in areas that are recognised as being of international value.

177 Senator Murray: To ask the Minister representing the Treasurer—According to the Australian Taxation Office, how many small businesses are there in each state and territory (using the small business classifications arising from registrations under the Australian Business Number program, the goods and services tax and the like).

*Notice given 11 March 2002*

178 Senator Ray: To ask the Minister for Finance and Administration—Has there been any occasion on which the department awarded contracts to J P Morgan between 11 March 1996 and 11 March 2002; if so: (a) what was the purpose of each contract; and (b) what was the total cost of each contract.

179 Senator Ray: To ask the Minister for Health and Ageing—

(1) On how many occasions did the department pay the subscription of the former Minister, Dr. Wooldridge, to the Australian Medical Association.

(2) What was the total cost of those payments.

(3) Did the department pay any other professional subscriptions on behalf of the former Minister; if so: (a) what were the organisations concerned; and (b) what was the cost of each of the subscriptions.

180 Senator Ludwig: To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—with reference to an article published in the *Australian* of 4 March 2002 that referred to a plan to give the Australian Federal Police investigative powers similar to those of the United States Federal Bureau of Investigation in crimes that affect the national interests of Australia:

(1) Where were these recommendations made.

(2) Who made these recommendations.

(3) Were the recommendations the result of a report written by Mr Mick Palmer, former Commissioner of the Australian Federal Police.

(4) When will this report be made available to the public.

(5) Will this issue be raised during a meeting of state ministers in April 2002.
(6) If state government leaders disagree with this plan, is the Commonwealth willing to override their views in order to implement such a plan.

(7) By what criteria will the Federal Government deem which crimes are appropriate for this style of police enforcement and investigation.

181 Senator Ludwig: To ask the Minister representing the Treasurer—

(1) Is the Treasury undertaking a review of the Trade Practices Act 1974; if not, why not.

(2) If there is a review being undertaken: (a) has a committee been formed; (b) have submissions been called for; (c) is a discussion paper available to the public; (d) who is on the committee; (e) what are the terms of reference for the review; (f) what is the timetable for the review; and (g) has the review been suspended; if so, at what stage and by whom.

(3) Is the Minister aware of any other reviews of the Act.

182 Senator Ludwig: To ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General—With reference to the consultation on a quality framework for primary dispute resolution under the Family Law Act 1975:

(1) Can copies of public submissions be made available to the Senate; if not, why not.

(2) Has any committee, or other body, been charged with the responsibility of examining the submissions; if not, why not.

(3) Have any recommendations or conclusions been drafted; if not, why not; if so, can they be made available to the Senate.

183 Senator Harris: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services—With reference to documents relating to heavy truck specifications tabled pursuant to orders of the Senate:

(1) In the middle of 1999 was a data disc deliberately corrupted by Mr Scott McFarlane of Roaduser International before being sent to the owner of F1, so that it would be unusable and thus prevent others from analysing the data, and that an uncorrupted disc was not sent until 2 to 3 months later.

(2) Were the air fare and related accommodation costs for the Melbourne to Brisbane return trip on 13 May 1999 that were listed in the external supplier expense document (K99-917, 024-026) relating to the Roaduser Report used solely for that purpose and not used to subsidise the costs of Roaduser personnel attending other functions at the Brisbane Truck Show, unrelated to the report.

(3) Was the second testing of F4, a Mack CH Fleetliner prime mover, undertaken at the request of the manufacturer; if so, was the expense of this additional test costed to the report or to the manufacturer.

(4) (a) Did the manufacturer of the Australian-designed and tested Hendrickson WD2 460 suspension that was fitted to the worst performing vehicle, F6, withdraw that suspension from the market early in 2001 after claiming there was nothing wrong with it; and (b) is it a fact that the manufacturer has no substitute available until a new suspension is introduced in 2002; if so: (i) why was the suspension withdrawn, and (ii) if it was due to its poor performance, why has there not been a recall or other action taken in relation to other vehicles similar in style to F6 fitted with that suspension.

(5) (a) Was Roaduser International’s tender for this investigation $79 400, compared with the losing bidder’s quote of about $120 000; and (b) was the final payment to Roaduser International close to $580 000.
(6) With reference to documents T1112-121-138 and K99-804—126-132, did Roaduser International tender to undertake publicity and problem definition for $8,000, inspect-and-drive appraisals of 6 vehicles for $14,850 ($2,470 each), instrumented testing of 4 vehicles for $33,050 ($8,250 each), computer simulation and analysis relating to 4 instrumented tests for $21,000, assessment of vehicles against industry standards for $5,000, risk amelioration and problem scoping for $3,000 and a report of the investigation for $5,000.

(7) Did Roaduser charge about $80,000 to appraise 13 vehicles ($6,200 each, or 2.5 times the quoted cost per vehicle) even though it did not undertake analysis of each vehicle using Roaduser’s in-house, computer-based performance assessment and did not undertake a lane-change manoeuvre.

(8) Did Roaduser charge about $340,000 for 8 instrumented tests and drives ($42,500 each, or 5 times the quoted cost per vehicle) even though the number of channels of data quoted to be collected was a minimum of 28 compared with only 3 more collected, and evaluation of the vehicle negotiating a standard bump and a steady turn and under severe braking were not carried out.

(9) In relation to the investigation: (a) was Roaduser allowed to charge, for graduate engineers with about 2-years experience on $40,000 per year (or $30 per chargeable hour), a rate around $150 per hour, or more than twice the rate generally charged by consultants for such engineers; (b) were the charge-out rates for the Chief Engineer and Manager Accident Mitigation $250 per hour, and the rate for Dr Peter Sweatman $350 per hour; and (c) have there been any other consultants in the road transport field for which the Australian Transport Safety Bureau has paid similar charge-out rates; if not, can the Minister advise why these rates were paid for this investigation.

(10) Can the Minister confirm that: (a) while the Federal Office of Road Safety tender suggested the use of subcontracted, experienced and qualified organisations to conduct the vibration related tests of the investigation, Roaduser, which was not an experienced or qualified organisation in this field, undertook this work itself; (b) Roaduser quoted on, and undertook measuring of, driver’s seat vibration in the vertical and fore-aft directions only, even though the relevant international standard (ISO 2631-1) required measurements in the side-to-side direction as well, and rates this vibration as being more important than the vertical direction; (c) in order to undertake this work, the Chief Engineer purchased a text on vibration around August 1999; (d) much of the analysis of ‘vibration’ and other data was undertaken by a PhD student with no specific skills in either heavy vehicles or vibration; and (e) Roaduser charged the same hourly rate for this work even though it was not expert in the field.

(11) Given the above, what action is being taken to recover excess monies paid to Roaduser under this contract.

184 Senator Bourne: To ask the Minister for Defence—

(1) What appeal and complaint mechanisms exist for cadets and adult instructors of cadets with regard to decisions of state unit commanders and staff officers of the Australian Defence Force Cadets.

(2) Why is there a compulsory retirement age of 60, with a 2-year discretionary extension, for adult instructors of cadets.
(3) What progress has been made in implementing the recommendations of the Topley Report, *Cadets in the Future*, dated 2000.

185 Senator Allison: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs—

(1) Given the Prime Minister’s recent statement that, ‘the Commonwealth is very strongly committed to ... bridging the gap between the less fortunate in the world and the more fortunate’, why was climate change and its impact on the Commonwealth’s small island nations such as the Maldives, Tuvalu, Tokelau and Kiribati not on the agenda for the recent Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) talks.

(2) Is it the case that Australia vetoed any discussion on climate change or compensation for small island states; if so, why.

(3) Is it the case that Fiji’s Foreign Minister requested that the impact of climate change be included at CHOGM talks.

186 Senator Allison: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources—

(1) (a) Is the Minister aware that coal consumption in ASEAN countries is forecast to rise by 9.5 per cent per year, especially in Malaysia, Thailand and the Philippines and that ASEAN imports are expected to rise by 14 per cent per year to 30 million tonnes by 2010; (b) is the Minister aware that coal imports by Malaysia, Thailand and the Philippines increased by 14 per cent from 1990 to 2000; and (c) based on these figures, what strategies is the Australian Government adopting to ensure Australian coal will be purchased in these growing markets.

(2) (a) Is the Minister aware that since mid-2001, the price for thermal coal has been declining, affected in part by the economic recession precipitated by the events of 11 September 2001; (b) is the Minister aware that Australia did not enter into direct price competition with Chinese exporters, which saw Chinese exports rise; (c) is the Minister aware that industry experts expect that Australian coal exporters will become more price-competitive in 2002 in order to ensure sales; and (d) how will this occur and what role will the Government play.

(3) With reference to the department’s coal trade promotion activities in Asia: (a) what promotional projects and material has the department produced in the past year; (b) what promotional plans does the department have for coal trade promotion in Asia in 2002; and (c) what budget has been allocated.

(4) (a) Does the department spend $1 million annually to promote the use of Australian ‘clean coal’ in the Asia region; and (b) what is this amount spent on.

(5) What work is the department doing to promote Australian renewable energy products and producers in the overseas market.

(6) What meetings has the department organised with the coal industry, in 2001 and 2002, to discuss and plan coal exports to Asia (please list the dates of these meetings together with a list of attendees).

(7) (a) Is the Minister aware that, in 1998-99, lower prices for thermal coal resulted in several mines being closed or placed on care and maintenance; (b) is the Minister aware that as a result, employment in the coal mining industry fell by 3 636 persons (14 per cent) over the year, the largest employment fall in any mining industry; and (c) what strategies does the department have to deal with this fall in employment in the coal industry.
(8) What level of involvement has the department had in securing coal-related projects funded by the Asian Development Bank and the World Bank.

(9) (a) Has the department provided the secretariat for Australia’s role as host of the APEC Energy Working Group during the past 10 years; (b) what is the annual budget for hosting this working group; (c) can a break-down of the budget for this program be provided; (d) what activities have been undertaken; (e) what outcomes have been achieved by hosting this group; and (f) does Australia have any intention of passing this role on to another APEC member in the near future; if so, who.

(10) (a) Is the Minister aware that at the 7th Conference of the parties held in Marrakech, November 2001, a board for CDM projects was established which will develop the process for approving CDM projects; (b) does the International Greenhouse Partnerships Office of the department anticipate that project applications will be called for by mid-2002, and that these will be based on a current pilot project; and (c) what are the current CDM/AIJ pilot projects that involve the mining and energy sector.

(11) (a) What level of consultation does the department have with the coal industry with regard to Australia’s stance on ratification of the Kyoto Protocol; and (b) can a list of meetings, written consultations and briefs prepared by the department on this topic be provided.

(12) (a) Is the Minister aware that the coal-fired power plants proposed for Prachuab Khiri Khan, Thailand, will use coal from the PT Adaro mine in Indonesia, owned by Australian company, New Hope; (b) is the Minister aware that the local people and the Bo Nok Subdistrict Administrative Organization have opposed the project through votes, letters of opposition and demonstrations; (c) has the Australian Ambassador to Thailand, Mr William Fisher, written press releases and letters to the editor, and to the Thai Government, supporting the use of ‘clean coal’; and (d) why does Australia continue to promote the use of Australian coal in this project, despite local opposition.

187 Senator Allison: To ask the Minister for Defence—

(1) What is the current estimated cost of the cancer incidence and mortality study of British nuclear weapons testing personnel.

(2) Which department will fund the study.

(3) How many department personnel are engaged in the: (a) nominal roll; and (b) study.

(4) Can a list of those personnel be provided.

(5) Will dose reconstruction be done as part of the study.

(6) Will this be contracted out.

(7) Can the full minutes of the meetings of the scientific group and the advisory panel be made available.

(8) (a) What would be the cost of providing all surviving servicemen from Maralinga with service pensions and Gold Cards; and (b) how is this cost calculated.

(9) Does the calculation take into account age and disability pensions.

(10) (a) What percentage of survivors already receive service pensions and Gold Cards; and (b) is this taken into account in the calculations.

(11) Will it be possible for the results of the cancer incidence and mortality study to be used in the courts.
(12) Will it be possible for personnel conducting the research and other aspects of the study to be brought to give evidence in support of the veterans; if not, why not.

(13) Given that the study will presumably not report on individuals, will individuals be provided with individual reports; if so, will individuals be able to make these reports public if they wish.

(14) Will those servicemen who are found in the study to have been exposed to high levels of radiation, but whose health condition was not previously followed up, be followed up after the study.

(15) (a) Is the Minister aware that the Health Physics Report, in 1964 stated, ‘Health Physics information and files held at Maralinga have been transferred to Commonwealth X-ray Laboratories in Melbourne, except the records of results obtained from film badges which by mutual agreement were transferred to AWRE’; and (b) has the department requested that these results be returned to Australia for the study; if not, why not.

(16) (a) Is it the case that a veteran, Mr John Hutton, requested records from AWRE and was provided with one page, SFS/OEL/UMB/1(P), which includes Australian servicemen; (b) did the Government point this out in DISR’s request to the United Kingdom (UK); and (c) does the Minister agree that those lists are not just of UK servicemen.

(17) (a) Is the Minister aware that many documents were provided to the Royal Commission and are now in the National Archives, but are still restricted; and (b) will they be made available to the study group.

(18) Will those documents that are not specific to individual medical records be released and/or used by the study group.

(19) Is there a clear document available for veterans and their widows on the options available for compensation claims; if so, can a copy be provided.

(20) What is the success rate for compensation claims that have been made under the Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1988.

(21) How does the Minister explain this very low success rate.

(22) Is there a protocol or are there guidelines for those at Comcare ruling on the cases.

(23) How does the point system work.

(24) Who are the delegates on the Comcare compensation panel.

(25) What are their qualifications.

(26) Given that John Sainsbury is often considered the ‘last resort’ for veterans, what are his qualification for this role.

(27) Is it the case that veterans are not allowed to discuss their cases amongst themselves or with anyone else; if so, why.

(28) Has any sort of analytical study been done of the material put forward in the compensation claim submissions; if not, why not.

(29) Will those applications be considered in the health study.

(30) Can a copy of the 1950s agreement with the UK on legal fees be provided; if not: (a) why not; and (b) what are the implications in respect to Australia’s legal costs in fighting claims for compensation under the common law.
(31) With reference to the answer to question on notice no. 3625 part (4), Senate 
Hansard, 22 August 2001, p. 26428: Why was it not possible for a 
breakdown to be provided of legal fees for each of the court cases.
(32) Did the Australian Government Solicitor (AGS) provide legal services for 
Comcare and common law cases.
(33) What monies have been paid to the AGS in legal fees for compensation 
court cases (can details be provided for Comcare and common law cases 
separately).
(34) (a) What representation has been made by Australia to the UK with regard 
to legal fees for compensation cases in the past 2 years; and (b) can copies 
of correspondence be made available.

Notice given 12 March 2002

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

(1) Has a short-term, cross-agency taskforce been established to ensure that 
action is taken on the high priority recommendations stemming from the 
report, Out of the Maze, by the Family Law Pathways Advisory Group; if 
ot, why not.
(2) Has the Attorney-General placed as a matter of urgency on the agenda for 
the Council of Australian Governments a request to consider ways to 

improve coordination between levels of government to ensure that: 

(a) family law, violence and child abuse matters can be dealt with in the 

same place at the same time;
(b) processes for handling these cases are streamlined;
(c) assessment and resolution of such cases is expedited; and
(d) cooperation is improved and promoted between professionals and 
services working with at-risk families who are involved with the 

family law system; if not, why not.
(3) Has the Attorney-General allowed for funding for the family law system to 
be based on the framework outlined in the report, Out of the Maze; if not, 
why not.
(4) Has the department undertaken any work on the analysis of funding based 
on systematic need in the family law system.
(5) Has the Attorney-General allocated any funding for the family law area to 
be directed towards education, information, early assessment and referral 
and intervention services that will support family decision-making; if not, 
why not.
(6) Has the department liaised with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander 
Commission, or other peak Indigenous community organisations, on 
developing culturally-appropriate service delivery models for Aboriginal 
and Torres Strait Islander communities with respect to family law; if not, 
why not.
(7) Is the Attorney-General currently examining section 61, subsection 60B(2) 
and paragraph 68F(2)(f) of the Family Law Act 1975 in a way that reflects 
recommendation 22 of the report, Out of the Maze.

*189 Senator Greig: To ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture, 
Fisheries and Forestry—
(1) What funding is being, or has been, allocated to the Australian Fisheries Management Authority for the implementation of bycatch action plans for Commonwealth fisheries.

(2) Will this funding continue after the bycatch action plans expire in 2002.

(3) What implementation, enforcement and compliance measures will be implemented to ensure that bycatch reduction strategies are effective.

(4) Will there be an independent observer program as part of each bycatch action plan implementation; if so, please describe the nature of the observer program to be used.

(5) What measures will be introduced to ensure that the impacts of fishing on threatened species are better understood and reduced (please provide information for each threatened and protected marine species in the Commonwealth fisheries).

(6) What steps will be taken to further research and develop improved bycatch reduction technologies and methods.

(7) Will specific performance indicators be identified and bycatch reduction targets be included in the implementation of the bycatch action plans.

(8) Does the Government consider the retention and sale of bycatch, which is then called byproduct, to be a bycatch reduction strategy.

(9) What assessment of these new target byproduct species takes place before their retention and sale is permitted.

(10) Does the assessment include an ecological assessment as opposed to a species specific assessment.

(11) What percentage of proposed bycatch reduction will be the result of designating bycatch as byproduct.

(12) How many non-processing boats were operating in the South East Trawl Fishery (SETF) in: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(13) How many observer trips were made under the Integrated Scientific Monitoring Program (ISMP) in the Blue Grenadier section of the SETF in: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(14) How many observer hours did these trips constitute in: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(15) How many of those observer trips and observer hours took place on non-processing boats in: (a) 1999; (b) 2000; and (c) 2001.

(16) How many reported deaths of seals, albatross and other threatened species have there been under the ISMP in the Blue Grenadier section of the SETF since its inception to date (please provide figures on a year by year basis).

(17) How many seal deaths have been reported in the Blue Grenadier section since 16 July 2000, under section 265 of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

(18) How many seal deaths have been reported in other fisheries since 16 July 2000, under section 265 of the Act.

(19) How many albatross deaths have been reported in all fisheries since 16 July 2000, under section 265 of the Act.

(20) How many deaths of other threatened, marine, migratory and cetacean species were reported since 16 July 2000, under section 265 of the Act.

(21) What funding is being provided to the National Action Plan for Sharks (NAPS).
(22) How will that funding be allocated within the NAPS.

ORDERS OF THE SENATE

Absence of President

1 Authority of Deputy President

That, during the absence of the President, the Deputy President shall, on each sitting day, take the chair of the Senate and may, during such absence, perform the duties and exercise the authority of the President in relation to all proceedings of the Senate and proceedings of committees to which the President is appointed.

(Agreed to 14 February 2002.)

Address-in-reply

2 Address-in-reply

That standing order 3(4) be suspended to enable the Senate to consider business other than that of a formal character before the address-in-reply to the Governor-General’s opening speech has been adopted.

(Agreed to 13 February 2002.)

Committees

3 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
Economics Legislation Committee—Further consideration of the 2001-02 additional estimates

That the Senate—

(a) instructs the Economics Legislation Committee to reconvene for the consideration of additional estimates on 13 March 2002, from 9 am until no later than 1 pm, to hear further evidence from the Minister representing the Treasurer and relevant officers concerning the responsibilities of the Australian Office of Financial Management (AOFM);

(b) directs the Minister to ensure that relevant officers, including Mr Michael Allen, Dr Martin Parkinson and officers serving on the Australian Office of Financial Management Advisory Board, appear before the committee at that hearing for that purpose;

(c) directs the Minister to ensure that the relevant officers bring to the hearing and make available to the committee for inspection and use, relevant documentation, including:

(i) copies of all reviews undertaken since 1996 of the management program for the Commonwealth debt portfolio, including but not limited to:

(A) AOFM: Review of Foreign Currency Exposure, 2000-01, as cited in the AOFM Annual Report, 2000-01,

(B) UBS: A Benchmark for the Commonwealth Debt Portfolio, May 1996, as cited on page 48 of Auditor-General’s report no. 14 of 1999-2000,

(C) UBS: Review of the Benchmark, June 1998, as cited on page 50 of Auditor-General’s report no. 14 of 1999-2000,

(D) Department of the Treasury: Review of the Benchmark, December 1996, as cited on page 54 of Auditor-General’s report no. 14 of 1999-2000,

(E) Department of the Treasury: Review of the Benchmark, November 1997, as cited on page 54 of Auditor-General’s report no. 14 of 1999-2000,

(F) Department of the Treasury: Review of the Benchmark, August 1998, as cited on page 54 of Auditor-General’s report no. 14 of 1999-2000,

(G) Bankers Trust, Carmichael Consulting and Cooper’s & Lybrand, Review of the Benchmark, 1997, as cited by the Treasurer in his press conference of 4 March 2002, and

(H) AOFM. Review of the Benchmark, November 1999, as cited in the AOFM submission to the Joint Committee of Public Accounts and Audit ‘Audit Recommendations and Status of Action as at End April 2000’,
(ii) File AOFM2000/00243 – Executive: Foreign Exchange Risk Management: Foreign Exchange Exposure Review Taskforce: CEO’s working papers,


(vii) File AOFM2000/00124 – Admin Unit: AOFM Advisory Board (Part 1),

(viii) File AOFM2000/00124 - Admin Unit: AOFM Advisory Board (Part 2),

(ix) File AOFM2001/00124 – Admin Unit: AOFM Advisory Board (Part 3),

(x) File AOFM2001/00124 – Admin Unit: AOFM Advisory Board (Part 4),

(xi) File AOFM2000/00316 – Portfolio Research Unit: Debt Management Strategy: AOFM Liability Management Committee Meeting Papers: from 25 October 2000 meeting,


(xiv) File AOFM2000/00234 – Debt Policy Unit: Swaps Policy: Notes Reporting on the Commonwealth of Australia’s Swap Activities during 2000-01,

(xv) File AOFM2001/00015 – Portfolio Research Unit: Swaps Policy: Swap Counterparties Utilisation of Market Exposure Limits,

(xvi) File AOFM2001/00017 – Portfolio Research Unit: Debt Management Strategy: AOFM Liability Management Committee Meeting Papers: from 10 January 2001 meeting, and

(xvii) File AOFM2001/00152 – Portfolio Research Unit: Debt Management Strategy: AOFM Liability Management Committee Meeting Papers: from 2 May 2001 meeting;

(d) directs the Minister to ensure that relevant officers of the Australian Prudential Regulation Authority Insurance and Superannuation Statistics Unit appear before the committee at the hearing to provide evidence on general insurance industry statistics; and

(e) that the time for the presentation of the report of the Economics Legislation Committee on the 2001-02 additional estimates be extended to 19 March 2002.

(Agreed to 12 March 2002.)

5 Estimates hearings

(1) That estimates hearings by legislation committees for the year 2002 be scheduled as follows:

2001-02 additional estimates:
Monday, 18 February and Tuesday, 19 February and, if required, Friday, 22 February (Group A)
Wednesday, 20 February and Thursday, 21 February and, if required, Friday, 22 February (Group B)

2002-03 budget estimates:
Monday, 27 May to Thursday, 30 May and, if required, Friday, 31 May (Group A)
Monday, 3 June to Thursday, 6 June and, if required, Friday, 7 June (Group B)
Wednesday, 20 November, and, if required, Friday, 22 November (supplementary hearings—Group A)
Thursday, 21 November and, if required, Friday, 22 November (supplementary hearings—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, 13 March 2002 in respect of the 2001-02 additional estimates, and
   Wednesday, 19 June 2002 in respect of the 2002-03 budget estimates.

(Agreed to 13 February 2002.)

6 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.)

Meeting of Senate

7 Meeting of Senate
That the days of meeting of the Senate for 2002 be as follows:

Summer sittings:
   Tuesday, 12 February to Thursday, 14 February

Autumn sittings:
   Monday, 11 March to Thursday, 14 March
Tuesday, 19 March to Thursday, 21 March

**Budget sittings:**
Tuesday, 14 May to Thursday, 16 May

**Winter sittings:**
Monday, 17 June to Thursday, 20 June
Monday, 24 June to Thursday, 27 June

**Spring sittings:**
Monday, 19 August to Thursday, 22 August
Monday, 26 August to Thursday, 29 August
Monday, 16 September to Thursday, 19 September
Monday, 23 September to Thursday, 26 September
Monday, 14 October to Thursday, 17 October
Monday, 21 October to Thursday, 24 October
Monday, 11 November to Thursday, 14 November
Monday, 18 November to Tuesday, 19 November
Monday, 2 December to Thursday, 5 December
Monday, 9 December to Thursday, 12 December.

*(Agreed to 13 February 2002.)*

**Orders for production of documents**

8 **Australian Competition and Consumer Commission—Australian grocery retailers—Order for production of documents**

(1) That there be laid on the table, as soon as practicable after 30 June 2001, a report by the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission on the prices paid to suppliers by Australian grocery retailers for the goods that they re-sell, and whether retailers and wholesalers of a similar scale, as customers of suppliers, are offered goods on like terms and conditions, and including:

(a) an assessment, based on a sampling of key suppliers and major retailers of:
   (i) the extent of any price differences,
   (ii) the impact of any such price differences on competition in the relevant markets, and
   (iii) whether there is public benefit in the existence of price differences;

(b) subject to paragraph (2)(b), identification of any conduct found by the commission in the course of preparing the report that is likely to be in breach of the *Trade Practices Act 1974*, together with an account of action taken or proposed to be taken by the commission in respect of such conduct; and

(c) an outline of the circumstances in which, in the commission’s view, differences in prices paid to suppliers by the various industry participants would amount to a breach of the anti-competitive conduct provisions of the Act.

(2) That, in carrying out the requirements of paragraph (1), the commission:

(a) is to take ‘prices’ to include all aspects of the terms and conditions of dealings between retailers or wholesalers and their suppliers,
including the total funding support given by suppliers to the major retailers and wholesalers; and
(b) may withhold genuinely commercially sensitive information from the report provided that the withholding of such information does not prevent the commission from giving the Senate a clear account of the matters mentioned in paragraph (1).

(Agreed to 8 February 2001.)

9 Health—Tobacco—Order for production of document

(1) That the Senate, having regard to:
   (a) the enormous health disaster represented by tobacco;
   (b) the rising costs of tobacco diseases, conservatively estimated at $12.7 billion (1992), that are borne by governments, individuals and businesses, including health care costs, lost productivity, absenteeism, and social security payments;
   (c) the availability of evidence that the tobacco industry in other countries, including parent companies to Australian manufacturers may have engaged in:
      (i) misleading and deceptive conduct to downplay the adverse health effects of smoking and the addictiveness of nicotine, and
      (ii) misleading, deceptive and unconscionable conduct in relation to the marketing of tobacco products to children; and
   (d) the desirability of preventing or reducing loss or damage suffered or likely to be suffered by such conduct, and of compensation being available for any loss and damage suffered or likely to be suffered by that conduct;
resolves that there be laid on the table, no later than 30 April 2002, a report by the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) on the performance of its functions under the Trade Practices Act 1974, with respect to:
   (e) the outcome of ACCC investigations into the conduct of Australian tobacco companies and their overseas parent and affiliate companies in relation to any such misleading, deceptive or unconscionable conduct;
   (f) whether documents publicly released during the course of tobacco litigation in the United States of America contain evidence of anti-competitive behaviour or breaches of Australian law;
   (g) the adequacy of current labelling laws under the Trade Practices (Consumer Product Information Standards) (Tobacco) Regulations to fully inform consumers of the risk that they are exposed to;
   (h) the extent of loss or damage caused, or likely to be caused, by the conduct referred to in paragraph (e) in Australia;
   (i) the extent to which the tobacco industry may be made liable to compensate for that loss or damage, or the extent to which that loss or damage may be prevented or reduced; and
   (j) the potential for tobacco litigation in Australia, including for compensation and remedial action, in respect of that conduct.

(2) That, in preparing a report under paragraph (1), the ACCC is to consider:
   (a) the importance of this issue to Australian public health;
(b) the impact of the costs of treating tobacco-related disease in Australia and the associated productivity losses borne by Australian businesses;

(c) the desirability of ensuring that the tobacco industry is made accountable under the Trade Practices Act in respect of such conduct, that any loss or damage suffered or likely to be suffered by that conduct be prevented or reduced and that any persons harmed or likely to be harmed by that conduct obtain appropriate compensation; and

(d) the potential for overseas parent and affiliate companies being made liable for such loss or damage; and

indicate in its report the action it has taken, and the action it proposes to take, with regard to the matters upon which it is required to report.

(Agreed to 24 September 2001.)

10 Lucas Heights reactor—Order for production of documents

That there be laid on the table, by the Minister for Health and Ageing (Senator Patterson), no later than immediately after motions to take note of answers on Tuesday, 19 March 2002, the following documents:

(a) the post-September 11 security review of the nuclear reactor at Lucas Heights carried out by the Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation; including the original analysis, and review documents from the Australian Safeguards and Non-Proliferation Office, and the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Office;

(b) all documents relating to the modelling and analysis of a deliberate large aircraft crash into the nuclear reactor at Lucas Heights;

(c) all documents relating to the claim made by John Loy at Senate estimates hearings on 20 February 2002, that should the reactor at Lucas Heights be breached, the ‘doses to any individual would be relatively small’ and that ‘the total collective radiation dose that is figured in that would be comparable to, but a little in excess of, the collective dose that was in the reference accident in the siting licence assessment for the Lucas Heights site, but not dramatically so’, including any documentation modelling this claim;

(d) any documents relating to the financial capacity and viability of INVAP since 1 January 2002;

(e) all documents relating to the selection of INVAP through the tender process; and

(f) all documents relating to guarantees made by the Argentinian Government in relation to INVAP’s tender and subsequent contract to construct the Lucas Heights reactor.

(Agreed to 12 March 2002.)

Orders for production of documents still current from previous parliaments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of order</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Addressed to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.10.1995</td>
<td>Administrative decision-making—Effect of international instruments</td>
<td>Minister representing the Attorney-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of order</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Addressed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.05.1998</td>
<td>Waterfront reform</td>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.03.2000</td>
<td>Environment—Queensland—Tree clearing</td>
<td>Minister for the Environment and Heritage (Senator Hill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.04.2000</td>
<td>Aged care—Riverside Nursing Home</td>
<td>Minister representing the Minister for Aged Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.06.2000</td>
<td>Tax reform—Petrol pricing</td>
<td>Assistant Treasurer (Senator Kemp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.11.2000</td>
<td>Environment—Tasmania</td>
<td>Minister representing the Minister for Sport and Tourism (Senator Minchin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.03.2001</td>
<td>Taxation</td>
<td>Minister representing the Treasurer (Senator Kemp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.05.2001</td>
<td>HIH Insurance</td>
<td>Minister representing the Treasurer (Senator Kemp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.05.2001</td>
<td>Workplace relations</td>
<td>Minister representing the Minister for Employment, Workplace Relations and Small Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.08.2001</td>
<td>Foreign Affairs—Japanese fishing boats</td>
<td>Minister representing the Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.08.2001</td>
<td>Transport—Black Spot Project</td>
<td>Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.08.2001</td>
<td>Environment—Great Barrier Reef—Water quality control</td>
<td>Leader of the Government in the Senate (Senator Hill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.09.2001</td>
<td>Transport—Ansett Australia</td>
<td>Minister representing the Minister for Transport and Regional Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.09.2001</td>
<td>Transport—Ansett Australia</td>
<td>Minister representing the Prime Minister</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 Stott Despoja)  
   Senator Brown  
   Senator Harradine  
   Senator Harris
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 Stott Despoja)**
   Senator Brown
   Senator Harradine
   Senator Harris
   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 Stott Despoja)**
   Senator Brown
   Senator Harradine
   Senator Harris
   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 Stott Despoja)**
Senator Brown
Senator Harradine
Senator Harris

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 Stott Despoja)
   Senator Brown
   Senator Harradine
   Senator Harris

   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 Stott Despoja)
   Senator Brown
   Senator Harradine
   Senator Harris

   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 Stott Despoja)
   Senator Brown
   Senator Harradine
   Senator Harris

   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 Stott Despoja)
   Senator Brown
   Senator Harradine
   Senator Harris

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 Stott Despoja)
   Senator Brown
   Senator Harradine
   Senator Harris

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 Bartlett, Calvert, Chapman, Cook, Crowley, Ferguson, Forshaw, Hogg, Knowles, Lightfoot, McKiernan, 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
Superannuation and Financial Services

Joint Statutory Committees
ASIO, ASIS and DSD
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; reporting date: 16 May 2002)
Members
Senator Cook (Chair), Senators Bartlett, Brandis, Collins, Faulkner, Heffernan, Mason and Murphy

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 Boswell, Bourne, Heffernan, Ian Macdonald, Ray and Schacht

ASIO, ASIS and DSD—Joint Statutory Committee
Members
Senators Calvert, Sandy Macdonald and Ray

Broadcasting of Parliamentary Proceedings—Joint Statutory Committee
Members
The President, the Speaker and Senators Knowles and West

Community Affairs Legislation Committee
Portfolios
Family and Community Services; Health and Ageing
Members
Senator Knowles (Chair), Senator Allison (Deputy Chair), Senators Bishop, Denman, Herron and Tchen
Participating members
Senators Abetz, Calvert, Carr, Chapman, Coonan, Crane, Crowdley, Eggleston, Evans, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Forshaw, Gibbs, Harradine, Lightfoot, McGauran, McLucas, Murphy, Payne, Tierney and Watson
Senators Lees for matters relating to the Health portfolio
Senator Cherry for matters relating to the Family and Community Services portfolio
Report presented
Matters not disposed of at the end of the 39th Parliament (tabled 14 February 2002)

Community Affairs References Committee
Members
Senator Crowley (Chair), Senator Knowles (Deputy Chair), Senators Lees, Gibbs, McLucas and Tchen
Participating members
Senators Abetz, Bartlett, Bishop, Calvert, Carr, Chapman, Coonan, Crane, Denman, Eggleston, Evans, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Forshaw, Harradine, Lightfoot, Mason, McGauran, Murphy, Payne, Tierney, Watson and West
Senator Cherry for the Family and Community Services portfolio

Current inquiry
Nursing (referred 5 April 2001; readopted 14 February 2002; reporting date: 27 June 2002)

Report presented
Matters not disposed of at the end of the 39th Parliament (tabled 14 February 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
Senators Brandis, Chapman, Conroy, Cooney and Murray

Economics Legislation Committee

Portfolios
Treasury; Industry, Tourism and Resources

Members
Senator Brandis (Chair), Senator Collins (Deputy Chair), Senators Chapman, Murray, Schacht and Watson

Substitute members
Senator Allison to substitute for Senator Murray for matters relating to the Resources portfolio
Senator Mason to substitute for Senator Chapman until 8 April 2002

Participating members
Senators Abetz, Boswell, Calvert, Carr, Conroy, Coonan, Crane, Eggleston, Evans, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Forshaw, Harradine, Knowles, Lightfoot, McGauran, Murphy, Payne, Ridgeway, Sherry, Tchen and Tierney

Report 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)

Economics References Committee

Members
Senators Bolkus, Brandis, Chapman, Collins, Cook and Ridgeway

Substitute member
Senator Allison to substitute for Senator Ridgeway for matters relating to the Resources portfolio

Participating members
Senators Abetz, Boswell, Calvert, Carr, Conroy, Coonan, Crane, Eggleston, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Forshaw, Harradine, Knowles, Lightfoot, Mason, McGauran, Murphy, Murray, Payne, Sherry, Tchen, Tierney and Watson

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)

Electoral Matters—Joint Standing Committee
(appointed 14 February 2002)
Members
Senators Bartlett, Ferris, Mason, Murray and Ray

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 Brandis, Carr, Ferris and Stott Despoja
Substitute members
Senator Murray to substitute for Senator Stott Despoja for matters relating to the Workplace Relations portfolio
Senator Lees to substitute for Senator Stott Despoja for matters relating to the Training portfolio
Senator Cherry to substitute for Senator Stott Despoja for matters relating to the Employment portfolio
Senator Allison to substitute for Senator Stott Despoja for matters relating to the Schools portfolio
Senator Crane to substitute for Senator Brandis for matters relating to the Employment, Workplace Relations and Small Business portfolio
Participating members
Senators Abetz, Boswell, Calvert, Chapman, Coonan, Crane, Eggleston, Evans, Faulkner, Ferguson, Forshaw, Gibbs, Harradine, Hutchins, Knowles, Lightfoot, Mason, McGauran, Murphy, Payne, Sherry and Watson

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 Brandis, Carr, Crossin and Stott Despoja
Substitute members
Senator Murray to substitute for Senator Stott Despoja for matters relating to the Workplace Relations portfolio
Senator Lees to substitute for Senator Stott Despoja for matters relating to the Training portfolio
Senator Cherry to substitute for Senator Stott Despoja for matters relating to the Employment portfolio
Senator Allison to substitute for Senator Stott Despoja for matters relating to the Schools portfolio

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Boswell, Buckland, Calvert, Chapman, Coonan, Crane, Crowley, Denman, Eggleston, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Forshaw, Harradine, Hutchins, Knowles, Lightfoot, Mason, McGauran, Murphy, Payne, Sherry and Watson

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)

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, Calvert, Lundy and Tchen

Substitute member

Senator Greig to substitute for Senator Bartlett for matters relating to the Information Technology portfolio

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Bolkus, Boswell, Carr, Chapman, Coonan, Crane, Evans, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Harradine, Knowles, Lees, Lightfoot, McLucas, Mason, McGauran, Murphy, Tierney and Watson

Senators Allison and Bourne for the Communications portfolio

Senator Stott Despoja for the Information Technology portfolio

Senator Ridgeway for the Arts portfolio

Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts References Committee

Members

Senator Allison (Chair), Senator Tchen (Deputy Chair), Senators Lundy, Mackay, McLucas and Tierney

Participating members

Senators Abetz, Bolkus, Boswell, Buckland, Calvert, Carr, Chapman, Coonan, Crane, Eggleston, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Harradine, Knowles, Lees, Mason, McGauran, Murphy, Payne and Watson

Senator Bartlett for the Environment portfolio

Senators Greig and Stott Despoja for the Information Technology portfolio
Senator Ridgeway for the Arts portfolio

Current inquiry
Urban water management (referred 5 April 2001; readopted 14 February 2002; reporting date: 27 June 2002)

Report presented
Matters not disposed of at the end of the 39th Parliament (tabled 14 February 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 Lightfoot

Participating members
Senators Abetz, Carr, Chapman, Conroy, Coonan, Crane, Eggleston, Evans, Ferguson, Ferris, Harradine, Knowles, McGauran, Murphy, Payne, Ridgeway, Sherry, Tchen, Tierney and Watson

Finance and Public Administration References Committee

Members
Senator Forshaw (Chair), Senator Watson (Deputy Chair), Senators Lightfoot, Lundy, Ridgeway and Schacht

Participating members
Senators Abetz, Brandis, Calvert, Carr, Chapman, Coonan, Crane, Conroy, Eggleston, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Harradine, Knowles, Mason, McGauran, Murphy, Murray, Payne, Sherry, Tchen and Tierney
Senator Allison for public service issues

Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade—Joint Standing Committee
(appointed 14 February 2002)

Members
Senator Bourne, Calvert, Chapman, Cook, Evans, Ferguson, Gibbs, Harradine, Hutchins, Sandy Macdonald, Payne and Schacht

Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee

Portfolios
Foreign Affairs and Trade; Defence (including Veterans’ Affairs)

Members
Senator Sandy Macdonald (Chair), Senator Hogg (Deputy Chair), Senators Bourne, Evans, Ferguson and Payne

Participating members
Senators Abetz, Bishop, Boswell, Brandis, Carr, Chapman, Coonan, Crane, Eggleston, Faulkner, Ferris, Forshaw, Harradine, Hutchins, Knowles, Mason, McGauran, McKiernan, Murphy, Tchen, Tierney and Watson

---

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

*Members*

Senator Hogg (*Chair*), Senator Sandy Macdonald (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Bourne, Hutchins, Lightfoot and West

*Participating members*

Senators Abetz, Bishop, Boswell, Brandis, Calvert, Carr, Chapman, Coonan, Crane, Denman, Eggleston, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Forshaw, Harradine, Knowles, Mason, McGauran, McKiernan, Murphy, Payne, Tchen, Tierney and Watson

*Report 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*)

---

**House—Standing Committee**

*Members*

The Deputy President (*Chair*), Senators Brandis, Calvert, Carr, Collins, Gibbs and Knowles

---

**Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee**

*Portfolios*

Attorney-General; Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs

*Members*

Senator Payne (*Chair*), Senator McKiernan (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Cooney, Greig, Mason and Scullion

*Substitute member*

Senator Lees to substitute for Senator Greig for matters relating to the Indigenous Affairs portfolio

*Participating members*

Senators Abetz, Bolkus, Brandis, Calvert, Carr, Chapman, Crane, Eggleston, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Harradine, Knowles, Lightfoot, Ludwig, McGauran, Murphy, Sherry, Tchen, Tierney and Watson

Senator Bartlett for the Immigration and Multicultural Affairs portfolio

*Current inquiries*

Provisions of the Proceeds of Crime Bill 2002 and provisions of the Proceeds of Crime (Consequential Amendments and Transitional Provisions) Bill 2002 (*referred immediately upon the introduction of the bills in the House of Representatives pursuant to the order of the Senate of 14 February 2002; reporting date: 14 March 2002*)

Statutory powers and functions of the Australian Law Reform Commission (*referred 1 December 1998 on adoption of the 73rd report of the Committee of Privileges; readopted 11 March 2002; reporting date: 30 June 2002*)
Report presented
Matter not disposed of at the end of the 39th Parliament (tabled 11 March 2002)

Legal and Constitutional References Committee
Members
Senator McKiernan (Chair), Senator Payne (Deputy Chair), Senators Cooney, Greig, Ludwig and Scullion
Substitute members
Senator Lees to substitute for Senator Greig for matters relating to the Indigenous Affairs portfolio
Senator Murray to substitute for Senator Greig for the committee’s inquiry into sections 46 and 50 of the Trade Practices Act 1974
Participating members
Senators Abetz, Bolkus, Brandis, Brown, Calvert, Carr, Chapman, Crane, Eggleston, Faulkner, Ferguson, Ferris, Harradine, Knowles, Lightfoot, Mason, McGauran, Murphy, Sherry, Tchen, Tierney and Watson
Senator Bartlett for the Immigration and Multicultural Affairs portfolio
Current inquiries
Outsourcing of the Australian Customs Service’s Information Technology (referred 26 June 2001; readopted 11 March 2002; reporting date: 14 May 2002)
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)

Library—Standing Committee
Members
The President (Chair), Senators Boswell, Crowley, Mackay, Scullion, Sherry and Tierney

Migration—Joint Standing Committee
(appointed 14 February 2002)
Members
Senators Bartlett, Eggleston, McKiernan and Tierney

National Capital and External Territories—Joint Standing Committee
(appointed 14 February 2002)
Members
The Deputy President and Chairman of Committees, the Deputy Speaker, Senators Greig, Crossin, Lightfoot, Lundy and Watson
National Crime Authority—Joint Statutory Committee

Members

Senators George Campbell, Denman, Ferris, Greig and McGauran

Native Title and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Fund—Joint Statutory Committee

Members

Senators Crossin, Ferris, Lees, Mason and McLucas

Privileges—Standing Committee

Members

Senators Eggleston, Evans, Knowles, McGauran, Payne, Ray and Sherry

Current inquiry

(a) Whether any breaches of the immunities of the Senate or contempts were involved in the search and seizure, and continued possession, by the Queensland police of material from the office of Senator Harris, and, if so, what remedies should be applied; (b) whether any steps should be taken to ensure that any such material protected from seizure by parliamentary privilege is returned to Senator Harris without further access to the material by the police; and (c) whether procedures should be established to ensure that, in cases of the execution of search warrants in senators’ premises, material protected by parliamentary privilege is appropriately treated (referred 14 February 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 Bourne, Ian Campbell, Eggleston, Ferguson, Ludwig and Ray

Public Accounts and Audit—Joint Statutory Committee

Members

Senators Colbeck, Crowley, Hogg, Murray, Scullion and Watson

Public Works—Joint Statutory Committee

Members

Senators Calvert, Ferguson and Forshaw

Publications—Standing Committee

Members
Senators Bishop, Calvert, Chapman, Hutchins, Lightfoot, McLucas and McKiernan

**Regulations and Ordinances—Legislative Scrutiny Standing Committee**

*Members*
- Senator Tchen (*Chairman*), Senators Bartlett, Brandis, Buckland, Ludwig and Mason

**Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

*Portfolios*
- Transport and Regional Services; Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

*Members*
- Senator Crane (*Chair*), Senator Buckland (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Cherry, Ferris, McGauran and O’Brien

*Participating members*
- Senators Abetz, Boswell, Calvert, Carr, Chapman, Coonan, Eggleston, Faulkner, Ferguson, Harradine, Hutchins, Knowles, Lightfoot, Mason, Sandy Macdonald, McKiernan, McLucas, Murphy, Payne, Tchen, Tierney and Watson
- Senator Bartlett for animal welfare issues
- Senator Greig for the Fisheries and Transport portfolios

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

*Members*
- Senator Ridgeway (*Chair*), Senator Crane (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Buckland, Ferris, Mackay and O’Brien

*Participating members*
- Senators Abetz, Boswell, Calvert, Carr, Chapman, Coonan, Eggleston, Faulkner, Ferguson, Harradine, Hutchins, Knowles, Lightfoot, Mason, McGauran, Sandy Macdonald, McKiernan, Murphy, Payne, Tchen, Tierney and Watson
- Senator Bartlett for animal welfare issues
- Senator Greig for the Fisheries and Transport portfolios

**Scrutiny of Bills—Legislative Scrutiny Standing Committee**

*Members*
- Senator Cooney (*Chairman*), Senators Crane, Crossin, Ferris, Mason and Murray

*Alert Digest presented*
- No. 1 of 2002 (presented to the President on 21 February 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 11 March 2002)

*Report presented*
- No. 1 of 2002 (*presented to the President on 21 February 2002, pursuant to standing order 38(7); tabled 11 March 2002*)

**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, Crossin and Ferris

Senators’ Interests—Standing Committee
Members
Senators Allison, Brandis, Bolkus, Collins, Denman, Forshaw, Herron and Lightfoot
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)

Superannuation and Financial Services—Select Committee
(appointed 22 September 1999 with effect on and from 11 October 1999)
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
Senators Bartlett, Cooney, Ludwig, Mason, McGauran, Schacht and Tchen

SENATE APPOINTMENTS TO STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

Advisory Council on Australian Archives
Senator Faulkner (appointed 27 June 1999 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).
**MINISTERIAL REPRESENTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minister</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senator the Honourable Robert Hill&lt;br&gt;Minister for Defence&lt;br&gt;Leader of the Government in the Senate</td>
<td>Prime Minister&lt;br&gt;Minister for Trade&lt;br&gt;Minister for Foreign Affairs&lt;br&gt;Minister for the Environment and Heritage&lt;br&gt;Minister for Veterans’ Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator the Honourable Richard Alston&lt;br&gt;Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts&lt;br&gt;Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate</td>
<td>Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations&lt;br&gt;Minister for Education, Science and Training&lt;br&gt;Minister for Science&lt;br&gt;Minister for Employment Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator the Honourable Nicholas Minchin (Nick)&lt;br&gt;Minister for Finance and Administration</td>
<td>Treasurer&lt;br&gt;Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator the Honourable Amanda Vanstone&lt;br&gt;Minister for Family and Community Services&lt;br&gt;Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for the Status of Women</td>
<td>Minister for Children and Youth Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator the Honourable Kay Patterson&lt;br&gt;Minister for Health and Ageing</td>
<td>Minister for Ageing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator the Honourable Christopher Ellison (Chris)&lt;br&gt;Minister for Justice and Customs</td>
<td>Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs&lt;br&gt;Attorney-General&lt;br&gt;Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator the Honourable Ian Macdonald&lt;br&gt;Minister for Forestry and Conservation</td>
<td>Minister for Transport and Regional Services&lt;br&gt;Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry&lt;br&gt;Minister for Regional Services, Territories and Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator the Honourable Charles Kemp (Rod)&lt;br&gt;Minister for the Arts and Sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator the Honourable Eric Abetz&lt;br&gt;Special Minister of State</td>
<td>Minister for Small Business and Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator the Honourable Helen Coonan&lt;br&gt;Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parliamentary Secretaries**

| Senator the Honourable Ian Campbell<br>Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer<br>Manager of Government Business in the Senate |  |
| Senator the Honourable Judith Troeth<br>Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry |  |
| Senator the Honourable William Heffernan (Bill)<br>Parliamentary Secretary to Cabinet |  |
| Senator the Honourable Ronald Boswell (Ron)<br>Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Transport and Regional Services |  |

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.