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Mr SPEAKER (Mr Neil Andrew) took the chair at 2.00 p.m., and read prayers.

BUSINESS

Motion (by Mr Reith)—by leave—agreed to:

That so much of the standing and sessional orders be suspended as would prevent the routine of business for this sitting being, unless otherwise ordered, a motion to be moved by the Prime Minister relating to terrorist attacks in the United States of America.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: TERRORIST ATTACKS

Mr HOWARD (Bennelong—Prime Minister) (2.01 p.m.)—I move:

That this House:

(1) expresses its horror at the terrorist attacks which have claimed so many lives in the United States of America;

(2) conveys to the Government and people of the United States of America the deepest sympathy and sense of shared loss felt by the Government and people of Australia;

(3) extends condolences to the families and other loved ones of those Australians killed or missing as a result of the attacks;

(4) declares that such attacks represent an assault, not only on the people and the values of the United States of America, but of free societies everywhere;

(5) praises the courageous efforts of those engaged in the dangerous rescue operation still underway;

(6) believes that the terrorist actions in New York City and Washington DC constitute an attack upon the United States of America within the meaning of Articles IV and V of the ANZUS Treaty;

(7) fully endorses the commitment of the Australian Government to support within Australia’s capabilities United States-led action against those responsible for these tragic attacks; and

(8) encourages all Australians in the wake of these appalling events to display those very qualities of tolerance and inclusion which the terrorists themselves have assaulted with such awful consequences.

In the 27 years that I have been privileged to be a member of this parliament, I can think of no more sombre occasion than the circumstances under which this House meets today. We have had tragedies of a national and international kind before. We have been touched by the poignancy of the deaths of people. We have confronted significant moral and national challenges, but none matches in depth, scale and magnitude the consequences of what the world must now do in response to the terrible events in the United States last week.

In sheer scale, the death and destruction are almost incomprehensible in a time not regarded as a time of war. It would appear that more than double the number of Americans who died at Pearl Harbour have died in New York City and Washington as a result of these terrorist attacks. The death toll could easily be more than the entire American battle losses on the first day of the Normandy invasion in June of 1944. They dwarf, of course, the terrible loss inflicted by Timothy McVeigh’s act of madness on the federal building in Oklahoma some six or seven years ago. So it is in every sense a tragedy and an obscenity of an appalling and repugnant magnitude.

It goes beyond the death so cruelly inflicted without warning, without justification and without any skerrick of moral authority on innocent people merely going about their daily lives; its context represents a massive assault on the values not only of the United States of America but also of this country—the values of free men and women and of decent people and decent societies around the world. It is an act of terror. It is an act which is repugnant to all of the things that we as a society believe in. On occasions like this, those things that divide us in this parliament, those things that we might bicker and quarrel over as a people, as we go about our lives, are so suddenly and so quickly put into perspective.

I remember the morning in Washington—as the House knows, I had been in the United States. I had been for an early morning walk. It was a beautiful Washington morning—there was just a touch of autumn. I had walked past the Lincoln memorial and many of the other great memorials of that great nation which stood between us and tyranny.
on one critical occasion in our history. I, like millions of other Australians, was deeply moved and distressed. I felt an enormous sense of empathy towards the American people who had suffered this awful deed.

Out of that tragedy have come, as always, great stories of the spirit and the heroism of men and women in circumstances of disaster and tragedy. As much as we are devastated and distressed by what has happened, and as much as we feel repelled by the belief that there should be people on our earth who would want to plot for years to undertake such attacks, as always the events that followed these attacks have given us a source of great hope and faith in the resilient spirit of men and women who face moral and physical danger and challenge. The stories of heroism that have come out of these events are a tribute to the spirit of the American people and a tribute to the spirit of resilient men and women around the world. Who will ever forget the story of that wonderful Father Mychal Judge, the chaplain of the New York Police Department, who remained behind to deliver the last rites of the Catholic Church to a dying fireman, or the immense courage of those three people on the plane that crashed in Pittsburgh who, knowing they faced certain death, decided to tackle the terrorists in the cockpit, perhaps averting even further destruction being rained on either Washington or New York?

As we struggle as Australians and as we struggle as citizens of the world to come to terms with what has happened, it is certain, as others have said, that the world has changed. We are all diminished, we are all changed, and we are all rather struggling with the concept that it will never be quite the same again. This is no isolated act of terrorism: this is the product of years of careful planning, it is the product of evil minds and it is the product of an attitude of a group of people who in every sense invoke those very evocative words of Winston Churchill when he said that those responsible for the Nazi occupation of Europe should be regarded in their brutish hour of triumph as the moral outcasts of mankind.

This is a tragedy which has touched many Australian homes. There is grief and sadness in hundreds of Australian homes at present. The sheer scale of the loss of life suffered by our American friends has perhaps dwarfed the realisation that up to 80 or 90 Australians have lost their lives. There will be many in this House who will know somebody or who will know the family of somebody who died in New York or in Washington. Moreover, we will know people who, simply as a result of the lottery of life, escaped death. In my own case it is a former Treasury official and economic adviser of mine employed by Morgan Stanley, a firm which had 3,500 employees in that building. But for the happy circumstance for him of being on parental leave for the birth of his second child, he would have been in the building. Two hundred of his work mates are yet unaccounted for. That story can be repeated time without number.

The number of Australians who have died is a reminder of just how interconnected we all are. This attack has brought home to us many things. It has brought home to us the global character of our world. I suppose in their evil disposition those who launched this attack had that precisely in mind. When you think about it, it was an outrage to attack buildings in a city which is a monument to inclusion. There is no more multiracial city in the world; there is no city in the world that has more generously welcomed people from around the globe than the city of New York. When you go through those poignant photographs of those who died, so many of them tragically young, you have white faces and black faces; you have smiling Irish-American faces, you have Asian faces and you have Hispanic faces; you have bearded faces and you have clean shaven faces. I have no doubt that amongst those who died were many Americans of the Islamic faith, and that is an issue to which I will return in a moment.

In the wake of this tragedy, we express our unstinted admiration for those who risked their lives. The tragedy upon tragedy of an event like this is that people such as firemen and policemen, whose sworn duty in life is to help others, often in the process risk their own lives and pay a greater price.
The world will think and ponder and react in different ways. In reacting to what has occurred, it is important to do so with calm and steely determination. Justice, decency and humanity require that no effort be spared to bring to justice and to punish unconditionally those who have been responsible for these deeds. Because I was in Washington I had the opportunity to express immediately to the US administration the willingness of the Australian government to work with the Americans in responding. I take the opportunity of thanking the Leader of the Opposition for the way in which he has associated the Australian Labor Party with the response that I have made to the administration.

These events do bear very much upon the relationship between our two great societies. The World Trade Centre itself was a centre for many activities and many activities in which Australians and Americans worked together, and it is therefore with symbolic as well as practical resonance that any response that is undertaken, if we are asked and within the limit of our capability, will have the involvement of the United States.

I did have the opportunity when I was in Washington the day after the attack to visit Congress to hear the resolution passed by the House of Representatives and then to go onto the floor of the Senate and particularly to personally extend my condolences to Senator Clinton and Senator Schumer, the two Democrat senators representing the state of New York in the United States Senate. The bonds between our two nations run very strong and very deep. They present themselves and manifest themselves in many ways, but none more so than in our shared commitment to liberty, our shared commitment to peace. The President said a few days ago that the American people are peaceful people. So indeed are we. We have a great peace-loving tradition.

Also, when we think of our military tradition, we think of it not in terms of seeking to inflict our views and our will on others but rather seeking, when required, to stand up and fight for the things that we really believe in. Standing up and fighting for the things that we believe in over the months and perhaps the years ahead in the wake of these terrible events will require perseverance. There is united, righteous, deep, seething anger around the world at present. But, as the months go by and as perhaps the early dividends of retaliatory action are not ready and not apparent, some of that anger may subside; and some may argue that the extra miles that are required to be travelled are not really worth it. But, if those who died last Tuesday are not, in the judgment of history, to have died in vain, there is an obligation on all of us to persevere, to travel the distance, to persist and to root out the evil that brought about those terrible deeds.

But, in the process of responding, we must do so with care as well as with lethal force. We should understand that barbarism has no ethnicity and evil has no religion. Both around the world and within our own society, we should take pause lest we engage in the evil of scapegoating individual groups within our society. I have said on a number of occasions that I know that my fellow Australians of Islamic faith are overwhelmingly as appalled about what happened as I am, as an inadequately practising Christian. This is an assault on values common to all the great religions of the world, and it is also an assault on the values of many people who profess no religion. I say to my fellow Australians of Islamic faith or of Middle Eastern descent that I extend to you the hand of friendship. You are part of our great society; you are part of the fabric of the great, decent, freedom loving, fair minded Australian nation; and you are as entitled to share my outrage, my sorrow, my anger and my sadness as are others within our community—because wouldn’t it be a terrible, tragic, obscene irony if in responding, however we do it as individuals or as nations, to these terrible terrorist attacks we forsook the very things that we believed had been assaulted last Tuesday in New York?

It has been said many times in the wake of these attacks that words are inadequate to express how you feel. Nobody is ever really prepared for personal tragedy. Nobody is ever really prepared for the sudden death of a wife, a husband, a son, a daughter, a sibling or another loved one, or a close friend. No nation is ever ready or ever prepared to re-
spond to a tragedy of this order and of this magnitude, and in the end the quality of our people and the quality of our society will be judged by how we respond: we will be judged very harshly in the eyes of those left bereaved by the people who died if we do not respond effectively and to the full measure of our capability but we will be also judged very critically if we respond in a careless or an indiscriminate fashion.

Finally, the experience of being in the American capital at the time enabled me to feel a sense of the despair and the desolation of the American people but also a sense of their great spirit, their great resilience, their great faith and the depth of their belief in the inherent decency of their society. The wonderful words spoken by the United States Ambassador at the memorial service earlier today beautifully evoked the spirit of a people who have carried heavy burdens, a people who have suffered a great deal and a people who have been joined to this country in every major conflict of the last 100 years.

In every way, the attack on New York and Washington and the circumstances surrounding it did constitute an attack upon the metropolitan territory of the United States of America within the provisions of articles IV and V of the ANZUS Treaty. If that treaty means anything, if our debt as a nation to the people of the United States in the darkest days of World War II means anything, if the comradeship, the friendship and the common bonds of democracy and a belief in liberty, fraternity and justice mean anything, it means that the ANZUS Treaty applies and that the ANZUS Treaty is properly invoked.

As a proud, patriotic Australian, I was literally moved to tears by what occurred in the United States. I was filled with admiration for the spirit of the American people. I can with genuine affection and fondness say that their behaviour in the wake of those events and their determination to respond appropriately, to heal the wounds and to help those who mourn and grieve demonstrates very powerfully that the American people do live, in the words of their wonderful national anthem, ‘in the land of the free and the home of the brave’.

Mr BEAZLEY (Brand—Leader of the Opposition) (2.24 p.m.)—Mr Speaker, I am proud to be supporting this motion, and I thank the Prime Minister for his consultation on its content. A new chapter is being written in American history—one of tragedy and terror, but also one of strength and courage that few could match. The terrorists may have set out to destroy America’s confidence and faith in itself, but instead they have revealed the best in Americans, what makes it such a great and resilient nation. Their evil has prompted strength not cowardice, righteous anger not fear. We have seen it in the selflessness of the rescuers—those firemen and policemen who charged up the stairs of the burning buildings and were never seen again. We saw it in the courage of those who helped others to safety, in the courage of those still waiting to hear the fate of their friends and family members, in the courage of New Yorkers as they have stood by to encourage those who are engaged in the process of rescuing those still within the buildings. We saw it in the enormous courage of the people who on the aircraft sacrificed themselves in order to stop an even greater tragedy. Massive though this tragedy has been, how much more awesome would it have been to all of us—in the rest of the world, as well as those in the United States—if that plane had continued to its intended destination?

Those of us who witnessed this attack on our television screens will never forget the horror of it. However many times we replay it in our heads, I do not think we will ever get used to it. I think it will be one of those events in which we will always remember what we were doing on Tuesday night last week, if we were still awake when it occurred, or Wednesday morning if we woke up to the horrifying news. I remember exactly where I was. I was driving from a meeting in Berwick towards the centre of Melbourne when a member of my staff rang up and said, ‘There’s an unconfirmed report that an aircraft has hit the World Trade Centre,’ and then the nightmare unfolded from that point on. We will never forget our feelings when we first saw those extraordinary pictures of the attack and tried for the first time to make sense of it. Wherever we were,
I think we all knew that things were changing forever, although we do not know quite how or why.

Today we think of the American victims, thousands of them, and their families. We also think of the 70 or more Australians missing, many believed dead, in this terrible tragedy. I know that in the coming days and weeks difficult national decisions will have to be made as we show our support for the United States and those in the world community who are united in their fight against terrorism.

The United States is a target because it accepts responsibility. I have often said in the past that one of the most unselfish acts in human history was a decision by the United States after the last world war that it was prepared to see its people as a target, perhaps of nuclear devastation, in order to defend values of freedom and the security of the nations who were its allies in World War II and those who subsequently emerged. The United States need not have been like that. The United States could quite easily have retreated into isolation, an economy virtually sufficient unto itself.

Instead, the United States chose to be a different sort of country. The United States chose to be a country that would accept responsibility even though it could mean in some sets of circumstances that the United States would be utterly devastated. Well, the Cold War has gone, but the United States’s acceptance of responsibility continues. The last time that we were engaged substantially with the United States in a conflict was the Gulf War, although I guess you can count the peacekeeping operations since then as well. But the last actual war was the Gulf War. If it turns out to have been the bin Laden group that was responsible for this act of terrorism, then there is a direct link between that conflict, in which we as a parliament approved our active engagement, and these events. There are many reasons why we should stand with the United States in this particular hour, and that is one of those reasons.

The United States continues to accept responsibility and it must be supported in its willingness to do so. We show our support for the United States in this fight because the fight against international terrorism is our fight. This is not only because of those Australians missing, believed killed, but also because of our belief in freedom, a belief we hold in common with the United States. It was an attack on all of us and all of ours. It was a shocking thing to think of the vulnerability of the Australians accompanying the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister himself in Washington at the time of the attack so very close to the White House, which we now, as I said, believe only escaped harm through the self-sacrifice of the passengers on the flight that went into the ground near Pittsburgh. Nevertheless, I am glad that the Prime Minister was there in the United States and was able to go to Congress and add our support in person at a time when it must have meant a lot to our allies to have you there, Prime Minister. Your presence there certainly brought the events closer here, as did the knowledge that so many Australians had been lost, and our hearts go out to their families as they wait for news.

The horror has already unfolded for us, but I very much fear that we are going to experience a new wave of that horror as the weeks go by and names get added to that list of numbers that is constantly from day to day being readjusted. The scale of this unspeakable act of terrorism is so great that we sometimes lose sight of the loss in New York and in the hijacked aircraft of those 70 Australians. America is not a foreign country to our people; so many of us travel there and work there. This makes us feel even more that it was an attack on all of us. Luck or fate might have put any of us there on that day.

The Australian Labor Party is missing one of its most loyal and active members in Andrew Knox, who worked on one of the top floors in one of the destroyed towers and is still missing. It is with great sadness that I express my condolences to his family, friends and political colleagues as they wait for news of Andrew. Andrew Knox was a member of the South Australian branch of the ALP and a member of our campaign team in Makin at the last election. Indeed, for a period of time he was a candidate for preselection in this forthcoming election for the area he grew up in and loved. Andrew’s
family has been contacted by many of those he assisted as an employee of the Australian Workers Union, and his efforts for them will also be remembered. My thoughts are with Tom and Marion, Andrew’s parents, and Stewart, his brother.

Confirmed dead in the tragedy are Qantas baggage handler Alberto Dominguez, 66, and retired Red Cross worker Yvonne Kennedy, 62, both from Sydney. There are at least another 69 missing, including 23-year-old Chris Porter from Brisbane. We can only guess what they went through in their last hours, and our thoughts and prayers are with their families.

Let us not forget either the many nations that are mourning lost sons and daughters now. The size of the calamity is truly international. Among the missing are several hundred Britons and Germans each, possibly up to 500 Mexicans, at least 50 Bangladeshis, 70 Italians, and many Pakistanis, Malaysians, Turks and Thais. It seems that nearly 40 nations have lost citizens in this shocking attack. They went to the heart of the world economy, and they found the world there, and the world has suffered as a result.

I have heard that there are some who have blamed all Muslims for this tragedy. I think we need to take a leaf out of Mayor Giuliani’s book here. Even after all that was suffered in his city, he has never stopped talking about the need for unity, and he stressed that all New Yorkers were appalled—Muslims, Jews, Christians, Buddhists, Hindus and others. He called on his fellow New Yorkers not to let the terrorists win by losing their humanity at this time. Mayor Giuliani has been an extraordinary figure in these events, commanding the rescue operation, comforting the afflicted and leading his people in the darkest hour that New York has ever experienced. If a man who has to deal with the full horror of this in his own city can keep his community together, surely we can keep ours together as well. I especially call on those in influential media positions to exercise responsibility. Those of us in public office must use our influence to maintain our unity as a nation. I would like to quote what British Prime Minister Tony Blair said in his speech on this issue:

We do not yet know the exact origin of this evil. But if, as appears likely, it is so-called Islamic fundamentalists, we know that they do not speak or act for the vast majority of decent law-abiding Muslims throughout the world. I say to our Arab and Muslim friends: ‘Neither you nor Islam is responsible for this; on the contrary, we know you share our shock at this terrorism, and we ask you as friends to make common cause with us in defeating this barbarism that is totally foreign to the true spirit and teachings of Islam.’

We have all been impressed by the US government’s rational, deliberative and calibrated response to this tragedy. America’s quiet, unyielding anger is not doubted, and it is shared by its friends. Lincoln said that we should have faith that right will make might. By ensuring rightness of action, the US will be able to draw on the might of many countries. When it takes action abroad, the US government and its allies must decide how to crack down on the groups plotting this carnage but in such a way as to avoid any more martyrs, anything that would feed the revolutionaries’ cause. The great challenge before the US government—and before all of us—is to show its people that it means to stop this sort of terrorism, but not at the expense of taking away people’s basic freedoms, freedoms on which the USA was founded. As the Prime Minister himself said, it would be a tragedy if those who committed this barbaric act should destroy the essential qualities of the nation that they attacked and turn its people in any way into the characters that they themselves already are. I do not believe for one moment that is going to happen; I do not believe it for one moment.

This sort of behaviour is not new. People have sacrificed themselves and others to draw attention to their cause in every generation and in most countries. The difference is technology, the sheer scale of the terror they can wreak. Difficult though it is to believe, the scale of this atrocity could have been, and could one day be, even greater. It could have been nuclear, chemical or biological weapons, now so readily deliverable by mechanisms other than those formerly employed by militaries. The challenge is to stop the terrorists with every means at our
disposal, but it must be done in such a way as to avoid feeding the revolutionary cause that creates new martyrs. It takes common-sense and coolness, and the United States has certainly shown that.

We in Australia owe our freedom to the United States. In our darkest hour in 1941, our wartime Prime Minister called on the Americans, and they did not let us down. In the Battle of the Coral Sea and in the Battle of Midway they were there for us and fought valiantly, with many lives lost, to halt the progress of the enemy. And we were there too: we saved ourselves at the same time that we were helped by them. That seminal event in Australian and American history created the ANZUS Treaty. It is an extraordinary thing to think really that, although we have been engaged with the United States military on many occasions since that point in time, this is actually the first time that the ANZUS Treaty has been formally invoked in the history of the treaty. I think, too, you would probably find that that is the case with NATO as well, and I think that in fact demonstrates the seriousness with which the globe is taking this new threat to international security. We must do our utmost to assist in fighting this very difficult enemy—one that lives in the shadows; one without a face. We do have to beat it because it has struck at the heart of what we believe in: our freedom and our safety.

The attacks on New York and Washington DC have fundamentally changed the modern threat of terrorism. Mass terrorism is now a reality. Governments worldwide must respond to this new reality. National leaders must demonstrate that they are prepared to deal with a fundamentally new level of threat to ensure that people can go about their lives in peace and security. Australia will need to commit itself to an international intelligence, police and military effort against those who planned the atrocities in New York and Washington and against those who supported and harboured the perpetrators. We must do this in this country in a bipartisan fashion and see this effort through, no matter what the result of the election later this year.

Joining the strong international coalition to fight terrorism wherever it threatens democratic and peaceful nations, as suggested by Secretary Powell, is the right way to go. This will mean integrating more closely our intelligence and police agencies with their international counterparts. It will also mean providing appropriate military and police support to international counter-terrorist operations. A long-term counter-terrorist strategy and resource commitment are now required. The role of the SAS, of Commonwealth law enforcement and of intelligence and other agencies will be critical. They must have the tools to do their job in the modern terrorist environment. As far as that is concerned, we have put forward some ideas, and this is a time for bipartisanship, working through those ideas together.

This is also primarily not a time for action yet; that will come. It is a time for grieving. It has been magnificent to be an Australian amongst our fellow Australians, as we have witnessed the outpouring of grief and emotion that has come forth from all of us. It has been good to see the flowers placed outside the consulates and to see the people flocking to church yesterday to add their prayers to those of the Americans for all those killed and all those who have lost their friends and family. The ambassador in his remarks told some lovely stories, including the experience he had with the picketing Ansett workers at Canberra airport. I can add one to them: I am told that those Ansett workers are now signing up to a list—by Saturday night 500 names were on it—whereby, should they receive their termination payments, or when they do, they will ensure that one day’s pay is contributed to the families of the aircrew who died in this attack and to the families of the Australians who died likewise.

It is at times like these that you realise how good it is to have your family safely together. And it is at times like these that you come back to what is truly important in all our lives: our love and affection for each other and our commitment to values of decency, tolerance, civilisation and freedom. These things sustain us; they will never be taken away.

Mr SPEAKER—Before I recognise the Deputy Prime Minister, I point out to all members that I understand that the whips
have agreed on a specific time allocation for each of the speakers to the condolence motion to enable the maximum participation of parliamentarians. So, with the agreement of the House, I will instruct the clerks to set the clocks accordingly.

Mr ANDERSON (Gwydir—Minister for Transport and Regional Services) (2.43 p.m.)—In joining the Leader of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition in speaking to this motion, I say at the outset that the terrorist attack on the United States, on New York and Washington, last Tuesday will mean that 11 September will be a date that lives on in infamy. It is a date that we will not forget; it is a date that we cannot forget; it is a date that we should never forget. It was a monstrous act, a premeditated and calculated mass murder aimed at ordinary people who were not just Americans but rather from a multitude of nations going about their ordinary lives. As others have said so eloquently, it constitutes an attack on decent people everywhere.

It is the very embodiment of evil, the visitation of evil upon our world, that has left us struggling for comprehension. No random act of a single madman and no sudden and tragic breakdown of one human being led to this. We have known those tragedies in our society but, while we cannot fully understand how they might come about, we can find at least some comprehension of them. The chilling and horrible truth of Tuesday’s events, however, is that this was not one man but many; it was not a sudden madness but a cold, careful and deliberate assault. It was done without humanity, without compassion and with no human feeling that any of us could regard or endorse as legitimate. It was in all ways and in all its dreadful execution evil.

We mourn the loss of lives that our friends in America have suffered, we mourn with their families for those confirmed Australian dead, and we pray that by some miracle the 69 Australians as yet unaccounted for may be found safe and returned to their families. In this country we feel a particular shock and horror because we, like America, see ourselves as part of a new world. Like that nation, we are a new nation that has provided refuge and succour to millions from other parts of the world seeking a new life, a new beginning and freedom from hatred and hatreds. But Tuesday has visited those dreadful hatreds upon all of us. It has attacked the very openness and regard for each other upon which Australian democracy is based. It tends dreadfully to make us want to suspect others and it makes us afraid for our children and their futures.

As has been said, the perpetrators of this horrifying terrorism must be—will be—ruthlessly pursued and brought to book. Australia will stand steadfast with its allies in this. We must not rest until the task is done. It should also be said, though, that, while ruthless, our response must be fair and just. We must not inflame misunderstanding but rather build more widely a deeper understanding of the sanctity and value of life and of human freedoms and the democratic traditions that are built upon those essential values. The battle we now enter against terrorism is a battle that will be fought in the name of our democratic freedoms: a fight to re-establish the trust and the safety and the openness of our society.

As others have alluded to, we have heard some evidence that might suggest a backlash against some members of the Muslim communities here in Australia. I join with all who would condemn such actions in the strongest possible terms. If we are to deem people guilty because of some association or to condemn them because of their background, we are playing in fact right into the hands of the terrorists; we are adopting the very values that they espouse but we reject. What they want to do is spread these dreadful values from one world to ours; what we stand for in Australia is an end to those hatreds. We must judge a person by what they do, not by where they or their parents came from. That is why we are so affronted by this terrorism; that is why we must play our part in pursuing them.

I will not delay the House for long because much of what should be said has been said so eloquently by the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition. Also, there are many others who want to speak. I do, however, want to particularly thank those who
sprang into action in this place at very short notice to cover all sorts of events, contingencies and planning and so forth that needed to be addressed. That obviously happened very early our time Wednesday morning last week. To those who were able to ensure that the Prime Minister was in contact with people back here—me included—and to those who covered off on a whole range of other very important matters, I record my very great respect.

I of course want to pay tribute to all of those emergency workers and volunteers who rushed to the aid of victims in New York and Washington last Tuesday. We have all seen and heard the reports of the loss of life among New York firefighters and police officers in particular and the reports of the extraordinary heroism that they displayed in what was to them their line of work. How magnificently they responded. While we mourn for them, they are of course also a symbol of hope and strength. I think we all know in our hearts that as long as our society has people who selflessly give their lives for others in this way—while our communities come together in times of crisis in the way that New York has done—democracy has indeed a very strong future.

As I reflect for a moment on this, I am reminded of Solzhenitsyn’s words as he, having survived the barbarities of Soviet death camps, observed that the dividing line in the end between good and evil lies in truth somewhere across every heart. All of us know what it is to struggle from time to time with resentment, with jealousy and with demeaning thoughts about others. Indeed, it seems to me that the strength of a civilised society is built to a very great degree on the extent to which the individuals who make up that society are able to put aside their baser instincts and encourage in themselves, in their children and in their neighbours the more noble and less selfish instincts in our make-up.

It is to us impossible to comprehend that there are others who would inflame the very basest of human behaviour. Yet those people plainly do exist; we have been forcefully reminded of that in recent days. We must face that reality; we must not be naive. Our attack on this cancer will succeed if we believe in and build on our own values. We must not fail in this. Terrorism cannot be allowed to win. This will not be a short-term battle, I suspect. It will not be easy to eradicate from our midst around the world those who would engage in outrageous and unforgivable behaviour. Whilst initial action may be rapid in coming, I think we should brace ourselves for the reality that to rid ourselves of this sort of appalling behaviour, based in such appalling attitudes, is something that all of us must commit to for however long it takes.

Mr CREAN (Hotham) (2.50 p.m.)—I wholeheartedly join with the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition in this motion of condolence for the atrocities committed last Tuesday. September 11 will never be forgotten. It has changed again how we view things. It is worth reflecting that, when the end of the Cold War came, the then US President Bush declared that there would be a new world order, a world that we then hoped would not only be free of the threat of a nuclear holocaust but one in which former adversaries would come together to end wars through peaceful means. It is true that events in Rwanda and former Yugoslavia—to name just a few—cruelly dashed those hopes. But it really is with the horrific scenes from New York, Washington and Pennsylvania that we now know that far from abolishing war the new millennium has simply given it a new and more terrifying form.

As the New York Times declared the morning after the attack:

It was, in fact, one of those moments in which history splits, and we define the world as “before” and “after.”

It went on to say:

If a flight full of commuters can be turned into a missile of war, everything is dangerous. If four planes can be taken over simultaneously by suicidal hijackers, then we can never be quite sure again that any bad intention can be thwarted, no matter how irrational or loathsome.

What that editorial highlighted was how the world has changed for all of us as a result of the events witnessed last week, and not just because of the horror we feel at the destruction of so many lives. The complacent secu-
rity that all of us felt before Tuesday has now been swept away. We now feel vulnerable even doing some of the simple things such as catching a flight or going to the office. Will anyone ever again be able to take a flight without at least considering the consequences of what happened in America? Will we ever again be able to enter a high-rise office block without wondering whether that building too could be a target?

We now know war no longer has to be declared; it can arrive, unannounced and with horrifying force, right amongst people simply going about their everyday lives. The weapons of the first war of the 21st century have not been guns or bombs but commercial jetliners filled with people no different from us, who boarded a plane to travel across a country for business or to meet their families or to go on holiday; and their targets are not rival armies but office blocks, filled with tens of thousands of people who are doing nothing more threatening than sitting at their desks, working at their computers or talking on their phones, just as millions of people do every day of the year in every country of the world.

If the greatest cities of the greatest power the world has ever known can have such destruction wrought upon them by 20 people wielding Stanley knives, how can anyone feel safe again? The vulnerability that we now feel was perhaps the principal goal of the terrorists, who timed their attacks in such a way as to force us all to be their witnesses, because whilst few witnessed the first attack, they knew that the cameras would be trained on the burning tower and, in the world of CNN and instant communication, millions on every continent, even those watching the late news half a world away—as I guess most of the people in this House were—could be made to watch the second plane dive into the tower.

It is hard to imagine a more horrifying scene than the one that we witnessed on Tuesday night as hundreds of those office workers screamed in vain for help out of the smashed windows of the World Trade Centre buildings and in some cases flung themselves out because of what could only have been unimaginable pain and terror as the flames engulfed their workplaces. When those buildings collapsed, we knew we were witnessing the destruction not just of two great New York landmarks but, right there in our lounge rooms, the deaths of literally thousands of people and unimaginable pain and grief for tens of thousands of families. As one of the many people who witnessed the collapse said, ‘I’m not seeing concrete and steel; I’m seeing people.’

We now know that many of these people had rung their friends and families to tell them of their love before they attempted to flee the buildings—loved ones who, perhaps just hours earlier, had kissed their partners goodbye before they stepped onto the bus or the train for an ordinary day at the office. What thoughts must have gone through the minds of these people as they then watched the buildings fall and knew that, as they fell, they were witnessing the deaths of their husbands, wives, children, fathers, mothers, lovers and friends? Despite this, many of these same people still walk the streets of New York, from hospital to hospital, carrying photographs of their missing loved ones. Even when all hope seems gone, they refuse to give in.

The terrorists also could not overcome the bravery of the hundreds of firefighters, police officers, ambulance workers and others who raced into the buildings to save lives, knowing full well the danger that they must have faced, and, as a consequence, themselves suffered horrendous losses. But in doing so they have already shown us that the terrorists have not won, because if, even in the midst of such carnage, terrorism cannot overcome basic human values like love and hope and bravery, it cannot ultimately triumph. So today our thoughts go out to all the American people; and we meet today to demonstrate that you are not alone and that, as you stood by us in World War II, we will stand by you in your hour of need, in thought and in deed.

But, as US Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld has pointed out, the buildings destroyed in New York were not called the New York trade centre, or even the US trade centre, but the World Trade Centre. This is not just a symbolic point, because the dead
come from nearly 40 nations, Australia amongst them. The Australian death toll in the terrorist attacks could exceed that of the Port Arthur massacre and will thus represent the greatest loss of Australian lives as a result of a deliberate act since the end of World War II. Some of these we know were like Red Cross volunteer Yvonne Kennedy and the Qantas baggage handler Alberto Dominguez, who were on holidays of a lifetime and died aboard doomed planes. But the bulk of them will be some of Australia’s brightest stars: brilliant young Australians whose prodigious talents led them to New York to demonstrate that they could stand with the best in the financial world. Here the Labor Party has not remained untouched: Andrew Knox, a brilliant young industrial advocate and one of our rising stars, has almost certainly been lost amid the rubble of the twin towers.

But amidst all this grief and the understandable demands for instant vengeance, we must not lash out at the first available target. Above all, we must not rush to judgment or to stereotype the perpetrators. The demonstrations by some Palestinians in support of the terrorists indeed did sicken us all, but they are not clearly representative of the feelings of the Muslim community in Australia, who have condemned the attacks in the strongest possible terms and held prayer vigils for the victims. The violence directed against Muslim communities in Australia shames us all, and above all it shames the memory of the victims in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania. Instead, we must calmly gather the evidence, identify those responsible for this horrific crime, build a coalition of nations, as occurred in the Gulf War, and then coolly bring to justice the perpetrators to ensure that only those responsible are punished and that the tragedy and terror of the past week are not visited upon more innocent victims.

Australia also cannot ignore the consequences of this new threat, and Labor has offered the government bipartisan support for a renewed effort against possible terrorist attacks at home. I hope, in the spirit of the bipartisanship that surrounds this motion today, that that issue can indeed be advanced.

The Leader of the Opposition has put forward a 10-point plan that the Australian Labor Party believes Australians must now undertake to fight terrorism.

There will be significant changes in coming months that will impact on all of us as we are forced to respond to this new threat. They may be as insignificant as meals being served on aeroplanes as knives are banned from cabins, perhaps, or delays at airport security and greater controls on our movement around the world. We all accept that these sorts of changes are now a fact of life after last Tuesday, but we must not overreact. We must not allow the terrorists to force us into a new dark age. As US Senator Joseph Biden warned within hours of the attack, ‘If we alter our basic freedoms—our civil liberties—we will have lost the war before it has begun.’ I am also reminded of President John F. Kennedy’s inaugural address in 1961, when he declared:

Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty.

Only now do we see just how terrible that price could be and how great is the burden. America, as the symbol of democracy, was the principal victim, but all of us were the target. So when we say that we stand with the United States, we are not just saying it because of our shared history and because, in every war fought by America since Australia became a nation, we have stood together. We stand together also because the attacks on the World Trade towers and the Pentagon were indisputably an attack on freedom and democracy everywhere.

Mr DOWNER (Mayo—Minister for Foreign Affairs) (3.03 p.m.)—I join with others in supporting the Prime Minister’s and the Leader of the Opposition’s motion before the House this afternoon. I join with them in condemning, as strongly as any human being can condemn anything, the terrorist attacks that were committed last Tuesday against the World Trade Centre buildings in New York and against the Pentagon in Washington.

Last Tuesday, 11 September, will indeed be one of those days when we will always
remember what we were doing at the time we were first informed of the attacks. I was at home—I had spent the day in Sydney—and I was sitting at my desk working on my computer. Somebody rang my office and said, ‘Turn on the television; the World Trade Centre has been hit by an aircraft.’ It seems an extraordinary proposition. The first thought that came to my mind was how bizarre it was that an aircraft could have lost so much height and accidentally flown into that building. I turned on my television screen and within moments a second plane went into the second tower. I sat there for some hours watching the appalling scene unfold. Throughout all of that time, as you can imagine, in my house there was a great deal of telephone contact. I spoke with the Acting Prime Minister and with officials of one kind or another as we put together our consular crisis centre.

I also had the experience that many have: I thought, ‘Who do I know in New York?’ I thought of somebody working there. I knew he worked down in that area near the World Trade Centre in the Lower Manhattan area. My wife and I tried to get in touch with him, but we could not do so for ages. Finally, my wife came up with the great idea to send an email. She sent the email and an email came back. That was a very happy moment that night, but we can reflect on how many people did not get the email back and how many people have never heard back. Nearly 5,000 people are missing as a result of these attacks in what must be termed one of the greatest human tragedies of the last two centuries. It is estimated that people from at least 19 nationalities have been killed, and of these we now know that at least three fellow Australians are dead. As others have said, there are 69 missing unaccounted for, although we are hopeful that that number may come down over the next few hours. It is almost certain to be the greatest number of Australians killed in a single incident overseas outside of wartime, so our prayers go out to those whose families have been affected, to their loved ones and to their friends.

I would like to acknowledge the role performed by many people in these difficult circumstances: our Consul-General in New York, Ken Allen, who is only new to the job, and his staff. It must have been very difficult for him. I acknowledge our Ambassador in Washington, Michael Thawley, and his staff; our Ambassador to the United Nations in New York, John Dauth, and his staff; and all those people in my department who did an extraordinarily good job.

By 1 o’clock in the morning of 12 September, my department had set up a crisis centre and had analysed what resources were required to plan consular and other responses to the crisis. A telephone call centre was activated and established by 4.30 in the morning and the first 20 volunteer telephone operators were briefed at 5.30 for the task that lay ahead of them. In the first 24 hours, 15,000 calls were handled on these lines and a further 20,000 were received subsequently. It was a very good effort by those hard-working public servants, many of whom went without too much sleep as they tried, on the one hand, to reassure many Australians and, on the other, to do their best to find the whereabouts of those who were unaccounted for.

Like others, I would also like to acknowledge the efforts and the heroism of the thousands of Americans—the firemen and police, and the many citizens not involved in official service, for example, the construction workers who did so much to try to save people’s lives at the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon. Others have said as well—and I feel very strongly about this—that the United States has always been the champion, in my lifetime, of liberal democracy. It stood up for us in World War II. It stood up to communism in the Berlin blockade, in the Korean War and in the Cold War. It has always stood against tyranny and oppression, and we have proudly stood beside America in every conflict it has been involved in through the last century.

These terrorists have brought innocent victims to the front line. For this, and the threat they represent to our institutions and our values, there must be a unified, national and international response. Our government is heartened by the near uniform condemnation of this heinous crime by the nations of the world, but it must be remembered that
words are not deeds. The challenge for the international community is to join together in a concerted international effort against terrorism and those who provide terrorists with safe haven. I think this House has already today demonstrated at the political level exactly what you hear at the community level, and that is that Australians stand ready to do their part. We will stand with our most important ally in this time of need.

For the first time in 50 years—and, indeed, almost to the day 50 years after the signing of the ANZUS Treaty—we invoke the ANZUS Treaty with the support of the opposition because we regarded these terrorist actions as an attack upon the United States of America within the meaning of articles IV and V of the ANZUS Treaty. As the Prime Minister has said on several occasions, Australia stands ready to provide military support to the extent that it is needed and to the extent to which we are capable.

Some people will ask whether action taken by the United States and its allies is legal. It is important to understand that there is already full coverage in the United Nations Charter, and through a United Nations Security Council resolution, for appropriate action to be taken by the United States. Article 51 of the United Nations Charter says:

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations.

This was without any doubt an armed attack against a member of the United Nations and, as article 51 makes clear, the United States has a right of self-defence. The House may also be interested to know that, on 13 September, the United Nations Security Council unanimously passed a resolution which, amongst other things:

Calls on all States to work together urgently to bring to justice the perpetrators, organisers and sponsors of these terrorist attacks and stresses that those responsible for aiding, supporting or harbouring the perpetrators, organisers and sponsors of these acts will be held accountable.

Whatever doubts or scepticism many members in this House may have about the United Nations and its efficacy, the Security Council resolution which was passed so soon after the attacks and with such a degree of unanimity—not even with the usual delicate attempts to try to negotiate some sort of a consensus, a paper-thin consensus, but in this case a solid unanimity of support for the United States, its right to self-defence and its right to bring to justice those responsible for these appalling acts—is important.

I have already said, in the context of any military assistance, what the Prime Minister had said—that we will do what we can usefully and within our capabilities, but we will also use other channels, including our intelligence connections and our diplomatic channels, in order to assist the United States deal with the appalling problem of terrorism. Last Friday afternoon, I spoke from my electorate office in Adelaide to the Pakistani Foreign Minister, Abdul Sattar, and in my conversation I encouraged him to cooperate with the United States in their efforts to locate Osama bin Laden and in their efforts to fight terrorism wherever it may be. There is no doubt that Pakistan has an important role to play here and it is appropriate for Australia to make its own effort to help to persuade Pakistan to take appropriate action to assist the United States and the rest of the global community in their fight against terrorism. Foreign Minister Abdul Sattar gave me a very positive response to my telephone call.

In conclusion, I think we all know that, as a result of these terrorist attacks, the world will never be the same again. The international agenda has changed. Terrorism and other transboundary crimes will become substantially more important—indeed dominant—international agenda items. The world has passed many resolutions and there are many UN conventions which condemn terrorism and which are designed to oppose terrorism. But this just proves, if proof were ever needed, that the world has not done enough to counter terrorism. It must do more and it must do better. That effort will be very strongly supported not just by this government but by the whole of this country.

We face a very great challenge as an international community to respond to these acts of terror but, as others have wisely said in this debate, it is important that that response be measured, that it be calculated,
that it be considered, that it be thought through and that it be done with as broad a coalition of international support as is practical and as is possible. The United States can absolutely count on its NATO allies, it can count on Australia and it can count on a number of other countries, but it is important to ensure that there is a broad coalition to fight this big fight against terrorism that lies ahead of us.

I have been very impressed by the resourceful, strong, thoughtful response so far taken by the United States administration. They have demonstrated not only strength but considered balance. We look forward to working with them over the months ahead to assist them in this great war against terrorism. All those people who died at the World Trade Centre and at the Pentagon must not die in vain. Those Australians who have died must not die in vain. As Australians we must do all we possibly can to fight terrorism as a result of this heinous crime.

Mr BRERETON (Kingsford-Smith)  
(3.17 p.m.)—As the Prime Minister observed in his remarks today, this is a very sombre occasion for this House and for Australia. The terrorist attacks on the United States last Tuesday constitute the worst single act of absolute evil perpetrated in my lifetime. This is a whole new class of terrorism. It is mass terrorism, carried out with real-time worldwide media coverage. More than 5,000 lives have been lost. More than 5,000 innocent victims were killed in the most horrific of circumstances. They were people of many nations and many faiths, and more than 70 amongst them were Australians. The destruction itself is truly astounding. The cost of reconstruction and repair will amount to many billions of dollars, and the economic effects will be felt across the globe. The world has indeed changed. As many people have said, this is an attack upon civilisation and civilisation must respond. Those responsible for this great atrocity must be pursued and brought to account. No stone should be left unturned in this task.

Today’s motion rightly expresses the horror felt by all Australians about those terrorist attacks and conveys our heartfelt condolences to the families and the loved ones of those killed or missing. It very rightly applauds the courageous efforts of those engaged in the rescue and recovery operations. The heroism of the firefighters, the police, the military personnel and the countless ordinary people of all walks of life knows no bounds. Today’s motion rightly affirms that these acts of mass terrorism represent an assault upon the people and the values of free societies everywhere and endorses Australia’s commitment to support the United States-led action to pursue those responsible. In this task, Australia stands foursquare with the United States. The government’s response to this terrible tragedy has been absolutely appropriate, and the opposition completely supports it. Not only must we sympathise with the US and express our distress and our shock, but we must do everything within our power—through our intelligence services, our law enforcement agencies and through the capabilities of our defence forces—to identify, to locate and to bring to account those responsible for these terrible deeds.

President George W. Bush has declared the United States to be at war against terrorism. He has rightly elevated the struggle against terrorism to that of a great national and international undertaking, but no-one should underestimate either how difficult or how protracted this international campaign may prove to be. This is no easy undertaking, but we have no alternative other than to embark upon a journey down a very difficult and dangerous road. The first step in winning any war is to know one’s enemy. The criminals responsible for directing these terrible acts in New York and Washington chose to remain hidden. They have not stepped forward to claim responsibility. Some people have suggested that this is cowardice, but these terrorists are not cowards and it would be a mistake to think that they are. They are fanatics utterly devoid of respect for their own lives, let alone the lives of others. They are people of fearsome determination and resolution. They are highly intelligent. They are cold and calculating, and they possess considerable resources of manpower, finance and expertise. They are very patient. They planned and prepared these attacks over a
long period of time, perhaps for as long as
two or three years.

They failed in their attempt to destroy the
World Trade Centre in 1993. This year they
were clearly determined to finish that task—
and in this their ambition knew no bounds.
They planned simultaneous strikes against
the World Trade Centre, the symbolic centre
of American capitalism; the Pentagon, the
central command post of US military power;
and, it appears, the White House or Capitol
building, as well as, of course, at the very
heart of American democracy. They would
also have thought long and hard about the
likely reactions from the United States and
the world community. Indeed, we should be
very clear in recognising that one of the pri-
mary purposes of these attacks was to elicit a
large-scale military response from the United
States and its allies against targets across the
Islamic world. The terrorist objective was to
trigger a conflict which would further radi-
calise Arab public opinion and destabilise
Arab governments who are friendly with the
West. This is not an argument for not re-
sponsing; we must respond and do whatever
needs to be done to eliminate this threat. But
in doing so we must be aware that a major
military campaign is precisely what the ter-
rorist perpetrators hope for.

There has, of course, already been much
commentary about the prime suspect, Osama
bin Laden. If, as it seems likely, the bin
Laden organisation is confirmed as a group
with significant responsibility for the attacks,
we must think very carefully about the nature
of our response. If this is war, it is war
against an enemy who is a man and not a
state. It will be war against an enemy who
has no structured organisation, no headquar-
ters, no fixed address. It will be war against
an enemy whose followers live in different
countries and who feel loyalty not so much
to bin Laden the man as to the ideology of
militant Islam. Osama bin Laden’s organisa-
tion is not a centrally directed terrorist or-
ganisation in the traditional model; rather, it
is more a clearing house from which other
terrorist groups solicit funds, training and
logistical support. It constantly changes
shape according to the whims of its leader.
Nor is this the single font of all terrorist evil.

Rather, it is an informal network of networks
across a dozen countries whose members
draw on each other for assistance and sup-
port. In a war against terrorism, the bin
Laden organisation may prove to be only the
first target.

No-one can be enthusiastic or cavalier in
threatening military action, but it is clearly
necessary. The form it will take is yet to be
determined, as indeed is Australia’s precise
commitment. What is clear, however, is that
the task of eliminating the threat posed by
terrorist groups such as these will require
much more than air strikes or attacks by spe-
cial forces. First and foremost it is the job of
intelligence and law enforcement to identify
the extent of the terrorist networks and locate
the organisation’s centre of gravity. This will
be a very challenging and difficult task.
Osama bin Laden was declared Washington’s
most wanted criminal in August 1998—more
than three years ago. Many millions of dol-

lars and many thousands of people have al-
ready been committed to the task of bringing
him to account for the US embassy bomb-


ings in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam.

Successful action against this terrorist
threat will also be critically dependent on
building and maintaining the broadest possi-
ble international coalition against terrorism.
President Bush and his advisers are clearly
very well aware of the vital nature of this
task. Securing the active cooperation of Is-
lamic states, notably Pakistan, is obviously
very challenging. We should be very mindful
of the potential long-term political conse-
quences of such cooperation. The terrorists
certainly hope to destabilise Islamic govern-
ments who cooperate with the West. But,
without such assistance, the task of hunting
down those responsible for this mass terror-
ism will be much more difficult and the risks
of adverse consequences all the greater. This
is going to be a very difficult balance to
strike.

International cooperation must also extend
to the worldwide effort to identify and close
down the web of financial arrangements
which has given the bin Laden organisation
its global reach and capacity for mass vio-

lence. For our part, Australia should set an
example by moving without further delay to
sign and ratify the two latest international conventions against terrorism, especially the 1999 International Convention for the Suppression of Financing of Terrorism.

Finally, we must also recognise, as the New York Times noted last week, that terrorism is a global threat. Part of the challenge is to recognise that the roots of terrorism lie in economic and political problems in large parts of the world. Terrible economic and political problems abound in the present context, which includes the hatreds of the Middle East. They will not be solved by military action either on the scale of the Gulf War or in the nature of a so-called surgical strike against the backers of last Tuesday’s attacks.

In this regard, I think it timely to reiterate the thrust of remarks I made in this House more than three years ago in speaking to the motion related to the possible military action against Iraq. Back at that time, in March 1998, I observed that, given the trend in Arab public opinion and its perception of Western double standards, it was incumbent on all members of the international community, including Australia, to do everything we could to encourage a resumption of the Israeli-Palestinian peace process and to resolve each of the other outstanding Middle East issues. A Middle East policy perceived, whether rightly or wrongly, as just on Western interests will ultimately fail to secure the necessary international and regional support. It would be a pyrrhic victory indeed if we were to successfully hunt down those immediately responsible for these terrible atrocities but fail to find a lasting solution to the wider problems of peace, security and justice throughout the Middle East. Last year, to the dismay of everyone, the Middle East peace process collapsed and violence has followed on a weekly and daily basis ever since. Terrorism will not disappear until the international community eliminates not only the terrorists but also the roots of terrorism.

Last Tuesday’s attacks introduced a whole new class of terrorism. The next step in this terrible escalation of violence may well be the use of chemical, biological or possibly nuclear weapons. We must understand that we simply cannot afford to fail either militarily or diplomatically in meeting the challenge of mass terrorism.

Mr REITH (Flinders—Minister for Defence) (3.29 p.m.)—I totally support the resolution moved by the Prime Minister and seconded by the Leader of the Opposition and wish, of course, to be fully associated with it. Words are inadequate to express the sense of shock and horror that I know all Australians have felt. Words are simply inadequate to fully express the sense of sympathy and shared loss which is also felt by so many Australians. Words simply cannot express adequately the sense of shared loss for those Australian families who today wait anxiously for the gravest of news, and words can never adequately express our sense of admiration, in the words of the motion before the parliament today, ‘for the courageous efforts of those engaged in the dangerous rescue operation still under way’.

As Minister for Defence, I want to take my opportunity today to focus on some matters which are perhaps more of a defence nature than might be the remit of others. I first want to personally express my sympathy to Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, who was here in Australia this year with Colin Powell for what were very successful meetings of ministers under the auspice of the regular Ausmin dialogue. It was no surprise to me, having met the man, to hear of the reports of his own involvement at the Pentagon. I mention Don Rumsfeld—and extend my personal thoughts, wishes and prayers to him and his team—for another reason; that is, for me personally, and I hope for Australians generally, it is a matter of some reassurance that at the heart of the American government we have people of the calibre of Donald Rumsfeld. He made a great impression—as did, of course, Colin Powell—when he was here. I think it is terribly important that Australians know that we have friends at the heart of government in America but, more importantly, that they know that we have people with experience and wisdom to deal with the many challenges which are going to face us.

Of all the words that have been spoken in the hours and days since these unspeakable
acts were committed, the ones that still resonate with me are the words of George Bush, who showed real leadership when he said that freedom had been attacked and freedom would be defended. When all is said and done, it is absolutely the truth of the matter that justice must be done in response to these outrageous acts of criminality. We must, of course, play our role in that. When he said that freedom must be defended, I think he really encapsulated the fact that this attack on American soil was an attack on the values and freedoms that underpin our society. In fact, when you think of our society, there can be nothing more important than the abiding values that give this society its character and, ultimately, that give people the freedom to grow as people, to prosper as people and to reach their full potential as individual human beings.

So it is that on that terrible night, as the first reports came through to Australia, one of the first responses to the US from the Australian government at the Canberra end—of course, our Prime Minister was there in Washington—as the phone calls went backward and forward between our people at the military level and at the central level in Canberra, was to say, ‘We are with you, and whatever we can do as a society we are keen, anxious and ready to do.’

What are we doing? In response to that immediate offer of ours and the very strong statements that our own Prime Minister made while he was in Washington, there have already been opportunities for Australia to play its role. Over the last few days we have had a request from the United States for the extension of the deployment in the Persian Gulf of HMAS *Anzac*, which is undertaking sanctions duties. It is not the first deployment of that sort that we have had in that region and I suspect it will not be the last. Of course, we readily agreed to the extension of that deployment for eight days, or thereabouts.

This gives me the opportunity to say—because I have had reports in respect of HMAS *Anzac*—that the work that that ship and its crew have undertaken in recent times has been of the absolute highest professional quality. As the defence minister, it makes me proud to think that, when there is a job to be done, we have the people who can do the job at the very highest professional level. We were also asked for some assistance with a Hercules aircraft that we had in the US—a transport aircraft able to ferry emergency workers and the like—and that was given without a moment’s hesitation. Also, it should not be forgotten that at any point in time Australia has various Australian Defence Force personnel in various units throughout the United States defence forces. Our thoughts are with them, not knowing in many cases what they are doing today, as they participate with their colleagues in the United States as part of those ongoing exchange arrangements.

One other area where we have been immediately involved—and, of course, I will not go into any details—is in the intelligence area. We have very close relations with the US, and we have had for many years. That is a day by day, moment by moment relationship where, again, we can provide practical assistance in the work that is still ahead of us. It is the case that we have not had evidence—facts, reason or otherwise—to have particular concerns in Australia about the security environment. But, as the Prime Minister has said on a number of occasions, the fact is that no-one is immune from this sort of terrorist behaviour. It was therefore a matter of sensible precaution that, as soon as the reports came in, the national antiterrorist plan was put in place. We have heightened security around the personnel and property of the US in Australia. We have increased security and the like around Defence establishments and in the aviation sector. All of those are sensible precautionary measures that have been taken. Again, this also requires a significant effort by members of the Australian Defence Force as well as law enforcement agencies, and I want to put on the record my appreciation for the work that those people are already undertaking on our behalf.

It is true that these terrorist acts are a form of war, of a dimension we have never seen before. But it is also a fact that in recent years there has been a lot of discussion within Defence and security organisations to
the effect that, in the future, the security risks that we may face may be terrorist acts and the like rather than the more conventional warfare which we have, sadly, experienced in the past. As a result of that, I am able to say to the House that the Australian government has made a number of policy changes in recent years to reflect the changing security profile with which we have to deal. Australia’s special forces have all the tools they require to do their job in the modern counter-terrorist world. Over the past six years, the government has continuously built up special forces capability, particularly with respect to counter-terrorism, ship underway response, clearance diving teams, special forces helicopter capabilities and intelligence support. Within other areas of the ADF, significant funds have been provided through the white paper for the decade ahead as we make further efforts to ensure that we have the capability to deal with these situations.

There has been some discussion briefly about international conventions and the like. Australia has been very active within the United Nations to draw these conventions and international law together to ensure that we have the jurisdiction to deal with terrorism. I completely support this motion and commend it to the House.

Dr MARTIN (Cunningham) (3.39 p.m.)—
As many people have already said in this debate, I do not think we will ever forget where we were last Tuesday evening when this terrible act of terrorism was perpetrated on the United States. I was attending a medal presentation for the Dragons, the football club that both the Prime Minister and I support. As I arrived home from that function, my mobile phone was ringing and I had text messages from my daughter—who had been watching television—and my staff. Like most people who were in Australia at the time, we sat up and watched the events unfold.

Who could forget the images that flowed from that time: the jets crashing into the World Trade Centre and people falling like confetti, as somebody said, from windows as they sought to escape the dreadful heat and smoke and the devastation that had already taken place in the upper floors of the World Trade Centre. Who could forget the video taken by the doctor who continued to film after the towers had collapsed? He said, ‘I hope I survive this,’ as all the rubble came down upon him. He said on his tape, ‘I think I’ve survived; now I’ve got to go and help someone else.’ Who could forget the 67-year-old who said, ‘Thank God I could still run’? Who could forget the images of the volunteers, the construction workers who were down the road, who simply said, ‘There is a job to be done. I’ve got to get in there’? These are the images that will endure for us all. These are the images that tell us something about the human spirit and the way that it will respond to tragedy. These are the images that we continue to see on our television screens and in our newspapers and that we hear through the radio media. They have cemented in the psyche of all of us forever concerns about the frailty of human nature and, as others have said in this debate this afternoon, our resolve to do something about terrorism.

Mr Speaker, over the years when I held the position that you now hold, I attended a number of Inter-Parliamentary Union meetings. At every one of those meetings there were resolutions on the table about terrorism and what parliaments of the world can do to stamp out terrorism. In the three years that I attended those meetings—which probably amounted to about six meetings—those same resolutions kept rolling around, but I have to say there did not seem to be a lot done by members of the parliaments of this world who attended the IPU conferences to stamp out terrorism. This event may at least resolve some of those problems at a parliamentary level in the future, but the most immediate concern of us all is: what response is going to come from the world community? As the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition have said, the United States’ response to date has been measured. It is full of anger—understandably so—but the words that have come from the leaders of that great nation have left no doubt in anyone’s mind that justice will be done.

We on this side of the parliament have supported the Prime Minister, we have supported the government and we have sup-
ported Australia in the attitudes that we have adopted. There are some 69 Australians still missing, and many of those are presumed dead as a result of this catastrophe. Many of us have been touched by experiences of people we know who were there. There was an article in the *Illawarra Mercury* this week entitled ‘Hellish start to Jason’s new job’. It tells the story of a young man who was in his second day working on Wall Street for a finance company and who was in the vicinity of the World Trade Centre. His father is a personal friend of mine; in fact, he is my accountant. The article tells about how Jason ran out of the district, covered in dust and grime, jumped in a taxicab, and then a huge girder came crashing down on the back of the cab. He got away, but that is yet another example. In this case it was young Jason Cachia of Wollongong. Another constituent of mine—the brother of the person from the Democrats who stood against me at the last election—was there, and he too was in harm’s way but was able to survive.

What the stories of each of these people identify for us all is the concern of every Australian: the lives of our loved ones being tragically cut short because of some inhuman terrorist activity. If we feel that here, we can only imagine what Americans feel like. The mums and the dads, the brothers or sisters have lost loved ones, each of whom had a long fulfilling life to look forward to—and now they do not.

One of the other things that is important here and that we must always turn our attention to—and I am pleased that both the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition commented about this—is that terrorism knows no religion, no race, no colour, no creed. We may well read and hear people talk about Muslims being an all-embracing group of people that embrace terrorism and who are supportive of what has happened. Clearly, that is not the case. Whether it is in Palestine or in Australia that is not the case. The Leader of the Opposition said to the caucus this morning that the Basques, the IRA, the Shining Path and, indeed, Tim McVeigh are not Muslim by religion. It behoves us all in this place, as we represent this great nation of ours, to recall that we have embraced people from every different background in this country and they have sought to live here in peace and harmony.

But, as the Minister for Defence just remarked a moment ago, the fact that to this extent Australia has been free of terrorism does not mean we should rest on our laurels; it does not mean we should let our guard down. What has happened in the United States has meant that no freedom-loving country—in fact, no country in the world—should let their guard down. How often have we in this place spoken to our friends about a bomb that has gone off in the centre of Jerusalem or about something that has happened in Germany, in France, in Italy, in Turkey or somewhere else in the world where an act of terrorism has taken place? We have said, ‘Isn’t it shocking, but thank goodness it is over there.’ Thank goodness to an extent—but that is no longer. As has been so eloquently said by the leader of the United States, and as has been pointed out again by the ambassador of the United States to Australia in the moving commemoration speech he delivered this afternoon, innocence has been lost.

We have all experienced some major changes, but, equally, we have to think about Australia’s commitment and that commitment, whether it be in a military sense or in a diplomatic sense, is unequivocal. Both sides of parliament recognise that and we do so on behalf of the Australian people. But I think that we also have to remember that, within the capabilities that Australia possesses, that commitment has to be careful, it has to be thought through, and it has to maximise Australia’s effort to ensure that those terrorists pay the price for the terrible tragedy in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania last week.

The other day—I think it was on Saturday night—I was driving my daughter, aged 14, and one of her friends to a school disco. It frightened me when her friend said to me, ‘Do you think that we are about to have World War III? My dad has been talking about it and he has watched television.’ I said to her, ‘No, I do not. I think that what we have had in this past week is a demonstration of man’s inhumanity to man, that people for
whatever reason have taken upon themselves to destroy a sense of community that was the United States and is, by definition, the world. No, I do not think that we are in World War III. But I also said that the United States and her allies would seek justice for what had happened. I think that each of us in this place needs to be assured that the justice that is sought is appropriate and that the fears of that little girl and her father are not realised through some terrible tragedy down the track. It was a dreadful day, there is no doubt about that. The ramifications of it we continue to see on a daily and nightly basis. I lend my support entirely to the motion that has been moved.

Mr COSTELLO (Higgins—Treasurer) (3.50 p.m.)—I rise to support the motion moved by the Prime Minister and supported by the Leader of the Opposition. Those of us who will never forget the sight of an aeroplane going into the World Trade Centre know that we have seen a great evil. We have seen evil in our midst which has been organised in a way which we have not seen before and which was coordinated in a way which many of us still find unbelievable. It was of a scale that we find hard to imagine. We have seen great evil conveyed to us through television as it happened and we are reminded again that evil lives within our midst all of the time and brings killing and death. Our hearts are heavy as we think of those that have died and of the families who have lost loved ones. There is indescribable sadness at the waste of life that arose out of these incidents. The thing about evil is that it is indiscriminate. Those who kill based on hate or fanaticism do not have any regard for the people who are their victims. They do not have any regard for those that are living their everyday lives. It has been said that this is an attack on civilisation because it is an attack on the right of people to go about their ordinary lives without being killed.

Undoubtedly those who perpetrated this wrong thought that they were bringing down the financial system or punishing captains of industry, but we know that they killed cleaners, clerks, telephonists—men, women, Christians, Jews, Muslims. They killed not just Americans but Australians too. Terrorists do not make much of a distinction when it comes to indiscriminate killing. This was an attack on civilian people who planned no war or military strike, but who were just going about their ordinary lives, going to their offices, doing their jobs, creating a work environment. Those who killed them undoubtedly targeted what they saw as a symbol of economic progress in the World Trade Centre and as symbols of constitutional government in the White House and the Pentagon.

Although we have seen great evil in our midst, we have seen a great triumph of the human spirit. How often is it the case that the worst in human beings brings out the best in human beings? The worst killing of the terrorists brings out the greatest bravery of the firefighters, the policemen and our leaders. It reminds us again that those values that can pull us down will only be transcended if we defend those values which will elevate us, lift us up. Ours, like the American society, is an open society: you can travel where you want when you want; you do not need permission. Terrorists do not like open societies, even though they seek to take advantage of them. They do not believe that people should have freedom of movement, as well as freedom of conscience and decision making. In fact, that is one of the values that brings them to have contempt for our kind of society, and it is one of the reasons why we have to defend our kind of society. If we do not defend the open society, if we should lose sight of what keeps us together, makes us distinctive and gives us that quality of life, the terrorist, to a degree, will triumph.

Let us take from this incident a determination to not let the terrorists triumph—not one inch, not in one respect. The defenders of the open society might be slowly roused, but when they are they act decisively. The US government might be slowly roused, but when it acts it must act decisively in favour of the open society, to defend those values which we know are good and right, lest they fall victims to those which we know are evil and wrong. To the people of the United States, to the grieving relatives, to the friends of our fellow Australians, we pay our condolences. We reaffirm our commitment to the values of our society and our commitment to
our ally in the steps that it will take to defend
those values and to make sure that no tri-
umph, no victory, will come to those who
have perpetrated a great evil and a great
wrong.

Ms BURKE (Chisholm) (3.55 p.m.)—I
stand here today to speak to a motion none of
us could have imagined one week ago. It has
already been said many times that the ca-
lamity that occurred last Tuesday will change
the world forever. It appears that up to 5,000
innocent lives have been ended in the terror-
ist attacks on Washington DC, New York
and Pennsylvania. This includes residents of
over 40 nations, including a potential of over
70 Australians; one of the great losses of
Australians at one single event. Five thou-
sand people were caught in the wrong place
at the wrong time. The World Trade Centre is
in ruins, and the Pentagon severely damaged.
Our sense of security has been shattered, and
for some, momentarily, so has our belief in
the humanity of our fellow man.

As awful as this tragedy is, it has not
shaken our belief in our shared goals of de-
mocracy and freedom. Our commitment to
the pursuit of peace and freedom has not wa-
vered. If anything, these terrorist attacks
have created a greater yearning for unity and
for an appreciation of not what divides us but
what unites us all as human beings. So many
poignant stories have emerged from Tues-
day’s tragedies—stories of great courage,
hope, selflessness and the triumph of human
spirit. As the rescuers sift through the wreck-
age in New York, we all hope for the mi-
raculous discovery of more survivors, which
leads me to pay tribute to the emergency
service workers who have so bravely risked
their lives by running into buildings crum-
bbling before their very eyes.

It is estimated that over 200 firefighters
and police officers were killed when the
burning twin towers collapsed. This horrific
figure is a very sobering reminder of the real
dangers emergency workers face every day
in carrying out their duties. As the wife of an
ambulance officer, I am well aware of the
hazardous nature of the jobs of emergency
workers. Their ongoing search for survivors,
and the grim task of recovering what is left
of those that have fallen, is perhaps the most
terrible, yet at the same time the most im-
portant, task, particularly for those grieving
families hoping against hope that they have
not been bereaved by this horrific incident.

I would like to join with the other speak-
ers in endorsing Australia’s commitment to
join the international coalition against ter-
rorism. We must do all within our power to
bring to heel those responsible for this hor-
rendous crime. As President Bush has said, it
is not only the organisations behind this at-
tack that should be punished but any state
that provides sustenance to these so-called
terrorist cells. It is crucial that the organizers
of these acts are identified and brought to
justice on the basis of irrefutable evidence. I
would also like to urge calm in the wake of
this tragedy. To do anything less would be to
dishonour those whose lives have been so
irreversibly changed. Whilst it would be un-
derstandable, we must not approach this with
an uncontrolled sense of revenge and anger.
Only a US-led response that is considered,
measured and supported by a broader coali-
tion of states will begin to counter the evil of
terrorism. To do anything else would be to
play into the terrorists’ hands and diminish
us all.

Australians and Americans have much in
common. We are both relatively young
countries. We are both multicultural coun-
tries that have opened our doors to thousands
of people made homeless by the ravages of
war, natural disaster and persecution. We are
both countries that fought the excesses of
Nazism and Japanese militarism during
World War II, and we are both countries with
a fierce democratic tradition where freedom
is cherished. The US came to our aid during
World War II, and they remained our most
important ally.

As the American people struggle to come
to terms with this attack, I have been im-
pressed by calls by leaders both here and in
the US for tolerance in dealing with our fel-
cow citizens of different ethnic backgrounds.
To date there have been a few isolated inci-
dents of racist acts against our local Muslim
communities. We must deplore these acts.
When any Australian indulges in the scape-
goating of a particular race, it demeans us
all. If we are to prove that these attacks may
have harmed our people but have not broken our spirit, these racist acts must end. As the American Ambassador put it so well at today’s memorial service, no true person of faith could have been behind this act. In the pursuit of their fanatical ideas, grudges and obsessions, these terrorists bastardise the very religions they claim to worship. Whether they are adherents of Christianity, Islam, Judaism, Buddhism or Hinduism, no faith condones the taking of life. I join with other members in calling for all Australians to refrain from stereotyping Muslim communities. They are part of the mosaic of Australian society, and we know their leaders share in our sorrow at these devastating events.

As has been said before, these attacks on America are really attacks on freedom everywhere, and must be defended. I formally extend my condolences to the American people and to all of those who have been hurt here in Australia and across the world. It is my hope that the bond that has developed amongst the citizens of the world in reaction to this horror can be a springboard for a more tolerant and compassionate world.

Mr WILLIAMS (Tangney—Attorney-General) (4.00 p.m.)—All Australians join with our American friends and allies in this time of grief and shock. All Australians condemn those responsible for these most atrocious and heinous terrorist attacks. The indiscriminate use of violence with total disregard for innocent life is the hallmark of terrorism, and the attacks on the United States mark a watershed in the scale, intensity and brutality of such violence. The fanaticism and hatred that drive terrorism are always frightening. In this case, as in so many others throughout history, the name of the Almighty is invoked. But no god, no religion—be it Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam or Judaism—preaches wanton violence and destruction. Because of this the terrorism we have just seen represents an assault on all fundamental human values.

The Australian government and the Australian people, like the rest of the international community, want to see those responsible for these atrocities brought to justice. While we cannot yet be certain, there is evidence that the attacks in the United States were the work of the Osama bin Laden organisation. It will take some time for the investigation to be completed. No doubt a complex network of interrelationships between those responsible will be revealed. But what has happened demonstrates that terrorism of any manifestation represents a threat that knows no borders. Terrorism is an attack on all decent people of all races and all religions. Not knowing exactly who is responsible for these attacks, we must not rush to retribution but we must do all we can to ensure that justice is done. We must also avoid the trap of assuming guilt through assumed association. Like others, I am distressed by reports that Australian Muslim and Arabic communities are being subjected to violence and vilification on the basis that they are somehow associated with the perpetrators of the United States attacks. Such incidents merely play into the hands of those who, like terrorists, do not share civilised democratic values. I call on Australians to promote tolerance, decency and inclusion to all members of the Australian community.

We are not presently able to conduct a detailed analysis of what all this may mean internationally and for Australia. The horrific events were of such a magnitude that it will take some time to comprehend fully the issues that will need to be examined over the coming months. Indeed, it will be essential for the examination to be undertaken with a cool mind and a steely resolve. However, we can say with certainty that what happened in the United States on 11 September 2001 has fundamentally changed the global environment in which we live, and the impact will reverberate for years to come. As a civilised people and as a civilised nation, we owe it to our fellow Australians murdered in the United States, and to the hundreds—the thousands—of other innocent people from other countries who died, to stand with the people of the United States in this time of need. Our memorial to their deaths must be a renewed, determined and sustained commitment to the elimination of terrorism. Anything less would be a betrayal of their memory. We must make the commitment to the elimination of terrorism in the certain knowledge that it will not be easy. There will be setbacks and there will be pain, and we
must be acutely aware that our own active involvement in the fight could well bring terrorism closer to our own shores. But the enormity of the challenge laid down on 11 September leaves decent people the world over with no other choice. It is not a fight of our choosing; it is, however, a fight in which we must join and which we must win.

Australians will need to work carefully and systematically through the implications for our own security and counter-terrorism arrangements. As is the case after any international security incident, we will of course review our security and intelligence procedures. We will do so not in panic or because we believe there are fundamental weaknesses but because it is the sensible and wise thing to do at this time. We will do so with an open mind, to ensure that we have the best possible arrangements for our own circumstances. The Australian people would expect no less. I know the dedicated men and women who work in Australia’s intelligence community, in law enforcement and in protective security policy and coordination will embrace and meet the challenge. They have and deserve our full support.

There has been much discussion about security and an open and democratic society. The two are not incompatible. Indeed, it is essential that we do not lose sight of the fact that it is our very democratic traditions which at the end of the day provide our strongest defence against the evils of the intolerance, bigotry and inhumanity enshrined in terrorism. I fully support the motion before the House.

Mr McMULLAN (Fraser) (4.05 p.m.)—I of course support the motion that is before the House. Quite properly, the bulk of the debate has related to the need for an international response to terrorism. In the immediate term, I, like other speakers, endorse the views reflected in this motion. In the longer term, I endorse the 10-point plan against terrorism released recently by the Leader of the Opposition. This is a circumstance that needs continuing bipartisan support. The consequences of these events will spread far beyond this year’s election. In supporting those remarks and the motion, I am encouraged by the speech made by the United States Ambassador this afternoon which led me to have confidence that the United States response will be proportionate, sensible and discriminating—and let us all hope that it is.

I wish today to focus my remarks on the domestic aspects and consequences of the recent events, as also reflected in the tone of the motion. I was struck—when listening, as I am sure we all have been, to television and radio commentary about these tragic events—by remarks by a former FBI director of counter-terrorism who was being interviewed about, and was quite properly articulating, a series of measures he felt needed to be taken to strengthen the hand of the United States government against terrorism. He made it clear in his remarks that, notwithstanding his strong views on that matter, it was fundamental to his views that nothing that was done to counteract terrorism should be done at the price of American civil liberties. Surely, if a former FBI director of counter-terrorism, with an understandable focus on the priority of action against terrorism, can see the need to protect civil liberties while pursuing the struggle against terrorism, we should do no less. It is very important that all of us, here as members of parliament and throughout the community as Australians, in the heated climate in the lead-up to this election do not do or say anything that would divide rather than unite our nation. In fact, while I recognise that sometimes controversy surrounds government communications campaigns, it seems to me that there would be no controversy about an active government campaign against racism. That is a campaign which I would be pleased to support.

In concluding my remarks, I want to refer to remarks that were made the last time the parliament—although I was then in the Senate—was debating a similar motion, a debate around the Gulf War. These were the remarks made at that time:

There is scarcely a party which has ever been in government or seriously aspired to government in any democracy which does not support—

and I will paraphrase slightly and say ‘resolutions of the nature we are supporting today’. There is universal support amongst parties which pursue democratic processes.
We hope that what is now developing will be carried out with the least possible loss of life and human suffering. We do not endorse these resolutions with enthusiasm for the battle, merely with a grim determination to do that which we do not wish to do but which we feel needs to be done. And if we do not back appropriate measures in response—as required, as outlined by the foreign minister, by decisions already of the United Nations—we will fall back to the circumstance where all we have is pious resolutions with which all people of goodwill concur but which dictators and aggressors can ignore with impunity.

Without a firm, sensible and proportionate response to this act of terrorism, there will be no peace. It is very important that we never forget, as has been said by people more famous than I, that peace is more than the mere absence of war; it is a state beyond merely refraining from taking military action. We must be prepared to act in difficult circumstances in response to these acts of terrorism. Therefore, I support the motion.

Mr Lloyd (Robertson) (4.10 p.m.)—In everyone’s life, there are probably only three or four events of which you always remember where you were at the time, and no matter what else happens they have a significant impact in your life. In my lifetime, there have been three events like that. The first was on 22 November 1963 when President John F. Kennedy was assassinated. The second event was 20 July 1969 when Neil Armstrong walked on the moon. Of course the third event was tragically last Tuesday, 11 September 2001 and I, like thousands of other Australians, sat through the night transfixed in horror at the events that were unfolding before our very eyes.

It has been a week of extreme emotions, where we have witnessed the worst of humanity and have also witnessed the very best of humanity—its strength, heroism and compassion. I wish to express my condolences and those on behalf of all my constituents of Robertson to the families and friends of all those people from 40 nations who have been killed or injured in New York, Washington or Pennsylvania, and particularly to the families of those 70 Australians who are missing and, unfortunately, now presumed killed. There have been spontaneous outpourings of grief and sympathy from the residents of the Central Coast, such as the ‘God bless America’ signs that have suddenly appeared along the F3 freeway, from the 2,000 people who attended the memorial service on Terrigal Beach at very short notice on Saturday, and from the thousands of other Central Coast residents who attended church services throughout the Central Coast yesterday.

Australia and the USA have very strong bonds of enduring friendship. Less than two weeks ago, I had the privilege of attending the launch of a new book by my friend and Central Coast resident and internationally renowned Australian photographer, Ken Duncan. This launch took place at the home of the new American Consul-General in Sydney, Eileen Malloy, who graciously opened her home for the launch of this magnificent book on the beauty of the USA. This particular book was actually taken by our Prime Minister, John Howard, as a gift to President Bush on his recent trip, and I do hope that he did have an opportunity to present the book to him. It is by an internationally recognised Australian photographer and is a book of photos of the beauty of the USA. I think this book now becomes a symbol of the friendship and the bonds between Australia and the USA. I had the opportunity, when speaking to the consul-general, to discuss what depth we have in the friendship between Australia and America.

Many of us would have seen President Bush, just after he had met with Prime Minister John Howard before the terrible events of 11 September, when he called to the assembled media and said, ‘It’s great to have friends who will tell you the truth.’ The friendship is so strong between Australia and the USA that we can discuss issues frankly. We can disagree on some things but, at the end of the day, we are strong friends; and the relationship between Australia and the USA will go on to continue to be a very strong one. Those bonds of friendship between our two nations are very strong, and all Australians will stand side by side with our American friends to fight against terrorism. Terrorism must not succeed. Terrorism will not
succeed. Democracy in the free world will stand against terrorism, and Australia will stand against terrorism—for the sake of our future and the future of our children.

Mr QUICK (Franklin) (4.14 p.m.)—New York is a wonderful city and New Yorkers are wonderful people. I have been fortunate to visit this amazing place several times, as my brother Bob and his wife Sue and their four children live close handy in New Jersey. Like many in this place, I have visited the landmarks of New York. I have clambered up the steps of the Empire State Building and the Statue of Liberty, and I have stood in awe looking at the towering heights that were once the World Trade Centre twin towers.

I have very personal close links with the United States of America. My Aunty May was one of the first American war brides to settle in the USA during World War II. Her late husband Bill, an American marine, fought in the Pacific, especially at Guadalcanal. Their children, Judy, Dale, Greg and Kim, and their families have made me and my family very welcome during our various sojourns over there in the United States. ‘Red’ Reagan, the late father of my sister-in-law Sue, was a fire chief and, during my first visit to New York in 1974 I was privileged to witness the obvious camaraderie and fellowship of the firefighters working in that part of the United States of America.

Last week’s tragedy, witnessed by so many Australians on their TV screens last Tuesday night and early into Wednesday morning, brought home to all of us the devastation capable of springing from the minds of depraved individuals intent solely on wreaking havoc on innocent individuals going about their daily lives. I can imagine New York that morning: tourists seeing the sights, New Yorkers enjoying a morning coffee and newspaper, couples planning their future lives and workers going about their daily tasks in their offices. We can imagine it all taking place—nothing out of the ordinary, daily life in another big metropolis. The sight of aircraft slamming into twin towers, repeated time after time, angle after angle, seemed surreal. Most of us have been desensitised after seeing so many disaster movies based in downtown New York. It was not until one saw those twin towers collapsing, the hundreds of workers desperately trying to save themselves and then that huge cloud of debris rushing down the streets that one realised that this was fair dinkum and that death and tragedy had hit in the most horrific circumstances. My first reaction was to question why: why now, and why in such a horrific way?

Today most of us were privileged to attend a very special service in the Great Hall and to hear the message of hope by the American Ambassador—this message at a time of tragedy and deep grief for so many people in so many countries throughout the world. As I read the Australian newspaper today and saw that long column of so many countries that have been affected by this horrific act, it brought home to me the anguish, grief and obvious desolation in so many families throughout so many countries in this world. It happened in America, but it had enormous impact throughout the world. As the days unfold and talk of retaliation to render a response to this barbaric terrorism is in everyone’s minds, one can but wonder where the future lies. I especially feel for my brother Bob and my sister-in-law Sue, as their eldest son, Seamus, has been called up by the marines for potential future deployment.

I hope and pray that those touched by this tragedy can be comforted somewhat by what is said in this place today. I offer my heartfelt condolences to all the Australian families suffering at this time. I fully support the motion before the House.

Mr IAN MACFARLANE (Groom—Minister for Small Business) (4.19 p.m.)—I rise today in support of the motion in relation to the horrendous events that we all witnessed last week—events that we will all remember for the rest of our lives. They were carried out by barbarians bent on one thing: taking innocent lives by attacking a symbol of the free world. My condolences, on behalf of my family and the people and residents of Groom, go to all those who have lost loved ones or had loved ones injured by this hideous act.

Today we need to pray, as we have done already on a number of occasions, for the victims and their families and friends. Aus-
tralia and the US have links that will never be broken by terrorism. In fact, to the contrary: our links, as is the case now, will only grow stronger through each of these challenges that our nations face together. Our brave soldiers have fought together, and on this occasion perhaps may again. The message that Australians want to give to the people of America is that we will stand beside them as we have in the past.

Despite the horrendous images of that fateful day, the image that sticks closest in my mind is that of the future. The image that was portrayed in yesterday’s Sunday papers and again today in one of the weekly news magazines is the image of the free world that is contained in the Star-Spangled Banner. In this case, it is the image of the American flag still flying, despite everything that has happened, above the ashes of the World Trade Centre.

I support this motion, as I support freedom—as I know it is supported by everyone in this House. I look forward to the days that this House will continue to support freedom with the bipartisanship that has been demonstrated today.

Mr KELVIN THOMSON (Wills) (4.22 p.m.)—I rise both to support the motion and to express the sense of distress and sadness felt by the people in the electorate of Wills and offer condolences on their behalf to the families and friends of those who have been murdered, who have lost their lives, in what is a cowardly, despicable and contemptible act of terrorism. This is indeed an act of terrorism which has diminished us all, which will change our world for the worst, which will generate a sense of insecurity and fear and which will challenge the tolerance, the sense of democracy and respect for others, which has been one of the hallmarks and strengths of Australia and our community. I would urge people both in my electorate of Wills and in the broader Australian community to stick with tolerance. Part of Australia’s great strength is that we are a proudly multicultural society, one made up of people from many different lands united in a distinctive Australian identity. Let’s keep it that way.

If this terrorist activity is found to have been perpetrated by people of Middle Eastern or Islamic background, it does not follow that all people of Islamic or Middle Eastern background are guilty of the offence, any more than it would follow that the rest of us are collectively guilty of, for example, the crimes of Martin Bryant at Port Arthur. I know that many Australians of Islamic and Middle Eastern background, many of whom live in my electorate, unreservedly condemn these terrorist outrages.

To maintain our tolerance, we need to have a dialogue with people of Middle Eastern and Islamic background about things that unite us and things that indeed have the potential to divide us. One of the things that I want to stress as part of that dialogue is my view that there is no place in this world, and certainly no place in Australia, for religious fanaticism of any kind. We can go back over the centuries and see Christian atrocities during the crusades, or wars between Catholics and Protestants in Ireland, France, England and other places, or the actions of Hindu fundamentalists in murdering the Christian missionary Graeme Staines—these sorts of things have gone on over the years. There is no legitimate place for them. We believe that the role of religion is in the private and that the public sphere of politics is not the place to pursue religious objectives. We believe in freedom of religious expression and tolerance for all, no matter what their belief or faith. That necessarily carries within it separation of church and state.

As part of an ongoing political dialogue, we also need to emphasise that there can be no role for violence or terror in seeking to resolve political differences. We must go to this question of suicide bombers, of martyrdom, and say that there can be no place in any civilised society for people who are prepared to engage in, shelter, condone or excuse in any way those who engage in suicide attacks.

I urge a response to this outrage, as this motion also says. But like other speakers, I urge that it not be indiscriminate. What we seek is justice. We are entitled to engage in self-defence, but we have no interest in revenge or vengeance. A successful attack on
terrorism will protect the innocent while punishing the guilty. If it fails to do that, it will simply perpetrate and rekindle the cycle of violence. The world will be diminished by this, and we must all accept some privations which will flow from it. Let us resolve here that we will prevail over terrorism and that the values that we hold dear—freedom, democracy, tolerance, diversity—will prevail as well. I pledge the people of Wills to this essential task.

Mr ENTSCH (Leichhardt— Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Industry, Science and Resources) (4.26 p.m.)—I rise to also very strongly support the motion that we have before us today and express my overwhelming sadness for an act that in my view has really changed the world forever. It is impossible to find words to describe this gutless, cowardly and very mindless act of wanton violence against innocent people. I guess it is also impossible to find words that can convey the deep despair and overwhelming sadness that we feel for all who have been affected by this act.

Certainly, my heart goes out to the people in the United States who are affected by this, and there is the deepest sympathy there for this shared loss. My heart also goes out to all those other families around the world, and I understand that some 20 countries have citizens affected by this. In particular, I mention our own country, which has some 69 missing and three confirmed losses. As the Prime Minister said in his speech earlier in the House, there would be very few Australians who could not relate in some way to somebody over there or who did not know somebody over there who was affected by this incident. In my own case, I attended a wedding in January of a very happy couple who had just been advised of a position that they had been appointed to with the New York Port Authority. They took up a job over there, and the lady concerned worked on the 71st floor of the World Trade Centre. She had to attend a mandatory meeting offsite in Philadelphia on the day of this incident, so fortunately she was not there on the day. Sadly, over 50 of her coworkers lost their lives.

So right around the world this type of thing certainly brings out a level of anger, a level of shock, a level of disbelief. It could be anybody. It happened there on that day, and I think it has highlighted the fact that it could happen anywhere. Any of us or any of our children could be affected by this type of event. I guess it takes us right out of our comfort zone, and I think this is the reason why we must be very, very strong in our response.

I was pleased to see that the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition were very quickly prepared to stand beside the United States and to declare our very strong support. In our action, not only do we need to be very targeted, very specific and very sure of those that have been involved in this act, but also we need to send the message out to those that have a mind to be involved in this type of activity that it will not be tolerated by the decent citizens of this world, and we need to be very swift in our response.

I would also like to congratulate the fire department, the police and the other emergency services over there for their work. It was absolutely outstanding. We see it whenever there are times of need, be it in the United States or in this country. The selfless work and sacrifice by people from these emergency services is just beyond description. Again, they have shown that they are true heroes. I hope that we are quickly able to identify and absolutely confirm those who are involved and that we take action that is a sufficient deterrent to stop this type of mindless violence from continuing in the world. We do not need it, and we must stand up as citizens of the world to see that it is avoided at all costs.

Mr O’CONNOR (Corio) (4.31 p.m.)—I rise today in this parliament—Australia’s great symbol of democracy and freedom—to join with the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition in expressing my condolences to the families and friends of all those who perished in the terrorist attack on New York and Washington on 11 September. On behalf of the people of Geelong, one of Australia’s great provincial cities, I particularly extend my condolences on the floor of this parliament to the people of the United States
as the search for survivors of this tragedy continues and that nation grieves its tragic loss of life and comes to terms with this cowardly and horrendous assault on the democratic values we commonly share.

My personal association with the people of the United States goes back many years, to 1972, when I left Australia with my then five-month-old son Adam to spend a year working and travelling in the United States. I spent that year in the city of De Kalb, Illinois, and experienced first-hand the extraordinary generosity and the great love of life of the people of that city. Those people made our stay a very memorable one indeed. My son Adam is in the gallery today as I extend to all Americans our heartfelt condolences at the great tragedy which has befallen their nation.

I have not seen many of the Americans who were such an important part of my life back then for nearly 30 years, but today, as the Australian parliament expresses its condolences in this motion, which I support, I remember the Modren family in Chicago and Peg and Jimmy Nelson and the many people in De Kalb, Illinois, who are now coming to terms with this attack on their nation and its tragic aftermath. As we all recoil in horror and disbelief at the carnage wrought by this attack, let us keep foremost in our minds that it is, once again, ordinary people going about their daily lives who are the casualties of this senseless and premeditated act of violence. Among them are 70 Australians who will never see their loved ones at home again.

In measuring our collective response to these diabolical acts of terrorism, we must ensure not only that the masterminds of this carnage are brought to justice but that innocents are spared the suffering that inevitably flows from a retaliation which is motivated purely by vengeance. There is a grave responsibility on those who wield such power, lest we all be dragged—honourable values and all—into the darkest abyss where barbarism eats away at our humanity and at the decent values that underpin our civilised society.

In Geelong we are very fortunate indeed to have many races and all the great religions represented in our community. I join with all of them, including the peace loving Muslim community in Geelong, in extending to the people of the United States of America our profound sorrow at your loss. To my fellow Australians who feel a sense of fear, anger and insecurity at these events, now is the time for us to demonstrate in our own communities our deep and abiding commitment to the decent and democratic values that have been universally attacked in such a heinous way in the United States. This is no time for prejudice; it is time for measured restraint. It is time to uphold in a decent, fair but just way the great values and respect for human life handed to us by our mothers and fathers down through the years. We are the guardians of future civilisation; we cannot let our children down. To the people of the United States, to the many rescue workers who have laboured intensely in the search for survivors, to the families here in Australia of those deceased, on behalf of the people of Geelong I extend to you our profound condolences and sympathy.

Mr TIM FISCHER (Farrer) (4.36 p.m.)—Sixty years on from World War II and all its horrors and the Holocaust, 55 years since white Russians and Cossacks were forcibly loaded on trains by the West and sent back east to be exterminated, 25 years or thereabouts from the tragedy of the Munich Olympic Games, and 11 years since the fall of the Berlin Wall, we now have 11 September 2001—this horrific tragedy, the subject of this motion.

Firstly, I would like to say that there are many things that unite religions, including the Christian, Jewish and Islamic faiths’ reverence for Abraham and Moses. But there are things that are even more uniting and they are peace and tolerance. They are revered by the Christian, Jewish, Islamic, Buddhist and Hindu faiths and that proves in a sense that the terrorists who took this action were outside the law, outside anything possibly reasonable, in their approach, and outside the spectrum of any religious faith.

I would like to quote Alistair Cooke, a famous broadcaster who spoke on ABC Radio National yesterday from his base in New York, where he had survived. At the end of his powerful commentary he quoted from a
spiritual hymn: ‘America might be up and America might be down and America might be almost in the ground but America is not in the ground.’

The United States of America is a huge economy and has a population with the determination to move forward and to help the rest of the world move forward from the horrific tragedy which has taken place. The United States of America will recover from this human tragedy and it will deal with everything that arises. I am quietly confident in saying that Australia will play its part and we will of course do so in honour of those who have died, been injured and been so seared in a direct way by that which happened in Pennsylvania, New York and Washington. I support the condolence motion before the House. As I prepare to depart this parliament, I extend my condolences to particularly the families of the Australian victims of this horrific carnage in the United States of America, but also to the families of the victims from all around the world—many countries—and of course from the United States of America.

I do so with a quiet pride in the response by this parliament to these very special and sad circumstances, a pride in the conduct of the Prime Minister, from when he was very much on the spot in the circumstances in Washington right through to this day, and a pride in the conduct of the Leader of the Opposition, the Deputy Prime Minister and the United States Ambassador. These were memorable moments in the life of this parliament as it draws towards its conclusion. Let us hope we will never see the same again or have the need to see the same again. I support the motion before the House.

Ms PLIBERSEK (Sydney) (4.40 p.m.)—I rise today to extend my condolences to the families of all of those who have perished in the United States, to the families of those who are still missing and of the citizens of countries other than the United States who have died or are missing since the terrible tragedy last Tuesday. I think that all members of parliament here share a sense of compassion for the families of those people who have died or are missing.

I am a little surprised that we have been referring to this—as President Bush has been referring to it—as an act of war, because, in a terrible way, that almost cleanses the act. I think that we all know that terrible things happen in war. Yet I think what happened last Tuesday is more accurately described as murder: it is murder that has happened 3,000, 5,000 or 10,000 times—we do not know how many times—that has been committed again and again on one day. I think it is worth remembering that the only thing that will stop the numbers continuing to grow is that the final plane load of terrorists was actually thwarted. We do not know how many more people would have died had that not happened.

When someone is murdered there is no way to prepare for it. There is no way of understanding it, there is no logic to the act and it is not something that any human being or any family should have to deal with in a lifetime. It is worth thinking about the effect on a country where this happens 3,000, 5,000 or 10,000 times in one day. There is an inevitable effect on a country when such a tragedy happens. It is difficult to understand that effect fully until we see the individual photographs of people who are still missing, see the families who are still searching for loved ones and hear the stories of people who tried to phone their families in their last minutes of life. That really brings home to us the true human tragedy of this event.

We also wish to express compassion from this parliament especially to the families of the Australians who have died or are still missing but also to those of the citizens of the 40 other nations who have been affected. We express our admiration for the bravery of the rescue workers. I know that many of my colleagues have expressed admiration for this bravery. But what an extraordinary thing it is to ignore every human instinct and, instead of fleeing from danger, turn around and walk into the heart of it in the hope of saving some other life.

While we debate this condolence motion, I think that it is wise to remember also that there are countries around the world where acts of terror are perpetrated on civilian populations every day. While nothing has
happened in our recent history to match the scale of this act of terrorism, it is worth remembering that in countries such as Ireland, Spain, Sri Lanka, Egypt or—in our own region—the Philippines, their citizens face this fear every day: that they will say goodbye to a loved one and never see them again because of some act of terror.

Some people have drawn comparisons with what happened in Pearl Harbor. Yet it is wise to take heed of what former Secretary of State Warren Christopher said in relation to Pearl Harbor: there is one mistake that we should not repeat when we are talking about the response, and that is that after Pearl Harbor many citizens of Japanese nationality were locked up for no reason other than that they were Japanese. In my final comments, I want to say that we must not compound the tragedy of this event by punishing the innocent. When we are talking about pursuing Osama bin Laden perhaps in Afghanistan, we have to remember that the civilians in Afghanistan have suffered perhaps more than any other people on earth. And they are suffering still: from famine, drought and the rule of the Taliban government. When we set out to punish those who are responsible, it is also worth remembering not just the civilians in the countries such as Afghanistan but also that the US, when they seek to punish, sometimes make mistakes. When the United States initially backed the Mujahadeen in Afghanistan in the hope of fighting communism, they created part of the monster that we are dealing with today. When we seek to punish, we need to be accurate and to be sure of who we are seeking to punish.

Mr CHARLES (La Trobe) (4.45 p.m.)—I rise to support the motion before the House. Those of us alive in the world today will never forget 11 September 2001. A despicable, calculated, premeditated, coordinated act of terrorism and murder was perpetrated on the United States of America, its citizens and citizens of another 40 countries around the world. This was indeed a worldwide act of barbarism which has repulsed those human beings who believe in freedom, democracy, liberty and justice. This was not a random act of terrorism designed to frighten but a crime so heinous as to have been a long time in the planning, executed with precision, and with the objective of destroying the maximum number of buildings and the maximum number of civilians in New York City and Washington DC. It was calculated as well to destroy buildings which were seen by those who carried out these crimes to be stark symbols of the free world, of the United States—a wealthy nation.

In a sense I bridge the societies of the United States and Australia, having been born and having lived in America until age 33 and having now lived in Australia for 32 years, having been a citizen of this great nation for 27 years and a member of this House of Representatives for 11½ years. And while in every sense of the word I am Australian, I still have many friends and, of course, hundreds of relatives in the USA, from coast to coast and from north to south. My support for the United States in this time of crisis is not that of an ex-American but rather as an Australian, friend, neighbour, trading partner and military treaty alliance partner with the USA. The relationship between America and Australia goes back a long way. I remind those of you in the House today that the foundation of our Federation, our Commonwealth government, is based on an executive drawn from the Westminster tradition and a House of Representatives as the people’s house, but with a Senate styled on the US model of equal representation from each state and on a High Court which is a direct steal of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The terrorist attack was not only on the United States of America but on freedom and democracy everywhere around the world. It is possible that 90 Australians have lost their lives in this tragedy and, while their deaths occurred not on our shores but in another country, it represents a far greater loss of life than our not so distant massacre at Port Arthur. This terrorist attack has touched our national psyche and our hearts. I have no comprehension of the bitter and twisted minds of those who would kill themselves in an effort to kill many others in the name of a religion. I think all of us know that these psychopathic killers were not religious fanatics but simply fanatics. All of the world’s
great religions are founded on the basis of love and caring and a value system that helps us towards the establishment of a decent and moral society. No religion could support this kind of barbaric action.

I do not know if I have lost friends, but my sister advises that my family is safe, and I send them my love. My sister Carrollyn and her husband, Les, visited this parliament when we were in session some 18 months ago and met the Prime Minister, the Treasurer, the Leader of the Opposition and many other members and senators. I am sure many in this chamber will remember them. They are safe, but their lives have been forever touched. In July last year Rosie and I were in New York City and travelled by ferry out to the Statue of Liberty. We prevailed upon a young Chinese gentleman to use my camera and take our photograph with Lower Manhattan in the background. That photo today sits on the kitchen windowsill at home. Standing stark in the background of the photograph are the twin towers of the World Trade Centre which are no more.

We in this place are determined that this will not become a modern religious crusade against anyone or any religion but rather a crusade against evil, ignorance, intolerance and inhumanity.

Mr SIDEBOTTOM (Braddon) (4.49 p.m.)—On behalf of the people of the north-west coast of Tasmania, who only recently faced the tragedy and the terror of Port Arthur, I offer our sympathy and condolences for all those people who tragically lost their lives in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania on Tuesday, 11 September 2001. I offer our sympathy and condolences to the family and friends of those who died. And I offer our sympathy to those who are survivors of these terrible acts and who, like the family and friends of those who died, will live with this tragedy and pain in the future. I offer, on behalf of the people of the north-west coast, respect for the courage and selfless duty of all who sought to assist the victims of these incomprehensible acts of terror—the New York Police Department, New York firefighters, ambulance workers, emergency services personnel and individuals—and of those tragically on United’s flight 93, which crashed before it could do even greater damage.

Thousands of people have lost their lives in this act of terror; some 70 of these are Australians. This act of terror affects us all. Some 40 nations had nationals killed in the terror of 11 September. It respected no race, religion, sex, occupation or age. This act of terror was deliberately planned and calculated to attack at the heart of Western civilisation. The United States was the location; Western civilisation was the target. It was a wanton assault on common decency by attacking common people going about their ordinary daily business.

What was its purpose? There is no religious goal achieved, because all religions of the world abhor evil and the roots of evil. There is no religion which can be associated with what is purely evil. No national goal can be achieved because no civilised nation harbours such evil. And the national ideals and values of decency, justice, freedom and the desire for peace have been reinforced in the wake of this tragedy and reaffirmed in the United States and other democratic and freedom seeking nations throughout the world.

If the goal was to attack the heart of the economic world or a symbol of its national security, it has achieved only a worldwide movement of solidarity to maintain ‘business as usual’ and has reminded the world of its need to be more vigilant in the face of evil. What this calculated evil has done, apart from the wanton destruction associated with it, is highlight two things. The first is the capacity of human beings to face evil and adversity head-on and to demonstrate human virtue and goodness when all seems darkest. The aftermath of events in Washington and New York has civilised this evil and suffering. The bravery and courage of those people has lit the torch of a coalition of nations determined to tackle terrorism head-on. The second thing that is highlighted is the fact that terror is real, international and beyond the boundaries of race, creed and locality. We are all vulnerable. Terror is not confined to isolated incidents that make their way into our television sets, to be forgotten soon after except by those who are directly affected.
This act of murder was deliberately designed to affect us all. If it was punishment for something, it delivered a maximum of physical and psychological pain, but it punished the innocent, the most vulnerable and the defenceless. This terrible act has highlighted the existence of evil in our world and the need for people of goodwill and decency to heed that fact and to attack it with equal vigour. This act of terrorism has international victims and it will have international consequences. It was internationally conspired and planned and it will be rooted out and tackled only by a broad coalition of nations.

There is a steely determination to bring to justice those who perpetrated this murder and to punish those who aided and abetted them. It is right that justice is sought and punishment is brought to bear on the guilty. However, it is crucial, in the name of those who have suffered and in the name of the ideals and practices they died by, to ensure that tolerance is given equal emphasis with justice both here and abroad.

Mr TRUSS (Wide Bay—Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry) (4.54 p.m.)—I rise to support the motion and to join in the expressions of sympathy of all Australians in response to the acts of horror that we have witnessed over recent days. They were carefully planned acts of terrorism and barbarity that few in humanity thought could be possible—fanaticism without bounds. The power of television brought this graphic horror to our lounge rooms. It took a recreation by Hollywood to show us years later something of what had happened at Pearl Harbour and in the bombing of London and Dresden, but all of us have instant memories of this event that occurred on the other side of the world—to imagine that Australians in their own households saw at the precise moment a second 767 crashing into the World Trade Centre.

It brought back some memories for us all—our personal associations with the United States or other places. For me, it brought back memories of my visit to the Pentagon a year or so ago. My wife and I were shown around the Pentagon by my cousin, who is a colonel in the United States Army. We were given a couple of little tags as a commemoration of that visit, presented by the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans. My wife and I took those tags to this morning’s memorial service. I hope that the general who presented the tags to us is still alive. His office was certainly destroyed. The office where my cousin worked was where the aircraft hit. Fortunately, he was transferred to another part of the United States quite a while ago, so he was safe during this disaster, but it certainly brings back personal memories.

The response around the world has been one of shock and horror, anger and bitterness, sorrow and sympathy, strength and courage, and sacrifice and heroism. But there is also a determination and resolve—a resolve to seek out those who are responsible, a resolve to ensure that terrorists do not achieve their objectives of disrupting and destroying a nation and the enthusiasm of mankind, and a resolve to rebuild and to resist such terrorism and barbarity. The fact that three out of the four similarly conceived and executed acts of terror actually achieved their primary objective is a warning to us all of how difficult it is to protect civilian life from this kind of action. If someone places no value on their own life or even regards their death as the gateway to glory, it is impossible to build an impervious wall of protection.

The motion before us today is not just one of sympathy and commemoration. It invokes for the first time in 50 years the provisions of the ANZUS agreement. When I entered parliament, I hoped and prayed that as a member of parliament I would never be asked to commit Australian troops to war or any perilous action, but in my very first term we were asked to look at issues like the Gulf War. Subsequently we have had to deal with East Timor. Last week, for the first time in 50 years, cabinet invoked articles IV and V of ANZUS. We need to be very conscious of the fact that this is indeed a very significant motion before the parliament.

Terrorism is a war in which everyone is in the front line. We cannot assume that this commitment is merely about sending trained soldiers; it could be our houses or our offices. I was greatly moved by the powerfully
eloquent tribute of the United States Ambassador in today’s memorial service. He effectively welded together sympathy for victims and families from the United States and from Australia, and he showed our determination to rebuild and our resolve to build a better and a safer world. It is not a disaster just for the United States; it is the worst peacetime loss of Australian lives at the hand of man. It is also an Australian tragedy, and we must show the same resolve to fight back, to resist terror and to show that we can still be a compassionate and caring society for the betterment of all mankind.

Mr EMERSON (Rankin) (4.59 p.m.)—As I watched the horror of the unfolding tragedy in the United States last week, I thought of mothers who would have to try to explain to their children that they would never see their dads again, and I thought of fathers who would have to try to explain to their children that they would never see their mums again. I extend my deepest sympathies to the victims of this murderous terrorism and to their families.

I was delighted by the wonderful words of the American ambassador at today’s service in Parliament House. He said, ‘Americans are not a vengeful people. We will not strike out at the innocent.’ We cannot avenge the death of innocents through the death of innocents. If all we achieve is the death of more innocent people, we will have achieved nothing and we will have lost our humanity. We must not lose our humanity, but we must hunt down terrorists and bring them to justice.

I trust that the President of the United States will be guided by wisdom and compassion and I am encouraged by his measured response and his steely determination. I am encouraged, too, by the words of the President, of the Mayor of New York, of the Australian Prime Minister and of the Leader of the Opposition, all of whom have said that they extend the hand of friendship to the Islamic community. As their elected representative, I extend the hand of friendship to the Islamic community of Logan City who are a peace loving community. Let us fight terrorism with wisdom. Let us retain our humanity and let us not seek to avenge the death of innocents with the death of innocents.

Mr VAILE (Lyne—Minister for Trade) (5.01 p.m.)—I am pleased to have the opportunity to associate myself with the motion moved by the Prime Minister in this most serious of all times that we have experienced in the world’s recent history.

Reflecting on the events of last week and on some of the forums I have been involved in over the last two or three months representing Australia’s interests with my responsibilities as trade minister, I was thinking about how much global interaction between nations had changed in the last 10 or so years. Much of the political divide and differences had dissipated with the fall of the Berlin Wall. Most of the interaction between most countries was based on a desire to improve the economic wellbeing of their societies. One had a sense that, at last, our globe and mankind were moving ahead with a view to eliminating poverty and improving the circumstances of all peoples around the world. Of course, in a large part, that was being led by the developed economies of the world, of which Australia and the United States are part. Only a matter of weeks ago, we had a significant event, the US-Australian leadership dialogue, here in Australia. A number of senior Americans came here and participated in that dialogue with senior Australians from government and the business community about how we are going to manage the future economic development and growth across the world.

Then we had the tragedy of last week when terrorists demolished the World Trade Centre buildings in New York, which were the icons and the epitome of the developed world and of how the democratisation of capital, information and technology is taking place and how that is benefiting all nations of the world. It may have been the defence secretary who mentioned that these buildings were not the New York Trade Centre or the American Trade Centre; they were the World Trade Centre. Indicative of that is the fact that the nationals of 40 or so different countries are still missing and believed killed in that act of terror last week. Australia is
amongst those countries and we still have about 69 people who are unaccounted for.

It is terribly sad that the whole world was moving forward so well in an economic sense. Over recent years, hundreds of millions of people have been lifted out of poverty because of the focus, cohesion and cooperation of the majority of the countries of the world and because, at last, the energies of all those countries were being put into improving the economic and social wellbeing of the nations of the world and not into conflicts over sovereign borders or into the sort of conflicts we have suffered across the world over the centuries. Let us hope that that direction has not changed with the events of last week. Let us hope that maturity, professionalism, clarity of thought and vision dominate the thinking across the world over the coming days, weeks and months. That is going to be critically important. Just before I came in here, I was watching CNN. It appears that a delegation from Pakistan has gone into Afghanistan to seek from the Taliban government in Afghanistan the handing over of one of the suspects of this act of terror. We are seeing a very united front across the world in trying to get some answers and bring some people to justice.

I thought it was important in this debate today to record in Hansard some comments that I received last week from our representatives—the Australian government’s representatives—in New York. The comments were by way of an email from Geoff Grey, Austrade’s senior trade commissioner and the deputy consul-general in New York. He wrote:

I sit here now with my shirt stained with the tears of my shocked staff. Behind me I can see out of my window southern Manhattan which is covered in smoke and dust as the horrors of the events four hours ago sink in and anger builds in the city. This morning, just before nine, I was at the computer when I turned around and witnessed the first plane hit the left side of the tower. This was a shock for all as just four years ago the Consulate was temporarily located in the World Trade Centre. We were all consoling ourselves as we watched the second plane hit the East River side tower and explode. The anguish and shock was nothing compared to how we felt when, an hour later, one tower exploded and fell down like a house of cards, then half an hour later the second tower disintegrated. All of a sudden, two of the world’s greatest buildings had gone before our eyes. All our staff and family are safe. Several, including myself, cannot return home. We know all the Reserve Bank people are safe, but we have concern for many Australian bankers, brokers and consultants who were in their offices in those buildings this morning. Our staff has departed, most still in shock, walking to friends’ places up town. All business is closed. There is a strange hush in the streets of this great city except for the sounds from the emergency vehicles. We are providing assistance for the consul-general, the ambassador and the disaster team we have established to support the Australian community in New York.

I would just like to acknowledge the great work that our Consul-General, Ken Allen, Geoff Grey, and our ambassador, Michael Thawley, and all their staff have done through this terrible tragedy in the US. (Time expired)

Mr COX (Kingston) (5.06 p.m.)—Last week the world witnessed something that we had not previously dared to contemplate. At this afternoon’s service in the Great Hall to commemorate the victims, the Bishop of the Australian Defence Force, the Reverend Tom Frame, described those attacks as ‘cruel, ruthless and indiscriminate’. They were acts that have no basis in any religion. They were political acts aimed at the heart of America’s military and financial institutions. As an attack on America, our strongest ally for more than 50 years, they were an attack on our way of life, as well as America’s.

Last week the US invoked the ANZUS Treaty. Australia will stand beside its friend in dealing with this threat to the way of life our people share. Similarly, the US has invoked the NATO alliance. Responding to this escalated level of terrorist threat is a collective responsibility of all nations who wish to live freely and without fear. The response must be measured and certain to deal with the perpetrators. That action must be calculated to avert any continuation or escalation of this new level of violence, which is indeed a very real risk. This collective action to deal with the causes of terrorism must be concerted and ongoing. The objective must be a world where not only is terrorism unaccept-
able but nations cannot promote, harbour or condone terrorism without serious sanction by the international community.

We have all been greatly uplifted over the last few days by the efforts of the rescue workers in New York. We have heard the stories of how many of them sacrificed their lives going up into that building before it collapsed. They would have been well aware of the risks that they were taking when they did that. We have seen and heard stories about the new spirit of community and unity in New York, which in other days has been a somewhat harder city. It is time to reflect on the sort of unity that we want in our own country.

We give our heartfelt sympathies to the families of the people who were killed in these incidents and to the many families who still do not know what has happened to family members and are waiting in the hope of some good news. Sixty-nine Australians are in that collective group. I would like to mention one of them. Andrew Knox is a young man from Adelaide and is a member of the Labor Party. He is well known to me. He was working on the 103rd floor of the World Trade Centre when the aircraft hit the first tower. He was on the phone to a colleague and he apparently said that they thought a plane had hit the tower and that they were going to the roof. That was the last communication with Andrew.

Andrew is the son of Tony and Marion Knox, who live at Modbury. He has a twin brother, Stuart. They are deeply concerned and waiting for information on what has happened to him. Before Andrew went to New York, he was a fine industrial advocate who worked for the AWU in South Australia. He was active in the Labor Party. He ran the Labor Party’s campaign in Makin at the last election. He thought about running as a candidate at this election but decided to further his career overseas. Our hearts go out to Andrew, to his family and to all his friends who are missing him greatly at this time.

Mr PYNE (Sturt) (5.11 p.m.)—In the book of Ruth, Ruth writes:

   I will go where you go. I will live where you live. Your people will be my people. Your God will be my God.

The words of Ruth say much more eloquently than I could how we feel as Australians about our kinship with the people of the United States. We feel complete solidarity with them in every way. There is no daylight between us and the people of the United States, not a fraction. To paraphrase Ruth, we will go where they go, we will live where they live, and we will do what they do to ensure freedom in the world.

The attack on 11 September on the United States was a world-changing experience. The world will never be the same as it was on 10 September, following the events of 11 September. In some ways that will be a tragic thing; in other ways it may be a catalyst for a war on terrorism, which has been long overdue amongst the nations of the free world. This was an attack on the free world. It was an attack on our values, on our way of life, on our commitment to peace and on our commitment to democracy. The Prime Minister was right to identify it as such in the first moments of his knowledge of it on Wednesday. The United States and Australia share the same values as many of the nations of the free world—free institutions, democracy and a commitment to peace—but once roused, as those nations of the free world have proven before and will prove on this occasion, they are the most formidable opponents imaginable.

The attack on the United States on 11 September was the greatest attack in the history of the United States since the war of 1812—ironically, a war fought by the United States against Great Britain, which just goes to show how much has changed and how far back in history an attack of this magnitude was on the soil of the United States. Its importance is magnified when you consider that NATO has invoked article 5 of its treaty and article IV of the ANZUS Treaty has been invoked. It is the first time in the history of those treaties that those articles have been invoked. It is the first time in the history of those treaties that those articles have been invoked for the protection of the United States and the rest of the treaty signatories. Its importance is also magnified when you think that the other two great world powers—not as great as the United States—China and Russia, are standing with the
The change in the geopolitical order of the world will be seismic as a consequence of 11 September because all countries are united against terrorism and against the indiscriminate attack on civilians. We have to remember that none of the people who died on 11 September signed up for military service. None of those people ever thought of themselves as being in the front line of any battle. They were innocent civilians just like you and me. It could have been any one of us in the World Trade Centre, the Pentagon or on those planes that were used so disgracefully, so repugnanty, on 11 September.

Australia has pledged to join the United States and the rest of the free world to fight this war against terrorism, and it is not an idle pledge, it is not meaningless. Australian lives have already been lost on 11 September, and it may well be that other Australian lives are lost as part of the war. The words of Tennyson in *Ulysses* come to mind at this time:

I am a part of all that I have met
… … … …
Tho’ much is taken, much abides
… … … …
... that which we are, we are—
One equal temper of heroic hearts,
Made weak by time and fate, but strong in will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.

Mr LEO McLEAY (Watson) (5.16 p.m.)—As the member for Watson, I represent a diverse group of Australians—many nationalities, many religions, many cultures—and I am grateful for the opportunity this evening to extend my condolences, on behalf of my constituents, to the people of America in the wake of this act of barbarism.

Like many members of this House, I never miss an episode of *The West Wing*, that encapsulation of American politics. So it was last Tuesday night. It was with a sense of unreality that I then watched on the news that immediately followed *The West Wing* the events which were unfolding in New York and Washington. Like many Australians, I was up until the early hours of Wednesday morning watching the news and wondering, ‘Can this possibly get worse?’ when all the time it did. There is no doubt that these were acts of barbarism, and our hearts go out to all those who have been touched by this disaster. It was particularly poignant to hear the stories of those who worked in the buildings—ordinary people going about their daily working lives. The people who were in those buildings were not involved in acts of aggression or war against anybody. And it was not just American citizens who were killed or injured in these events. I am particularly mindful of the nearly 70 Australians who are still missing—a reminder to all of us that we now live in a truly international society.

But, as in all disasters, our spirits were lifted by the selfless sacrifice of many. In the newspapers and on the television every day last week we saw new heroes. We saw people who lost their lives to support others: the passengers on the plane that crashed outside Philadelphia and the brave firemen and police in New York and Washington. That terrible photograph in one of the newspapers of the fireman going up the stairs in the World Trade Centre to his own certain death while everyone else ran out epitomised to me the courage of the emergency service workers, and our hearts go out to their families.

No decent person of any faith would perpetrate a barbarous act like this against innocent people. In supporting this motion I would particularly like to draw the attention of the House to paragraph 8. This is particularly important because, at this time of great emotional turmoil, we should not be looking for enemies within. We should bear in mind what the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition have said about making scapegoats of Australians of the Muslim faith. In this time of crisis, we must reach out to them as well because they are suffering due to the actions of a few bigots. Last Wednesday, with the state member for Lakemba, I visited the Lakemba mosque in my electorate, where they were holding a prayer vigil for the victims and their families. Tonight I want to assure those people that it is as absurd to attribute blame to Australian Muslims for these actions as it would
be to attribute blame to Australian Catholics for the actions of the IRA. No decent Australian attributes any blame to the Australian Muslim community.

I was pleased to hear Vice-President Cheney and Secretary of State Powell saying that America’s response to this tragedy will be measured and accurate. The international community should join together to strike down international terrorism because it is a threat to the freedom of us all, but we should not give in to hysteria or calls for revenge. This resolution is not a carte blanche for international war against innocent people; otherwise, we become no better than the terrorists themselves. This is a time for cool heads and considered actions. We should join with the Americans in bringing the perpetrators of this crime to justice, but we should ensure that we are not laying the ground for another group of disaffected fanatics to grow out of the ashes of our actions.

I join with all members of the House in extending my condolences to the families and friends of all those who died or were injured in those terrible atrocities in the United States last Tuesday.

Mr HAWKER (Wannon) (5.21 p.m.)—I join with colleagues in this condolence motion. Listening to the Chief Opposition Whip, I could not help but agree with some of his sentiments about the importance of cool heads and taking a considered view on how we might handle this. I very much support the words of the Prime Minister and the eight points that he has made, and I acknowledge the very strong support given by all members in this House to this motion, which was seconded by the Leader of the Opposition. I think that it shows our very strong and, dare I say it, unanimous support for the United States at this very difficult time and, in particular, for the families of the bereaved, who would still be questioning why this ever occurred and why it was ever considered that innocent people should be struck down in this bizarre way.

When we look at this whole question, there is no doubt that the point made in the Prime Minister’s motion where he talks about expressing our horror probably has unanimous support not only in this House but also throughout the nation. I think it is very important that we reinforce the very strong support that we do have for the people of the United States and their government at this difficult time and that we extend our deepest sympathy. We certainly do share not only the loss they feel for their people but also their concerns about the ongoing effect. As previous speakers have pointed out, this is a point in time where things have changed and where things will not go back to where they were.

These actions represent an assault not only on the people and the values of the United States but also on free societies everywhere. Again, I think that is a very significant point and one on which we in the free world are going to have to unite with people right across the world to work out how we are going to tackle this very difficult attack that has been mounted on the freedoms that we value so much. I think it is also important that, when we consider what happens hereon—and I know that today is not the day to discuss that in any detail—we do display tolerance, as the Prime Minister put it, and the inclusion that we value so much and which the terrorists have assaulted. It is very important that, when we deal with this issue, we do not stoop to the level of the terrorists and see the loss of innocent lives, wherever it might be in the world that those who need to be brought to justice are going to be brought to justice.

Having said that, it is very important that we do see these people brought to justice, and therefore I strongly support the Prime Minister’s invoking article IV of the ANZUS Treaty to ensure that Australia demonstrates very clearly that we are wholeheartedly with the United States in their efforts to seek out those who perpetrated this crime against innocent people and to ensure that not only are they brought to justice but also the message is made very clear right throughout the world that this is not going to be tolerated. I think that is very important.

It is interesting to note how this situation has developed, probably in a way that we have not seen before. The military people have an interesting expression for it: asymmetric warfare—that is, when one side is
incapable of direct warfare they will use such a thing as this unexpected attack on the World Trade Centre to wage what has been described as war. I think that really is what it was: it was an unprovoked attack on innocent civilians and therefore something that will have to be dealt with accordingly. I certainly express on behalf of my electorate of Wannon our heartfelt sympathy to the families of those who lost their lives in this tragic and dreadful situation.

Mr BYRNE (Holt) (5.26 p.m.)—It is with a sense of sadness that I rise tonight to support this condolence motion. I think there will be very few times in our political lives where we will discuss an issue that has affected our nation and our community as much as this one. I would particularly like to start by extending my condolences to the people of America and to the families who have lost loved ones and, importantly, to the families of the 69 missing Australians. What must be going through their minds at this time is something that obviously we would not want to share; the only thing we can do is lend our support as fellow Australians and our respect and our love. Having lost loved ones ourselves, we know how it feels. For them to be put in a situation like this, with their families being very far away, must be a terrible set of circumstances.

We have reacted not just as Australians but as human beings with a great sense of horror, outrage and disbelief. I think events like this clarify to us the fragility of human existence. Who of us, when we were watching the news on our television sets at 11 p.m. on that Tuesday evening, as I was, could have possibly envisaged that a plane, with the intent of the wanton destruction of human life, would smash into a symbol of democracy, of freedom and of power? What it quite clearly illustrates to our community and to the community at large, visually, dramatically and inescapably, is that no building, however tall, and no country, however strong, is immune from acts of wanton human destruction, of evil. As I said, this has been brought home to us in the most dramatic and visual way possible.

There is no doubt that freedom loving nations must react strongly to this atrocity, this barbaric act, that was committed. But I urge that we react in a measured way, a calculated way and a deliberative way. We have obviously been given an inescapable reminder that these sorts of terrible acts can be committed. But we must react with a sense of calm deliberation, not with a sense of wanting revenge and not with a sense of trying to perpetrate wanton destruction. I take great heart and strength from the purposefulness of the American people, their resolve, their coolness, their sense of unity and their sense of trying to move forward. Thus, when we think of ways in which we must react, we must use that same sense of purpose and that same deliberate calm—that same manner of response. Thus, if we react in that way we will react in a way in which we should, rather than seeking wanton revenge on an unclear enemy at this point in time.

It is amazing how this event has affected people in my electorate. What seems to have been missed in this condolence motion is the strength of character of the Australian people. Who among us would not have been impressed, as we have moved through our electorates, by people coming together and talking about their experiences? In Melbourne, for example, a radio station threw open its lines so people could talk about their experiences. Australians have reacted with sympathy, profound sorrow and profound grief, and they have been sharing their experiences with fellow Australians. There have also been other, less palatable manifestations of what has happened. In my electorate, we have a large Muslim community and people feel as though they have been unfairly scapegoated. But that is a very small proportion. I have found that people have been talking with sincere regret and horror about what has happened; they are trying to rationalise what has happened and to make sense of it. That certainly is a hallmark of the Australian character. They have been trying to provide support. I live next to an American family who knew someone who was on one of the planes. We are citizens of a global community and this event, more than anything, ratifies that.

Church services were held throughout my electorate, and a parish priest asked me to
raise one story in particular. The story goes:

some time ago, a man punished his five-year-old daughter for wasting a roll of expensive gold wrapping paper. Money was tight. He became even more upset when the child used the gold paper to decorate a box to put under the Christmas tree. The little girl brought the box to her father the next morning and said, ‘This is for you, Daddy.’ The father was embarrassed by his earlier overreaction, but his anger flared again when he found that the box was empty. He spoke to her in a harsh manner:

‘Don’t you know, young lady, that when you give someone a present there is supposed to be something inside the package?’ The little girl looked up at him with tears in her eyes and said, ‘Daddy, it’s not empty. I blew kisses into it until it was full.’ The father was crushed. He fell to his knees and put his arms around his little girl, and he begged her to forgive him for his unnecessary anger. An accident took the life of the child only a short time later, and it is told that the father kept the gold box by his bed for all the years of his life. Whenever he was discouraged or faced difficult problems, he would open the box, take out an imaginary kiss, and remember the love of the child who had put it there.

In a very real sense, each of us has been given a golden box filled with unconditional love and kisses from our children, family, friends and God. It is this we must remember in these sorts of circumstances. (Time expired)

Mrs DE-ANNE KELLY (Dawson) (5.31 p.m.)—I rise to support the Prime Minister’s motion. This week, evil has taken flight and crashed into the heart of the greatest democracy on earth. People from many countries and many faiths died at the World Trade Centre in New York, at the Pentagon in Washington DC, and at the aircraft crash site in Pennsylvania. They were people like you and me: waving to spouses, kissing children off to school, preparing for a busy day—unaware that it was their last morning on earth.

The toll is truly terrible. One firm alone has lost an estimated 700 people. That is 1,400 children who have lost a parent. These people were attacked because they live in and support a free, open and democratic society. The attack on America and on her values and beliefs is an attack on Australians as well, for we share the same values and beliefs. For our dear friends in America, may God’s loving kindness be a comfort and support in the terrible days and months ahead.

The evil perpetrators of these terrible acts must be brought to account. There must be a calm, purposeful and effective response to these terrorists and to those who laud terrorism. The Prime Minister has rightly said that terrorism has no faith and no nationality. This is true. I want to mention to the House our own Muslim community in Mackay, some of whom attended the interdenominational service on Friday afternoon. Imam Barry Hassan told me how distressed the Mackay Muslim community are by the tragic events and that they condemn those responsible. I also fully support the Prime Minister’s pledge of Australia’s support, within our capabilities, of the United States-led action against those responsible for these terrible acts.

We must not allow time, rhetoric, cost or academic argument to cause us to waver in supporting our American friends. Those who died, and their families who remain, must have justice. Those of us who live must live not in fearful shadows but in the sunshine of freedom and democracy.

Mrs CROSIO (Prospect) (5.35 p.m.)—I, too, join the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition in this condolence motion. In the United States, on 11 September 2001, what can only be described as a truly horrible attack on freedom changed our world. Many Australians watched in a state of complete disbelief as the twin towers of the World Trade Centre, which were once symbols of success, democracy and capitalism in the free world, came crashing to the ground, and the defence headquarters of the world’s only superpower lay crippled by the senseless acts of a few madmen.

To the people of America: the whole Australian community mourns with you. Words expressing our deepest condolences and sympathy seem, at a time like this, so futile. To the people who have lost their loved ones in this senseless human tragedy: we pray for you. To those who gave their lives to help
save others: may you never be forgotten. We as a society must continue to denounce this cowardly act, the magnitude and consequences of which are far too great to comprehend at this moment. However, violence must not beget violence. People are looking for a reason. Feelings of shock are now being replaced with feelings of revenge, anger and retribution for this act of bastardy. To those people who call for revenge: your rage and anger is shared by all people of good faith, regardless of their religion. We must turn these feelings into actions which show civility and intelligence, by reacting in a way which will punish the guilty and protect the innocent. We must not start to engage in stupid actions which will only create division and hatred within our multicultural communities. A network of international extremist terrorists was obviously responsible for this act of pure evil, and it is these underground terrorist organisations which must be brought to justice.

People will always remember what they were doing at the moment when this event took place. I was here in Canberra at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conference. Just before midnight, my daughter rang and said, ‘Mum, quick, turn on the TV.’ I sat there glued to the TV for six hours. Of course, my first action was to ring my son, who travels widely. Two weeks before, he was in that very spot in America. He was fine; he said, ‘I’m in Hong Kong.’ I rang my sister to find out about my nieces, nephew and other family who live in Philadelphia.

Then my daughter sent me Rory Robertson’s report, a first-hand account of what happened. Here is a man who was lucky, an Australian who escaped. I would like to put his account on the record of this parliament. This is not what the reporters are reporting; this is an individual, an Australian, like you and me. He said:

Like many others, I was way too close to the action. I am pretty shaken, though I do not have even a scratch. Thank you to all those who called to see that I am okay.

At about 8.45am, we were on the ground floor of the World Trade Centre Marriott listening to the breakfast speaker at the NABE (National Association for Business Economics) conference when what turned out to be the first hijacked plane hit our tower.

There was a bit of a bang and the building shook. We all looked at each other across the table, wondering. Earthquake? Presumably everyone else was also thinking about the 110 floors above us. Then the building shook again. Everyone ran for the door and then the foyer. The move was reasonably orderly. I noticed dust and smoke coming from one lift well; probably it was a bomb (as in 1993), I thought? I was terrified, but okay.

Everyone was keen to get out into the street, but we didn’t really know how frightened to be. On getting to the foyer, you could see the debris outside on the ground. Hotel officials told people not to go outside, as things might still be crashing down. Maybe five minutes later, people moved outside and we could see the hole near the top of the building. And the fire. It was a mind-numbing sight.

Thousands of people were spilling out into the street from buildings in the financial district, but none of us had much idea what had happened. Someone said it was a missile; another said a helicopter had crashed into the tower. So it might have been an accident?

I didn’t have a clue what to do. I guessed the conference was over. Growing crowds were milling around. Like everyone else, I kept looking up, marvelling at the hole and the fire near the top of the first tower. I didn’t see people jumping out, but many were talking about it. I noticed a car torn in half and an engine that seemed to have flown out of nowhere. I tried to ring Gwen and Matt (they knew I was in the WTC today) to let them know that I was okay. The mobile wouldn’t work but eventually Gwen got through, and she let Matt know at work for me. I tried to ring my brother in Brisbane, but the mobile wouldn’t call out.

I figured I would walk downtown away from the WTC and then walk to midtown via the East side. As I started to move away, I observed debris here and there, the sorts of things you would expect to see when a passenger plane explodes. I was maybe 250 yards from the WTC when I looked up and saw the second plane fly directly—maybe 150 yards—above me. Instantly, I knew it was going to hit the tower. I didn’t watch, I didn’t see it hit. I just ran, maybe 50 yards towards an alley behind the building, terrified that the debris could easily carry to where I stood.

As I ran, I heard the explosion as the second plane hit. I made the alley, and hugged the near-side of the building. My thought was that the
building was high enough to block out any flying objects, but looking around the alley I could see bits and pieces from the first plane. A young Japanese woman stumbled into the alley, crying and very distressed. We hunkered against the wall. I put my arm around her shoulder and told her that we were safe, at the same time hoping that we were. It was like being in the middle of a disaster movie; it was hard to credit what was unfolding all around.

After waiting a few minutes, I started walking quickly to the bottom of the island, before heading East and then uptown. Looking over my left shoulder, I could see the holes in the two towers, and the fires.

And it goes on. This man, an Australian, experienced it. He said:

... I shudder to think how many hundreds, probably thousands of people have been killed today. This is huge human tragedy.

It is a human tragedy but I plead with those people who want action—and we all do—that we will be judged in history by what actions we take and deeds we do today. Let us again mourn those people who have lost their lives and let us praise those who have worked to try to save them.

Mr ANDREWS (Menzies) (5.40 p.m.)—Like tens of thousands of other Australians, I switched on the television last Tuesday evening to catch the late news and spent the next few hours transfixed as the destruction and devastation of the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon took place. The image of the second aircraft exploding into the World Trade Centre and the subsequent implosion of the two buildings, killing thousands in the process, will remain imprinted on my mind forever. Words cannot describe fully our reaction to this terrible tragedy, nor convey our feelings of horror at this manifestation of evil.

Terrorism is not confined to those who purport to clothe themselves in the garments of Islam. We only have to recall some of the other trouble spots in the world to know that evil is not born of a particular race or religion but in the minds of fanatical individuals. The shock and devastation of this tragedy is shared by all men and women of goodwill, men and women of all faiths and of none.

If we allow fear to fester and individuals or particular communities to become scape-goats, the terrorists and their supporters will have achieved, in part, their objectives. We should not, and cannot, allow that to happen. Darkness cannot be lifted by darkness nor terrorism defeated by terrorism. It can only be overcome by a firm commitment to those values which undergird our civilisation: justice tempered with compassion; rights balanced by responsibilities; and our response to aggression not only resolute, but targeted and proportionate. Forty years ago, John Fitzgerald Kennedy said:

In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. Unexpectedly and without adequate warning that role has been conferred on the peace-loving peoples of the world. We cannot fail this task; the alternative is too horrifying to contemplate. There can be no freedom without personal safety and national security. Let our memorial to the thousands of innocent victims of these murderous deeds be a more peaceful world in which virtue abounds and fanaticism is driven from the face of the globe.

I join with my colleagues in this place in condemning these attacks, offering prayer for the victims, expressing condolences to the families and friends of those killed and injured, praising the bravery of the emergency workers, supporting the United States in their response to this terror, and recommitting to the pursuit of peace, welfare and dignity for all the people of the world.

Mr SNOWDON (Northern Territory) (5.43 p.m.)—On my behalf and that of my family, and I am sure on behalf of every person living in my electorate in the Northern Territory, I would like to extend our deepest sympathies to the families and friends of those who have been killed and injured and those who are missing, and ask God to assist those who are undertaking the heroic emergency work both previously and now.

I know that I speak on behalf of all Territorians when I express anger, horror and sadness at this absurd, vicious and premeditated act of terrorism and mass murder against defenceless citizens. This is a tragedy for the world community that will reverberate through time. It is particularly important for
us in the Northern Territory because in Alice Springs we host a relatively large number of citizens of the United States, most of whom work at the Pine Gap joint defence facility. I can say with certainty that the community of Alice Springs has expressed its concern and its support for those United States citizens in Alice Springs and their families further away. We also of course express our heartfelt condolences to those Australian families who we know have family members who are missing. We know of three Australians who are dead.

Those involved in this tragedy were innocent victims. They did not deserve to die. They were not part of anyone’s war. The murders of these innocent people can never be accepted, never be condoned and never be supported. Those who committed this terrible act must be brought to justice. There must be a war on terrorism, but it must be even tempered. The innocent must be protected around the world. That is why, when we seek the criminals who did this terrible act, we must not fall into the trap of committing terrible acts of our own. When we embark on this quest for justice, we must not allow innocent people to become victims. The innocent everywhere must be protected, regardless of where they live. We cannot afford to escalate the danger to innocents in our quest for justice. If we do so, we begin to lose the battle. The only way to win this war is by protecting the innocent to ensure a permanent end to the war against terror.

When Islamic Australians and Australians of Middle Eastern heritage are threatened or assaulted or when their properties or places of worship are attacked, we are heading for defeat—down entirely the wrong path. We damage ourselves and our unity as a nation. We must ensure that we are not guilty of typecasting, vilifying or victimising innocent people because of who they are, their religion or where they have come from. Our success or failure in this war depends on our capacity to defend the innocent and ensure a lasting peace. We have an obligation to ensure that, in committing ourselves to this cause, we will do so with humility and humanity. We must be involved in this struggle for justice and we must recognise and accept that our diversity is itself a mark of our strength as a democracy.

We must ensure that our quest for justice is prompted not by vengeance but by a desire to bring to justice those who are responsible for this outrageous act of terror. In the cold light of day, the world community has an obligation to those whose lives have been lost, to those who feel the pain of loss and are grieving, and to all in present and future generations, to strive to fight against terrorism and violence wherever and for whatever reason it exists. The fight against terrorism is a fight that we must win. It must be fought with commonsense and it must be fought with humanity. Our friends in the United States have suffered. We say to them: we will stand by you in this quest for justice, in this your hour of trial. We stand by you with an emerging international and strong coalition of nations. We share your grief. To all those who have lost friends and family: you are in our prayers.

Mrs Vale (Hughes) (5.48 p.m.)—I rise in support of the Prime Minister’s motion of condolence on behalf of our American friends in their hour of national distress. The act of terrorism against a peaceful democratic nation, one of the family of democratic nations to which Australia belongs, is an act of terror against Australia and every human being who believes in freedom, democracy, decency and justice. We say to our American friends: your loss is our loss, your grief is our grief. The many thousands of souls who lost their lives last Tuesday—in the four aircraft, in the World Trade Centre towers and in the Pentagon—came from many nations, but they were all our kindred. They shared our values, our ideals, our hopes and our aspirations for the future. We say to our American friends: we will stand beside you in your time of trouble, as you have stood beside us in the past. With other nations of like spirit we will face the future together, equally committed to liberty, freedom, truth and human decency for all peoples of the earth.

In addition to the loss of so many thousands of our fellow human beings, and in the face of the hateful, deliberate destruction of the symbols of the economic and industrial
supremacy of the Western world, we witnessed the ravaging of the fragile, vital trust from which our shared democratic institutions derive their authority and consensus. The democratic freedoms and the decency which we in the Western world treasure but take so much for granted are all based upon trust. They stem from a mutual respect for the shared values which underpin the social and commercial intercourse of our global fraternity. After 11 September, the democratic freedoms and the common decency which characterised our world can no longer be taken for granted. From now on, we will be chillingly aware that we must be vigilant. We have again learnt the terrible lessons of our forefathers: that we must be forever vigilant against tyranny, now a tyranny manifested in a warfare of mass terrorism.

Last Tuesday, the world stood still. In Australia we are very much aware that our world will never be quite the same again. We are aware that our civilisation has reached a fork in the road. While we wait at the junction, with the untravelled pathways ahead, it is useful to remember whence we have come, because our past often holds sound lessons for how we can navigate the future. We look to our national flag. It boldly proclaims three crosses of ancient Christendom—the historic crosses of St George, St Andrew and St Patrick that were revered by our earliest forefathers—and it blazes with our own cross from the celestial firmament above our island home, the great Southern Cross, the symbol of the great south land of the Holy Spirit.

Our national flag has flown high and free over several generations of Australians. It was saluted by my grandfather and his mates when they marched into the mud and death in Ypres in 1917, it was saluted by my father and his mates in the Middle East in World War II, and it was saluted by our soldiers in Kapyong and Maryang San in Korea and later in Long Tan and Nui Dat in South Vietnam. Our national flag has been the standard of our brave for just over 100 years, and may it remain so for 1,000 more. Every Australian knows our flag stands for democracy, decency, freedom and justice. In the aftermath of the terror of last week, we must never forget that each of these very important values has served our nation so very well for so long that they have become part of our national psyche. Our flag, the flag of the legendary Anzacs, reminds us that in the face of adversity Australians never give up, Australians believe in a fair go, Australians always look after their mates, and, especially, Australians know the distinction between vengeance and justice.

All Australians reject and deplore any notion of guilt by association that has reportedly been alleged against our fellow Australians of the Muslim faith. In the face of an uncertain world, my prayer at this hour is that our heavenly father will make Australia a blessing to all nations; that he will grant to our Prime Minister, to the Leader of the Opposition and to the parliament the wisdom, the courage and the determination to lead us in justice and righteousness and, as our forefathers before us, with the Southern Cross to steer by, that they will lead us fearlessly and in the honourable defence of the values of democracy, freedom and utter decency that all Australians hold as dearly as our American friends. God bless America. God bless Australia.

Mr Adams (Lyons) (5.53 p.m.)—How can one express the feeling of condolence on such an immense tragedy? I watched the World Trade Centre buildings fall, and I thought of when I had been there in those buildings. I had had lunch with some American friends there some years ago, and there were probably hundreds of people there as well, doing what I did, innocently, without any thoughts of fear or disaster. As I watched this growing horror unfold, I saw so many innocent people, non-combatants in war terms, ordinary people like us.

We know the bravery of the emergency service personnel who rushed towards the scene rather than away from it, when they were needed there; and of course so many perished. The firemen and the police must be the biggest heroes. Those who managed to divert that fourth plane from some other target are also heroes. Such bravery is always seen by those who are involved as, ‘I only did what others would do,’ or ‘I was only doing my job.’ Yet we rely on those people
so much in our day-to-day lives, certainly even here in Australia. When there are bushfires, floods and disasters, we know that we have some of the best people on hand. Likewise, in the United States they have those men and women who, although merely doing their job, put their lives at risk without question.

I know only too well that, when the Port Arthur tragedy occurred, our police, emergency services, ambulance and fire personnel, doctors and nurses bore the brunt of that tragedy. So too their US counterparts have put themselves in danger, and some have paid the ultimate price for their professionalism. We are fortunate to have such people. We are fortunate that all around the world—and it does not matter from which country, which belief, which idealism—there are still people who will risk their lives for others. I include here aid workers and peacekeepers: they too forget the dangers and discomforts and go forward to help their fellow human beings with whatever form that help takes.

We do not yet have the full account of this tragedy, but we know that at least 40 nations have been affected by the loss of people, and there may be more. Why should something like this happen? Why should hate be so strong as to wish thousands to die, as they have done here in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania? It is because, despite the selflessness of so many people in many parts of the global communities, there are some who move in hate and envy or are under the control of one or more people who are fanatics, who do not understand the greater tolerance and the human rights that all religions adhere to; they are into power, and control is everything, really, for these fanatics.

We can have the hate here too, if we are not careful. It does not come from without; it comes from within. It can take over each and every one of us, if we allow the baser sentiments to emerge. I hear it on my phone lines about refugees, I hear it about racial intolerance both here and in countries overseas, and I hear it with neighbours, one against the other. So before we move to criticise any persons or countries for leaving a country under siege to these powermongers and terrorists, we must look in our own hearts and say, ‘What would I do in their position?’ Yes, we must find whoever has committed these crimes. We must seek them out by all the means that we have, but we must bring them to justice and not seek revenge. Hate breeds revenge, and we must do everything to stop that hate breeding among the countries that have a concern in this tragedy. We should support the United States of America in their move to bring these culprits to justice.

So to all the families here in Australia—all the Australian families and all the American families who have lost loved ones or who have loved ones still on missing lists—I send my heartfelt condolences and those of my family, my staff and the people of Tasmania. I support the motion.

Ms WORTH (Adelaide—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs) (5.58 p.m.)—On 16 September last year, I was at the swimming at the Sydney Olympics. Along with 17,500 others, I watched the men’s 4 x 100 metres freestyle when Australia defeated the United States of America for the first time ever in this event. We were friends but great rivals. I, along with so many others, was elated and sang the national anthem with joy, celebration and pride. Today with my parliamentary colleagues I sang the Australian and American national anthems as hymns, and we did so for good reason. Today in a special memorial service we were remembering the victims of 11 September. Our hearts were light this time last year, and today they are heavy.

I want to associate myself with what the Prime Minister has already had to say. Like so many others, I saw the horror unfold as it happened on CNN. I was at home with my son on Tuesday night when I received a phone call from a friend to suggest that I put the television on because a tower of the World Trade Centre had been hit by a plane. To watch television in my own home and see a second plane hit the World Trade Centre is something that will live with me forever. I know this has been said many times before, but to hear then that the Pentagon had been hit, that another plane was unaccounted for, and that a fourth plane had crashed in Pennsylvania—no doubt because of the brave
actions of some passengers who had decided that it was better to die then than to have their plane used as another weapon of horrible destruction—was like watching a horror movie.

We now know that there are over 5,000 missing, presumed dead, from 40 different nations. It was an attack on all of us in the free world. The United States stood by us in World War II and, while we are a peaceful people, we must now stand with the people of America. As Brad Crouch said in yesterday’s Sunday Mail:

It is the time to stand up for shared values and the US and UK are the torchbearers of values we hold most dear—freedom, democracy, human rights, justice. It also is the time to stand by a friend in pain.

I visited Kuwait in 1994 with other colleagues and saw destruction there. I also met with families of missing persons and they had photos—and, when they cried, I confess that I cried. I have also visited Cyprus and seen women who, after more than 25 or 26 years, still hold up photos of their missing loved ones at barbed wire fences and United Nations checkpoints. We then saw on our own television sets in more recent days American people holding up photos of their families, and we saw how they were grieving. That had a powerful effect on us. I must also say, in thinking about Kuwait, that the Prime Minister and others have warned that we must not typecast Muslim people—or, I would say, people from the Middle East—and Kuwait is the classic example. They are our friends. Of course there are others, but it does not require too much imagination to remember how grateful they were for our assistance in the Gulf War.

The people we saw on television holding up photos of members of their families are just like us, and it is too terrible to think of their suffering and of the more than 5,000 grieving families, not to mention their countless friends and acquaintances who are also suffering. Witnessing such heartbreak, pain and sorrow makes us want to stay close to our families. The destruction caused by the terrorists casts them as murderers, not martyrs. This is about evil versus good. It cannot possibly be about a religion or other altruistic goals, because such things do not condone murder or violence, let alone attacks on innocent and helpless civilians.

But there have been inspiring stories, stories of great survival and heroism, and today we pay tribute to those who in frightful circumstances have helped others. There is grief within my own electorate wherever I have been over the last few days, including at street corner meetings and community functions. People have wanted to tell me about the anguish, their insecurity and their feeling that the world is suddenly a more dangerous place, and of their sympathy for the American people. On behalf of the people of my electorate of Adelaide, I convey to the people of the United States of America our sympathy, our understanding and our solidarity. We express our sympathy also to the families of Australians who are known to be dead or who are still unaccounted for.

Mr SWAN (Lilley) (6.03 p.m.)—Like 7 December 1941, 11 September 2001 is yet another date that will live on in infamy. When President Roosevelt declared war on Japan all those years ago, the world could never have envisaged that 60 years on it would again face terror from the skies. It is a grossly different world today: the stakes are higher, the weapons more terrible, the fanaticism more ruthless, but the peace just as fragile. Needless to say we are all shocked to the core by the events of the last week and are keeping in our thoughts those who may still be alive and the friends and families of all those souls who have not made it. In this difficult time for the US, every Australian spent the last week sharing the terrible sadness felt by the American people. Like America, we value our peace, we value our standard of living and we value our security—but the last week has taught us how fragile these treasures really are.

In the place that made famous the motto ‘greed is good’, we all must now acknowledge that in the events of the last week following the tragedy we have seen, through the efforts of the firefighters, the volunteers and all of those people who have flocked to assist those in need, the bonds of love and peace that hold our families and our communities together. We have seen, I guess, good old-
fashioned mateship. It is the foundation upon which Australia’s culture is built. In the official history of Australia in World War I, the great C.E.W. Bean observed that Australia’s prevailing creed was a romantic one, of which the chief article was that a man should at all times and at any cost stand by his mate. It was, he said, the one law which the good Australian must never break. It was there at times of war; it was also there during our own disasters and tragedy. It is hardest and most often displayed in our emergency services, our armed forces, our volunteer firefighters, our public hospitals and our ambulance services. We saw it too amongst the American emergency workers. Many a survivor of the world trade buildings commented as they fled the building that those incredible emergency workers were literally running in the opposite direction. Sadly, a great many of them did not come out. Crises like the one of 11 September teach us how much we rely on the bravery and commitment of these people and how valuable to us they in their selflessness are. It is testament to our public services and a timely reminder that we must value them and resource them in good times as well as bad.

There is a terrible human toll of the last week. It will dwarf some of our peacetime disasters. Five thousand people are still missing, 70 of whom are Australians unaccounted for. So in the events of the last week, we must confront our feelings of bitterness and the desire for revenge, but we also have to know our enemy and acknowledge too that the world over there are peoples filled with the same bitterness, hatred and desire for revenge for all sorts of reasons. This is now the context in which we live. Robert Kennedy said, on the death of Martin Luther King:

Let us dedicate ourselves to what the Greeks wrote so many years ago—to tame the savageness of man and to make gentle the life of this world.

Citizens around the world are now rightly asking questions about their own nation, about their world and about the direction in which the world should now move. As we look to the future, I sincerely hope that the terrible events of the last week do not trigger a vicious cycle of hate and war. History will judge those who killed, but history will also judge us by how we respond. Difficult times lie ahead. Difficult decisions must be made. We must strike at the heart of terrorism, but we must be careful not to exact a toll of yet more innocent lives.

Above all, I hope and trust that good will come of it and we can make our world a safer place to live. Over and above that, I think we must talk to our young people about the events of the past week or so, because I think they have been tremendously affected. What do our young people think about those images? I would like to read a poem written by a 17-year-old young Australian, my daughter Erin, summing up her feelings. It says:

I sit watching the Buzzing TV The Cameras swarm Like bees Over the wildflower ... dying Right before my eyes Tears spilling down Like the perspiration in my head Scared for them For us … … … How can I imagine what It must have been like on That plane In those buildings People fall like Rain Petals Crashing down around The ghosts climbing the skies Drifting up and looking down I wonder what the view is like In humanity’s darkest hour? So many tears And they sweat from the heat of the blaze that is Anger, what’s the point in revenge? And they wonder as I do How can we call ourselves humanity? When the flower is dead ...

We can only move forward by talking to our young people and we can only talk to them
about a better future. That is the good that must come from this.

Mrs SULLIVAN (Moncrieff) (6.08 p.m.)—I am pleased to have this opportunity to totally support this motion of condolence on behalf of my constituents. I also have a feeling of deep personal identification with what it conveys. I was born in Brisbane in the darkest days of World War II, two months before the battle of the Coral Sea, and I grew up hearing about the ‘Brisbane line’ and how the United States’s entry into the Pacific War had saved me and my family from an unthinkable fate. My American-born husband enlisted for that Pacific War immediately after the bombing of Pearl Harbour.

Ever since we turned on CNN at 11.00 p.m. last Tuesday—9 a.m. New York time—idly curious before we went to bed as to what the morning news was in the United States and witnessed the live broadcast of those cataclysmic attacks on New York and Washington, we have been grieving together at what they mean for both America and Australia. No-one in the world, whether now or in future generations, will escape the aftershocks of those terrorist attacks on the United States of America on Tuesday, 11 September, in the first year of the third Christian millennium. We all rightly have deep fears for the future of the world as we know it.

Civilised people stand dumbfounded and uncomprehending of the nature of a mind that could firstly conceive and then carefully plan and execute over a period of years such an unspeakably barbaric act. Notwithstanding its incomprehensibility, we nevertheless know instinctively that it is an act of war. We may have been able to fondly hope over the past decade since the end of the Cold War that we may never again see a world war. Now we are wracked by uncertainty as to whether we would ever dare hope that again.

Nevertheless, with all the fearsome possible consequences of that massacre of innocence on such a catastrophic scale, the overwhelming reaction I have sensed from the Australian public has been one of the most profound revulsion, as well as sorrow and personal sympathy for America and its people. Almost everyone recognises it for what it is: an attempt to destroy American spirit and what they stand for as a freedom loving nation. The outpouring of expressions of condolence and the offers of staunch support from so many of the peoples and governments of the world have given Americans a measure of reassurance that they are not alone. It is particularly appropriate then that Australia express that support here today through this condolence motion in its principal national democratic institution, the Australian parliament. It is a symbolic affirmation of the mutuality of both our nations’ most deeply cherished standards of respect for freedom, the very standards which are now being directly attacked by terrorism.

There has been a constant reference over the past week to America’s ‘just right of retaliation’ under these particular circumstances. Frankly, I do not see an American military response as retaliation; I see it as an act of self-defence. None of us believe that last week’s events represent the entirety of the enemy’s attack plan, albeit that that enemy is as yet nameless and that it will most likely prove not to be a conventional military operation of a particular national government or governments. For America to not defend itself in a way meant to eliminate future attacks that would surely kill many more ordinary Americans would be to fail the most basic obligation of any national government to defend the lives of its citizens.

The New York emergency workers have become a worldwide symbol of courage, tenacity and decency in the face of veritably mountainous stark evidence of unimaginable horror and personal tragedy. Their task last Tuesday and the days ever since exemplify the daunting challenge we all now face. Their response to their particular challenge sets an example for the world.

I also want to pay tribute to how President Bush has handled every stage of these events since he was first made aware of them. He has shown both self-control and calmness as well as steadfastness and steely resolve to rise to the awesome duty that now rests so heavily on him. The measured way he has handled that grim task has reassured me that he understands it only too well and is deter-
I am extremely grateful to have had the opportunity to speak briefly to this motion. Many other members of the House await that opportunity and, in an effort to facilitate that, I simply say that I totally associate myself with the words already spoken by others before me regarding concern for the families of Australians killed or still missing and about the need for us all to determinably protect the equal rights of Australian Muslims.

Mr Danby (Melbourne Ports) (6.13 p.m.)—When we saw those twin towers—icons of American success and diversity—collapse, the entire democratic world stood eyeball to eyeball with evil. Let us not underestimate the audacity or daring of this attack on the United States, a close ally and friend of Australia. I hope it is not being too brutally analytical to say that, from the point of view of the extremists who perpetrated this deed, we could even describe this as a successful operation. One of the most frightening aspects of the event is that some hundred people were involved in planning this terrible deed for over a year and not a word of it leaked.

Some of us will have seen the frightening interview with Osama bin Laden’s mentor, Khalid Kwaja, shown on CBS in June that was rebroadcast on 60 Minutes last night. Kwaja said that the White House was very vulnerable and could be destroyed at the cost of just a couple of lives. Kwaja claimed that the weakness of the United States was that its people were brought up to avoid death. ‘What would happen if 100,000 people were killed? What would happen if 200,000 were injured?’ he asked. Mr Peter Hartcher took this further in the Financial Review on the weekend when he said:

It is clear that bin Laden believes he will weaken the US resolve to fight by inflicting massive casualties.

Is that what lies ahead of us? Those numbers imply something far more lethal than the attacks during the week. They suggest chemical, biological and perhaps nuclear capacity. Al Quaida, the Base, bin Laden’s terror franchise, is said to have chemical weapons capability.

I cannot help but fear that this whole operation is but part of an operation that is very well planned. In my view, it is no coincidence that the leader of the opposition in Afghanistan, Ahmad Shah Masood, was killed just hours prior to these events in America. We are entering into a truly existential battle between the democratic world and a small group of extremists who envy, hate and despise the modernity not just of the United States but of all of us who live in our current democratic system. This is not a battle between the United States, Australia, the democratic world and Muslims. That would be a defamation of one of the world’s great monotheistic religions. Moreover, we must not conflate the desperate boat refugees who happen to be of Muslim faith with these few extremists. Yet let us not fall into the other fallacy of saying that these events in New York and Washington were the result of some poor people’s angst over Western colonialism. This is not a fight over this or that US policy. This is no justifiable response to American policy in the Middle East.

What should our response be? I echo the words of the American Ambassador and of my friend the member for Wills, who spoke earlier in this condolence debate. Our policy ought to be not vengeance, not retaliation, not retribution, not revenge, but rather a cool, calculated and measured policy of self-defence. This attitude ought to inform our response. Lethal force would only be used discriminately to prevent these terrorists from triumphing, to prevent these people from doing it again. The US Ambassador said in the very moving condolence ceremony that we had that United States policy would not be informed by vengeance. I hope that the people who were behind these events heard all of the people in that room singing the Battle Hymn of the Republic. To hear an Australian audience singing that so lustily should inform them that, when democratic people are aroused, as we were during the Second World War, we have the ability to respond to the kinds of things that were perpetrated in New York and Washington. Our ethos in confronting terrorists ought to be the ethos of those very brave three on United flight 93, Jeremy Glick, Thomas Burnett and Mark Bingham, who decided that, rather
than let their plane plough into the White House, they would take the terrorists with them.

I have long been associated with the United States. I was very pleased with the reaction of people in my electorate who were putting flowers outside the US consulate-general. Thousands participated in a very large service at St Paul’s Cathedral on Friday. I have had to explain these events to my children, and all I can say is that we need to have that spirit that Abraham Lincoln talked about—‘the better angels of our nature’—to guide our policy in the coming battle with these extremists.

Ms JULIE BISHOP (Curtin) (6.18 p.m.)—On the evening of 11 September, as we Australians on this side of the world watched in horror the unfolding tale of death and destruction in the United States that morning, we asked ourselves, ‘Will anything ever be the same?’ For the world had changed in those few hours in a way we would never have imagined, would never have wished for. Not only has the skyline of Manhattan been altered, so forevermore has the geopolitical landscape.

The awesome, terrifying photographs and film footage have shown us again and again the enormity of these evil, diabolical acts. The cruel conception of these acts has begun to sink in: using domestic passenger jets as weapons to attack the metropolises of New York and of Washington, killing thousands of people just going about their innocent daily lives. Will anything ever be the same? And now we begin to realise the enormity of the human cost—the loss, the pain, the distress. We will not be able to erase the images from our minds. CNN provides us with a constant, ever present reminder, real time, of this tragedy.

As I watched the awful scenes, I was reminded of some wonderful times I have spent in New York and in Washington with American friends. These are people and cities that I love. Five years ago I spent a sabbatical in Boston at Harvard Business School. Our class of 180 comprised students from 30 countries around the world. We came together in the United States to learn from some of the best and brightest talents on business, management and finance. We developed strong and lasting friendships, our common bond being our learning experience in the United States. I check the Harvard Business School web site daily to find any news of any of my colleagues, for a number of my classmates worked in the financial district of New York.

I am here as the elected representative of the Western Australian electorate of Curtin. There are a number of American citizens living in the beautiful beachside suburbs of Perth, many of whom are with American companies or work in the mining, petroleum and resources industry that provides such an economic base to our state. On behalf of the people of Curtin, I express to all Americans and all those who have been personally affected our sympathy, support and friendship at this time of tragedy.

A mood has descended over the civilised world: a complexion of grief, anger, resolve and unity. Australia joins the international expressions of solidarity, support and friendship with the United States. As it faces one of its greatest challenges in its proud history, the United States is not alone. I support this motion.

Dr THEOPHANOUS (Calwell) (6.23 p.m.)—I also wish to support this motion. I will begin by reading a letter which I sent on Thursday, 13 September to his Excellency
Dear Ambassador Schieffer,

We wish to express our most heartfelt and sincerest condolences to the people of America. Our prayers, thoughts and hearts are with you in this time of sadness and devastation. Time will mend but the memories will last a lifetime.

As the Deputy Chairperson of the Australia/USA Parliamentary Friendship Group, and Federal Member for Calwell, I wish to extend our deepest sympathies. I would like to take this time to say that our thoughts and prayers are going out to the victims and their families, and to all Americans. We have all been deeply affected by this horrific series of events.

I have no doubt that the perpetrators of this heinous crime will be brought to justice.

Our hopes are for a fast recovery to restore your nation with its sense of freedom and security. It is obvious that all of America is joining in the spirit of togetherness and solidarity in engendering a full recovery.

Warm regards, Andrew Theophanous.

As many have said, this is a very solemn and sad occasion. We have a situation unparalleled in modern history in terms of destruction of innocent people by the deliberate hand of people acting with motives unknown but obviously with very evil motivations. We have a situation where totally innocent people working in the World Trade Centre and in the Pentagon were attacked and killed—thousands of people given no chance whatever. Not only were they killed but all of their relatives and friends have to bear the suffering due to the consequences of what has happened. Obviously we sympathise with the friends and relatives, but we sympathise more generally with the American people in this situation.

A lot has been said about the possible perpetrators of this act. I understand that at this very moment pressure is being put on the Taliban regime to deliver Osama bin Laden to the proper authorities so that he can be questioned and, if necessary, tried for these crimes. I think it is very important that the Taliban regime do this. But we should also reflect on the fact that the Taliban regime has been guilty of acts of violence and terror against its own civilians and as such has also perpetrated crimes against humanity. For some time, I have been talking about the horrible situation that ordinary Afghani people face under that regime. I want to say that pressure should be brought on them not merely for the delivery of that particular terrorist but also for changes in terms of human rights and the behaviour of that regime. I would prefer it if that regime were removed from power but, if not, I would at least like to see big changes in the way in which they approach their citizens and their situation.

It is very important in this context to look at the last clause in the motion and ensure that people of different backgrounds, including people of Muslim background, do not become innocent victims in this situation of necessary punishment of those who have carried out this terrible crime.

Let me conclude by saying that I think it is very important in particular that those refugees who have escaped from the Taliban regime should not be punished in any way, because they are the people who are protesting against the very same regime that has been harbouring the terrorists. Let us not confuse one thing with the other; let us not confuse the refugees with the awful Taliban regime and other supporters of the terror that has occurred in the United States.

Mr SLIPPER (Fisher—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Finance and Administration) (6.28 p.m.)—Try as I might, there is nothing I can say or do to change the events or bring back the thousands of people who died in the United States of America last Thursday. What I can do, however, is to offer heartfelt condolences and support on behalf of all those living in my electorate of Fisher and, more generally, on the Sunshine Coast of Queensland.

Many of us often bemoan the Americanisation of our culture, the way that our music, sport, language and even eating habits have been modified to so closely reflect those of the USA. It is at times like this, however, that we stop and realise that it is more than culture which binds our two nations together. As Australians, we look to the United States for support and security in times of need. We also look to them as a nation that upholds our values of democracy and freedom, of peace
and goodwill. At the service this morning, His Excellency Thomas J. Schieffer, the American Ambassador, outlined this very well in one of the most moving speeches I have ever heard.

Together with the United States, Australia is one of a handful of countries to have remained totally democratic throughout the entirety of the 20th century. Our two nations fought side by side in every major conflict of the last century and we have together sought to help other nations uphold the values and freedoms we are so privileged to enjoy. It is for this reason that I and so many others have been so deeply touched by the images of devastation and destruction that have come out of New York and Washington. The terrorists may have hit their targets, but they will never achieve their goals. They will never hold the world to ransom and they will never dent the fabric of the American people.

When I rose to sing the Star Spangled Banner in the memorial service this morning I could not help but think of the particular significance of this anthem at this time. On 12 and 13 September 1814—nearly 187 years to the day of the terrorist attack—a part-time poet by the name of Francis Scott Key wrote of his relief in seeing the US flag still flying after a vicious bombardment by the British. Imprisoned on the frigate Surprise, through the nights of the 12th and 13th, Key struggled to catch glimpses of the star shaped Fort McHenry, adorned with its huge flag, 42 feet long, with eight red stripes, seven white stripes and 15 white stars. In the dark of the night of the 13th, when the shelling suddenly stopped, Key could not tell whether the British had been defeated or the fort had fallen. As the sun began to rise, Key used the back of an envelope to pen the first lines of a poem he called Defense of Fort M’Henry. When the sun rose, and following his intense relief and pride at seeing the fort had withstood the onslaught, Key finished his poem by writing:

Tis the star-spangled banner—O long may it wave
O’er the land of the free and the home of the brave

In the last few days we all witnessed this same pride as the American people so bravely draped their flag from the Pentagon and on the site of the former trade centre building in New York. These touching images speak volumes about the strength of the American people and their determination to ensure good triumphs over bad.

Francis Scott Key could not have imagined the profound and symbolic influence his words would have on democracy, nor the way—187 years later—they would help bind the American people together in their greatest time of need. Day in, day out, we hear news stories from the US that make us all realise how precious life is and how nothing in life can be taken for granted. As Americans struggle to come to terms with their grief and their shock, and as they unite under their flag and through the strength of national pride, we can be sure of one thing. We can be sure the star-spangled banner will continue to wave and that, irrespective of what some terrorists might think and do, America will continue to be a land of the free, a home of the brave and an inspiration to us all.

Mr MURPHY (Lowe) (6.33 p.m.)—On behalf of the people of Lowe, whom I represent, I stand here tonight to express my support for this motion and to convey my deep and heartfelt sympathy to all those families from all parts of the world who lost loved ones last Tuesday and to the people of the United States of America. Following this horrible attack on our freedom, we anticipate military retaliation. However, we must secure a permanent solution.

I believe that the solution is found in preserving freedom. Freedom is the very essence of our jurisprudence, the doctrine of universalism, that belief that holds that every person is as valuable as another, that every person has the same intrinsic value. Charles Rice, in his text 50 Questions on the Natural Law, is cited for this simple and profound quote, ‘Jurisprudence kills people,’ for in jurisprudence flows the moral and legal justification for much that is done in the name of good and evil. Sadly, we know there are people in the world who believe that different human beings are of varying significance or worth, depending upon their culture or their faith. They are the same people capable of hijacking four jet aircraft and sacrificing
themselves and others in order to kill many more thousands of innocent people. We can only imagine what was in the hijackers’ minds when they carried out this terrible act. There can be no moral reasoning or any justification for anyone to perpetrate such evil.

In the short term we support the invocation of the ANZUS Treaty. However, in the long term we must secure freedom. Every man, woman and child in Australia must be educated to know that we are all human beings. No religious or political ideology can ever be licit if it condones moral or cultural relativism, a regime that says, ‘I may treat another person differently merely because they are of a certain religion, race, sex,’ and so forth. Any ideology that advocates moral or cultural relativism is anathema to democracy and an affront to freedom itself. Sadly, there are some on this earth who subscribe to relativist beliefs.

Those who flew those four planes full of innocent victims, and who killed many more in the process, believed that what they were doing was right and moral. They believed that they were acting with moral sanction. We in Australia, and governments around the world, must make it our mission to proclaim freedom and the universalist principle of intrinsic human value in each person. If we do not convince Australia’s children of this basic truth, our children will grow to become vulnerable to ideology that may value certain human beings differently. United today, we condemn the violence perpetrated on the innocent. We condemn the violence against humanity. We are deeply saddened by the horrific loss of life.

Australia has an obligation to proclaim the truth of universalism and denounce and condemn the lies of anyone who would say that one person is less valuable than another and less deserving of the minimal standards of dignity. Let us be brave and stand for what is right and condemn what is wrong, for relativism is a lie. There is right and there is wrong. In the defence of freedom it is our duty to hold to higher values so that we positively discriminate against wrong and support right. In defending freedom, I am fortified by the words of the Anglican Bishop of Sydney South Region, His Grace Robert Forsyth, whom I heard say yesterday that our Christian faith teaches us not to be afraid. I too say to this House tonight: be not afraid.

Mr BAIRD (Cook) (6.38 p.m.)—The year was 1964 when I first visited New York, along with my new wife on our honeymoon, at the ripe age of 22. My wife and I both fell in love with the city—its pace, its style, its heady belief in itself and the rhythm of life which seemed to imbue the very pavements. The Metropolitan Museum, the Guggenheim, the Chrysler building, the Empire State, Central Park, Grand Central, Fifth Avenue, St Patrick’s Cathedral, Broadway and the Statue of Liberty were great icons that we delighted in visiting. In 1977, I returned as the Australian Trade Commissioner to New York. To the list of New York icons was added the twin towers of the World Trade Centre. I visited them many times to visit Australian exporters, particularly the Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation, which was based there. I took off in a helicopter on the top of the World Trade Centre and flew around Manhattan. For someone who loved living there, it was a tremendous sorrow when the events unfolded last Tuesday night.

We have a number of American friends. We had difficulty phoning through. When we rang some close friends, they were in absolute despair because their only son was missing close to the World Trade Centre. It was not until some 12 hours later that he emerged from the rubble, and they were absolutely thrilled and delighted to see him.

We have seen in the events that unfolded last week the unleashing of evil in the world. There is no doubt that we have seen it—we have seen its face, we have seen its reality and we have seen the despair of humanity as people respond to the unfolding events in New York. Our sympathies go out to the people of the USA, particularly those who live in New York—the bright and dynamic people who inhabit Manhattan and who make much of the world’s economic cycle go round. We condemn terrorism in all its forms that occurred at that time to produce a loss of humanity such as we have never seen in our lifetime outside of world wars. We stand shoulder to shoulder with the USA at this
time of immense trial, we recognise the goodness that is in much of the American people and we understand the humanity that they explore and show to the rest of the world. To see this perpetrated on them is even more of a calamity.

In terms of our debt to the American people and their traditions and values, we think particularly of the battle of the Coral Sea. I was born during the war years. I remember my parents talking of the great debt that we owed to the American people, and people of my generation understand that. We share similar values, we share a sense of vision, and we share a sense of faith. It is that sense of faith that draws us together and gives us hope in these very dark hours. I noticed a common theme in the national prayer breakfast that was held here this very day. As people reflected on the events of the last week, they talked about the light that was shining in the darkness and they said that those who have faith can turn to that light.

At the same time, we look with sympathy to the Muslim community and we realise that the prejudice that is being shown towards them is the result of absolute fanatics. It gives us some recognition of why so many people have escaped from Afghanistan, why we have seen them launch themselves on boats and why they want to escape the Taliban in all its unseemly, horrific nature. In my electorate, which is basically Anglo-Celtic, there is enormous shock at what has happened. We need to reach out to those who are subjected to prejudice and say, ‘You and I together are Australians and we will move forward together.’ It is appropriate that we recognise our great indebtedness to the United States and remind them that we stand shoulder to shoulder with them. We extend our sympathies in the horrific disaster that we watched unfold. In future, great hope will come from this amazing disaster.

Mr STEPHEN SMITH (Perth) (6.43 p.m.)—I rise to support the motion and associate myself unreservedly with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister. The human tragedy that we have witnessed over the last week has touched the hearts of many Australians. Whether we watched these terrorist attacks unfold on television late on Tuesday night, as I did, or saw the consequences of them over the course of the last few days, Australians are struggling to come to terms with what many perceive as a new world, a world in which terrorism can strike, no matter who you are or where you live. While this was unquestionably an attack aimed at the United States, it was also an attack on all citizens of the world. While citizens of the United States will rank first in the final casualty list, people from around the world have died or are missing, many Australians among them—the most Australian casualties from a single event outside of war.

These people were attacked regardless of their nationality, their colour, creed or religion. These people were singled out for no good reason other than that they were in the wrong buildings or on the wrong plane at the wrong time. This was not just an attack on the United States in peacetime; it was an indiscriminate attack on fundamental human decency. As a result, the perpetrators of these crimes should not be punished because of where they come from or the religion—if any—they believe in; nor should we punish others simply because they live where they live or because of whom they worship. To do that would be to repeat the crime against humanity that these terrorists have already committed. Rather, these people should be punished because they have committed these crimes against humanity.

Australians want no part in a world that devalues human life in this way and we repudiate these crimes absolutely. But we also know that we have to deal with the consequences that flow from these tragic events. Many Australians are now deeply worried about what will come next. While I am sure that we all support and understand the right and need of the United States to respond to these unprovoked attacks, many of us are also concerned about what that response will mean for the future. We are concerned that other innocent people, no matter where they live, may intentionally or unintentionally become victims of a maelstrom soon to be unleashed.

Conflict is never something to be sought. Regrettably, justice dictates that it cannot
always be avoided. The decision to invoke articles IV and V of the ANZUS Treaty is the only appropriate response in this time of crisis. It reinforces the awesome and sombre responsibilities that must be faced by governments and parliaments at these times. It also reminds us how Australians across the generations have been prepared to secure what is fair and right, not just for Australia and for Australians, but in defence of the values we hold dear.

Australians, whether at home or abroad, know that this is a conflict that will not be contained to the traditional fields of battle. The perpetrators who committed these acts of terrorism clearly are not concerned that innocent people, whether they be Australians or people living in their own communities, may become the victims of their crimes. Despite the great weight of responsibility and inevitable sense of unease that I believe we all have in considering our response to this tragedy, this is the time for us all to say that enough is enough. If there is such a thing as a just conflict, then the proportionate and targeted response currently being planned by the United States is surely that.

In that context, I would like to recommend to all Australians the remarks of Ambassador Schieffer made in the Great Hall of Parliament House today. I would like to read some of those remarks into the record. Ambassador Schieffer said:

Yesterday, as so many others did I sought the comfort of a higher being. I am a Presbyterian by faith but I felt as the American Ambassador, it was important to remember that God is worshipped in many places and ways. I attended a Catholic mass, an Anglican service and visited a Jewish study centre. At the end of the day, I visited with the Imam of the Canberra Mosque. In each place I felt the presence of God. In each place I looked into the faces of men and women who shared our pain, shared our horror, shared our disgust at the monstrous acts that have been committed. It is important for all of us to remember, that just as Hitler was no Christian, those who committed these acts were not men and women of faith. No Christian, no Jew, no Muslim would have done such a thing. The common thread that runs through these three great faiths, is that love must conquer hate, good must defeat evil.

Ambassador Schieffer then went on to say: Americans are not a vengeful people. Our nation is founded on the principles of liberty and justice. We are free to choose our faith, free to choose our creed, free to choose the means that will comfort our souls and the souls of others. No, we are not a vengeful people but we are a people who love justice. We will not strike out the innocent, we will not end the lives of good men and good women for no good reason. We will find those responsible for this dastardly deed and we will bring them to justice.

I commend the motion to the House.

Mrs MOYLAN (Pearce) (6.48 p.m.)—Along with many other Australians, over these last few days my thoughts and prayers have been with the people of the United States, with the families and friends of many people from the international community, and with the families and friends of those Australians who have perished or who have not yet been found.

Like many Australians, I was deeply saddened and horrified as I watched the terrible tragedy unfold. The incredible acts of bravery by those trying to save others stand in stark contrast to this terrible act of terrorism. Acts of terrorism have concerned the international community deeply now for some time. Many countries, including some of those that embrace Islam, whose citizens have felt the effects of terrorism, have vowed to do everything possible to stop these premeditated acts of barbarity.

In the midst of this terrible act and the tragedy that it brings upon so many, it is a time for all nations to renew their commitment to preventing terrorism, and it is a time to reflect on the conditions that give rise to, but never excuse, such extreme acts. It is a time to commit to putting an end to poverty and prejudice, in all its forms, that give rise to hatred and bitterness that so divides many countries and many people of the world. It is time to commit to doing everything possible to prevent such an act from ever occurring again. As a representative of the people of the electorate of Pearce in Western Australia, I express our deepest sympathy to all those affected by this terrible event and, in particular, to Ambassador Schieffer. And to the people of the United States of America, and to those who continue to search for people who have perished, and who search in hope
for those who may have survived, our thoughts and prayers are with you.

Mrs IRWIN (Fowler) (6.50 p.m.)—I join other members of this House in extending my deepest sympathy to those who have lost family and friends in the tragic acts of terrorism in the United States. Shortly before midnight Sydney time last Tuesday, I was awoken by my son calling me to come and see the news pictures from the United States. Like the millions of others who watched that night or who saw the replays the next day, my reaction was disbelief.

Nearly a week later, the shock of this atrocity is still sinking in. What it means for the world, and for Australia, is still hard to say for certain. As we go about our daily tasks, we cannot help thinking of those thousands of innocent people in the World Trade Centre going about their daily tasks when suddenly their lives were cruelly ended. Our certainty and confidence have been shattered. We no longer feel safe in our own homes and workplaces. We are targets of an enemy without morals or feelings, an enemy who does not wear a uniform, but hides among us; an enemy whose numbers are small, but whose effect is widespread.

While Australia has thankfully been spared all but a few major acts of terrorism, the events in New York and Washington have shown us how vulnerable we are. If New York and the Pentagon can be attacked, how open are we to attack? The world now awaits the wrath of the mightiest military machine ever assembled. We may identify and deal with those behind the attacks, but will that mean the end of terrorism? I think not. How can we deal with it in the long term? What kind of people—what mothers’ sons—can carry out such an attack? We can point the finger at an individual, but does that answer the question of what drives an individual who has no regard for human life, least of all their own?

Someone said to me the other day that we should introduce the death penalty for suicide bombers. That is about the level of understanding about terrorism. Anyone who has visited a refugee camp in the Middle East, as I and other members of this House have, and anyone who has felt the despair of people living in the same camps where their grandparents were born would know that it is not hard to recruit people willing to die for a cause. If you think that one evil individual is behind all acts of terrorism, you have been reading too many Superman comics. What makes a leader, terrorist or otherwise? The answer is: followers. What makes followers? What drives people to give their own lives? What leads them to destroy human life, including their own? It cannot be money; it can only be hatred. So, along with those who recruit, train and direct terrorists, we must also accuse those who incite hatred of being responsible for acts of terror.

Those who incite hatred are not limited to one religion. In the past few days, I have been alarmed by reported incidents of terror against Muslims in Australia. There were reports of the attempted firebombing of a mosque. In my own electorate of Fowler, I have heard reports of Muslim women being spat upon and having scarves torn from their heads. If you think that is trivial, can you imagine a Catholic nun having her scarf torn from her head? We have seen students of Arabic origin verbally abused on a university campus. These are acts of hatred; they are acts of terror. They are minor in comparison with the events of New York and Washington, but they must also be condemned. Until we realise that terrorism breeds on hatred and bigotry, until we realise that these faults are not limited to one religion, we will not be free from the threat of terrorism.

In the coming years our banks will probably spend more on security than it would cost to relieve Third World debt. Our security services will intrude more and more into our privacy, but we will still be vulnerable until we come to terms with the causes of terrorism, until we learn that those who preach hatred do so not only from minarets but also from our radio stations. Until we condemn hatred in all its forms, we can only expect terrorism to continue, and the thousands who died in the United States last week will have died in vain.

Mrs BRONWYN BISHOP (Mackellar—Minister for Aged Care) (6.55 p.m.)—I rise to support the motion moved by the Prime Minister and join others in extending con-
dolences to the American nation and to the families and loved ones of the individuals who are lost. The end of the Cold War brought us a sense of elation. We talked of a peace dividend—that we could relax our vigilance to ensure freedom. The thought was abroad that the world would be safer, and yet a decade later, in a new century, one great threat has been replaced by an even greater one. Here in Australia, our innocent belief that we are free from danger is now undone. As we mourn with the American people and look to the way forward, it must be with a new sense of reality.

The world has changed. Our vigilance must return. Forty nations have lost citizens, 5,000 people are missing and some 80 Australians could be lost, and that to the jubilation of those who are committed to a fanatical cause, who pursue it ruthlessly and are incapable of ever being persuaded otherwise, by reason, compassion or indeed any sentiment related to human understanding. Hitler was committed to his vision of the Third Reich and the removal of all and any that did not fit his vision. These terrorists who rejoice in the destruction they perpetrated in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania will similarly target and destroy anyone who hinders their ideal. They are Hitler’s brothers, bound in evil.

The way forward requires leadership and action guided by wisdom, courage and determination. But answered this terror must be. By invoking articles IV and V of the ANZUS Treaty, Australia has shown once again that we answer the call every time to fight for freedom. We will join with our ally the United States of America to combat those who wantonly kill to serve their fanatical purpose. Ours is a friendship that Australia and the United States forged through adversity and joy—adversity when the freedom of men and women is threatened, and joy when peace is attained. May President Bush have wisdom in his deliberations and strength in his leadership.

**Mr RIPOLL (Oxley) (6.59 p.m.)—**I rise to support the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition in the condolence motion put forward today. I will begin by offering the people of America my deepest sympathy and sorrow for the victims of the tragedy that took place on 11 September 2001. To the families, the friends, the children, the firefighters, the police, the emergency service workers and to all those ordinary people who went to help others, on behalf of the electorate of Oxley I offer condolences for the terrible loss of life.

The pain experienced because of this terrible crime will be felt all over the world, and it will be felt no less here in Australia. There are still some 80 Australians who remain unaccounted for, now presumed dead. Many Australian families will be directly and indirectly touched by the loss of so many innocent lives. One life that I knew personally was that of Andrew Knox. While I had not seen Andrew for quite some years, his memory is still with me. The loss of his life is a great tragedy for all of us and it must be a time of great pain and suffering for his family.

The world will never be the same again, as many have said over the past week. This could not be more true, for never has there been a terrorist crime as devastating or as calculated to strike at the heart of innocent people as the attack on the buildings in New York and Washington and the plane that crashed in Pennsylvania. While these attacks were committed against the American people, they were also committed against all the people of the world. The victims of these cowardly attacks were of all colours, races and creeds and from all walks of life. They were young, they were old, they were Christian, they were Jewish and they were Muslim. But, most disturbing, they were all innocent of any crime and were merely going about their normal lives. The pictures and images that were beamed to us live from the United States will live with us forever. Before our very eyes we saw the brutality and the evil that is terrorism.

As I said, all our lives have been changed forever and nothing will ever be the same again. There is a great task ahead for the American people and the Australian people. The perpetrators of this horrendous crime must be found, punished and brought to justice. The people of the United States and American President George Bush have re-
acted with incredible strength and courage. The people of America will not be deterred or damaged by this evil act, nor will the people of the world. I offer my support, my sympathy, my sorrow and my prayers for all those who lost their lives. I know that the spirit of freedom and democracy will never be damaged by the material world, because it is built not on concrete and steel but on courage and unity. At this our greatest hour of need, I offer my sympathy and condolences to the American people.

Mr Anthony (Richmond—Minister for Community Services) (7.02 p.m.)—I certainly support the motion and I express not only my condolences but also the condolences of the people of Richmond. The terrorism attack on the United States has touched all of us—some directly and most of the world indirectly. Because of this senseless act of terrorism, the world will never be the same again. The United States is rebuilding both physically and emotionally, and Australia is playing a role in that rebuilding.

Earlier today, along with most of those here today and many others, I attended the memorial service in the Great Hall of Parliament House for the victims of the attack in the United States. It was a moving and uniting service, but we can do so little in the face of such a barbaric tragedy. While America considers their next course of action, Australians have united to support the United States in this their greatest hour of need. But we must not forget that this tragedy has also touched this country, with a so far unknown number of Australian lives lost in this terrorism attack. Even in my own electorate of Richmond, there are several cases of miraculous escapes from death by people who could have been, quite literally, in the wrong place at the wrong time. The brother of a Bangalow resident, Bird Jensen, was in the World Trade Centre when the first plane hit the building. Fortunately, he survived. A young man from Byron Bay, Michael Asange, witnessed the attack from the Manhattan apartment block he was staying in. A member of my own staff spent a frantic Tuesday trying to find his father who was missing after the attacks in Manhattan. Again, fortunately, he was safe.

Australia has already pledged its support to the United States in whatever shape that help is needed. Australia has always stood firmly behind its allies in their time of need, and this is certainly no exception. Today I also attended the prayer breakfast in Parliament House to give our spiritual support to the victims of this senseless tragedy. We all prayed for God to give us the strength to come to terms with what happened last Tuesday and to be able to understand this terrible evil. I now reaffirm and repeat a call I made at that breakfast for all of us to join together against evil, to make this world a better place for all of us to live in. I support the motion.

Mr Allan Morris (Newcastle) (7.05 p.m.)—Like you, Mr Deputy Speaker Nehr, on Tuesday night I was at a function in Singapore hosted by the Speaker of the Singapore parliament. My wife managed to get a phone call through to me to tell me what she was seeing on the TV screen back home. The events that followed the attack on America took on a likeness to events just over 10 years ago following the earthquake in Newcastle—one of those cataclysmic events that do so much damage and are so bewildering but which also have the capacity to unite people. The earthquake in Newcastle united the people in the community, and the attack on the World Trade Centre united people across the world because the people who were affected by that attack were from virtually every major nation of the world, including Australia. The events in America have also united the people of this parliament, where all of us are supporting a motion. This is not a very common occurrence, as we all understand, but these events are so extraordinary as to warrant such a course of action.

These are very challenging times and, in a sense, I am reminded of that old saying about challenges also being opportunities. There is now an opportunity facing the world leadership—America, Europe, Australia and other interested countries—to try to differentiate between our fellow human beings and those who caused this act. The phone calls and
emails I have been receiving in my office in recent days which lump all Muslims together are, in a way, more dangerous than the act of terrorism itself. This is a time to face the challenge, to differentiate and help the world understand that the people who perpetrate these kinds of activities do not belong to any mainstream religion in the normal sense that we understand. They are outcasts within their own community, as the Prime Minister said this afternoon in quoting Sir Winston Churchill.

But the challenge for all of us is to be able to differentiate and to help explain to our community that in the same way these events can unify—whether it be the people of Newcastle after an earthquake, the people of America following this event or the people of the world, particularly our country. By finding and understanding the depth of it, the opportunity is available to explain that our strength comes in our unity, in our cohesion and from our talking to each other and understanding and working for similar objectives. Today the parliament set a standard for the rest of the country: if we can unify, surely our community can. I would ask those in the community who want to blame and to scapegoat and who call for extreme actions against innocent people to understand that that will not help; if anything, it is almost as great an evil as the act of terrorism itself. This is an important motion and one that I am pleased to support. I just regret the fact that we have been exposed to the need to have to do this. I commend the motion to House and to the public at large.

Mr St CLAIR (New England) (7.08 p.m.)—I rise also, on behalf of the people of New England, to support this motion before the House and to support the comments made by the Prime Minister of Australia and the Leader of the Opposition in this place today. The shocking events of last week will go down in my memory as being among the worst that I have ever been privy to. It started with a phone call from my youngest son, who has just turned 19, who at the moment is overseas in London. He rang fairly early in the morning. I was not aware of the devastation that had been wreaked upon the United States. He told me on the phone, and at first I did not believe him. It was only through his pressing me to go and turn on the television in the early hours of the morning that I realised the horror that was being perpetrated against the people of the United States. But something else I noticed was the fear in the voice of my youngest son, obviously a fear that is around the world in that generation. The innocence that was there for anyone born after the early 1970s is gone forever. As the day unfolded, the horror committed against the innocent men, women and children of the United States has now passed on to little children. In my visits around the electorate during the rest of that week I went to many schools, and I noticed that there were also fear and questions from children as young as five and six, which was reiterated in the drawings they were doing for their teachers. I think that all of us have been overwhelmed by what has happened.

On Saturday night I was listening to a guest speaker in Tenterfield who, by chance, had spent a large amount of his time on behalf of the World Bank and many others working in Afghanistan. He hoped that the act of war would also be complemented with an act of development. He also used terms which I think described quite well these terrorists without principle—that is, that they were mad dogs with insane minds. I think that, coming from the country in particular, when you goad something as hard as it has been, you realise that there is a mindless attitude that takes over. When one has seen on the television those dramatic shots, I do not think anyone shall forget it. I repeat, on behalf of the people of New England, our heartfelt sorrow and our full support. As Australians, we will stand by our friends in the United States of America.

Mr RUDD (Griffith) (7.11 p.m.)—The motion before the House has my wholehearted support and the support of the people of Brisbane whom I represent in this parliament. The motion sets out three things. Firstly, it expresses our support for the extraordinary experience of suffering that the people of America have gone through in these last days. Secondly, it conveys the grave news that, for the first time in the 50-year history of our security arrangement with
the United States, we have operationalised our security alliance with them. Thirdly, it contains within it the complete expression of the will and the resolve of this parliament to act with the United States to meet the common danger.

When we speak of America we speak of a democracy, we speak of a vibrant economy, we speak of the world’s last remaining superpower. America is proud of its tradition as the ‘arsenal of democracy’, to paraphrase Roosevelt’s great speech of the Second World War. We know of its economy, the generator of world economic growth and that which has kept much of this region afloat in the period since the Asian financial crisis hit. But, when we think of the United States as a superpower, it is worth reflecting on the history of superpowers in the history of this planet. We had Pax Romana, we had Pax Britannica and we have had many powers in the history of humankind that have dominated this planet. But rarely have we had a power such as we have had with the United States, which has exercised its supreme power so benignly when it had copious opportunities to do the reverse. Had any other power been the United States in 1945, what would it have done? The opportunity for world domination available to the United States at that time was immense had it the political predisposition to do so. It did not. It did not because of its cherished democratic traditions. The United States faced a similar opportunity in 1991, with the collapse of the world’s other superpower, the Soviet Union. Once again the United States did not seek world domination, though it possessed the power to do so. If we reflect on the exercise of power, both political and military, in the history of humankind, it is almost unique. In fact, it is unique that a power that possesses such unsurpassed military predominance chooses not to use it; instead, it chooses to extend benefit to the rest of humanity.

The first thing this motion does is to express our feelings of solidarity with the American people at this time; our feelings of common humanity as we saw first-hand, through our television screens, the extraordinary carnage in Washington and New York. That sight of carnage has deeply touched people across the entire civilised world. People in Brisbane have been on the telephone to me, as their local member of parliament, asking, ‘How could anyone do this to another human being?’ This afternoon I had an email message from Mr Joe McLeod, of Carindale, expressing thanks that I had, on behalf of the community in that part of Brisbane, proposed sending an open letter of support to the people of America at this time of their profound national need and crisis. Expressing our common humanity with our American friends at this time is important. It is important, I believe, as part of the process of grieving.

The second thing which the motion before the House does is to operationalise the relevant clauses of the ANZUS alliance. This, as I noted before, is unique in the history of our security relationship with the United States. Despite the range of crises we have met together since 1951, the operational clauses of this alliance have never been put to effect. It is of enormous importance that the parliament resolves to put them into effect and supports the action of the executive government of Australia in so doing.

The third and final thing which this motion does is to commit, through this parliament, the resources of the Commonwealth of Australia to meet the common danger, that we now confront. That danger is global terrorism. The actions we saw on 11 September mark a turning point in human history, in the history of international relations, in terms of how one nation deals with another. We have not just turned a page; we have closed one chapter and we have begun a new chapter. What that chapter contains has not yet been written, but as we embark upon that chapter we must reflect on a simple proposition: if good men are silent, then evil will prevail.

**Dr SOUTHCOTT (Boothby) (7.16 p.m.)—**It is hard to add something new after the millions of words that have been written on this terrorist act and all the excellent speeches that have already been made on this motion. I fully endorse this motion. I want to speak about what this motion means to me in terms of what it means for the United States,
what the action means, and what this motion means for ANZUS.

During the voyages of the Puritans who first settled America, the first great American, John Winthrop, described their task in a shipboard sermon. He said, ‘We must consider that we shall be as a city upon a hill. The eyes of all people are upon us.’ It was a far-reaching statement. Over four centuries, this has remained America’s mission. It runs deep in their culture and underpins American leadership. It is why they were targeted and it is why we should stand with them. I believe that, given a goal, America will not fail.

We will never forget 11 September 2001. In the future, we may see the last 12 years as a golden summer when we came out of the shadow of the Cold War, before the bombing of the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon. There is no event in my life which comes close to this evil, indiscriminate act. Events of my parents’ generation, the bombings of Dresden and Hiroshima, were different. They occurred during war. They were not televised live. The United States have long recognised the challenge they face from the asymmetric warfare terrorists wage. But who would have believed that instruments of commerce, commercial airlines and skyscrapers, could be turned into a weapon of mass destruction against New York and Washington?

Last week’s attack was not an attack on only Washington and New York. It was an attack on citizens of the world; it was an attack on our way of life. The terrorist network, which subscribes to a hateful interpretation of the Koran, should be—as has been said this week—smoked out and ripped up. This will not be like the Gulf War. It will need a sophisticated, unconventional response and it will require patience and determination.

America is a familiar society to Australians. Children can recognise fire hydrants and the New York police. We know about New York’s finest and we know about New York’s bravest. American values are similar to Australian values. We are a New World country with strong, unbroken, democratic traditions. In December 1941, Britain, Australia and the US were hit by a common enemy. At that time, we looked to the United States and they came to our aid. In America’s hour of need, we must help them to the best of our abilities.

Mr MOSSFIELD (Greenway) (7.20 p.m.)—I rise on this occasion to offer my condolences and the condolences of the electorate of Greenway to the families of the victims and to the people of the United States of America. The tragic events of 11 September will never be forgotten by anybody who believes in freedom and tolerance. These events have touched us all. On Tuesday and Wednesday last week, I had the privilege of presenting a number of certificates to local volunteers for their work in the community. On Wednesday, a number of these volunteers were Red Cross workers from Western Sydney. We learnt on that day that one of their Red Cross colleagues was aboard one of the hijacked planes.

I believe that the events of 11 September will be a defining moment in the history of our world. How we respond to this tragedy will mark the direction of our society for decades; maybe even centuries. Will we spiral into barbarism and war, with attacks and retaliation, or will we as a society rise above that endless violence and vicious circle? George W. Bush has said that this is the first war of the new millennium. Do we then fight it the same old way as we did last century, or do we find a new path? That is the dilemma that we face today. Is it possible to find a new path, or will the old hatreds and prejudices prevent us? Certainly those responsible must be brought to book, they must be held accountable, and they must be punished. But we cannot allow the response to be indiscriminate. Too many innocent civilian lives have been cut short already. Fanaticism, in all its forms—religious or political—only leads down the path of bloodshed and revenge. An eye for an eye leaves only the blind and the angry. To find a balance, we must deal with the anger that boils inside us; but we must deal with it in a way that will not lead to a spiral of violence and the loss of more innocent lives.

This was an attack on not only the nation of America but also the beliefs and ideals that underpin our society—freedom and tolerance. A fanatic cares nothing for either.
These ideas and beliefs also underpin our society. We as a nation have also lost citizens. Therefore this was an attack on not only Australia but every other country that has suffered the loss of its nationals or believes, as we do, in freedom and tolerance. If we do not find a new path away from the spiral of violence, the terrorists will have won. He who strikes with anger in his heart will be damned. Robert Kennedy in a speech to the University of Cape Town in South Africa in 1966 said:

Each time someone stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope and crossing each other from a million different centres of energy and daring, those ripples build a current that can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance.

I commend the motion to the House.

Mr NEHL (Cowper) (7.23 p.m.)—In consideration of my colleagues, I will be as brief as possible, because time has nearly expired. I certainly support and totally endorse the motion moved by the Prime Minister, and I endorse the comments made by all of my colleagues on both sides of the House. Over 17 years in this place, I have frequently said that the ‘p’ in ‘politics’ stands for ‘people’. I just want to say a few words to people that I know in the United States. David and Karen French and their children Kevin and Shari, who live at Santa Rosa, will have been devastated by this. I mention my friends John and Rose Kelley in Washington. John was the political counsellor at the American Embassy here some years ago. I mention John and June Reisz—John was the agricultural counsellor—who became close friends, as did the Kellys, in their time here. I would also like to mention Mel and Betty Sembler, he a former ambassador of the United States and both of them good friends. My heart goes out to them along with the rest of the American people.

I would like to say one thing about the memorial service in the Great Hall today. It was very moving indeed, and I would like to relate a very tiny incident. As we moved out and walked in two columns—the American Embassy people on one side and we on the other—I had a youngish American woman alongside me. We looked at each other, we smiled, we said, ‘Hello,’ I put my hand on her shoulder, and we kissed each other. That is the human dimension of this relationship between Australia and the United States. Finally, when I present flags to the Australian Rotary exchange students from all over northern New South Wales going to countries all over the world, I have one admonition for them: make love, not war. That is what the world has got to do.

Mr KERR (Denison) (7.25 p.m.)—On the night when these events took place my son, who is 12, joined me to watch the television. He asked me to explain what was happening. I was unable to do so and still am. That is the question that we will be struggling to answer for future generations. The task that we have to undertake as parliamentarians is to understand what is happening and to find that moderated response that is necessary in the national interest—a national interest that Australia in this instance shares with all those coalition countries that we will be joining in trying to deal responsibly and effectively with this.

I know a colleague has personal knowledge of people who have died in this tragedy, so I will briefly make one final remark. I also personally saw the ugly side that we must work to avoid. I was driving in a taxi with a Sikh driver who was wearing a turban. He was not a Muslim, but a car load of youths pulled to the side of the road and abused him for what they asserted to be his role in that event. We as Australians must not lose our national unity in a way that allows those who would participate in these events to achieve their objectives.

Mr HOCKEY (North Sydney—Minister for Financial Services and Regulation) (7.26 p.m.)—Can I say on behalf of the financial services industry in Australia how profound the impact of this devastating event is. I have spoken to the chief executives of Morgan Stanley, Aon, Marsh and McLennan, Salomon Smith Barney and to a number of other chief executives, and they have some terrible tales to tell. Morgan Stanley had 3,700 people on the top 26 floors of tower 2. Thankfully, fewer than 15 people are unaccounted for. Deutsche Bank have possibly lost four
people. Citigroup have lost four people. The real cost has hit Aon, which is an insurance broker that has 200 people unaccounted for, and also Marsh and McLennan, which has only 1,400 out of 1,700 people accounted for.

There are two specific examples I want to refer to. One is of a woman that I knew, Leslie Thomas. She worked at Bankers Trust with my wife. I met her in New York earlier this year and remember her to be a vivacious and outgoing person. She was working at Cantor Fitzgerald. I understand her husband was working in the tower directly opposite. Her husband, Joe O’Keefe, was able to get out of tower 2, but as yet she has not been found. The second story involves Leanne Whiteside. Leanne, who is 30 years old, went on behalf of Aon on a one-year scholarship to New York. She was there for two days when this event occurred. She has not been accounted for. Everyone has their tales.

I say thankyou to the member for Parramatta in particular. I had just put my wife on a plane to New York to go and work in the region. The member for Parramatta rang me—I was overseas—to let me know what had occurred. That is what it is all about in this place: people taking care of each other.

The member for Sturt rang me as well. At 2 o’clock in the morning, one certainly frets, but the fact is that everyone sends their heartfelt message out to those who have been affected. We think not of ourselves but of others, and that is what matters. In particular, to the families of those two young Australian women who are unaccounted for, and the families of all the other Australians and the more than 5,000 people who are dead as a result of this terrible action, we all send our most sincere condolences.

Mr SPEAKER (7.30 p.m.)—Friends, I rise simply to identify all of those on both sides of the House who have not had an opportunity to speak in this debate on the motion. I indicate to the House that the member for Calare wrote to me, saying that he would be absent and that he wanted to be associated with these remarks. I know that he is by no means alone and that we all want our American friends, our Australian friends and our friends around the world who have suffered in this awful tragedy to know that every member of this House wants to be identified with the sentiments expressed by all members, particularly by the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition. We want to pass on to our American friends particularly the sense of solidarity we feel with them and express our condolences to them in this time of awful loss. I invite you to join me by indicating your assent to this motion by rising and standing for one minute’s silence.

Question resolved in the affirmative, honourable members standing in their places.

House adjourned at 7.32 p.m.

NOTICES

The following notices were given:

Mr Beazley to present a bill for an act to establish the Australian Coast Guard, and for related purposes.

Mr Beazley to present a bill for an act to amend the Corporations Law and the Workplace Relations Act 1996, in order to develop corporate responsibility and to protect the entitlements of employees.

Mr Ruddock to present a bill for an act to excise certain Australian territory from the migration zone under the Migration Act 1958 for purposes related to unauthorised arrivals, and for other purposes.

Mr Ruddock to present a bill for an act to make consequential provisions for dealing with unauthorised arrivals in places excised from the migration zone under the Migration Act 1958 for purposes related to unauthorised arrivals, and for other purposes.

Mr Ruddock to present a bill for an act to validate the actions of the Commonwealth and others in relation to the MV Tampa and other vessels, and to provide increased powers to protect Australia’s borders, and for related purposes.
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The following answers to questions were circulated:

Transport and Regional Services Portfolio: Procurement Policies
(Question No. 2384)

Mr Sidebottom asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 1 March 2001:

(1) Is the Minister’s Department, or are agencies within the portfolio, large purchasers or consumers of office paper.
(2) How are Commonwealth procurement guidelines being adhered to by the Minister’s Department and agencies within the portfolio.
(3) What methodology or weighting criteria does the Minister’s Department and agencies use to determine the importance of the core principles which underpin the procurement guidelines, namely (a) value for money, (b) open and effective competition, (c) ethics and fair dealing, (d) accountability and reporting, (e) national competitiveness and industry development and (f) support for other Commonwealth policies.
(4) What weighting criteria are used to implement the mandatory provisions in the guidelines which state that agencies must be able to demonstrate that Australia New Zealand (ANZ) suppliers have had a fair opportunity to compete.
(5) In inviting suppliers to tender for the provision of goods, are suppliers advised that they must offer ANZ goods.
(6) If the Minister’s Department or agencies within the portfolio do not have weighting criteria for determining the principles, will the Minister take steps to ensure that they provide an appropriate means to demonstrate their compliance with Commonwealth procurement policy.

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

I am advised by my department as follows:

(1) Taken collectively, the Department and portfolio agencies are low to moderate consumers of paper.
(2) Within the transport and regional services portfolio, only the Department and the National Capital Authority (“the NCA”) are required (under Regulation 8 of the Financial Management and Accountability Regulations 1997) to have regard to the Commonwealth Procurement Guidelines. Nonetheless, other major portfolio agencies, such as Airservices Australia and the Civil Aviation Safety Authority have drawn upon the Commonwealth Procurement Guidelines in the establishment of their own procurement manuals.

Both the Department’s Chief Executive Instructions and the NCA’s Financial Management and Administration Manual require officers to observe the requirements of the Commonwealth Procurement Guidelines. The Department is establishing a central contract advisory unit to oversee major procurement activity and to ensure the Commonwealth Procurement Guidelines are followed. The NCA has an administrative Tender Board which reviews, advises on and approves all tender recommendations for contracts in excess of $50,000.

(3) The Commonwealth Procurement Guidelines treat the core principles equally. Neither the Department nor the NCA weight the core principles, but do use weighting systems, dependent upon the circumstances of each procurement activity, that achieve outcomes that are consistent with the core principles. The primary focus is on achieving value for money, consistent with the other core principles.

(4) See answer to question 3. It should be noted that procurement by the Department and the NCA is generally sourced from within Australia and New Zealand.

(5) In the case of the Department, not normally, but in appropriate procurement activities such a course of action would be taken. In the case of the NCA, no.

(6) Both the Department and the NCA currently have regard to the Commonwealth Procurement Guidelines, which do not require weightings.
Second Sydney Airport: Location  
(Question No. 2414)

Mr Murphy asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 1 March 2001:

(1) Further to the answer to question No. 2046 (Hansard, 27 February 2001, page 21302), during the then Minister for Transport and Regional Services’ second reading speech in the House of Representatives on the Airports Bill 1996 was it stated that (a) no sales Sydney (Kingsford-Smith) Airport (KSA) should occur until all environmental impact statements processes were completed and the future of Sydney West Airport resolved, (b) the Government was determined not to sell Sydney Mascot and Sydney West Airport until such time as the environmental impact studies have been satisfactorily completed and decisions made in relation to that and (c) the Government would not be putting on the market Sydney Mascot and Sydney West Airports until such time as the election commitment made by the former shadow Minister for Aviation, Senator Parer and reiterated by the Prime Minister was fulfilled.

(2) Is the primary purpose of the Airports Act, in light of the then Minister for Transport's second reading speech, not to sell KSA until the future of Sydney West Airport is resolved.

(3) Following, and as a result of the environmental impact assessment conducted for Badgery’s Creek and Holsworthy sites, does Sydney West Airport mean the Badgery’s Creek proposal.

(4) When will Sydney West Airport at Badgery’s Creek be built.

(5) In respect to part (1) of his answer to question 2046, does the 13 December 2000 announcement mean that, for the purposes of the Environment Protection (Impact of Proposals) Act (a) the proposal of Sydney West Airport located at Badgery’s Creek is thereby withdrawn by the proponent, (b) the proposal has been officially withdrawn by the proponent, (c) the withdrawal has been officially issued in writing by the proponent to the Minister for the Environment in the prescribed manner, (d) the withdrawal, in light of his announcement made on 13 December 2000, means that there is currently no proposal for Sydney West Airport before the Minister for the Environment.

Mr Howard—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) (a), (b) and (c) The Second Reading Speech by the then Minister for Transport and Regional Development on the Airports Bill 1996 reiterated the Government’s election commitments relating to the issue of aircraft noise in Sydney, including that: Sydney and Sydney West would be withdrawn from the airport leasing process until there was a solution to the aircraft noise issues there; the east west runway was reopened; and a full EIS was undertaken on Sydney West Airport.

(2) The Airports Act contains no provisions in relation to the timing for the sale of Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport.

(3) The Government announced that it will retain ownership of the Badgerys Creek site and will legislate to protect the site from incompatible development in surrounding areas.

(4) In December 2000, the Government announced that it would be premature to build a second major airport in Sydney, and that it would further review Sydney’s airport needs in 2005.

(5) (a), (b), (c) and (d) The Government’s position on the Second Sydney Airport Proposal at Badgerys Creek was made clear in its announcement of 13 December 2000 on Sydney’s future airport needs.

Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport: Sale  
(Question No. 2415)

Mr Murphy asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 1 March 2001:

(1) Has his attention been drawn to a media article on 27 February 2001 in the Australian Financial Review by Mr Steve Lewis titled “Airport sale may have to wait for poll”.

(2) Will he furnish a copy of the terms of reference to Salomon Smith Barney in respect to the proposed sale of Sydney (Kingsford-Smith) Airport (KSA).

(3) Will he furnish a copy of the scoping study prepared by Salomon Smith Barney in respect to the proposed sale of KSA.

(4) How is a proposed sale of 25% of KSA consistent with section 18 of the Airports Act.
(5) How can a partial sale or lease of KSA be part leased in light of the provisions of sections 11 to 22 inclusive of the Act.

(6) Is the paramount consideration on a decision for the construction of Sydney West Airport the ability to cope with increasing aircraft traffic until the end of the decade, in light of his statement of 13 December 2000.

(7) Is the capacity of Sydney Airport consistent with the aims expressed in the second reading speech of the Airports Bill 1996 in which the then Minister for Transport indicated that solving Sydney’s aircraft noise problem was the paramount consideration prior to sale of KSA.

(8) Have terms of reference for Bankstown, Hoxton Park and Camden Airports also been issued; if so, to whom.

(9) Are there overseas airport operators interested in the purchase of KSA; if so, who.

Mr Howard—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) (2) and (3) In relation to the matters raised in the article, the Sydney Airports Scoping Study and its terms of reference are confidential as they contain commercially sensitive material, the release of which could damage the Commonwealth’s interests.

(4) and (5) Following its consideration of the scoping study report into the sale of Sydney Airports Corporation Limited (SACL), the Commonwealth Government has decided to sell Sydney (Kingsford-Smith) Airport (KSA) by a 100% trade sale to be completed in the second half of this year.

(6) The Government announced in December 2000 that it had concluded that it would be premature to build a second major airport for Sydney. It would be under-utilised for many years. The Government will further review Sydney’s airport needs in 2005.

(7) The Government has addressed the aircraft noise issue by providing for a substantially more equitable sharing of noise compared with the arrangements in place prior to March 1996.

(8) On 29 March 2001 the Government announced that following consideration of the scoping study report into the sale of SACL that the other Sydney basin airports at Bankstown, Camden and Hoxton Park will be sold by a 100% trade sale in the second half of 2002. No terms of reference for the sale have been issued.

(9) An invitation to Register an Expression of Interest to bid for KSA was advertised in the Australian press on 23 April 2001. Responses to that invitation are confidential. This is a requirement of the rules of the sale process.

Age Pension: Pharmaceutical Allowance
(Question No. 2537)

Mr McClelland asked the Minister representing the Minister for Family and Community Services, upon notice, on 22 May 2001:

(1) Is the pharmaceutical allowance paid to a couple who are in receipt of an aged pension less than the accumulative value of the allowance as paid to single pensioners.

(2) How does the Government justify that calculation when medication is prescribed to individuals rather than to couples.

Mr Anthony—The Minister for Family and Community Services has provided the following answer to the honourable member’s question:

(1) No, the rate of Pharmaceutical Allowance for Aged Pensioners is $5.80 per fortnight for singles and couples combined. Both singles and couples (families) receive a total of $150.80 Pharmaceutical Allowance a year.

(2) Pensioner couples receive the same amount of Pharmaceutical Allowance ($5.80 per fortnight) shared between them as a single pensioner. This is because of the way the Allowance interacts with the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme (PBS) safety net. The PBS has been designed so that the greatest subsidy is given to those with chronic illness or greatest financial need, while ensuring that all consumers’ out of pocket prescription costs are limited by a safety net. The fact that the same safety net applies to single people as well as families, reflects the aim to have a straightforward system.
Single pensioners, pensioner couples and pensioners with children all receive the same amount of Pharmaceutical Allowance and all receive free pharmaceuticals after they reach the same safety net threshold. In pensioner couple families, half the Pharmaceutical Allowance is paid to each member provided that each is a pensioner (or older long term allowee).

Generally, for concession cardholders, PBS medicines cost only $3.50 a script. However, once a cardholder or his/her partner or family has purchased a combined total of 52 PBS prescriptions in any calendar year, the rest are free for that year.

**Job Network: Selection Criteria for Providers**

(Question No. 2550)

**Dr Lawrence** asked the Minister for Employment Services, upon notice, on 22 May 2001:

In relation to the purchasing of Job Network Services, will he explain the formula used for calculating a provider’s “Q” or quality rating number, including the criteria used and the weighting given to each criterion.

**Mr Brough**—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

Tenderers responding to the Job Network Services Request for Tender issued on 11 June 1999 were required to address three selection criteria for each service they tendered to deliver. The selection criteria were:

1. Demonstrated capacity to deliver outcomes for (the particular service) eligible clients in the labour market for which they are tendering; weighted 55%
2. Effective methods to deliver assistance for (the particular service) to the client group in the labour market for which they are tendering; weighted 30%, and
3. Demonstrated capacity to operate in a similar environment to Job Network; weighted 15%. The Department assessed and rated each criterion. A single quality score for each labour market region tendered was calculated by combining the individual scores for each criterion in proportion to the designated weighting.

**Airservices Australia: Terminal Control Units**

(Question No. 2560)

**Mr Martin Ferguson** asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 22 May 2001:

1. With respect to the feasibility study into the consolidation of Terminal Control Units (TCUs) by Airservices Australia, (a) when will the study into the technical and logistical issues associated with the possible consolidation of TCUs, including a cost and benefit analysis, be completed and (b) will the report be made public: if not why not.
2. When did the study commence on the feasibility of consolidating the remote TCUs at Sydney, Adelaide, Perth and Cairns into the major control centres at Melbourne and Brisbane.
3. As part of the initial feasibility study, was his Department and office involved: if so what was the advice from his Department and office about the consolidation of the Sydney, Adelaide, Perth and Cairns TCUs and if consultation did take place, on what date did it occur and what was the nature of the consultation.
4. When and how did he advise Airservices Australia that the Government did not want to proceed with the consolidation of the Cairns TCU, and what was the basis of the Governments justification in giving this advice.
5. Given the decision to instruct Airservices Australia not to proceed with the consolidation of the Cairns TCU, why hasn’t the Government given Airservices Australia a similar instruction not to proceed with the consolidation of the Sydney, Adelaide and Perth TCUs.

**Mr Anderson**—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

1. (a) The feasibility study was completed in January 2001 and has been placed on the Airservices Australia intranet site with access by Airservices Australia staff. (b) The study is an internal working document and it is therefore not appropriate to publicly release it. It has been provided to all staff and relevant unions.
2. The study commenced in August 2000.
(3) Neither my Office or my Department was consulted during the initial feasibility study.

(4) On 13 February 2001, I advised the Chief Executive Officer of Airservices Australia that the proposal to close the Cairns TCU was inconsistent with the Government’s decision that there would be no further withdrawals of Commonwealth services from regional Australia.

(5) The Sydney, Adelaide and Perth TCUs are not affected by the threshold issue of the Government’s overarching policy on regional Australia. Airservices is continuing to consider a range of issues associated with the possible consolidation of its TCUs. Airservices has advised that safety of operations and consideration of the potential impact on stakeholders will be paramount in this process. It is only after this work has been completed that the matter will be considered further to determine whether the project should progress.

Melbourne Airport: Noise
(Question No. 2644)

Dr Theophanous asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 5 June 2001:

(1) Is he aware that there has been a substantial increase in flights over residential areas as a result of increased air-traffic at Melbourne Airport.

(2) Is he aware that a significant number of these flights are between 11pm and 6am, a period which is under curfew at Sydney and Adelaide Airports.

(3) Is he aware that many residents have complained about the increase in aircraft noise, as a result of the additional flights into and out of the airport, especially during the night hours.

(4) Is one reason for the increased flights over residential areas the very large increase in the use of the southern route of the north-south runway at Melbourne Airport.

(5) Is one reason for the increase the inadequacy of the east-west runway, which has been declared too short for many large aircraft.

(6) Would an extension of the east-west runway mean that there would be fewer landings and take-offs on the north-south runway, and therefore a significantly reduced noise problem for residential areas.

(7) In light of the planned and predicted increase in flights into Melbourne Airport over the next few years, will the Government act to deal with this problem by giving a high priority to the extension to the east-west runway at Melbourne Airport so that it can reduce the number of flights over residential areas.

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) Airservices Australia has advised that Melbourne Airport has experienced traffic growth in the last twelve months from some 40000 movements during the first quarter of 2000, to some 45000 movements during the first quarter of 2001. While the Preferred Flight Path arrangements associated with the Melbourne Noise Abatement Procedures have been maintained, this growth has inevitably resulted in an increase in flights over areas of Melbourne.

(2) Airservices Australia has advised that night activity numbers for Melbourne Airport between the hours of 11pm and 6am were 3949 for the first quarter of 2000 and 3865 for the first quarter of 2001. Melbourne Airport was designed to operate on a 24 hour basis. There are land use management arrangements in place around the Airport; noise abatement procedures which aim to minimise aircraft noise impacts and there is a consultative committee which provides a forum for a range of stakeholders.

(3) Airservices Australia has advised that comparative quarterly complaint figures to the Melbourne Noise Enquiry Unit on Melbourne Airport activity shows 29 enquiries in the first quarter of 2000, and 26 in the first quarter of 2001.

(4) Airservices Australia has advised that the answer to the question is no. Runway usage is subject to prevailing weather conditions and aircraft operational requirements. Both impact upon the use of preferred runways as defined in the Melbourne Airport Noise Abatement Procedures.
Comparative quarterly runway usage statistics for arrivals on Runway 34 (from the south) and departures on Runway 16 (to the south), expressed as a percentage of total movements, were as follows for the first quarter of 2000, and for the first quarter of 2001:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st qtr 2000</th>
<th>1st qtr 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arr 34</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dep 16</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) Airservices Australia’s advice is that the prevailing wind essentially determines runway direction but some heavy long-haul aircraft have an operational requirement to use the north/south runway.

(6) Airservices Australia has advised that a longer east/west runway could increase its utilisation by departing heavy long-haul aircraft.

(7) A decision to build extensions to runways or construction of new runways is a matter for the private operators of the airport. Any such proposal would, of course, be subject to the requirements of the Airports Act 1996.

Civil Aviation Safety Authority: Corporate Governance
(Question No. 2646)

Mr Martin Ferguson asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 6 June 2001:

(1) What guidelines were established for the interaction of the Civil Aviation Safety Authority Board and management following the briefing from Professor McNamara of Bond University on the respective roles of the Board and the Chief Executive of public sector companies and authorities and the interaction between the two.

(2) Was his office or Department consulted in the finalisation of these guidelines; if so, (a) to what extent and (b) did he approve them.

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

The Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) has provided the following advice:

(1) and (2) The question appears to relate to a corporate governance seminar specifically organised for Board members and held at Bond University on 16 April 1999, which covered a variety of issues including the interaction between the Board and the Chief Executive. Professor McNamara of Bond University acted as a presenter/facilitator and arranged the seminar, but other presenters/facilitators were also involved.

The principal documentation resulting from the seminar was a comprehensive Board Manual, which specifies the role and responsibilities of the Board, and supports the Board’s commitment to best practice in Corporate Governance.

Other developments resulting from the seminar included a fully revised Charter for the Board Audit Committee and development of a set of Board Expenditure guidelines.

As such these are matters that quite properly lie within the Corporate Governance responsibilities of the CASA Board under the Civil Aviation Act 1988 and CASA’s Corporate Plan.

Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport: Sale
(Question No. 2656)

Mr Murphy asked the Minister for Finance and Administration, upon notice, on 6 June 2001:

(1) Further to part (1) of his reply to question no. 2374 (Hansard, 4 June 2001, page 26114), will he table a copy of the advice from Salomon Smith Barney and Freehills, if not, why not.

(2) Further to part (3) of this reply to question No.2374, will he furnish a copy of those provisions that ensure the lease of Sydney Airport and Sydney West Airport are either the same company or subsidiaries of the same company; if not, why not.

Mr Fahey—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) Consistent with the practices relating to the deliberations of Cabinet, the Sydney Airport Scoping Study (which included this advice) is confidential.
I am advised that the effect of Part 2 Division 3 of the Airports Act 1996 is that, if an airport lease is granted for Sydney West Airport, the airport lessee companies for Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport and Sydney West Airport be wholly owned subsidiaries of the same holding company. The provisions are contained in the legislation, not the airport lease.

Sydney Basin Airports: Sale
(Question No. 2658)

Mr Murphy asked the Minister for Finance and Administration, upon notice, on 6 June 2001:

(1) Further to part (2) of his reply to question No. 2436 (Hansard, 4 June 2001, page 26114) and the answer of the Minister for Transport and Regional Services to part (2) of question No. 2307 (Hansard, 23 May 2001, page 25926), (a) has the Long Term Operating Plan (LTOP) not been fully implemented, (b) has the number of houses now requiring insulation from increased aircraft noise resulting from management changes increased the number of noise insulation project eligible households and (c) was the environmental assessment of 1995 for the second Sydney Airport wholly defective in light of the two-site selection of Badgerys Creek and Holsworthy.

(2) Further to part (3) of his reply to question No. 2436, have the two preconditions not been satisfied; if so, should his answer have been “no”.

(3) Further to part (4) of his reply to question No. 2436 and in light of the Minister for Transport and Regional Service’s answer to question No. 2307, will the scoping study advisers, Salomon Smith Barney and Freehills, be briefed in respect of the fact that the LTOP, the environmental insulation program and the size, capacity and location of Sydney West Airport have not been determined.

(4) If these preconditions have not been met, is the sale of the Sydney basin airports not in conformance with the Government’s election promises and second reading speech to the House in the Airports Bill 1996.

Mr Fahey—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) This question should be directed to the Minister for Transport and Regional Services as he has portfolio responsibility for this matter.

(2) The preconditions set by the Government for the commencement of the sale of Sydney Airport have been satisfied.

(3) The Government’s advisers for the sale of Sydney airport have been appropriately briefed on issues relevant to the sale.

(4) See answer to (2).

Airports: Privatisation
(Question No. 2659)

Mr Murphy asked the Minister for Finance and Administration, upon notice, on 6 June 2001:

(1) In light of reports in the Australian Financial Review during May 2001, have all airports that have been privatised been financially successful.

(2) Have any airports reported losses since privatisation; if so, what are those losses.

(3) What is the maximum economic rent for the land within Sydney Airport’s boundary.

(4) Is its maximum economic rent as residential redevelopment and would it give a value many times higher than the anticipated proceeds from privatisation of the Airport; if not, why not.

(5) What are the economic grounds of privatising the airport for less than what the 886 hectares of bayside real estate is worth as residential or industrial re-development.

(6) Have any international airports been successfully relocated to new sites and the original airport sites re-developed as residential areas; if so, which airports.

(7) Has he previously asserted that newer aircraft are becoming so quiet as to make noise problems around urban airports a non-issue in the future.

(8) Is the Sydney Airport Noise levy $3.60 per passenger, and not $3.40 per passenger.
(9) Is every passenger arriving at Sydney Airport charged this levy; if not, what exceptions exist to waive the levy.

(10) Did community groups concerned with noise and air toxic impacts outside the airport boundary who participated in the Government’s workshops in 1999 unanimously reject the Draft Sydney Airport Environment Strategy because (a) it failed to provide a strategy for dealing with environmental and health impacts outside the airport boundary and (b) the Master Plan, when requested by these groups at the initial workshop, was withheld.

(11) Has Sydney Airports Corporation Limited (SACL), during any of its visits to regional NSW, ever claimed to any regional NSW Member of Parliament that without the removal of the legislated 80 movements per hour cap at Sydney Airport, access for regional airlines to Sydney Airport would be in jeopardy; if so, who are those Members of Parliament and when were those statements made.

(12) Is he able to identify the risks associated with future expansion of Sydney Airport; if so, has he disclosed those risks to interested parties involved in the due diligence process of the privatisation of Sydney Airport; if not, why not.

(13) What notice, if any, has he provided to potential bidders for Sydney Airport and to advisers to the bidders for Sydney Airport regarding future potential risk of profit erosion that may occur should public pressure for world class environmental protection cause the Government to curtail aviation operations or road traffic congestion at Sydney Airport; if not, why not.

(14) Has his attention been drawn to SACL’s document titled “Sydney Airport Australia’s International Gateway teachers and students booklets – Human Society and Its Environment Curriculum support materials Stage 3”; if so, (a) are there omissions and inaccuracies in the document and (b) will he withdraw it from all Sydney schools on the grounds that the material contains inaccurate material; if not, why not.

Mr Fahey—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) Financial information on the leased airports can be found from the relevant financial statements in the annual reports where available.

(2) See answer to question 1.

(3) This is a hypothetical question since the Commonwealth is selling Sydney Airport through the sale of the shares in Sydney Airports Corporation Limited (SACL), the airport lessee company for the Airport. The lease for the Airport, which was granted in June 1998, is for a period of 50 years with an option to renew for a further 49 years. The Commonwealth will retain ownership of the land and SACL is required, under the provisions of the Airports Act 1996 and the lease, to continue operating the Airport as an airport for the period of the lease.

(4) See answer to question 3.

(4) See answer to question 3.

(6) The Department of Transport and Regional Services has advised that no Australian international airports have been relocated in this way and the Department of Transport and Regional Services has not conducted the research necessary to establish whether the former sites of those foreign international airports that have been relocated, have been redeveloped for residential purposes.

(7) The Department of Transport and Regional Services has advised that the International Civil Aviation Organisation, of which Australia is a member, establishes noise standards for aircraft. These standards have increasingly become more stringent since the 1970s.

(8) and (9) The Department of Transport and Regional Services has advised that the Aircraft Noise Levy at Sydney Airport is levied on operators of jet aircraft landing at the Airport. This levy applies whether the aircraft are carrying passengers or not. The amount payable per landing depends on the noise characteristics of the aircraft concerned.

(10) (a) The Sydney Airport Environment Strategy, developed in accordance with the requirements of the Airports Act 1996, incorporates management measures for minimising pollution at the airport site. Environmental and health impacts outside the airport boundary are subject to other Commonwealth and State legislation and are not within the scope of the Environment Strategy. (b) There is no current approved master plan for Sydney Airport.
(11) I am not aware of any such claims. The Government has reaffirmed its commitment to the existing operating arrangements at Sydney Airport in its announcement of the sale of Sydney Airport. The curfew and the 80 movements per hour cap will remain in place. As well access for regional airlines will continue to be guaranteed via the Slot Management Scheme.

(12) The new owner of Sydney Airport is required to comply with the airport lease. Any future obligations are for the commercial judgement of the new owner.

(13) See answer to question 12.

(14) No.

(14)(a) See answer to question 14.

(14)(b) See answer to question 14.

Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport: Risk Analysis
(Question No. 2663)

Mr Murphy asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 7 June 2001:

(1) Further to his response to question No. 2311 (Hansard, 22 May 2001, page 25772), is the risk of being killed in an aircraft crash in the order of 4.5 chances per million per year for fare paying passengers as testified by Professor Jean Cross on 22 September 1995 to the Senate Select Committee on Aircraft Noise in Sydney.

(2) Since March 1996, how many times has he publicly stated concern for the safety of fare paying airline passengers.

(3) Did Professor Cross testify to the 1995 Senate Select Committee on Aircraft Noise in Sydney that aircraft crash risk for some residents in 2010 was forecast by Kinhills in the Third Runway EIS to be around 100 in one million, or more than 20 times higher than the risk for fare paying passengers, and twice as high as he advised in his response to question No. 2311.

(4) What is the most recent aircraft crash risk analysis for Sydney Airport for the year 2010 and on what number of aircraft movements and mix of aircraft types is that aircraft crash risk analysis based.

(5) Has a risk analysis been undertaken to assess the aircraft crash risk to residents on the ground associated with aircraft movements at Sydney Airport in excess of 353 900 movements per annum.

(6) Has a risk analysis been undertaken to assess the aircraft crash risk to residents on the ground for risk associated with changing the aircraft mixes at Sydney Airport and Bankstown Airport.

(7) How many times since March 1996 has he publicly stated concern for the safety of residents living under the flight paths of Sydney Airports parallel runways.

(8) Is (a) the risk of aircraft crash for residents living close to the airport not separate from, but in addition to, the risk of being killed in a road accident and (b) road traffic congestion associated with Sydney Airport and Port Botany disproportionately heavy in Sydneys inner western suburbs.

(9) Will the risk of aircraft crash for residents rise with small aircraft being moved out of Sydney Airport, and aircraft traffic increasing over time up to the maximum operational capacity of the two existing parallel runways; if so, by how much.

(10) What risk assessment studies have been undertaken to assess whether the introduction of small jets at Bankstown Airport would compromise the operational safety over residential areas around Sydney Airport and Bankstown Airport; if so, (a) what are the names of those studies and (b) will he table these studies in the House.

(11) Have any military aircraft joy rides been proposed to operate out of Bankstown Airport; if so, will he provide details in the House; if so, when.

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) to (10) The specific risk analysis data requested by the Honourable Member is not available. The Government is committed to ensuring that the highest priority is placed on aviation safety. No changes will be made to the operating arrangements at Sydney or Bankstown Airports unless all safety standards are fully complied with.
The Australian Fighter Flight Centre operates joy rides in ex-military Strikemaster aircraft out of Bankstown Airport.

**Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport: Noise**

(Question No. 2671)

Mr Murphy asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 7 June 2001:

(1) Further to his response to part (1) of question 2309 (Hansard, 24 May 2001, page 26023), has the Sydney Airport Noise Insulation Project complied in full with the Australian Standard for Aircraft Noise AS2021, and has the projected increase in airport capacity been reflected in a review of noise contours and hence those eligible for the noise insulation project.

(2) Will he provide a capacity forecast specifically for Sydney Airport in 2010, taking into account the implications of the removal of small aircraft from Sydney Airport.

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) The issue of compliance with Australian Standard AS2021-2000 is addressed in my reply to other parts of question 2309 (Hansard, 24 May 2001, page 26023). The boundaries for eligibility for insulation under the Sydney Airport Noise Amelioration Program were reviewed in May 1997 to reflect anticipated noise exposure for the airport based on the Australian Noise Exposure Concepts associated with the Long Term Operating Plan. Since that time boundaries have been reviewed on the basis of noise exposure reflected in annual Australian Noise Exposure Index maps for the Airport.

(2) The Government has guaranteed regional access to Sydney Airport through arrangements under the Slot Management Scheme and I am not prepared to provide a forecast based on a hypothetical example.

See also my answer to part (a) of the honourable member’s Question No. 2493.

**Great Barrier Reef: Commercial Coral Collection**

(Question No. 2676)

Mr Murphy asked the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 7 June 2001:

(1) Is the Coral Fishery on the Great Barrier Reef to be closed; if so, what (a) consultation has been undertaken with interested parties and (b) impact will the closure of the Coral Fishery have on jobs in that industry.

(2) Is the impact of the aquarium trade on the Great Barrier Reef minimal.

(3) What is the impact on the health of the Great Barrier Reef from cyclones, soil run-off, freighters and tourists.

(4) Do marine aquarium hobbyists contribute significantly to the viability of the Great Barrier Reef.

(5) Is a significant level of research and education undertaken by marine aquarium hobbyists.

Mr Truss—The Minister for the Environment and Heritage has provided the following answer to the honourable member’s question:

(1) Yes. The commercial collection of coral on the Great Barrier Reef is to be phased out.

(a) The determination that commercial coral collection is an ‘inappropriate activity in the World Heritage Area’, was discussed on 8-9 March 2001 at the Management Advisory Committee that Queensland established to provide advice on its “Harvest Fisheries”. There are two commercial coral collector representatives on this Management Advisory Committee, both were present at the March meeting.

The matter was also discussed at the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority’s Fisheries Reef Advisory Committee on 29-30 March 2001. A commercial coral collector is a member of this advisory committee.

(b) There are 36 collectors with licences/permits to harvest coral in Queensland. These collectors employ people to assist in collection and in managing the husbandry of the live collected coral prior to its despatch to market destinations within Australia.
I have asked for advice on how to phase out the commercial collection of coral in a sensitive manner and over a reasonable period of time so as to minimise any adverse economic impacts.

(2) The commercial extraction of coral by hammer and chisel is not consistent with the environmental values for which the Great Barrier Reef is listed under the World Heritage Convention.

(3) The physical impact on the health of the Great Barrier Reef from cyclones, soil run-off, freighters and tourists are as follows:

**Cyclones**
Cyclones can cause significant disturbances to the marine environment through physical wave action on reefs and shallow systems and fringing mangroves. Significant cyclonic impacts are generally site specific. If the system is healthy, recovery is usually relatively rapid.

**Sediment and nutrients and pesticides**
Fifteen years of research has shown that water quality in the near shore regions of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area (GBRWHA) is declining due to polluted runoff from the Great Barrier Reef Catchment (GBR Catchment).

This pollution results in declines in coral growth, survival and recruitment and can impact on the health of seagrasses. Pesticides (eg. diuron) have also been found in sediments at levels that can be detrimental to seagrasses.

Blubber samples from 29 dugongs carcasses stranded along Queensland coast revealed organochlorine residues in 21 of the dugongs. These findings are of concern given the implications of these compounds to immunological and reproductive abnormalities and failure. Octachlorinated dioxin concentrations were also found to be highly concentrated in dugong fat tissue compared with marine mammals elsewhere.

**Shipping**
Shipping operations present two forms of risk to the GBRWHA. These are:

- **Pollution derived from normal ship operations:**
  The normal operation of a ship leads to number of different waste products that can impact upon the marine environment. These wastes include oil, chemicals, sewage, garbage, toxic compounds released from anti-fouling paints (such as TBT) and ballast water. There is potential for exotic marine pests to be translocated in ballast water or through hull fouling. In general terms the impacts tend to be greatest in areas where shipping is concentrated at offshore anchorages and around berths in ports, although discharges of oil and garbage have the potential to cause impacts some distance from the point of discharge.

- **Pollution and environmental damage as a result of shipping accidents:**
  The poor navigation, operation or maintenance of ships can lead to grounding, collision, and mechanical or structural failure of a vessel. These forms of maritime accidents can lead to direct damage to coral reef structure and the spilling of fuel and/or cargo. The impacts resulting from these events tend to be acute and may be long lasting depending upon the type of pollutant.

Between 1985 and 2001 there have been 20 groundings in the Great Barrier Reef. Damage assessments were conducted on fourteen of these incidents and all had substantial reefal damage in the area of impact. At least two of these groundings were not on coral reefs.

**Tourism**
Marine tourism has expanded significantly in the last twenty years with improvements in transport and technology. Tourism in the GBR is primarily located in the Cairns and Witsunday Areas, which account for 90% of visitation to the Reef. Tourism impacts tends to be site specific associated with direct coral damage from infrastructure and visitor activities.

Evidence from the impacts from tourism varies between sites. At many sites these impacts are minor and recovery is swift. Where tourism has contributed to significant localised coral damage at popular anchorages in the Whitsundays, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority/Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service has instigated a system of public moorings and no anchoring areas to minimise anchor related damage.

(4) No.
Mr Price asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 7 June 2001:

(1) What is the definition of Roads of National Significance.
(2) What criteria are used to choose between different projects involving Roads of National Significance.

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) and (2) The Government funds a program of Roads of National Importance. The guidelines for the program indicate that Roads of National Importance will promote regional and national development by: (a) encouraging inter-regional and international trade in goods and services; (b) improving national competitiveness by maximising transport efficiency and reliability; and (c) allowing for quick adjustments to the pattern and nature of trade in response to emerging national and international opportunities.

In choosing between projects the Government considers the merits of the particular project, the level of funding available and the needs of the communities affected.

Civil Aviation Safety Authority: Licensed Aircraft Maintenance Engineers

Mr Martin Ferguson asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 19 June 2001:

Further to the answer to question No. 1143 (Hansard, 9 May 2000, page 16097) regarding licensed aircraft maintenance engineers, (a) what is the current extent of the shortage of licensed aircraft maintenance engineers, (b) what is the status of any measures taken or in train to redress this shortage and (c) are there any plans to facilitate importing licensed aircraft maintenance engineers, including making it easier to have overseas qualifications recognised in Australia; if so, (i) what is the detail of this proposal and (ii) when will it be issued for public discussion?

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(a) There is a recognised shortage of licensed aircraft maintenance engineers (LAMEs) in Australia, including regional areas, and also overseas. In Australia there are currently approximately 5800 LAMEs compared to 4500 in 1990. The increase has not kept up with the increase in activity in the aviation industry. In fact the ratio between the LAME and the aircraft fleet changed from 2:1 in 1970 to 1:2 in 1990, and this trend has continued since 1990.

The Department of Employment, Workplace Relations and Small Business (DEWRSB) prepares skill shortage assessments of most, albeit not all, trade occupations on an annual basis. Aircraft maintenance engineers were not included in the year 2000 assessments, but have been included in the 2001 program. Information on the current status of shortages for LAMEs is not available, but DEWRSB will be able to provide such information late in 2001.

(b) Considerable work has already been done to restructure the training framework for LAMEs and other aviation maintenance personnel to align it with the Vocational Education and Training National Competency Based Framework. The Australian National Training Authority (ANTA), the Manufacturing, Engineering and Related Services Industry Training Advisory Body (MERSITAB), the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) and the aviation industry have undertaken a major overhaul and modernisation of the training syllabus for aeroskills, ie. aviation maintenance skills. The new structure will provide progressive Certificate and Diploma status for aviation maintenance personnel.

At the same time CASA, in close consultation with the aviation industry, is drafting new Civil Aviation Safety Regulations (CASRs) covering requirements for issuing maintenance personnel licences (CASR Part 66) and requirements for maintenance training organisations (CASR Part 147). The new training structure will align with the CASR requirements.

The new CASRs will harmonise with international standards and practices, including the US Federal Aviation Regulations (FARs) and the European Joint Aviation Requirements (JARs).
Under the National Industry Skills Initiative announced by Dr David Kemp, Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs, in late 1999, an Engineering Skills Task Force was established. A sub-committee of the Task Force is developing an Action Plan to provide strategies to address the shortage of LAMEs and other aviation maintenance personnel, including ways to address skill shortages.

The Federal Government will also be spending $4.1 million over four years to expand aircraft engineer training in regional Australia by supporting the development of a new aircraft engineering college at Tamworth Airport, called the Australasian-Pacific Aeronautical College.

(c) The current Civil Aviation Regulations (CARs) provide for the recognition of equivalent licences issued by a competent foreign authority. This provision will continue under the new CASRs. The new regulations will be circulated under a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) in October 2001. Following acceptance of the proposal, the regulation should be in place by 2002. Also see (b).

Where possible, Trades Recognition Australia (TRA) has assisted in the quick turnaround of applications for the assessment of aircraft maintenance engineers for migration purposes.

Telstra: Advertising Costs

(Question No. 2710)

Mr Gibbons asked the Minister representing the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts, upon notice, on 20 June 2001:

(1) What is the total cost associated with the Telstra advertising which has appeared in media in the Bendigo district in June 2001 under the heading “We’re making a big investment in Bendigo” and which claims that Telstra Country Wide in Bendigo is “here to stay”.

(2) In what media in the Bendigo district is advertising being run and on what dates.

(3) Did the Minister authorise Telstra to approve Telstra Country Wide to state that Telstra Country Wide in Bendigo is here to stay.

(4) Does the Government intend to fully privatise Telstra in 2003 if re-elected; if so, on what basis can Telstra guarantee that any of its operations in Bendigo or elsewhere would be here to stay under full privatisation.

(5) In what other regional centres is similar advertising being run by Telstra and what is the cost in each case and in total.

(6) If similar advertising is not being run in other regional centres, why is Bendigo alone being targeted.

(7) How many Telstra staff were employed in (a) Bendigo and (b) the Loddon Mallee region (i) when the Government took office in March 1996 and (b) June 2001.

Mr McGauran—The Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts has provided the following answer to the honourable member’s question:

based on advice from Telstra:

(1) Telstra regards details of its expenditure on advertising as commercial in confidence.

(2) The advertisement appeared in the Bendigo Advertiser on Wednesday 6 June, Saturday 9 June, Wednesday 13 June, Saturday 16 June and Saturday 23 June. A similar advertisement appeared on STAR FM Radio 10 times in the week commencing 3 June 2001 and 20 times each in the weeks commencing 10 June, 17 June and 24 June and on 3BO FM 10 times in the week commencing 3 June and 20 times each in the weeks commencing 10 June and 17 June.

(3) No. Telstra’s Board and management are responsible for the day to day running of Telstra’s operations.

(4) The Government is committed to not proceeding to the full privatisation of Telstra until it is satisfied that arrangements exist to deliver adequate services to all Australians. In particular, the Government’s immediate priority is to get more services into rural and regional Australia. Telstra’s statements that it intends to continue to operate in Bendigo reflect Telstra’s long-term commitment to the provision of telecommunications services to the people of Bendigo.

(5) Similar advertising has not been run in other regions.
(6) In line with Telstra Country Wide’s practice of utilizing locally based businesses where practicable, a Bendigo-based advertising contractor worked with Telstra Country Wide to develop advertising that was considered the most appropriate for the Bendigo market. Other TCW regions adopted different advertising strategies.

(7) Telstra regrets that it does not have this information available as at 1996. As at June 2001, Telstra employed 332 staff in Bendigo. Telstra advises that employment for the Loddon Mallee region is not available, however Telstra staff in the Central Victoria region, including Bendigo, at June 2001 was 548.

Second Sydney Airport: Land Acquisition
(Question No. 2713)

Mr Price asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 20 June 2001:

(1) How much of the land required for the proposed Sydney’s Second Airport at Badgerys Creek has been acquired and what has the land acquisition cost been to date.

(2) Is any land still to be acquired; if so, how much and what cost.

(3) Has there been a recent valuation of the land acquired to date, if so, when was it undertaken and what was the valuation amount.

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) The Commonwealth has acquired all of the land for the airport design described as Option A in the Environmental Impact Statement for the Second Sydney Airport Proposal at Badgerys Creek completed in 1999, except for that portion of The Northern Road which crosses the site. The Commonwealth has also acquired 12 potentially aircraft noise affected properties in the Badgerys Creek vicinity.

The expenditure by the Commonwealth on the acquisition of the land and associated improvements for airport purposes has totalled some $137 million. Negotiations on three compensation claims arising from the compulsory acquisition of properties on the site are still continuing. The cost of acquiring the 12 potentially aircraft noise affected properties was some $7.2 million.

(2) There is currently no proposal by the Commonwealth to acquire further land at Badgerys Creek for airport purposes. However, there are eight outstanding offers by the Commonwealth to acquire, on a voluntary basis, potentially aircraft noise affected properties in the Badgerys Creek vicinity. The owners of these properties have chosen not to take up the Commonwealth’s offer at this time.

(3) The most recent valuation was obtained in September 1999 for financial reporting purposes. The land and improvements at Badgerys Creek, which were acquired for possible airport purposes, were valued at $38.5 million as at 30 June 1999. This valuation was made on the basis of the land being zoned for airport use. The potentially aircraft noise affected properties acquired by the Commonwealth were valued at $4 million as at 30 June 1999 taking into account the impact of a future airport.

Sydney Basin Airports: Sale
(Question No. 2715)

Mr Murphy asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 20 June 2001:

(1) Further to part (2) of the answer to question No. 2493 (Hansard, 7 June 2001, page 27668) why is the lessee being given first right of refusal by the Commonwealth to build and operate any second major airport within 100 km from the Sydney Central Business District.

(2) Does this contractual right surrendered by the Commonwealth deny Sydney Airport aircraft noise affected residents any relief from aircraft noise emanating from that airport.

(3) Was the intention of the Sydney West Airport Environmental Impact Statement to build Sydney West Airport.

(4) Was the intention to build Sydney West Airport in part to alleviate the suffering for affected residents of aircraft noise emanating from Sydney Airport.

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
(1) Giving the new owner of Sydney Airport the first right of refusal by the Commonwealth to build and operate any second major airport within 100 kilometres of the Sydney Central Business District is intended to provide an appropriate degree of commercial certainty to the new owner in regard to the possible future development of new airport capacity in the Sydney region. It will also facilitate future compliance with the provisions in the Airports Act 1996 dealing with the issue of common ownership of Sydney Airport and Sydney West Airport.

(2) The sale arrangements for Sydney Airport will not prevent the development of a second major airport for Sydney if a future Federal Government decided that such development should proceed.

(3) The purpose of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Second Sydney Airport Proposal was to examine the potential environmental (including social and economic) implications of building and operating a domestic and international airport at Badgerys Creek. The EIS did not make recommendations on whether or not the airport should be built.

(4) The Government’s primary means of addressing the aircraft noise issues associated with Sydney Airport has been to provide for a substantially more equitable sharing of noise through the implementation of the Long Term Operating Plan and by continuing the aircraft noise insulation program.

Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport: Sale
(Question No. 2736)

Mr Murphy asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 21 June 2001:

(1) Has his attention been drawn to an article in the Australian Financial Review of 12 June 2001 titled Airport bids growth conundrum.

(2) Does the article state that the three key bidding groups for the $4 billion Sydney Airport sale will be lodging indicative bids late next month based on some 14 times earnings before interest, tax and depreciation of about $280 million; if so, does he agree with the estimates made in this statement; if not, what is his estimate of Sydney Airports earnings before tax.

(3) Does the article also state that figures contained in the information memorandum being circulated among bidders makes it clear that the two value drivers will have first right of refusal over any new airport being built in Sydney and unfettered access to 68 per cent of the airports revenue; if so, does he agree with the estimates in this statement; if not, what are the value drivers for Sydney Airports sale price.

(4) Is it expected that the growth in international passenger numbers will be as forecast in the information memorandum, that is by between 3.4 and 5.6 per cent from June 2001 to the 2016 financial year, after growing by 3.2 to 6.2 per cent over the next five years; if not, what are the correct relevant forecasts for passenger number growth at Sydney Airport.

(5) Is he able to estimate the environmental impact of this forecast growth on (a) aircraft noise from aircraft movements emanating to and from Sydney Airport and (b) the ability to implement the Long Term Operating Plan.

(6) Based on the forecast growth of Sydney Airport, must Sydney West Airport be built and operational before Sydney Airport may be leased; if not, why not.

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) Yes.

(2) and (3) It would not be appropriate for me to comment about press speculation on the amount of, or basis for, the estimated sale price for Sydney Airport.

(4) The Final Environmental Impact Statement for the second Sydney airport proposal forecast that total passenger movements (excluding international transits) into and out of the Sydney basin would grow at an average rate of 4.2 percent per year in the ten year period to 2009-10 and 2.8 percent per year from 2009-10 to 2021-22. International passengers at Sydney Airport currently make up about one third of total passengers through the Airport and therefore measures of potential growth in this sector of the market are not representative of overall demand.

(5) (a) and (b) The Long Term Operating Plan has been designed to take into account future growth at the airport. Since the main demand pressures are focussed on the peak hours, it is expected that
there will continue to be less busy periods when the noise sharing modes involving operations on the east-west runway can be used.

(6) The Government concluded that Sydney Airport will be able to handle the anticipated growth in air traffic to the end of the decade and that it would be premature to build a second major airport.

Hague Conventions
(Question No. 2743)

Mr McClelland asked the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 21 June 2001:

(1) Has any State objected to Australia’s instrument of accession to the 1973 Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Decisions relating to Maintenance Obligations, which entered into force on 1 August 1976?

(2) Will he bring up to date the information that he gave concerning conventions in the Hague Conference system in his answers to questions No. 906 (Hansard, 24 November 1999, page 12599) and No. 1009 (Hansard, 17 February 2000, page 13865)?

Mr Williams—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) No objection to Australia’s accession has been made.

(2) Australia has ratified or acceded to nine Hague Conventions. Most recently, in October 2000, Australia acceded to the Hague Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Decisions relating to Maintenance (1973).

The Attorney-General’s Department’s work on Hague Convention matters remains focussed on:

• administrative work required under Hague Conventions to which Australia is already a party (including the Convention on the Taking of Evidence Abroad (1970) and the Convention on International Child Abduction (1980));

• public consultation and participation in meetings of a Special Commission of the Hague Conference which is drafting a new Convention on Jurisdiction, Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters; and

• work with relevant Commonwealth, State and Territory agencies on ratification of three other Hague Conventions:
  • The Convention on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition, Enforcement and Cooperation in respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the Protection of Children (19 October 1996). A Bill to implement the Convention has been drafted and is being considered by a Commonwealth/State working group. The Bill may be introduced in the current sittings of the Commonwealth Parliament if drafting resources allow.
  • The Convention on the International Protection of Adults (2 October 1999). The Attorney-General’s Department has published an Issues Paper and will be consulting relevant State and Territory authorities on the question whether Australia should ratify the Convention.
  • The Convention on Service Abroad of Judicial and Extra Judicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters (2 October 1973). The Attorney-General’s Department will be consulting relevant State and Territory authorities on the question whether Australia should accede to the Convention.

Sydney (Kingsford-Smith) Airport: Sale
(Question No. 2782)

Mr McClelland asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 28 June 2001:

(1) What are the boundaries of the property which will be sold as part of the sale of Sydney (Kingsford-Smith) Airport and, in particular, do the boundaries include an area of roadway; if so, what area of roadway is included within the boundaries of the sale.

(2) Has the Government made any plans regarding the future management and use of the roadway and/or roadways.

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
(1) and (2) The current sale process for Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport involves the sale of the Government’s shares in Sydney Airports Corporation Limited (SACL). SACL holds a 50 year lease (with an option to extend for a further 49 years) for Sydney Airport which was issued by the Commonwealth in 1998. As is presently the case, the ownership of the property comprising Sydney Airport will remain with the Commonwealth after the sale of SACL.

There are a number of roads within Sydney Airport, many of which are accessible to the general public. It is presently a requirement of the lease that SACL maintains these roads to an appropriate standard. This will continue to be the case after SACL is sold.

Of particular relevance is the road known as Qantas Drive which is located on land that forms part of the Sydney Airport lease. This road is an important public thoroughfare and I have given assurances that the current access arrangements for Qantas Drive will continue when the airport is privatised. The sale arrangements for SACL will include a covenant preventing the imposition of a toll or other road charge on vehicles using Qantas Drive, or unreasonably restricting access of vehicles to Qantas Drive.

The eastern extension of the M5 Motorway, which is currently under construction, will cut across a small section of the Sydney Airport lease on the western periphery. It is proposed that this small section of the airport site will be sold to the New South Wales Roads and Traffic Authority who have responsibility for the current extension of the M5 Motorway.

Illegal Immigration: Prospect Electorate
(Question No. 2792)

Mrs Crosio asked the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, upon notice, on 6 August 2001:

(1) How many foreign citizens has his Department found working illegally in the electoral division of Prospect in (a) 1998, (b) 1999, (c) 2000 and (d) 2001.

(2) What are the names of the employers or labour providers in the electoral division of Prospect who employed foreign citizens who were not authorised to work in Australia.

(3) How many illegal workers had each employer engaged.

(4) What range of sanctions and penalties can be placed upon an employer or labour provider found to be employing illegal workers.

(5) What sanctions or penalties has the Government placed upon each of the employers and labour providers in the electoral division of Prospect who was found to be employing illegal workers.

(6) What action did his Department take with the illegal workers.

(7) Were illegal workers in the electoral division of Prospect detained and subsequently deported.

(8) In each case, was the cost to the Commonwealth of the detention and deportation recovered from the illegal worker.

(9) Following the 1999 Review of Illegal Workers in Australia, will the Government implement the three-tiered approach to sanctions and penalties for employers who engage illegal workers as outlined in recommendation 3.6 of the review.

Mr Ruddock—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1), (2), (3), (5), (6), (7) and (8) Statistical information is not available by electoral division.

(4) It is an offence under the Crimes Act 1914 to knowingly aid or abet, directly or indirectly, the commission of an offence against a law of the Commonwealth. This includes employment of illegal workers. The penalty for such an offence would accord with those set out in Section 235 of the Migration Act 1958 being a fine not exceeding $10,000.

(9) Following the Review of Illegal Workers in Australia (RIWA) report, my department conducted extensive community consultations on implementing the recommendations. These consultations revealed a lack of awareness of how to check work rights. As a result it was decided to implement the RIWA recommendations in phases.

The first phase includes measures designed to enhance employers’ and labour providers’ awareness of their obligations, and to provide support to employers and labour providers in checking
work rights and interpreting visa labels. The sanctions legislation will be implemented in the second phase.

**Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport: Curfew**

(Question No. 2805)

Mr Murphy asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 6 August 2001:

1. Has he read an article that appeared on page three of *The Australian Financial Review* dated 4 July 2001 titled “Sydney Airport offers in the air.”

2. Is his Department considering a recommendation to alter the current curfew times for Sydney Airport to 12 a.m. to 6 a.m.; if so, can he furnish particulars of any proposed legislative amendments to the curfew legislation currently in force for Sydney Airport; if not, why not.

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

1. Yes.
2. No.

**Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport: Additional Runways**

(Question No. 2806)

Mr Murphy asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 6 August 2001:

1. Has he read an article that appeared on page 18 of *The Australian Financial Review* dated 20 July 2001 titled “Airport gets pick of three plans”.

2. Are there three plans for extra runways at Sydney Airport; if so, what are those plans and will he table copies of these plans in the House.

3. Is one of the plans to construct two further parallel north-south runways starting on Botany Bays southern shore just north of an area of preserved sand dunes and running parallel to a spit known as Towra Point; if so, will he furnish details; if not, why not.

4. What will be the aircraft movement capacity for Sydney Airport if the plan by Dr Bill Bradfield for the IAC Aviation Consultancy is introduced at Sydney Airport.

5. Will he support the Bradfield Plan proposals; if so, why.

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

1. Yes.
2. to (5) The Government has no plans to construct additional runways at Sydney Airport.

**Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport: Additional Runways**

(Question No. 2807)

Mr Murphy asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 6 August 2001


2. Is there a proposal to increase the number of runways at Sydney Airport; if so, what are the details.

3. What impact will the permissible expansion of the number of runways at Sydney Airport have on the sale price of Sydney Airport.

4. What impact will the decision to permit extra runways to be constructed at Sydney Airport have on the timing and likelihood of the construction of Sydney West Airport.

5. Is the proposal for extra runways to be included in lease or sale of Sydney Airport; if so, why.

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

1. Yes.
2. to (5) I refer the Honourable Member to my answer to question No. 2806.
Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport: Long-Term Operating Plan
(Question No. 2808)

Mr Murphy asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 6 August 2001:

(1) Further to the answer to part (1) of question No. 2600 (Hansard, 28 June 2001, page 27325), (a) does this confirm that the aggregate number of air traffic movements to the north of Sydney Airport (27.3%) is more than 60% additional air traffic movements than Sydney Airports Long Term Operating Plans (LTOP) target of 17% of total movements to the north and (b) can the 17% target of air traffic movements to the north of Sydney Airport be achieved; if so, how; if not, why not.

(2) Further to the answer to part (2) of question No. 2600, will he table a copy of the advice from Airservices Australia that Bankstown Airport operations can be configured so they will not be an impediment to the implementation of the remaining elements of the LTOP such as the trident and power-off approaches; if not, why not.

(3) Further to the answer to part (2) of question No. 2600, (a) when he refers to the Environment and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 does he mean the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act 1999, (b) can he define what necessary clearances means, (c) can he define precisely what provisions of the EPBC Act will apply to provide the necessary clearances; if so, what does this laypersons term mean in respect of the statutory provisions of the Act, (d) when will these matters be referred to the Minister for Environment and Heritage in accordance with the requirements of the legislation, (e) does the decision of the Government on 13 December 2000 to use Bankstown Airport as an overflow airport for Sydney Airport constitute an action that triggers the provisions of the EPBC Act and (f) does the act of redesigning the airspace trigger the provisions of the EPBC Act; if so, what are those provisions.

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) (a) Over the 12 month period July 2000 to July 2001 27.5% of total movements at Sydney Airport were to the north.

(b) I refer the Honourable Member to my answer to part (3) of question No. 2442.

(2) I refer the Honourable Member to my answer to part (2) of question No. 2600.

(3) (a) to (f) The Government’s decision on Sydney’s future airport needs specifically refers to making Bankstown Airport available as an overflow airport for Sydney. When a detailed proposal for upgrading Bankstown Airport is put forward by a future owner of the Airport this will need to be referred to the Environment Minister if the nature of the proposal triggers the statutory requirements for referral laid down in the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act 1999.

Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport: Sale
(Question No. 2809)

Mr Murphy asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 6 August 2001:

(1) What grants or other payments were made to employer organisations by the department or any of its agencies in the 1997-98 financial year.

(2) In each case: (a) what was the purpose of the grant or other payment; (b) what was the actual value of the grant or other payment; and (c) was the grant or other payment made as a result of an application from the organisation.

(3) If the grant or other payment was made in response to an application from the organisation, in each case: (a) how was that application assessed; and (b) who approved the application.

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) (a) to (c) The adoption or implementation of a new or substantially amended plan for aviation airspace management involving aircraft operations that has or will have or is likely to have a signifi-
cantly impact on the environment will be considered under the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 as and when required.

(2) A master plan is not commercial-in-confidence. In addition to the consultation requirements set out in the Airports Act 1996 for the preparation of a master plan, the airport lessee must, within 90 days of the Minister’s approval:

- publish a notice in the newspaper stating that the master plan has been approved, that copies of the plan are available for inspection and purchase by members of the public during normal office hours while the plan is in force and specify where the plan is available for inspection and purchase;
- make the master plan available for inspection and purchase as notified in the newspaper.

(3) Any actions that trigger the provisions of the Airports Act 1996 and the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Act 1999 will be assessed as and when required.

Sri Lanka: Ambassador to Australia
(Question No. 2811)

Mr Murphy asked the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 6 August 2001:
Further to part (8) of his answer to question No. 2737, (Hansard, 9 August 2001, page 29669) can the Minister say why the appointment of Major-General Janaka Perera as Sri Lankan Ambassador to Australia is acceptable to the Australian Government; if not, why not.

Mr Downer—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
As I stated in Parliament on 18 June 2001, this appointment was carefully considered and this did not establish any basis from which the Australian Government could challenge the Sri Lankan Government’s advice that his is a worthy and suitable appointment.

Veterans: Gold Card
(Question No. 2818)

Mr Murphy asked the Minister for Veterans’ Affairs, upon notice, on 6 August 2001:
Will he grant a Gold Card to servicewomen who were members of the Women’s Australian Air Force during World War II; if not why not.

Mr Bruce Scott—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
Under the Veterans’ Entitlements Act 1986 (VEA) Australian servicewomen and servicemen have equal access to compensation and health care benefits. Eligibility criteria for World War II veterans is dependent upon qualifying service in Australia’s Defence Force (ADF) between 3 September 1939 and 29 October 1945 and the age of the veteran and not the arm of the ADF in which the service was rendered.

Ex-members of the Women’s Australian Air Force are eligible for a Gold Card, providing they meet the eligibility criteria detailed in the VEA.

A Gold Card is issued to all World War II veterans of the ADF and Australia’s merchant navy who:

- are ex-prisoners of war; or
- served in the ADF between 3 September 1939 and 29 October 1945, who have qualifying service from this period of hostilities and who are aged 70 years and over; or
- receive a disability pension at or above 100% of the general rate; or
- received a disability pension for pulmonary tuberculosis before 2 November 1978.

Government policy on qualifying service has been in place since the 1930s. Under the former Repatriation Act 1920 and then the VEA, qualifying service has always meant that the person served in a theatre of war or has incurred danger from actual combat with hostile forces of the enemy. It is appropriate that those who served under these conditions should be given priority care.

The Government recognises that many veterans were willing to serve anywhere but did not have a choice as to where they were sent. It also gratefully acknowledges the service provided by World War II veterans of Australia’s Defence Forces without qualifying service.
These veterans can still be granted a Gold Card in circumstances where their individual level of war-caused disability is such that the issue of a Gold Card is warranted. Many of them have been issued with Gold Card because they are in receipt of disability pension at or above 100% of the general rate, or at the special rate (Totally and Permanently Incapacitated) or are in receipt of Extreme Disablement Adjustment.

Alternatively, a White Card may be issued to these veterans to provide medical treatment for accepted specific war-caused disabilities.

**Hoxton Park Airport**

(Question No. 2825)

Mr Latham asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 6 August 2001:

In the Governments lease arrangements for Hoxton Park Airport, what contingency provisions apply with respect to (a) the future development of Badgerys Creek International Airport which would necessitate the closure of Hoxton Park for air safety reasons and (b) future land use and zoning arrangements at the Hoxton Park site should the airport ever cease operations.

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

There are no contingency provisions with respect to (a) the future development of Badgerys Creek International Airport including any that would necessitate the closure of Hoxton Park for air safety reasons and (b) any future land use and zoning arrangements at the Hoxton Park site should the airport ever cease operations. The lease provides for the continued operation of Hoxton Park as an airport.

**Education: Wesley College Satellite Campus**

(Question No. 2828)

Mr Latham asked the Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs, upon notice, on 6 August 2001:

(1) Is he aware of the proposed partnership between the Shire of Boddington, Boddington State School and Wesley College in the development of campuses in Boddington, WA.

(2) What support will the Government provide to this project.

(3) What discussions has he had with the WA Minister for Education to ensure Federal and State co-operation in the development of the project.

Dr Kemp—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) I am aware that Wesley College is considering establishing a satellite campus in Boddington and my office has recently responded to a letter from Mr Peter Bradbrook, Chief Executive Officer, Shire of Boddington about the matter. I have also personally responded to an enquiry on this matter from the Hon Judi Moylan MP, Member for Pearce.

(2) As an independent school, Wesley College is free to establish a new campus. In regard to support from the Commonwealth, Wesley College is currently in receipt of Commonwealth General Recurrent Grants (GRG) funding for eligible students at its existing South Perth location. If it wished to seek GRG funding for students attending a new location at Boddington, it would need to apply to the Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs for approval.

The main requirement for Commonwealth approval for GRG funding is that the campus is recognised by the Western Australian Minister for Education for the level(s) of education and location(s) for which Commonwealth funding is sought.

In regard to capital funding, non-government schools such as Wesley College are eligible to apply for funding under the Capital Grants Programme. The Commonwealth does not provide grants directly to schools for capital projects. For non-government schools, it provides block grants to block grant authorities (BGAs) in each State and Territory. If Wesley College wants to pursue capital funding for the project, the school should contact the Association of Independent Schools of Western Australia (AISWA) Capital Grant Association for information about the application procedures for Commonwealth capital funds.

(3) To date, my Department has not received any correspondence from the WA Minister for Education on this matter.
Government Departments: Frequent Flyer Points
(Question No. 2829)

Mr Martin Ferguson asked the Minister for Finance and Administration, upon notice, on 6 August 2001:

(1) What Departments and/or agencies have or will have their frequent flyer points suppressed and with which airline companies has this occurred.

(2) As a result of the suppression of frequent flyer points, what savings will Departments and/or agencies make.

Mr Fahey—The Minister for Finance and Administration has supplied the following answer to the honourable member’s question:

(1) There is no central register for frequent flyer points. It is the responsibility of each Department/Agency to manage its own frequent flyer programs.

(2) Not applicable.

Roads: Casula and Campbelltown Ramps
(Question No. 2842)

Mr Latham asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 8 August 2001:

(1) Further to the answer to question No. 1907 (Hansard, 6 November 2000, page 22254), has he now received the Campbelltown Ramps Study.

(2) What progress has been made in implementing the findings of the Study.

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) No.

(2) The Government will consider the findings of the study when it comes to hand.

Education: Student Nurses
(Question No. 2851)

Mr Murphy asked the Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs, upon notice, on 8 August 2001:

Further to the answer to part (2) of question No. 2752 (Hansard, 6 August 2001, page 29227), will he initiate a separate study to assess the impact of HECS on student nurse enrolments.

Dr Kemp—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

My response to Parliamentary Question 2752 advised that the National Review of Nursing Education will report in early 2002. Any recommendations from the Review, including any it may make about the impact of HECS, and subsequent courses of action will be considered once the results of the Review are available.

Education: Languages Other Than English
(Question No. 2853)

Dr Theophanous asked the Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs, upon notice, on 8 August 2001:

(1) Is participation by young Australians in the learning of languages other than English a critical issue for Australia’s cultural and economic development.

(2) Should the Government do everything possible to encourage the teaching of languages other than English, especially facilitating the teaching of children from non-English backgrounds in the languages of their original heritage.

(3) Has the teaching of languages other than English at universities been seriously cut back, with more than 100 positions in language teaching disappearing in the past 5 years.

(4) Is Federal funding for the teaching of some community languages in Saturday-schools and afternoon-schools being increasingly constrained.
(5) Have the total points given for the knowledge of community languages in some States, such as Victoria, been drastically reduced, and does this discourage children of non-English speaking backgrounds from pursuing the study of the language of their background.

(6) Have languages in Victoria, such as Turkish and Croatian, had the allocation reduced from 250 points to 100 points for the VCE.

(7) What is his response to the above issues, and what does he intend to do to promote second-language learning in Australia.

Dr Kemp—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) The participation by young Australians in Languages Other Than English (LOTE) programmes is indeed an important consideration in Australia’s cultural and economic development. LOTE is one of the eight key learning areas in the National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-First Century. It is an area of considerable national significance, which impacts on Australia’s economic competitiveness in the global market and contributes to social cohesion throughout our multilingual and multicultural community. It is an area of education to which the Commonwealth makes a substantial contribution.

(2) The Commonwealth’s commitment to languages education is marked by the significant investment it makes through the School Languages Programme. In 2001 this amounts to approximately $50 million consisting of:

• $20 million under the LOTE element; and
• $30 million under the National Asian Languages and Studies in Australian Schools (NALSAS) Strategy.

The LOTE element of the Schools Languages Programme supports the study of languages in schools and in after hours ethnic schools. Its objective is to assist schools and school communities to improve the learning of languages other than English. LOTE element funds are paid to education authorities in the States and Territories who then allocate the funds as strategically as possible.

Under LOTE element funding education authorities provide support for community language programmes in insertion programmes in schools and in after hours ethnic schools. The purpose in funding community language programmes is to maintain the languages and cultures of students from a language background other than English and to increase students’ awareness and understanding of those languages and cultures.

The second component of the School Languages Programme, the NALSAS Strategy, aims to improve Australia’s capacity and preparedness to interact internationally, in particular, with key Asian countries. It is a collaborative initiative of Commonwealth, State and Territory governments. The Strategy assists government and non-government schools to improve participation and proficiency levels in language learning in four targeted Asian languages – Japanese, Chinese (Mandarin), Indonesian and Korean – and to develop Asian studies content in key learning areas.

(3) The Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs does not collect data on university staff numbers at the disciplinary level. Student load in the ‘Languages other than English’ discipline, however, has declined by 876 Equivalent Full-Time Student Units (EFTSU) (from 9,811 to 8,935) between 1996 and 2000.

(4) There has been no reduction in the level of Federal funding for the School Languages Programme. There have been some administrative changes to provide additional flexibility for education authorities in the use of funds. The States Grants (Primary and Secondary Education Assistance) Act 2001-2004 combined funding for the former Community Languages and Priority Languages elements into the Languages other than English (LOTE) element of the school languages programme. For the last four years education authorities have had the capacity to move funds between the two elements under broadbanding provisions. The rationale for simplifying Commonwealth control over inputs was to provide more flexibility for jurisdictions to allocate funds so that decisions about the most strategic use of funds are made as close to the ground as possible. Ultimately, the way in which funds are allocated is a matter for education authorities in States and Territories.

(5) Rather than being discouraged, students in Victoria are choosing to study languages in increasing numbers. Between 1997 and 2000 there has been an overall increase in the number of students
studying languages at Year 12 level – 9,232 in 2000 compared with 8,253 in 1997. Matters such as the allocation of points in the VCE are for the Victorian education authorities to determine.

(6) Education authorities have the responsibility for making decisions about their curriculum and assessment programmes. Therefore, the allocation of points for specific languages in the VCE is a matter for the Victorian education authorities.

(7) The Commonwealth actively promotes second language learning in Australia through its significant investment in the Schools Languages Programme. It recognises the educational, cultural, vocational and social benefits that learning another language brings not only to the learners themselves but also to the community as a whole. Languages education is vital in equipping young Australians with the skills and attitudes necessary to fully participate in the life of a tolerant, harmonious and outward looking multicultural Australia.

Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport: Risk Analysis

(Question No. 2856)

Mr Murphy asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 8 August 2001:

(1) Further to the answer to parts (1) and (2) of question No. 2612 (Hansard, 6 August 2001, page 29199), in light of the fact that he says that the Environmental Impact Statement for Sydney Airports Third Runway is a publicly available document, can he explain why the specific risk analysis data requested is not available.

(2) On what basis could the (a) implementation of the Precision Runway Monitoring System, (b) proposed changes to the Slots Management Scheme 1998, (c) expansion of Sydney Airport as announced by the Government on 13 December 2000 and (d) change of use of Bankstown Airport as an overflow airport as also announced on 13 December 2000 be made without any risk analysis data being available.

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) The specific risk analysis data requested by the Honourable Member in that question was for (a) installation and operation of the Precision Runway Monitoring System, (b) proposed changes to the Slots Management Scheme 1998, (c) expansion of Sydney Airport as announced by the Government on 13 December 2000 and (d) change the use of Bankstown Airport as an overflow airport as also announced on 13 December 2000.

Chapter 25 of the Environmental Impact Statement for Sydney Airports Third Runway, completed in September 1990, contains risk analysis information on Sydney Airport operations at the time.

(2) The Government is committed to ensuring that the highest priority is placed on aviation safety. No changes will be made to the operating arrangements at Sydney or Bankstown Airports unless all safety standards are fully complied with.

Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport: Long-Term Operating Plan

(Question No. 2857)

Mr Murphy asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 8 August 2001:

(1) Further to the answer to part (1) of question No. 2714 (Hansard, 6 August 2001, page 29220) are aircraft movements to the north of Sydney Airport still in the order of 60% higher than the Long Term Operating Plan (LTOP) target of 17%.

(2) Further to the answer to parts (6) and (7) of question No. 2714 and in light of his answer to part (2) which says the aggregate movements of aircraft to the north of Sydney Airport up until 31 May is 29.4%, when compared to the LTOP target of 17% for aircraft movements to the north, is he in error when he asserts that the LTOP has been substantially implemented.

(3) What does substantial implementation mean in light of the facts on aircraft movements for Sydney Airport.

(4) Further to the answer to parts (5) and (8) of question No. 2714 when will he direct Airservices Australia to cease its practice of mere historical reporting on the implementation of the LTOP and direct it to implement true project management scheduling including a declaration of the LTOP
implementation date, as repeatedly requested by resolutions passed at the Sydney Airport Community Forum meetings; if not, why not.

**Mr Anderson**—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
(1) Yes.
(2) No.
(3) and (4) I refer the Honourable Member to my answer to parts (6) and (7) of question No. 2714.

**Citizenship: Dual**

(Question No. 2862)

**Dr Theophanous** asked the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, upon notice, on 9 August 2001:
(1) When will the dual citizenship bill be introduced into Parliament.
(2) When will he announce specific details of this bill.
(3) Given that the bill will not be retrospective, how will this affect persons who already have another nationality as well as being Australian citizens.
(4) How will this bill affect the question of Australian citizens being able to travel on non-Australian passports into, and out of, Australia.

**Mr Ruddock**—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
(1) The Australian Citizenship Legislation Amendment Bill 2001, which includes provision for repeal of s17 of the Australian Citizenship Act 1948, was introduced into Parliament on Thursday, 23 August 2001.
(2) Details of the Bill are contained in the Explanatory Memorandum tabled in Parliament when the Bill was introduced.
(3) Australian citizens who already possess another citizenship will not be affected by this Bill. The legislative changes will benefit those adult Australian citizens who acquire another citizenship after the new law comes into effect.
(4) The Bill will not affect documentation arrangements for entry to and departure from Australia.

**Australian Customs Service: Ms Bev Newberry**

(Question No. 2872)

**Mr Kerr** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice and Customs, upon notice, on 21 August 2001:
(1) On Tuesday, 14 August 2001, did Mr Nick Arthur, Regional Director (Tas) of the Australian Customs Service meet with Ms Bev Newberry, the Master of the yacht Half Moon.
(2) At that meeting, was Ms Newberry told by Mr Arthur that a former employee of Customs, Mr Rex Cox, no longer stood by assertions to the effect that Mr Cox had left Ms Newberry with the expectation or assumption that an extension to her stay could be negotiated if necessary.
(3) Will the Minister seek from Mr Cox a direct statement of the representations that Mr Cox made to Ms Newberry.
(4) If what Ms Newberry was told by Mr Arthur is false, will the Minister explain (a) how these circumstances have come to exist and (b) why Ms Newberry has been placed in a situation where Customs has failed and will not stand behind what she was advised by Mr Cox.

**Mr Williams**—The Minister for Justice and Customs has provided the following answer to the honourable member’s question:
(1) Yes. Mr Arthur met with Ms Newberry on Tuesday 14 August 2001.
(2) Mr Arthur told Ms Newberry that Mr Cox had advised him that no assurance was given that an extension to her Cruising Permit would be automatically granted.
(3) No. Mr Cox provided a Statutory Declaration on Monday 6 August 2001 in which he declared “I did not give an assurance that any extension would be automatically granted.”
(4) As Mr Arthur did not tell Ms Newberry anything false this question is not applicable.
Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport: Long-Term Operating Plan
(Question No. 2879)

Mr Murphy asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 7 August 2001:

(1) Further to the answer to part (2) of question No. 2716 (Hansard, 20 August 2001, page 29772), notwithstanding his answer that the lease of the Airport will have no effect on the Direction given to Airservices Australia by the then Minister for Transport and Regional Development in July 1997 to implement Long Term Operating Plan (LTOP), will Airservices Australia be unable to implement the LTOP if it should be found that the Direction cannot be fulfilled due to operational constraints posed by the lease for Sydney Airport.

(2) What guarantee can he give that the LTOP can be achieved in light of commercial interests seeking to maximise aircraft movements at Sydney Airport.

Mr Anderson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) and (2) The implementation of LTOP will not be affected by the sale of Sydney Airport. The current airport lease between the Commonwealth and the Sydney Airports Corporation Limited contains no reference to the LTOP and it is not envisaged that this will change after the sale.

Occupational Health and Safety: International Labour Organisation Conventions
(Question No. 2883)

Mr Bevis asked the Minister for Employment, Workplace Relations and Small Business, upon notice on, 21 August 2001:

(1) Further to the answer to question No. 2350 (Hansard, 29 March 2001, page 26101), have there been any legislative developments in either State or Territory jurisdictions regarding the ILO Conventions referred to in that question.

(2) What are the names and qualifications of the delegates to the 13th Asian Regional Meeting of the ILO to be held in Bangkok on 28-31 August 2001.

Mr Abbott—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) The ILO Conventions referred to in question No. 2350 are: (a) C139 Occupational Cancer, 1974; (b) C148 Working Environment (Air Pollution, Noise and Vibration), 1977; (c) C155 Occupational Safety and Health, 1981; (d) C162 Asbestos, 1986; (e) C167 Safety and Health in Construction, 1988; (f) C170 Chemicals, 1990; (g) C174 Prevention of Major Industrial Accidents, 1993; and (h) C176 Safety and Health in Mines, 1995.

My department has not been advised of legislative developments in any State or Territory jurisdiction regarding these Conventions.

(2) The delegates to the 13th Asian Regional Meeting are:

Mr Rex Hoy, Group Manager, Workplace Relations Policy and Legal Group, Department of Employment, Workplace Relations and Small Business
Mr Phil Drever, Assistant Secretary, Labour Relations Policy Branch, Department of Employment, Workplace Relations and Small Business
Mr Bryan Noakes, Executive Director, Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry
Mr Bill Mansfield, Assistant Secretary, Australian Council of Trade Unions.

(Question No. 2885)

Mr Latham asked the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 22 August 2001:

In the vote on the Draft Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage in Paris between 2 and 7 July 2001, which countries (a) voted in favour, (b) voted against and (c) abstained from voting.

Mr Downer—The answer to the honourable member’s questions is as follows:
In the vote on the Draft Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage in Paris between 2 and 7 July 2001, the countries that:

(a) voted in favour numbered 49 in total. The vote was taken by a show of hands, however, the UNESCO Secretariat did not take a complete list of countries voting in favour. The UNESCO Secretariat did note the following countries who were amongst the 49 countries that voted in favour: Australia, Canada, Indonesia, Denmark, Egypt, Spain, Japan, Bangladesh, Belgium, Belize, Brazil, Colombia, Croatia, Finland, Italy, Libya, Mexico, Mozambique, Namibia, Panama, Philippines, Tanzania, Thailand, Tunisia, Uruguay, Viet Nam.

(b) voted against were Norway, the Russian Federation, Turkey and Venezuela;

(c) abstained were Chile, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, The Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

Human Rights: United Nations Global Compact
(Question No. 2886)

Mr Latham asked the Minister for Employment, Workplace Relations and Small Business, upon notice, on 21 August 2001:

(1) Is the Minister aware of the United Nations Global Compact that requires governments and corporations to support the protection of human rights, the right of workers to bargain collectively, the elimination of forced labour, the abolition of child labour, ending workplace discrimination, the promotion of environmental responsibility and the encouragement of environmentally friendly technologies.

(2) Is the Minister aware of the decision of Melbourne City Council to join the Global Compact and require corporations tendering for Council contracts to comply with the Compact's terms and conditions.

(3) Will the Federal Government also join the Compact and require corporations receiving Federal subsidies, import protection and tax concessions to comply with its terms and conditions.

(4) If not, what action is the Government taking to ensure that companies meet their proper social, labour and environmental responsibilities in return for Federal financial assistance.

Mr Abbott—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) The Government is aware that the Global Compact is a United Nations Initiative to promote good practices by corporations based on nine principles drawn from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Labour Organisation’s Declaration on Fundamental Principles on Rights at Work and the Rio Principles on Environment and Development. These principles include those listed by the honourable member.

The Government is also aware that participation in the initiative is a matter for businesses rather than governments, as its purpose is to promote global corporate social responsibility.

(2) to (4) These matters are not the responsibility of my portfolio.

Higher Education: European Convention
(Question No. 2889)

Mr Latham asked the Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs, upon notice, 22 August 2001:

(1) Further to his answer to question No. 2382 (Hansard, 2 March 1998, page 142), was the Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region adopted at Lisbon on 11 April 1997 signed under the auspices of the Council of Europe and UNESCO.

(2) Did the Convention enter into force on 1 February 1999.

(3) Was the Convention signed for Australia, subject to ratification, on 20 September 2000.

(4) On what dates, in what circumstances and with what results were letters sent to the relevant State and Territory Ministers following signature.

(5) What countries have ratified the Convention.

(6) What is the timetable for Australia to ratify the convention.
**Dr Kemp**—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

1. The Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region was negotiated under the auspices of the Council of Europe (CoE) and United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO). It was adopted at an international diplomatic conference in Lisbon, Portugal, on 11 April 1997.

2. The Convention came into effect on 1 February 1999, following the deposit of the fifth instrument of ratification.

3. The Convention was signed for Australia, subject to ratification, in Paris on 19 September 2000 by Mr Paul Cowan, Deputy Permanent Delegate of Australia to UNESCO. (It was 20 September 2000 in Australia at the time when the Convention was signed, which may have been the source of some confusion about the date in the past.)

4. The Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs (DETYA) undertook an extensive process of consultation with the Australian States and Territories and also with the higher education sector, both prior to the adoption of the Convention and before Australia signed it. DETYA has not however undertaken any further consultation with the States and Territories on this matter since the signing of the Convention.

5. The Convention has been ratified by Austria, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Georgia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Moldova, Norway, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland and Ukraine. Canada, Israel, Italy and the United States of America, like Australia, have signed the Convention but have not as yet ratified it.

6. DETYA proposes to table the proposed treaty action for ratification at the first tabling opportunity in 2002.

**Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport: Long-Term Operating Plan**

(Question No. 2898)

**Mr Murphy** asked the Minister for Transport and Regional Services, upon notice, on 23 August 2001:

1. Under the Long Term Operating Plan (LTOP) for Sydney Airport, are the air traffic movement targets to the north 17% of movements and to the west 15% of movements, respectively.

2. Do the latest Sydney Airport Operational Statistics to 31 May 2001 provided by Airservices Australia reveal air traffic movements to the north are running at 33.1% and to the west 6.1%.

3. Does he stand by his reply to part (4) of my question No. 2751 (Hansard 20 August 2001, page 29776) that the LTOP has been substantially implemented with the exception of a small number of elements; if so, why.

4. In light of the statistics referred to in part (2), when will the LTOP target of 17% aircraft movements to the north be achieved.

5. Will he direct Airservices Australia to fully implement the LTOP before the lease of Sydney Airport is sold; if not, why not.

**Mr Anderson**—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Yes, there are only a relatively few elements of the overall Plan to be implemented.

4. I refer the Honourable Member to my answer to part (3) of question No. 2442.

5. The implementation of LTOP will not be affected by the sale of Sydney Airport.

**National Estate Register: Essendon Airport**

(Question No. 2899)

**Mr Kelvin Thomson** asked the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 28 August 2001:

1. Who initiated the request for parts of Essendon Airport to be listed on the National Estate Register.
How was the request considered prior to the Australian Heritage Commission report concerning the application.

Mr Truss—The Minister for the Environment and Heritage has provided the following answer to the honourable member’s question:

1. The assessment process was initiated by staff of the Commission under a Commission policy of, inter alia, giving priority to the heritage assessment of Commonwealth owned property.

2. Staff assessment commenced in May 2001 and draft official documentation was considered by the Historic Environment Sub-committee of the Commission on 18 June 2001. On 19 June 2001, the full Commission considered and agreed to the sub-committee's recommendations concerning the supporting documentation and boundary of the heritage area and to publicly propose the entry of the airport in the Register of the National Estate.
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